

REALTIME FILE

CAA-City Council Meeting

December 6, 2021

6:30pm ET

CART CAPTIONING PROVIDED BY:
ALTERNATIVE COMMUNICATION SERVICES, LLC
www.CaptionFamily.com

* * * * *

This is being provided in a rough-draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings

* * * * *

[Gavel]

>>> Good evening, everyone.

Welcome to the December 6 meeting of the Ann Arbor city council.

If you're able, please rise and join us for a moment of silence followed by the pledge of allegiance.

[Silence]

>> I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

And to the republic for which it stands, one nation, indivisible with liberty and justice for all.

Would our Clerk please call the roll of council.

>> Councilmember Beaudry: Councilmember Hayner.

Council member.

>> Here.

>> Council member Disch.

>> Here in Ann Arbor.

>> Council member Griswold.

>> Here, Ann Arbor.

>> Council member Song.

>> Here, Ann Arbor.

>> Council member Grand.

>> Here in Ann Arbor.

>> Councilmember Radina: Mayor Taylor.
>> Here in Ann Arbor.
>> Councilmember Beaudry: Mayor Taylor?
>>.
>> Mayor Taylor: I am still in Ann Arbor.
>> Councilmember Beaudry: Council member Nelson?
>>.
>> Councilmember Nelson: Here in Ann Arbor.
>> Council member Briggs?
>> Councilmember Briggs: Here in Ann Arbor.
>> Councilmember Ramlawi.
>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Present.
>> Excellent.
Motion.
Seconded.
Discussion, please, of the agenda.
All in favor.
Opposed.
The agenda is approved.
We have communications today from our city administrator.
>> No, sir, we don't.
>> Thank you.
We now have an introduction from the Chair of the independent community police oversight commission, Dr. Lisa Jackson.
Dr. Jackson.
>> Mayor, I do not see Dr. Jackson on the call.
If she's on under a different name, if she could raise her hand.
>> Dr. Jackson, will you raise your hand by entering star-9.
Star-9.
If she rolls on in --
>> Councilmember Beaudry: I do not see her.
>> All right.
If she rolls in, please let me know, if you would.
>> I have her now.
>> Oh, excellent.
>> She'll be joining us in just a second.
>> Super.
Thank you.
>> Councilmember Beaudry: Test.
>> Good afternoon, my apologies, or good evening, my apologies for keeping you all waiting.
>> Oh, no worries.
It's all you.
Thank you for coming.
>> Thank you for having me.
And for those of you that don't know me, I'm Lisa Jackson and I'm the chair of the

community police oversight commission.

Last month I spoke before this body about the concept of radical imagination that we should allow ourselves to recognize the possibilities created by considering seemingly impractical ideas before limiting ourselves with our real constraints.

Today I'd like to continue that conversation by speaking about what it takes to get buy-in for radical imagination at an institutional level.

This past April, the City approved a resolution directing the City administrator's office to establish a program or to produce a report outlining the impediments to establishing a program, to introduce a non-police public safety response within the city.

For those listening who aren't familiar with the language of the resolution and the context behind it, this resolution has the potential to lay the groundwork for true, unarmed, nonpolice response in Ann Arbor.

Also included in the resolution was language specifically noting that this work should be done in consultation with the independent community police oversight commission.

Over the past two years, our commission has been enthusiastic about working with other agencies and institutions to improve public safety in Ann Arbor.

So we were particularly excited at the prospect of working directly with the City Administrator's office to implement the kind of substantive change the community has been asking for for years.

However, in the months that followed, we were met with silence.

We reached out to the previous City Administrator, the previous interim City Administrator, and the current interim city administrator to inquire about collaborating on this project.

And each time we were dismissed, despite stressing to them that we had access to essential information that they didn't have.

Because as collaborators, we felt it was our duty to share the expertise that we have acquired to assist them in their task.

And in the eight months that have followed since the passing of the resolution, our commission has participated in over 50 more seminars, town halls, workshops, as well as other trainings on non-police alternatives to public safety to further our expertise on the subject.

And yet this expertise will continue to be a limited value to the City of Ann Arbor and the communities within it if every collaborative effort we engage in ends in being stonewalled by our partners' disinterest.

We've got to be honest about this.

The behavior of the City Administrator's office, not dissimilar from behavior of the Ann Arbor police department's administrative department about which I have previously commented to council makes sense.

No one likes oversight.

No one's paycheck or bonus ever fends on a hearing to oversight.

No one gets a pat on the back from their boss for thinking about oversight.

And no matter how much I talk about the importance of oversight, no matter how much the activists in our community demand more accountability from our government, at the end of the day, there's no real incentive for the people working on the ground within these institutions to care about the work we do because the cultures within which they exist fundamentally do not value being held accountable.

And that's not something my commission can change.

No more than putting flashing neon lights on a floor is wet sign makes people more excited about workplace safety.

The only way people's perceptions of oversight will change is if incentives are provided that change them.

That means that in this case, the power lies in council's hands, in your hands.

For all of the resolutions proposed and public comments made, this council cannot expect attempted oversight to bear fruit if your own work doesn't extend to changing the way in which institutions over which you preside think about both public safety and community oversight as a whole.

Today is December 6.

25 days before the deadline outlined in the April resolution.

And I have no doubt that shortly after making these comments, I'll get an email from the City Administrator's office with a version of the proposal that they'll have coincidentally just finished and want our buy-in on.

And in all likelihood, we'll have to decline their request.

Not because we don't want to work together.

We do.

And we've been trying to do that.

But because when this city and its institutions think of oversight, they just think of a check box.

And I know this City deserves better than that.

Thank you.

>> Thank you, Dr. Jackson.

We have come to public comment reserve time.

It's an opportunity for members of the public to speak to council and community about matters of interest.

To speak, one needs to have signed up in advance.

Please enter the number on your screen.

That is 877-853-5247.

877-853-5247.

Once you're connected, please enter meeting ID94212732148.

94212732148.

Once you're connected further, please enter star-9.

Star 9 to indicate that you wish to speak.

Our Clerk will identify you when it is your turn to speak by the last three digits of your telephone number.

When it is your turn to speak, you will have 3 minutes in which to speak.

So please pay close attention to the time.

Our Clerk will notify you when 30 seconds are remaining and when your time is expired.

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

Our first speaker today is Lauren London.

>> Lauren London, go ahead and unmute yourself.

Lauren London, you can go ahead and speak.

>> Hi, everyone.

Can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can.

>> Hi.

Thank you so much for having me.

Sorry, I was having some problems with my microphone there.

My name is Lauren London.

I come to you this evening on behalf of the Parks Advisory Commission in which I'm privileged to sit.

I'd like to just briefly draw your attention to the resolution that PAC passed, recommending that city council include the Gallup park and trail renovation project for consideration in its award of American Rescue Plan funding.

We understand that the City is going to receive upwards of \$23 million in funding as a result of the ARP, and we think that the Gallup Park Bridge replacement and park road and trail renovation project is a great candidate for this money.

It falls into the eligibility requirements for general government services including infrastructure.

We think that it would appropriately support council's priority of providing well-maintained and sustainable transportation infrastructure across the city.

Also, the parks and recreation open space plan, which is part of the city's master plan, identifies park bridges and infrastructure improvements with a goal, and residents have continuously expressed that maintenance and widening of existing segments of the border-to-border trail is a high priority.

We think that this project will greatly improve circulation access and safety in this most popular of our parks.

Already there is a master plan and schematic design, and community engagement is under way.

So we think the project is ready to move into design engineering and could be bid as early as the latter part of 2022 and constructed as early as 2023, which is well before the 2026 ARP spending deadline.

Right now this segment is of the B-2B trail very heavy, and the trail doesn't meet current standards given its high level of use.

So the project would expand nonmotorized access to Gallup park, across the bridge, meeting current standards, and separate commuter cyclists from recreational users to improve the safety experience for everyone.

The project is scalable.

It includes two parks that can be funded and constructed in phases or concurrently together.

And it would free up, as a result, having this funded --

>> Clerk: 30 seconds.

>> -- would free up significant capital improvement funds for other park investments.

So we greatly appreciate if you'd take a look at this project for inclusion in the ARP request.

Thanks so much for having me.

>> Thank you.

Our next speaker is Karen -- pardon me -- Kevin Karpiak.

>> Clerk: Kevin Karpiak, please unmute yourself.

Kevin Karpiak, do you have a comment?

>> Hello.

Can you hear me?

[Echo]

>> Yes, we can.

We can no longer hear you if you're speaking.

>> Clerk: Mr. Karpiak, you're muted again.

>> Hello?

[Echo]

I don't know why there's echo.

>> Clerk: I think you need to turn down the volume.

>> So can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can.

>> Sorry about that.

Technical problem.

>> That's all right.

>> Hello.

So my name is Dr. Kevin Karpiak, I am a Professor of criminology at Eastern Michigan University, Director of the smart research project and a resident of Ann Arbor.

I am calling today to voice my objection to agenda item CA24, resolution to approve the collective bargaining agreement between the City of Ann Arbor and Ann Arbor police professionals assistants who are representing by the police officers association of Michigan and whose resources fall within the administrative control of Ann Arbor PD.

I object not necessarily to the content of the agreement but because of the process whereby if it had come before council which bypasses the independent community policing oversight commission.

ICPOC was created to be a forum in which members of the community could discuss issues of public safety in order to provide recommendations that could ensure better informed council decisions.

However, if it's not systematically included in that process, its potential to achieve it is undermined.

Any item city council votes on or city administration plans to make a decision on that pertains generally to public safety or specifically to Ann Arbor PD and its resources should go before ICPOC.

It is my understanding that this was not the case for CA24, nor for any other number of recent items such as on this agenda, CA23 and CA10, both of which also directly bear on the allocation of police resources.

If city council is voting on it, it pertains to public safety and the allocations of resources they're in, ICPOC should have a chance to host a public discussion of it and provide recommendations to council on it.

On a separate but related issue, I am looking forward to the report on unarmed public safety being prepared by the City Administration.

As a member of the coalition for reenvisioning our safety, a diverse coalition of community members who care deeply about transformative justice and building care-based safety in our community, I have witnessed directly the value of a community-led engagement on these issues.

This has resulted concretely in our recent proposals for how such a plan might work.

To date over 500 people have endorsed our plan.

I am greatly encouraged by the enthusiasm displayed by our community to explore an unarmed nonpolice service that could connect people to the resources they need when they need them without exposing them to additional risks.

For that reason, I do hope --

>> Clerk: 30 seconds.

>> -- it has been given a substantive role in shaping the city's recommendations as the initial resolution says it should and it will be brought before ICPOC as part of a public meeting prior to any conclusions about the feasibility of such a program being offered or decisions about how to proceed with potential program are made.

Thank you.

>> Thank you.

Our next speaker is Ralph McKee.

>> Clerk: Mr. McKee?

>> Hi, I am speaking on the mayor's appointment proposal which strips council members of certain committee assignments based on the recent Salvatore report complaint.

The report, as you know, says flat out that Nelson and Ram Wallie disclosed from a closed session and then piles on several other accusations completely dependent on that one.

The report is flawed.

I sent a detailed memo to you earlier today exposing those flaws.

I can't even list them in 3 minutes so I'll just -- actually below the belt points.

She treats her central accusation as an established fact without even mentioning that she interviewed both Ramlawi and Nelson and asked, they categorically denied it.

The only source is in her view with Tom G17 days after the council members met with him.

She didn't record the interview, describe what he said, or provide her notes.

Bellator's failure to even mention a flat denial of her accusation is inexcusable.

If she was acting as a special master in court, they would likely read her the riot act.

They say they told Mr. G what happened in open session.

And what happened there likely caused him stress and made him fear for his future.

Let's review.

His complaint says as to his relationship that Fournier, was obnoxious.

He says he went to post them on Friday, 10-1, was promised a protocol and sent his first written complaint.

On Monday he went to the same meeting and became very upset.

He felt after that he could no longer trust and September a second detailed written complaint to you.

In open session council member Griswold said the complaint was in part against Steve Postema.

Postema responded quote there is no complaint against the city attorney.

Earth to Steve.

Actually, there was.

And his statement is worse than prejudging or mischaracterizing, it's flat out denial of

reality.

Seven of you then lauded his and his staff's actions up to then without any independent investigation of why the human resources director believed a no-contact protocol was in place or why it actually wasn't.

He clearly believed that was Postema's fault but you blew off.

Then you rejected the request he made via Elizabeth Nelson's amendment and professional opinion --

>> Clerk: 30 seconds.

>> -- in favor of the city attorney's view.

I guess that high regard you had for his professional judgment when you used him to justify getting rid of Tom Crawford isn't so useful when you want to protect one of your own, Mr. Fournier who has since tweeted that the whole complaint was a complete fabrication.

The real reason our human resources director left is Fournier, Postema, his staff and you.

Look in the mirror.

The attempted blame shifting going on here is ludicrous.

Thank you.

>> Clerk: Time.

>> Thank you.

Our next speaker is Ann >> you can go ahead and unmute yourself.

>> Hello.

Can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can.

>> Okay, great.

Hello.

This is Ann Banister, former council member from Ward 1, and I'm calling tonight to raise concerns about DC4, putting the climate action millage on the May ballot before the energy commission and environmental commission have a chance to weigh in on it. I'm also raising concern about BC2, the purging of mayor Kaehler's political opponent on council from their committee appointment.

And then lastly, D2, the ordinance to amend Chapter 55 to consolidate power in the planning department and remove the requirement and opportunity for valuable public hearings before city council on important projects and proposals like the mass rezoning with CC1, Valhalla, lockwood on Jackson road, the garnet, and lower town.

In November 2019, I was the original council member who responded to Ken Garber and the students with the climate mobilization project to bring forward their petition to declare a climate emergency.

We took it to the environmental commission and ultimately city council and achieved a unanimous approval from both bodies.

In 2020, this resolution became the A20 carbon neutrality plan.

So I've been active involved in our climate action, but at this time I do not feel that it's ready to be on the ballot, and I would prefer that it be referred to the environmental commission and the energy commission for their expert feedback.

With regard to the council committee appointment, in October when Tom Wahardo, the esteemed HR director that we had searched for years to find, filed a formal complaint

against John Fournier within a few months of arrival.

I received an email from one of my African-American friends where they explained another Black man under attack upon their arrival at City Hall.

And, you know, I have to say that then when the Mayor's legal team and outside counsel investigation determined that his complaint had no merit, I found that very hard to believe.

That there was no merit there.

And Mayor Taylor, respectfully, your brand of diversity, equity, and inclusion -->> Clerk Beaudry:: 30 seconds.

>> Is not in keeping with my understanding of pre-town, and U of M has hired him to be their HR director of the museum.

So it's our loss.

And I do wish that you will see all elected city council members equally on the committee so that they can serve the citizens who elected them at the ballot box.

>> Clerk Beaudry:: Time.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Our next speaker is Elizabeth Hunter.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Ms. Hunter, phone number ending in 877.

Press star 6 to unmute your phone.

Ms. Hunter, press star 6 to unmute your phone.

>> Am I live?

>> You are audible, yes.

>> Hello?

Our new city HR director, Tom Gahardo, reported to council many instances of mistreatment by city administrator John Fournier.

I will read some examples which is on the city website.

He has engaged in blatant discrimination against me.

Mistreatment and retaliation become more prevalent as I had vocalized my objections to his willful neglect for the law as well as his intentional action to illegally manipulate and alter budget documents for the sole purpose of deceiving city council.

End of quote.

At first HR director Gahardo did not accept the job offer due to the illegal nature of the hiring process.

I will read again from the report.

At that time I formally notified city administrator Crawford and Postema of the illegal activity by Mr. Fournier.

To this date there nobody no coaching to him for his blatant violation of the law.

You will see direct evidence in this memo in which Mr. Fournier is guilty of violating both state and federal employment law 68 times.

The attached email from Mr. Fournier containing illegal commentary and questioning.

Regarding the management and treatment of executive staff, there is clear discrepancy particularly toward Persons of Color.

I have witnessed Mr. Fournier be confrontational, disrespectful and combative.

This has also been witnessed about I numerous staff members on multiple occasions.

End of quote.

The complete report is on the City website along with an investigator's report where amazingly Fournier is absolved of all of Gahardo's complaints.

The reports are indicative of the now sinking ship that we call our city government.

The captain is Christopher Taylor who is currently attempting to throw certain council members overboard.

And by the way, he is on record as not supporting EPA involvement in the Gillman Plume.

Also the investigator, Jennifer Salvatore who Taylor hired to absolve Fournier is the same one he hired to knock off City Administrator Crawford.

I'd like to end by saying I'm greatly disappointed in Attorney Postema for partnering with Taylor in the tyrannical degradation of our government.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> Thank you.

Our next speaker is Thomas Stallberg.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mr. Stallberg, phone number 534, press star 6 to unmute your phone.

Go ahead.

>> Good evening.

This is Tom Stallberg calling from Lower town in Ann Arbor.

I'd like to talk about three items.

First off the climate action millage.

I would like to see this come to us voters and I'd like to see it come when it's ready.

It is not ready.

I'm on a task force that sees into one of the items that's asked around here.

I know my task force is not ready yet.

The time spent between now and when this comes to us perhaps in November when more people are voting than special election in May, I'd like to see spent on detailing how the money will be spent including goals, deliverables, metrics, et cetera.

It simply needs to be clear enough for us to understand exactly what we're voting on for this money.

Also, I'd like to see it dovetailed with specific ATA millage increase that we know will be required in order to meet our A20 goals.

These two things are not going to happen in a vacuum from each other.

They need to happen together.

Let's know what the total ask is before we ask the voters.

Thank you.

DC2, committee appointments.

Mayor Taylor, stop playing politics.

This stuff about you going after your opponents to make it harder for them to win a re-election.

Council member Hayner was charged, convicted and sentenced by you, Mayor Taylor, and your council allies.

And now that his sentence is up, you're extending it.

That is not how an ethical democratic institution operates.

And then you're just playing more games with council members Nelson and Ramlawi.

It's we citizens, we're the ones who are being penalized by Mayor Taylor's political

actions against the city council members that are not part of his team.

This is how dictatorships work.

Not how democracies work.

I'd like to talk about item C2.

There's a lot in here, I want to focus on one element.

The removal of the requirement for city council public hearing and review of site plans, making the city planning commission the deciding body on site plans that that are by right rather than a recommending body.

There is in merit to do this and there's support for planning associations, and that could be a good policy in a vacuum, but Ann Arbor is not in such a vacuum.

We're overdue on revising our comprehensive plan.

We didn't do it because that COVID hit.

But now we're able to do things.

We've all learned as a society how to engage publicly.

It's time to get on with that, and we should not be making this change prior to revising our comprehensive plan in part because there's a whole lot of things we should have done as part of comprehensive planned revisions, even partial ones that we haven't -->> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> -- and we are out of formance with the Michigan zoning enabling act.

So if we want to talk about this as a good policy that's recommended by planning associations, there's a whole lot of things that Ann Arbor is not doing right now that would be frowned -- planning associations would frown upon what we are doing.

I want to look at one thing real quickly.

TC1, we didn't hold a comprehensive plan revision for that.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> Now we're going to take it away for 69 parcels that the city is going to mass rezone, and will never come to council ever for a site plan.

>> Our next speaker is Daniel Adams.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Daniel Adams, phone number 761.

Press star 6 to unmute your phone.

>> I can hear you.

Can you hear me okay?

>> Yes.

>> I'm calling in to talk tonight about two items.

First, resolution C2 is a badly overdue reform of the City's development approval process.

We've seen time and time again how the current site plan approval process creates opportunities for unhelpful political grandstanding or no-win litigation on buy right projects.

And so public confusion regarding council's role in approving unpopular projects.

If a project complies with prevailing zoning, the process of obtaining city review and approval for that project should be clear, cheap, and fast.

And C2 is a welcome step in that direction that will make it easier and more predictable to build Howesing in Ann Arbor.

Second I was disappointed, not surprised, to read that two members of city council may have interfered in a pending significant HR investigation by meeting with the

complainant.

I'm using May as a courtesy to these two council members despite the fact that the investigating attorney was unequivocal in her final report in her view that these events transpired and despite the fact that both members have publicly admitted through media reports that they did in fact meet with the HR director after council approved launching an investigation.

That approval occurred early in the morning of October 5.

Conducting an independent investigation free of outside influence benefits both the accused and the accuser.

To preserve that, the investigator and only the investigator should have been communicating with the complainant regarding subject matter of the investigation after October 5.

It is undisputed that that did not take place and that this meeting occurred.

So the mere act of meeting with the complainant at this time on this subject was an indefensible lapse in judgment regardless of intent.

And that's true before we even reach the more troubling allegations here.

What did these council members say?

Did they waive the attorney/client privilege that is the city's privilege alone to waive?

Did they misrepresent key facts, mislead the complainant, and actually interfere in the investigation?

As an attorney, the overheated rhetoric we've heard tonight, words like purge, dictator, and the excuses we've been subjected to regarding this obviously improper behavior are gob smacking.

We've heard that the investigating attorney who owes a duty of candor to her client lied to her client and defamed council member Nelson.

We've heard that the firm's engagement letter wasn't signed until October 6.

So any contact before that signature was somehow fair game.

And tonight we've heard a familiar group of apologists and conspiracists lies as they rose in defense of council member Hayner's indefensible use of hateful slurs to peddle rumors and substitute their factual judgments in place of an independent investigators.

These are ethically unMoored rationalizations for unacceptable behavior.

The voter -->> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> Above all else the individual complainant were owed a fair and independent investigation.

And we didn't get that here because of what these council members did.

And it's a troubling continuation of years of staff mismanagement by a now four-person political caucus, the same caucus who hired Howard Lazarus because they couldn't get along with him, the same one who voted to retain Tom Crawford despite the outcome of another recent investigation into his conduct.

Anyone who claims to care about fairness and due process ought to be incredibly troubled about what's transpired here and thus far in public comment.

Thank you.

>> Thank you.

Our next speaker is James deMoore.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mr. DeMoore, phone number ending in 411.

Press star 6 to unmute your phone.

>> Mayor Taylor, Ms. Beaudry, can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can.

>> Excellent.

Members of council, thank you.

Thank you for your hard work to make sure Tree Town meets our A20 carbon neutrality goals by 2030.

Making us once again an influential and visionary leader on environmental issues in our country.

I see DC3 and DC4 as an important step.

We need that leadership given the uncertainty of state and national action in this insane political environment right now.

That being said, I do take pause to this given that on October 18 this year, we proved the concord pine site plan and development agreement.

Please explain this.

One, how can the positive impact of 800 mature trees in our ecosystem in our A20 efforts be replaced by mitigation.

New saplings and small trees cannot be the answer.

These take decades to rebuild.

Too late in terms of the crisis now.

Two, how can the negative impact removing 800 mature trees be justified under the A20 plan and replacing them with auto-oriented, nonrenewable energy self-sufficient luxury housing as opposed to affordable housing?

This is what you approved.

It feels like this was a step backwards.

Rather than towards such important goals in community as are expressed in the A20 program.

I ask are we truly ready for this new millage?

I'm not sure we are.

And yet we deem development petition quote buy right, unquote.

Three, if an enhanced tree canopy is part of our A20 plan, how does chopping down 800 mature trees honor it?

Tonight you are going to pass C2 on first reading.

An ordinance change that removed many site plans under the planning process from council process.

Concord pines will be one of these, since they have been defined, falsely in my opinion, as a quote buy right unquote property.

With climate change a central issue and with your commitment to A20 goals, your approval of the concord pine development in October didn't make sense.

Neither does agenda item C2 this evening.

So to review, instead of fact tracking the proposal for May, I recommend as council member Nelson suggested, having the energy and environmental commission review ballot leverage in an expeditiously yet diligent matter and allow public input in the process before releasing it to the voters.

I trust their ideas and suggestions.

I also support policies that bring the public along in terms of climate change, which includes natural features protection.

D2 does not do that.

Folks, I know most of you talk a great game.

But your actions speak louder than words in terms of your actual priorities and commitments and the actions within the city.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> It is overdue time we act with integrity.

I really wonder if that is possible.

With that, I thank you for considering my remarks.

Thank you and good evening.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Greg Woodrin.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mr. Woodrin, phone number ending in 228, go ahead.

>> Hi.

Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Awesome.

Thank you so much for your time.

As stated my name is Greg Woodring, I'm the President of Ann Arbor for public power and I'm calling in to speak to the climate millage as many others have today.

Just heard a little background for those who don't know Ann Arbor Power is a local grassroots organization, proposed in many other local organizations that are fighting for a clean and publicly owned energy future.

We are trying to help push towards the A20 goal of 100% renewable energy by 2030.

And we believe that the only realistic way that we are going to achieve that goal is through the process of municipalization.

Like many of the other callers tonight, we are very interested by this millage proposal, but we are hoping to see a few more details into exactly where those funds will be going and what the plan will be with them.

The SEU report that the office of sustainability initiatives put out recently provided a very exciting pathway towards helping to achieve some of those goals.

Ann Arbor Public Power fully supports moving forward with the SEU, though we certainly hope that the city will do its due diligence to ensure that we are doing that the best way possible.

And we hope that some of these funds can be used towards helping to move towards electrifying renewably in the city as well as to increase energy efficiency.

However, we simply are not going to be able to reach our 100% renewable energy goals with local generation alone.

The A20 plan knew this.

That is why it called for the CCA plan.

CCA would allow us to execute power purchase agreements without the need for purchasing DTE's assets.

The unfortunately reality in Michigan is that CCA is illegal.

And in talks with our state representatives Robbie and Irwin, they have told us that that is unlikely to change.

We hope that the City will instead pursue municipalization as a means of executing those power purchase agreements to source renewable energy outside of the City.

Municipalization also provides many great benefits to the residents of Ann Arbor by allowing us to directly improve the reliability of our energy system, something that has been a consistent problem in Ann Arbor, especially in year.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> And will continue to become an issue as climate change progresses.

Another great aspect of municipalization is that it does not need to be a large weigh on the budget.

Instead, it actually contributes to the budget in almost every city that it's been done in.

To find the exact details of how much money municipalization would give back to the City, we would need a comprehensive feasibility study, something we hope that you will approve after the energy commission approves such a resolution.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Adam Goodman.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mr. Goodman?

>> Hi.

Good evening.

My name is Adam Goodman, and I am a resident of the Fifth Ward.

And I'm also here tonight to speak about the proposed climate millage.

To put it simply, there's no doubt that we're experiencing a climate emergency.

And last year city council, in recognition of this, adopted the ambitious A20 plan.

There's also no doubt that implementing that plan will require a significant financial commitment from our community.

As some wise people often say, the truth about a city's aspirations isn't found in its vision.

It's found in its budget.

I do think this millage is needed, and I hope you all will support it.

However, I also hope that this is not the end of the conversation on how we will fund our climate goals.

I'll give you one example.

As I'm sure you're aware, the restrictions and state laws in the Constitution, in the really only two ways to increase our City's revenue from property taxes.

We can increase the tax rate with the millage, and we can increase the tax base with new development.

Now, the A20 plan itself calls for changes to our land use in the City to enable more people to live in close proximity to the places where they work, shop, and play, to live less car dependent, more energy efficient, and frankly more joyful lives.

If we make these zoning changes and allow for lots of new car-light energy-efficient developments, then that will also add to the City's budget.

Imagine that.

We could raise money for our climate plan by implementing other parts of our climate plan.

But if we're to do that, we're not proceeding with nearly the sense of urgency that's required.

For example, ideas about transit corridor zoning have actually been called for in our comprehensive planning documents for, like, a decade, if not more.

And we're only now, at long last, proceeding with the project implement.

And in one small corner of the City.

We need to work faster here because even after we make these changes, they will take many years to show their full impact.

So, really, even in a best-case scenario, I'm pretty certain that the strategy I just described would not raise enough revenue soon enough to meet our climate goals.

So we do need this millage, but it can't be the end of the conversation.

We need to do everything we can.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Are there communications from council?

Council member Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: Thank you.

I just wanted to note two really great pieces of news.

And one was that the CDP recognized Ann Arbor as one of 95 global cities named as a new generation of climate leaders.

And on a related topic, this past Saturday, the Great Lakes Renewable Energy Association recognized Dr. Stults for an exemplary project award, and that was for the SEU, and they went -- when they gave her the award, they underscored the idea that we in Ann Arbor are doing things that can serve as models for other cities, and we are doing amazing and innovative and imaginative work.

And I thought we should all have that piece of good news to start off the meeting.

>> Mayor Taylor: Council member Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thank you, council member Disch for starting on a positive note.

I'm sorry to turn us the opposite direction.

I wanted to start with a note of condolences -- condolence to the Oxford community, to the families, the educators, the entire community there.

This was a huge loss for their community, for our state, and I just wanted to make sure that we acknowledge that here tonight, that our sympathies are with them.

And at the local level, I also wanted to just note that recently we had a very impressive community leader who passed away, Linda Diane Felt who was a strong pedestrian safety advocate.

I worked with her with Washenau, served with her on the transportation commission.

It is a big loss for our community that she is no longer here.

And with that, I'd like to point council members' sort of attention to the staff report.

Thank you, Mr. Fournier, for preparing that on winter sidewalk maintenance and just note to council that council member Grand and I met with staff last week and are coming up with a follow-up resolution on some steps that we might be able to take next. And I'm working with council member Griswold as well on that.

>> Council member Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

I just wanted to comment on a full things on our agenda that I think are exciting or noteworthy.

Lauren London with parks advisory commission did a fabulous job talking about E6 and the Gallup Park Bridge and that resolution that came from PAC.

So I won't add on to that other than to thank her.

Also related to parks is CA on our agenda, and that is renaming of Winchell park to Dr. Harold Lockett Park.

So I want to thank the committee, neighbors, staff for bringing this to our attention and look forward to the official renaming of that park.

There should be a ceremony sometime when it's warmer in the spring.

But I think that's an excellent outcome and really lays the groundwork for how we think about naming all sorts of things in our City.

I also want to thank elected officials from the county, staff from both the county and the City, different leaders of not-for-profit organizations that are serving the most vulnerable in our community, for helping us come together on CA25 which is hopefully going to provide some much-needed funding that will get us to the point where if we're going to change this model, that we can do so without interruption of key services.

So thank you to staff and electeds.

It was a really just fantastic example of collaborating, both between the City and the County, which I look forward to doing more of.

So those are my three items.

Also just want to thank all of the teachers in our schools and parents.

We know this has been a really challenging week for a lot of people.

And just want to thank the schools for the message that they sent out to us today for the work of our local law enforcement for partnering with the schools and for all the teachers who worked together to, you know, get our kids back to school today.

Thanks.

>> Council member Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: First I want to thank everyone who sent well wishes on my daughter's wedding last weekend in the Lake Tahoe area.

It was unfortunate that people from Michigan could not attend due to the pandemic.

Then on a more serious note, I am planning to bring a resolution at the next council meeting to waive privilege and confidentiality of all of the communications regarding the Gahardo compliant and the City's responses including communications with Salvatore. I think that Dan Adams's comments tonight underscore just how political this issue has become, political in a very inappropriate way.

I can tell you that what happened in terms of tonight's agenda is not a surprise to me.

I've been involved in local politics for 25 years since I started serving on the school board.

However, we have an authoritative trend that is continuing, and we have people repeating misinformation with great authority, but it's misinformation.

The result was based on -- I'm lost for words right here.

Anyway, we -- I spoke out against the first report by Ms. Salvatore.

I recommended that she not be hired again due to her lack of detail.

And we basically got the report that we paid for.

Therefore, for transparency, we need to know exactly what communications occurred between her and other staff members that led up to this very biased and embarrassing report that I believe damages the environment for our community and especially for our staff in the City of Ann Arbor.

Thank you.

>> Council member Song.

>> Councilmember Song: I'd like to give an update on Afghan refugees who are continuing to be resettled in the area.

I know folks were following that work for our GFS, 32 families were settled in Ypsilante, again, as an indication of the housing crisis that we have here and those services are big here in Ann Arbor.

But as we see families come in and out throughout the county, I hope we welcome and continue to give folks a warm welcome, for families who have escaped authoritarianism and who have experienced it firsthand.

We will be expecting hundreds more in the coming months.

I also wanted to, you know, echo councilmember Grand's comments.

The work behind making sure our social service agencies continue to have continued funding, has been ongoing for months.

And I want to thank Mr. Dohoney and a number of agencies and understanding how funding for nonprofits works in a certain cycle.

And at this time of year where donations are not even at pre-pandemic levels, I'm really glad to see that we can provide for essential services.

That's it.

So thanks for the good work.

>> Council member Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I address my community and this organization with deep sadness and a heavy heart tonight.

For the last several months there have been a series of meetings, events, and investigations that I have been responsible and judicious in my actions in my capacity as your councilmember from the Fifth Ward.

Unfortunately this evening I find myself under a dark, toxic political cloud formed not by my actions but by the actions and the intent of others in this organization and at this table.

Perhaps one can look back 15 months ago when a current sitting council member warned me that she would become a seek and destroy missile and deploy herself to those who stood in her way.

On all absolute terms, I deny the unsubstantiated allegations reported last week by investigator Jennifer Salvatore and her flawed report of complaints made by our former HR director against our former interim City administrator.

I did not compromise any privilege or confidential information from the October 4 closed session meeting.

And which has been described as to why Mr. Gahardo has left the City of Ann Arbor.

What this is about is about authorize tearian leadership.

Leadership to eliminate oversight and political dissent.

There currently is no safe space to speak.

My integrity will not be defined by a corrupt and flawed investigation, nor will I be defined by this Mayor and his majority.

The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice.

The outcome of all of this is a deep-chill factor to those in this organization, especially People of Color.

That their complaints about workplace discrimination and harassment will be judged in

an ad hoc fashion and not treated equally.

Also --

>> Council member, you're past your 2 minutes, councilmember.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Who are approached by those People of Color.

>> Council member Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks, Mr. Mayor.

I'm guessing that statement was going to be if somebody feels they're being treated in a poor way, in a way that's in compliance with state law, in a way that is, you know, offensive to them personally or discriminatory in any way, that they shouldn't feel that they can't reach out to someone.

I know a lot of times what happens with residents is by the time they get ahold of an elected official, it's because they have exhausted all of their other opportunities.

Sometimes they've already been through the courts.

They've already been through the system.

They don't know where else to turn so they turn to city council.

So it's our responsibility.

The emails and comments we've received this week about all kinds of things that, you know, we're here for a purpose as a council, and I'll remind everyone that we're here.

We've been elected to, you know, cooperate as a council on what's best for our community, and we shouldn't be doing this from a place of fear or hate or ignorance.

And Dr. Jackson's remarks were right on today yet again.

You know, we need to look inside ourselves and become the change that we want to see in the world.

It's just that simple.

And so I encourage everyone to reflect on their behaviors, as I reflect on my own behaviors.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Council member Idina.

>> Thanks.

I wasn't planning on speaking, but after hearing a number of comments from the public and from members of this table kind of questioning and impugning the integrity of the independent investigator that the City hired, I just wanted to point out that there's a reason that we as a city have hired Attorney Salvatore in cases like this over the years.

She has 24 years of legal experience working in employment and civil rights law.

She is an AV-rated lawyer, which is the highest Martindale Hubble peer-review ranking for ethics and legal ability.

And only about 10% of the attorneys in the country hold that rating.

So I think unfortunately while we've seen a continued trend where when we don't like the message we're hearing, we often turn and attack the messenger and try to discredit the messenger.

And this particular case, I think Attorney Salvatore's reputation and her integrity stand for itself.

And so I'm really disappointed to hear continued attacks on Attorney Salvatore, and that's all I really wanted to say.

I think her reputation speaks for itself.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Council member Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Thank you.

I'm similarly troubled by a lot of what I've heard here.

You know, I'm hearing a council member disparage and really slander a member of the state bar, which is -- it's just -- it continues the trend that is incredibly troubling that everything is being politicized here.

The independent investigator has been hired multiple times by the city has done excellent work, has an impeccable reputation.

And we're hearing allegations that the investigation was corrupt with no evidence whatsoever.

It's Trumpian.

It's flat-out Trumpian.

And it is so troubling to just so -- you know, carelessly, callously impugn someone's reputation like that.

Further, the concerns about whether City employees should feel safe to come forward, especially our minority employees, this -- the majority of council reacted to the Crawford investigation in a way that protected our minority employees who came forward.

And it was council member Ramlawi and others who chose to try to protect Tom Crawford, not the minority employees.

In this case the independent investigation found that there were -- there was no discrimination.

The allegations were baseless.

So I really hope that we can finally get to a place at some point where we stop politicizing City employees, stop viewing them as on our team, your team.

>> Mayor Taylor: Council member.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Thank you.

And let's get back to the business of the people.

>> Mayor Taylor: Council member Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Thank you.

I will try to be brief.

It is alarming to me that the leaders in our very liberal, progressive community have so little respect for representative democracy.

Both what it means for each individual person sitting at this table and what it means for the people who elected each of us to sit at this table.

DC2 is not serious.

It is juvenile.

And treats our local government like something straight out of high school.

All of us who are elected to be here, and some of us take this job seriously.

And some of us have memories longer than six months.

>> I'm sorry, point of order.

We were just attacked by saying that we don't take our job seriously.

>> Mayor Taylor: Council member Grand has the floor.

>> What has been offered as justification for targeting me on this agenda was somehow a virtue just six months ago.

Six months ago council members were eager to hear directly from any anonymous person who could claim to have heard anything awkward or strange from our former

City Administrator.

Some at this table loudly proclaimed how important it was to make space for any kind of complaint, allow it to be heard, and believed the victims.

This week staff get the message, your formal written complaint with documentation can be disposed easily, and after we dispose of it, a member of our City administration will publicly refer to it as a complete fabrication.

In six short months, we have shifted our posture from believing victims to calling them liars.

I do not regret taking a whistleblower seriously and responding to a desperate request for help.

I vehemently deny having said anything inappropriate in the context of a complaint that implicated our city attorney's office.

I could say a lot about double standards and hypocrisy, but I believe it would mostly fall on deaf ears.

Our community deserves better than this.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further communication from council?

I'll observe that there is a resolution to appoint Joshua Mizler, Cynthia Harrison, and Randy to the police oversight commission which I infer will be up for consideration at our next meeting.

Is that correct, council members?

With respect to my communications, I have the following nominations and appointments for your consideration to the board of review.

Katherine White and Ryan Dibble to the board of review 2, Alice Owings, Kathy Smith, Nicholas Crow and Kurt Swoboda.

I also have the pleasure to report that I am in continued conversations and discussions with respect to her service as city attorney and I look forward to further action on that towards the end of the month.

We now have the consent agenda.

May I have a motion, please, to approve it.

Moved by Grand, seconded by Griswold.

Council member.

>> Thank you.

I'd like to pull CA3 and CA24.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Council member Hayner.

>> I just want to publicly express my concerns about CA18 to CA20 about electric fleet garbage trucks.

Those are very hardworking vehicles, and I think we -- maybe everybody received a correspondence from a resident today who pointed out what my own experience has been working at diesel engine manufacturing that, you know, these things are difficult to operate, maintain, and hopefully we'll get our money out of them.

I'd also like to pull CA16 for further discussion.

And CA15 is related to that, so I guess I'll pull that also.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion and consent agenda.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Taylor: All in -- yes.

Yes, Ms. Beaudry?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Was that 16 and 15 were the last two?

>> Yeah, sorry about the reverse order.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

3, 24, 16 and 15.

Further discussion to the consent agenda.

All in favor, please say aye.

Opposed.

The consent agenda is approved with the exception of CA3, CA24, CA16, CA15, which will be dealt with separately.

The remaining items have been approved with 11 members present, and the 8-vote requirement with respect to CA1, CA2, CA13, CA18, CA19, CA25.

CA3.

Resolution to prove a participation agreement with parks and recreation and appropriate for the fee title to the Maisel property moved, seconded by council member Disch.

Discussion, please, CA3 council member Ramlawi.

>> Thank you.

I was interested in knowing if staff was present to give us how it is scored and what percentile did this property score in.

I don't know if I missed it somewhere.

I apologize.

I didn't get it in with my questions.

I'm just concerned as to this purchase being in Northfield township where Northfield Township does not contribute to the acquisition costs.

Our percentage on this is 75%, rather high, with nothing coming from Northfield Township once again.

So I'm not moved to spend this money this way without that kind of contribution coming from that community and with a percentage as high as this one, but I don't know all the facts.

If I could just get what percentile this fell under to help perhaps persuade me.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, Mr. Long -- okay.

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Long?

>> Mr. Long: Thank you.

Can you all hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Great.

So apologies for not submitting the scoring memo as supplemental documentation to this project.

This property received a score of 131 points out of 172, placing it in the 100th percentile of all open space applications we have received.

It's our top-scoring application on record.

That would be due to its size, adjacency to protected land, connectivity, habitat quality, and then the public recreation opportunity it offers.

>> Thanks, Remy, for being here and helping explain that.

Just while we have you here, is there any discussion in Northfield Township?

I know there has been in the past about having a green belt millage of their own, so they can partner up with us and others on these.

Is there anything coming to the voters in that community this year, or does anybody know about that?

>> I've been in talks with the Chair of the township land preservation committee, which is mobilizing an effort to persuade the board of trustees to put it on the ballot soon. And that information's being provided for them on conservation benefits and what the green belt and county programs have accomplished as well as the other townships that do have dedicated millage funds.

So we are working with them to support that effort and make sure that we can get an additional matching funds in the green belt district.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Council member Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: I didn't get a chance to do this during council communications, but I want to point out that a lot of our properties coming forward from the green belt now are being scored and showing their carbon storage as well.

So as we look to properties sometimes within the city or hearing about loss of trees, if we look for the investment that we're making in terms of our, you know, A20 goals and sustainability goals, this is a 220-acre site that's of incredibly high quality.

If I missed something, I'm sure Mr. Long can fill that in for me.

You know, we do know that this is unusual in terms of -- that we are being asked to pay a higher percentage than we usually do.

But the commission felt that, you know, being in the 100th percentile, that it was more of an investment.

And I think it's helpful to look at properties like this when we talk about carbon storage within the City as well because we can see that for our dollars we're actually getting a much greater return on the investment.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It's approved with 11 members present, all voting affirmative to satisfy the vote firm with respect to CA30.

Mr. Long, thank you.

CA24.

Resolution to approve a collective party agreement between the City of Ann Arbor and police through December 31, 2024.

Moved by Councilmember Ramlawi seconded by Councilmember Radina.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

And thanks to our public speaker, Dr. Karpiak, for pointing out once again the omission of ICPOC when it comes to these type of negotiations.

Unfortunately I had missed that last meeting on the budget and labor committee, and it looks like I will no longer be able to serve my community in that capacity.

That's a very unfortunate decision and one I think is a bad one.

Being on ICPOC and being a small business owner, I felt like I added a lot to those

conversations, but that's not why I'm pulling this.

I'm pulling this because my experience on that budget and labor committee gave me the impression that we had very little input even as council members when it came to negotiating these contracts.

The process with these contracts, who's involved, and who gets to decide is several steps removed from ICPOC and from council members, done honest with you.

And I've seen this time and time again, and it has not changed.

From the first time I seen it to this time.

And until we can get the right process involved, I'm no longer going to support these type of contracts.

It's not -- it's not what we laid out to do when we established ICPOC, and it will not bring us the community policing that we deserve and the reforms that we need.

It's the same old, same old with marginal improvements with nothing drastic being done. And until I see everybody at the table participating in these things in an equal and fair way, I'm not going to support them.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: Since we have you here, can you walk us through the process can contract negotiations and also does this align with what we had approved when it came to budgeting earlier?

When we passed the budget?

>> I'm going to kick that one to you since you handle the budget part of this.

>> Me?

>> Yeah.

>> Okay.

Thanks.

Do you want to answer the question?

I'll just answer the whole thing.

So this contract is pretty much right online with our budget.

It's over the course of three years.

It exceeds our total budget figure by 1500 -- I think it was \$124 or \$174, so it's only marginally above the budgeted amount for the contract.

In terms of process, was your question specifically about how these contracts are handled with ICPOC or how they're handled with budget and labor?

>> Councilmember Song: Both, both.

So, you know, I think there might be some confusion on the timing on when there might be community engagement or community input when it comes to labor negotiations with the City.

>> So I'll just generally speaking with our collective bargaining agreements, we have nine of them for the benefit of the public, five of them are in the police department.

When we begin negotiating a contract, we will convene a meeting of the budget and labor committee and discuss various provisions of the contract with the city council members in closed session and begin to strategize what our bargaining strategy might look like and what particular issues we should prioritize.

We take feedback from the council members on what that prioritization should be and whether issues identified by staff should be prioritized, and council members also raise issues on their own at that point.

From that point the bargaining process really relies on a chief negotiator representing the City and negotiations.

And that chief negotiator has to be empowered to make a deal at the table with the union.

And so otherwise you could run into a situation where the City is, you know, not negotiating in good faith, and the person who can make a deal isn't actually at the table, and various other issues.

And so generally speaking, the human resources director has served as the chief negotiator on collective bargaining agreements.

There have been brief periods in time where we've deviated from that, but usually it's the human resources director.

As long as the bargaining proceeds along the lines that were originally outlined by city council in the closed session, we will reach a tentative agreement, bring that tentative agreement back to the budget and labor committee, and discuss it.

And the budget and labor committee, you know, from there goes from the budget and labor committee up to city council.

Now, the process is a little different when it comes to police contracts.

With police contracts, we essentially engage the same process, but we meet with a subcommittee of ICPOC and have a similar discussion with them.

That process started when we negotiated our patrol officers contract in 2020.

And we did the same thing with our command officers contract.

Now, it has been pointed out tonight that this contract did not go before ICPOC for review.

And the reason why is because we -- like I said, there are five contracts in the police department.

There's the deputy chiefs who are represented by Teamsters, the patrol officers, and the command officers who are represented by the police officers association of Michigan.

Those three unions contain sworn police officers.

The two other unions are our PSS and PPA unions.

They are also represented by POAM, but neither of them represent any sworn police officers.

These are administrative support personnel for the police department.

So in terms of the PPA contract, these are administrative support who work in, like, the records office or who are providing administrative support for detectives from the detectives bureau and things like that.

And so the other union PSS provides similar service to other units in the police department.

When we negotiated the PSS contract in 2020, almost exactly a year ago, we approached ICPOC and asked for their input on the contract, and they told us they weren't interested in providing input on either the PSS or PPA unions.

And so we did not get input from ICPOC on the PSS contract even though we sought it.

And based on the input we got from them, we did not seek it for the PPA contract.

Now, if they have changed their mind, that's fine.

More than happy to bring these contracts forward to ICPOC and have their feedback.

It is really not an issue.

There is no opposition from staff and we're happy to do it.

There really is no issue with that.

We are just going on the request that we received from the committee.

And I will note that the concessions that we got from PPA in this contract are identical in every way to the concessions that were adopted by council in the PSS contract that was passed last year and similar in a council meeting in December.

And so we will -- the same process that we undertake with the budget and labor committee, we also undertake with ICPOC for police contracts.

And then once we get through that process, it comes up to the full council for consideration.

>> We could have -- council member -- no.

>> Mayor Taylor: I'm afraid --

>> I raised my hand again.

>> Mayor Taylor: The answer went so long, council member, that that actually kind of lopped into your second amend as well if that's all right.

>> Sorry.

>> I'll raise it again.

>> Mayor Taylor: Council member Song.

>> Councilmember Song: So if I understand the process correctly, then, there is a subcommittee that does review our police contracts, that volunteers review contracts, and that this particular union, because of its administrative support, is not on their priority.

>> Yes.

That's what they have communicated to us in the past, yes.

>> Councilmember Song: Okay.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

For my part, I guess I'll just say that I'm, as someone who's on the budget and labor committee for a fair bit now, I'd like to express my appreciation to the work that staff does.

I feel like I, in the course of those meetings, I myself personally and have seen staff engagement with council members and have seen staff receiving council members' input when it was consistent with staff's inclination and inclination was inconsistent and staff went away and strove to do what council asked them.

So thank you.

Further discussion?

Roll call vote, please, starting with council member Disch.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Disch?

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Griswold?

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Song?

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Grand?

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Radina?

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.
>> Mayor Taylor: Mayor Taylor?
>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Eyer?
>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Nelson?
>> Councilmember Nelson: No.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Briggs?
>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Ramlawi?
>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.
Councilmember Hayner, I'm sorry.
Councilmember Hayner?
>> Councilmember Hayner: No.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.
>> Councilmember Radina: CA16, between the City of Ann Arbor and the downtown development authority of the City regarding responsibilities and cost allocation for the installation of 80 electric vehicle chargers in public spaces and to authorize city sharing the amount of \$367,200 moved by Councilmember Hayner seconded by Councilmember Radina.
Discussion, please, CA16, Councilmember Hayner.
>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks.
I asked to have this off the agenda so that I could ask a couple quick questions. And reading through it a second time and putting together some notes from some folks in the community that are pretty hip to this kind of thing, it says that the resolution at its base says \$327,000.
But when you actually read the agreement, it says that we're in for \$367,000, I beg your pardon, it says that we're in for \$367,000 and we're also in for \$263,000 and then five years for \$73,000.
And for all that we get back 20% of the total parking revenue each year for five years. And so I wasn't sure which one it was.
If somebody could answer that, I would appreciate it, because it didn't seem to add up properly.
>> Councilmember Radina: Dr. Stults?
>> Thank you for the question, Councilmember Hayner.
I'm sorry, I missed that last part.
>> Councilmember Hayner: Exhibit B.
And in asking this question I'll mention the reason I pulled CA15 is because your office was tagged on this Harper on-call service for some 500,000.
I wondered if that was in anticipation of this?
>> Yep.
So the 263,000 would be for the contract for Harper.
The additional increase, that's for the 80 chargers and the circuit work that we would have to do to get those ready, as well as the charging for the electric refuse trucks. And then the 367,200 is the grant for the five-year charging as a service contract.

So both of those services we would incur.

>> Councilmember Hayner: So the City is paying 263 plus 367.

>> Correct.

>> Councilmember Hayner: And the development authority is paying up to maybe -- maybe they're paying 25 grand.

>> Well, they're paying definitely the 25 grand and then they'll pay for the electrical costs.

And then that's what will get somewhat reimbursed through the process itself.

>> Councilmember Hayner: This is just grid energy we're talking about here?

>> Yeah.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Okay.

Okay.

Well, you can see why I pulled it because the title of it says that it's only for 367, but it's for over 500.

And then what's the five years at 73,000?

How is it that -- it also discusses -- sorry, I've got a lot of windows open here -- it also discusses the -- it says that we're going to be paying 70 some thousand a year for five years for the -- I'm not exactly sure what that was for.

>> Charging as a service.

That's the 367.

That's how you get to that number.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Okay.

So 367 plus 263.

>> Yeah, it's 73 per year.

So we rolled it up to a five-year contract.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Okay.

So we're paying 100 and some thousand for five years.

And then at the end of this, do we own this infrastructure?

>> We have the option to own it, to buy it outright.

>> Councilmember Hayner: What is that going to cost us?

>> To be determined.

Based on how the assets kind of operating.

We'll do an asset assessment to see what it's actually worth at that point.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Okay.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

I'm wondering why we aren't just having a third party provide the chargers and have community members pay and why we're getting involved in this, and my experience is that the life of the asset is not that long.

I was in Lansing recently with my electric vehicle, and there were no chargers operational in the Lansing parking structures because they were replacing all of them. So I assume you did a cost analysis to determine why we're not using one of the popular third parties?

>> Yeah.

And Councilmember Griswold, we should commiserate because I got stranded in

Lansing, I'll share that.

This actually is a third party.

So it's a charging as a service contract where the third party would be responsible for maintaining, operating, installing the equipment.

We just have to do the electrical work, hence what's on the contractor side.

So we're paying for them as a third party to own the assets and making them.

But that is the route.

>> Okay.

And we're charging people for the electricity that our -- when they're parked?

>> That's right.

What they use they pay for.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Okay.

I just want to make that very clear to the public that we're not subsidizing, that people are paying for their electricity.

Okay.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Councilmember Hayner?

>> Councilmember Hayner: I mean, we are kind of subsidizing in a way in that we're leasing 80 chargers for \$100,000 a year for five years, and then we've got to buy out our lease at the end and we don't know what that's going to cost yet.

And so that's a big open-ended thing.

I mean, I assume that these will be installed in a way by Harper or whoever the contractor is that will be sort of a slip fit where if we go to a different type of charger in the near future, that it will be relatively easy switch of the unit itself.

I mean, I assume this is all putting in the backbone that currently doesn't exist in these spaces.

And so I'm just -- it just seems like I know this is the right way we're headed for this kind of thing, but have we -- I think you mentioned at a previous meeting that we find many of these spots to be filled.

I know that's been my experience in the Maynard structure, that they're all filled all the time I walk by there.

And so there has been, I would assume, then, there's been a big public outcry for more spaces in our parking garages?

>> We definitely have demand.

I know Moira's with us.

Is there anything you want to add from your perspective?

>> Councilmember Hayner: Before you add, what portion -- I mean, are we going to get any of this back from use fees whatsoever?

Is this sort of just moving forward with our climate action plan?

>> I'm going to take the last one and then I'll kick it over to you, Moira.

So two things that are probably buried in there, we'll get some of it back because there will be a fee that we get from charge point.

And so will come back in some of the uses, the use fees that we pay, 20% from DVA.

The other side, though, is there are rebates available and we are working right now on bee baits.

And so if we secure these debates from the charging program, all of that money is coming back to us through recoup the costs of what we're putting into these assets. We just don't have that before you right now because we haven't got those rebates. So we're applying for them and I expect that if we're successful, we'll come back and appropriate that funding as well.

Moira, do you want to take it?

>> Sure.

Yeah.

So we currently have 30 Clipper Creek EV units within our parking system, which pre-pandemic were always used and at capacity.

And the difference here, too, is right now we don't charge for electricity, as

Councilmember Griswold knows.

So we have no way of incentivizing people to charge up and then, you know, move on to a different space.

So this new model, this charge as a service model, allows us the ability to structure the fees so that people are incentivized to move.

So our anticipation with the increase in electric vehicles and the ease of finding spaces, we will price it such that people will charge, and then they will be incentivized to move to a different spot or move on with their day.

But, yeah.

We've definitely seen an increase in demand pre-pandemic, of course.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you and thank you, Dr. Stoltz, and Moira for being here to answer questions and enlighten us.

You said that we have 30 that are existing in the system.

Will these 80 replace those 30 to net 80 total?

I'm just wondering how many we will have at the end of this installation and whether these are going to replace all the current ones that are out there.

>> Yeah.

Go ahead, Moira.

>> Sorry.

So the 30 clipper creeks which are about ten years old and getting on the antiquated side, those will be replaced, so we'll have a consistent system, EV system, within all of our facilities.

And then the office of sustainability may be reusing those clipper creeks in other locations.

So we're going to make the most of them.

>> Yeah.

We're looking at using them in affordable housing sites with our colleagues there to do some charging infrastructure with car share programs and we're looking at other community sites that have a need for charging but don't have the ability to purchase those chargers.

So we're going to repurpose the existing to kind of take them as far as we can.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I like that thought and it just sends me to why don't we buy these outright?

I know it's expensive, but I hate leasing things.

I just feel like it's a rental more than anything.

Is it just cost prohibitive at this point to actually outright purchase these type of chargers?

>> Go ahead, Moira.

>> Yeah.

I'll just jump in on this.

Our parking services manager, Jada Holbrook, had done extensive research on different ownership models when the DDA actually had parking funds when we were going to invest in EVs pre-pandemic.

And this charging as a service model, because they take care of all of the maintenance, they take care of the credit card processing, they have 24-hour customer service.

It's really a model that when we looked at it, it made the most sense for our system.

And I think systems around the country are finding that.

So this charging as a service model is less labor intensive on our side than outright ownership.

>> CouncilmemberRamlawi: And will we be generating on-site electricity at all at any of these structures?

I know there was talk, and Katherine and Ann's structure to add some solar.

Will we be having any on-site generation?

>> I could say at some point, I would hope so.

I mean, at this point in time, we're not, you know, investing in any additional equipment at the moment given our revenue situation.

But, you know, I would hope we'll be working with the office of sustainability on that in the future.

>> Completely on the table for consideration.

>> CouncilmemberRamlawi: Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

For my part, I'd just like to say thank you.

This will be an exciting support for our city's goals in encouraging EV infrastructure.

This is pretty cool stuff.

So thank you both and the folks standing behind you.

Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

CA16 resolution to approve agreement between the City of Ann Arbor -- it's a resolution so nice we should do it twice.

CA15, resolution approving amendment number 3, professional services agreement with Harper Electric Inc. For on-call city electrical services not to exceed \$525,000, moved by Councilmember Hayner, seconded by Councilmember Radina.

Discussion of CA15?

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks.

Obviously this is tied to 16 because the extension of this contract is necessary if 16 passed which had been to potentially use them for these new ones, if I understand this correctly.

And so I guess what I don't understand is it had to be separated out from the other one. I just -- when expenses are divided up like this, I want to make sure everything's in order is why I pulled this out.

So when we had them do the city hall charges, there was about 32,000 apiece or something for those.

For the four of them.

And so is that why it's a good deal, considered to have this charge point do, you know, lease them to us for 1250 a year each instead of buying them outright over that five years?

Because like the ones we bought at city hall for 32,000 each installed, is that correct, or was that just the installation costs?

>> That was installation costs.

It was 170,000 because of the fast chargers.

So these are level 2 chargers.

We still have to do the electrical upgrades on site.

That's part of the charging as a service.

You sort of have to get the site ready.

And that's what Harper will be doing is getting the circuits in place.

And they've been on site and looked at each of the locations.

And so that's how we generated the figure with them.

>> Councilmember Hayner: So they're pulling the conduit and running wires.

>> You know it.

And also the EV refuse structure.

I don't want to lose that too.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yeah, okay.

All right.

Well, I mean, I don't have a complaint about this.

That's what these folks are getting paid.

And I guess it just points out that this transition to this type of infrastructure is very expensive.

You know, that's why I have been adamant in the past about, say, trying to get our housing commission projects to include these types of things, trying to get our developers to include these types of things in their developments.

Because retrofitting is expensive.

And we're seeing that right here.

So I thank you for answering this and putting this together.

Yeah, we need to do the things that we can do as a body to preempt these retrofitting costs.

And we need to push this back on the folks who are building these buildings so that they can do it at a fraction of the cost that it costs us later.

It's disappointing that we haven't come up with that yet.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

Yeah.

I just want to say thank you for bringing this all to us.

I remember first joining council, and we were asking these questions, refuse trucks, electric.

We talked to AAATA about getting those electric.

And we know it's going to be expensive.

And we're willing to pay that premium to be leaders and to lead by example.

And these are community values that we have.

This is not -- we're not shopping around for the lowest price when it comes to this.

We're doing what's responsible.

And sometimes what's responsible isn't the cheapest application.

So I'm just so thrilled to see this coming within my first term here to reality.

So kudos to the work and doing what we asked and doing it fast.

So -- and knowing, again, that it's not going to be cheap doing this as Councilmember said.

I guess we'll be talking about that more later tonight with a couple other resolutions.

So thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

Just real briefly to Councilmember Hayner's concern.

I did want to remind council that we did approve this past year changes to our parking codes that we do have EV charging that is required and a variety of different levels because there was concern both from energy commission and planning commission about this issue of retrofitting.

So we are trying to be very proactively thinking about it with projects moving forward.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

Thank you both.

We now have -- we have come to one of our public hearings.

Public hearing is an opportunity for members of the public to speak to council and the community about a specific item on the agenda.

That is to say the specific subject matter of that public hearing.

To speak at a public hearing, you need not have signed up in advance, but your speech must relate to the specific subject matter of the public hearing.

To speak, call the number on your screen.

877-853-5247.

Once you're connected, please enter meeting ID94212732148.

94212732148.

Once you are connected, please enter star 9.

Star 9 to indicate that you wish to speak.

When it is your turn to speak, our Clerk will identify you by the last three digits of your telephone number.

You will have 3 minutes in which to speak.

So please pay close attention to the time.

Our Clerk will notify you when 30 seconds are remaining and when your time has expired.

When your time has expired, please conclude your remarks and cede the floor.
Purr hearing number 1 resolution to approve 106 north fourth avenue site plan at 106 north fourth avenue.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: I don't see any callers with their hands up.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Seeing no one, this public hearing is closed.

We have before us the minutes of November 8 and November 15, both 2021.

Make a motion please to approve these minutes, seconded by Councilmember Disch.

Discussion, please, of anyone.

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

C1, an ordinance to amend sections 2 to 5, 226 and 238 of Chapter 27 water service of title 2 of the code of the City of Ann Arbor.

May I have a motion, please.

Disch.

Seconded by Radina.

Discussion, please, of C1.

All in favor?

I'm sorry, council member Nelson.

Were you trying to --

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yeah, I was, actually.

In one of my questions on the agenda, I asked the question about how many people were not yet in this program or were eligible for an opt-out.

And the answer was 30.

And I guess I was curious to know, 30 properties are prompting this ordinance, or are we anticipating that as meters break, there might be further resistance to installing them?

I was just curious.

>> We don't know how many we might get.

We just know that we have 30 right now, and we've had some people express interest.

And we realized we didn't have the ability to offer this.

>> I would jump in and say it's about giving our customers options.

>> Okay.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks.

As we are a municipal utility on this matter, water, are there any mandates or laws from above or sideways or whoever is in charge of our municipal utility that we have to provide opt-outs?

Is this something --

>> No.

>> No.

None.

>> Councilmember Hayner: So we're doing it to make it center on our cost structure that

is necessary if we have to send somebody to.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Hayner: To read this meter.

Okay.

>> That's correct.

>> Councilmember Hayner: There's no mandate for providing an opt-out.

>> No, no.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Okay.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

What will the cost be to the customer to opt out in this program?

I know it says not to exceed \$50 a month.

Do we happen to know what it would cost the typical customer to opt out?

>> So the \$50 a month is not the opt-out fee.

The opt-out fee is a different attachment and will be considered at the -- that's part of the fee amendment that's coming on December 20, which will follow the second -- or be as part of the second reading.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Okay.

And you said there's 30 customers currently.

I thought that program would be coming to its conclusion.

I know COVID has delayed things.

Are we near completion on changing out all of the meters, or where are we at in that process?

It's just -- for me it would be nice knowing this.

I know things change, but early on we did get a lot of emails from people who were concerned with contractors coming into their home, and I didn't have a good answer for them.

And now it seems like there's an alternative.

So I suppose back to the question is where are we at in that program of replacing all the water meters?

>> So the 30 customers that we talk about in this particular resolution or in the question that Councilmember Nelson had are residents, customers, who have refused us access that still have old meters.

So we're not entirely sure why they've refused access.

Some of them, though, you know, maybe don't want to have us come in and change the wireless transmitter.

This opt-out option will allow them not to have the wireless transmitter in their home.

And so that's slightly different than the meter replacement project.

All of the meters have to be replaced, whether in the home or they choose to put it outside of the home.

And we are about 80% complete on that project.

We were stopping for the winter and we're going to resume in the spring.

Our contractor is going to remobilize in the spring.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yeah.

I think many are concerns about 5G.

I'm not even sure if that technology is employed with this.
You know, the (indiscernible) are the ones that are concerned about this as well.
Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yeah.

I'm happy to hear that you're giving options, and I attended a hearing in Lansing where they were talking about electromagnetic sensitivity.

Most of the speakers were licensed.

And so I view it sort of like a peanut allergy.

Most people are not impacted by peanuts, and they're just fine.

But there are some that may be, and so I hope that we do this in an understanding way and that we're not punitive in any way that could open the City up to a lawsuit.

>> No, we calculated the costs based on the costs that we are going to incur to provide the service.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Oh, okay.

Great.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

I'm sorry.

My apologies.

Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: Concerns around 5G with county department of health (indiscernible) or would staff let us know?

We would be alerted, probably, right?

>> I don't think we heard your question clearly.

>> Councilmember Song: Is there a public health concern around 5G may be alerted by county health or staff, correct?

>> I think that that -- I mean, we don't know of any other individual concerns right now over this.

>> We can also bring back to you how frequently the meters broadcast out.

These are not continuous broadcast like you would see on a cell phone necessarily.

>> Councilmember Song: Okay.

Thank you.

That's all.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

C2, an ordinance to amend Sections 50.22.3, storm water and soil erosion, 35.29.6, site plans of title 55, unified development code of the City of Ann Arbor, seconded by Councilmember Idina.

Council member Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Just first reading, so I just have a few comments and I'll ask more questions in writing this next week.

I think that just speaking to the second part of this, which is the notification of council and the creation of this table that streamlines the approval processes, I think there's

some things missing from this that we could do to further streamline and reduce costs, you know, around site plan review.

I've been speaking with some staff folks about it over the last year.

When site plan reviews are triggered, it triggers zoning -- or triggers zoning reviews and other things that can, you know, further, you know, you can have appeals.

Can you have all kinds of approvals that are contingent on the geometry of your property.

And I'm not certain what the purpose of excluding council from these approvals is, like, what is the real benefit to our community other than these developments can happen a little bit faster?

I think a lot comes from speaking to council.

I think a lot -- if we're asking the right questions of developers, especially for larger parcels, I think we can learn a lot.

We can find out if our policies are helping or hurting the community.

We can -- there's all kinds of things we can learn and hopefully have a better partnership with these developers so it's not just not like (indiscernible) because, you know, that's no way to plan a community for the future.

And we have no way of proofing our policies unless stuff comes back to us.

I mean, currently we don't even -- we talk about a lot of metrics in tracking and we really don't -- I still have been unable in my three years on council to get an answer of the total amount of bedrooms that we've added in our community.

Now, if that isn't readily available to us for our planning purposes, I think that's a problem.

And I think that waiving our privilege to review these developments prior to firming up what our zoning ordinances are going to be is putting it backwards to say it mildly.

And so I don't necessarily approve these changes.

I have concerns and I will also share my residents -- a lot of residents' concerns that without the benefit of a plan review process, a public plan review process, that it's a bad idea to waive our privilege on this.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: Thank you.

So as we know, delays are costly.

And we are -- we want to see less -- we want to see more affordable housing in this town.

And the more cumbersome our project approval process is, the more expensive these projects are going to be.

Now, if it's cumbersome because it's bringing improvements and oversight, that would be one thing.

But when a developer brings a proposal that is consistent with the zoning of the site and that meets all of the technical requirements that the City imposes for development on that site, approval of that project is an administrative decision.

It is a best practice according to the Michigan Planning Association, that administrative decisions be made by administrative entities like the planning commission and planning staff, not by the council.

Because it is.

I think we'll repeat some fine language that one of our callers offered, it does so

confusion when people believe that council has discretion, and it doesn't. In addition, since 2010, January 1, 2010, 177 projects have come before council. About half of those would not have if we weren't having so-called buy right projects come to council.

And something else we should all be aware of is that since 2016, which is the past five years, not the past decade, the planning commission and the city council have come to the same conclusion on site plans 72 times.

That's 92% of the projects that came before council in those five years.

So we -- it is redundant, what we are doing.

There were six times where council came to different conclusions.

And in two of those six times, that ended us up in court.

So that's my first volley.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Idina.

>> Councilmember Idina: Thanks.

I'll just add to what Councilmember Disch was saying.

In reviewing for this, you know, I looked to our neighbors up in East Lansing at the MSU extension who do a lot of work on this as well.

And one of the things that they highlight is there are three possibilities for governments to approve these buy right zoning reviews.

And planning commission is, by far, the most common throughout the state of Michigan. Zoning administrators are planning departments approving them themselves is the second most common, and the least common, the most rare, is for legislative bodies to do this review themselves.

And the reason for that is really important, and they highlight this extensively, it is because if all standards and requirements are met, approval must be given for a buy right development.

And the reason for that is because if a decision is challenged in court, the court will focus only on ordinance standards and nothing else.

So any of the extraneous things that we hear that do not meet -- or that do not fall under our actual ordinance would simply -- we would lose that case in court.

And so I agree that adding this idea that we somehow have reviewed and we don't is dangerous.

And I also just want to highlight that some of this is also bringing us directly in line with policies that are being encouraged by the Biden White House and were previously encouraged by the Obama White House to help reduce red tape in some local zoning laws so that we can increase housing supply, improve our affordable housing policy, and really just make ourselves more efficient in developing policies that will allow for more housing to be built in our community.

So I know that this is first reading.

We'll have more to say and hear public comment next meeting.

But I do think these are really important changes and appreciate staff bringing them forward.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: I want to thank the staff and planning commission for their work and going through the proper process for getting us here.

You know, a couple things to add on to this.

I'm going to say that it really -- not having this policy puts council members in the position where I think they're often being dishonest with their constituents and thinking that we can do something.

And I think it instills a lot of distrust in the community for that reason.

I also think that the policy that we have right now sucks up a lot of time from our planning staff in going through this next step and delays, and we want -- if the goal is to have our ordinances to be better so that when buy right development comes to the planning commission, it's in line with our values.

Freeing up all of this time so that planning staff can work on improving those ordinances and zoning is really where we want to be focusing their time and our time.

So I think it's not only moves us to a more honest place with our constituents but also enables staff to utilize their talents for the betterment of our city.

And I'm just so excited that this is finally here.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thanks.

I don't want to repeat too much.

I do want to say to Councilmember Hayner's concern, I think I share the idea that a public hearing is helpful to be able to hear from the public in terms of identifying changes that we might want to see in our code moving forward and the presence of -- preservation of both hearing at planning commission level allows for that to be done and to be heard at the appropriate level to start moving code forward as recommendations to council.

So I'm glad to see the planning commission recommended that.

That was not necessary.

These could all be administrative decisions.

I know that we heard from a caller around -- I didn't write them all down, but former council Banister mentioned concerns around projects like Lockwood, on Jackson and Lower Town project, those types of projects not coming to us.

I wanted to point out that each one of those, if they were to come forward in the future would come to the council because they were rezoning or PED.

So those are the types of projects that council should be talking about, and it is very important that those do come to council.

And then if there's opportunity still, I thought it might be useful for if Mr. Leonard wanted to speak.

We focused really on one component of this, if you wanted to speak at all to some of the changes that are going to facilitate, you know, moving small and medium-size projected forward more.

I'd love to have you articulate that rather than myself.

>> Sure.

So the charges were to -- from the council resolution was to look at easing the process for some projects.

On average, a site plan that goes to city council takes about often 60 to 90 days more than after planning commission.

So -- and time is valuable to development.

So even for projects of all scale, that could have a benefit.

Additionally, we have increased some categories of very small projects that would either

be exempt now from the site plan altogether, small additions under 300 square feet. And we have made modifications in the proposed standards for that eliminate previous standards that would be dependent on the level of review might be dependent on whether or not a previous site plan was on file or not.

That ethic now is to be reliant upon our current standards as the way that we measure and evaluate development as successful in our community.

So those are some of the ways in which that goal will be achieved.

The other piece of it was to more effectively communicate the standards.

You'll see it's a pretty significant change in sort of the format.

That is it goes to a table format.

That was something that the planning commission seemed to embrace relatively quickly.

And hopefully this particular approach provides sort of a couple entry points, that is you can either look at your type of use proposed or the type of work being done to use.

And you can get to that answer in either regard.

So I'm happy to address anything.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks.

I'd just like to point out for the record that, you know, the language that we use at this table is, you know, it's important, and it's noted by the residents.

And I think suggesting that council members are being dishonest is a poor approach to collective governance here.

The storm water management aspect to this hasn't been talked about much because the big elephant in the room is removing approval for projects because we know that there seems to be a grave concerns over the amount of profit that developers make in our community.

And I don't share those concerns because I don't think it's really reflected.

I think that housing is priced as what the market will bear.

And, I mean, I just know that for a fact.

It's just being realistic.

And so, you know, if somebody isn't profiting for another 60 days because it needs a site to plan proper scrutiny, it's a shame, really.

So this is going to pass to the second reading.

We're going to have all kinds of questions about it.

I feel strongly that we're doing this backwards.

I'll say it again.

That there's a lot of things in motion here.

We haven't done a comprehensive land use review.

We have -- we're getting ready to approve almost 70 parcels rezoning which will make them buy right and completely, if this is passed, completely aside from any consideration of that.

And I don't think what we're asking is enough in our zoning.

I think we've made mistakes in not -- in not creating baselines that are in line with our other community goals like A20.

And so I'm just not going to be comfortable with passing up on this.

You know, I have a constituent that has contacted me.

And they have grave concerns about 212 Miller.

They just spent \$900,000 on a condo.

And they're about to have their beautiful sunset view blocked by another five-story condo that's going to be 15 feet from the guy's balcony.

And is that buy right?

Should I have any say about that at all?

What should I say to this constituent?

What can he do about it?

Well, if this didn't even come to us, I wouldn't even have an opportunity to comment on it.

And so we're not --

>> Mayor Taylor: Council member?

>> Councilmember Hayner: We could speed up -- we could speed up the council approval time without doing away with our ability to approve.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

And I appreciate staff coming back with this.

I know we did ask for this.

And it falls in line with that request to help streamline the process and reduce the financial burden placed on people who want to add a small addition or improve their property in ways that are incremental.

But yet are burdened with this site plan approval process.

I, for one, don't have a problem listening to these proceedings.

I learn a lot from those.

I think there's a back and forth that goes on, as has been mentioned, that we learn where the fallacies are in our policies.

And so we go back and sharpen our pencil.

And we don't learn that without these conversations.

So to completely eliminate them, I think we lose out on learning where we can be better.

Site plan approvals, they generally take 13 seconds at this table, for the most part.

Unless it's, you know, a rezoning.

I think most of us don't get hung up on them.

And, you know, so I appreciate that, but I understand it comes at a significant cost.

And it's probably not worth putting people through for some of these smaller projects.

I will say, though, I do -- I did take note.

I wrote it down.

The word "dishonesty" to your constituents.

That's, I think, a poor choice of words.

In this I we're advocates for our constituents and our wards.

Most things do not require unanimous votes.

If a member or two from a specific ward objects to something in that ward for those constituents, it still passes.

You could still advocate for your constituents and your concerns that they have.

You know, we have safety and welfare issue with all our site plans, as the case that we approve the development on Earhart where I felt like the welfare and safety and safety for the community was in jeopardy.

We are under an existential climate crisis.
And so things like that, I think, need to be brought up.
And that's why I voted against that particular project.
I know that doesn't -- wouldn't -- this doesn't affect that type of vote.
But, again, it's good to have conversations.
We all walk away learning something new.
>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.
>> Councilmember Song: I'm looking at the dashboard that Teresa (indiscernible).
New units of 133 since 2013.
Loss of 191 since 2015.
And we have 221 planned units in development or in construction online within the next three years.
So my question for staff is, is there any way that -- can we actually also break down the time line on these approved units and then as kind of, like, a layer?
I know there's a way to search for areas, where we've learned township, for example, has been very aggressive in building affordable housing in their public parcels.
But can we also connect that with how long it takes from approval from beginning to end as earlier, if I can also ask if there is a way to separate out buy right by zoning, too?
>> We can look at the data as I mentioned before.
On average you're adding 60 days at best on average probably closer to 90 days.
But I can provide in advance secondary provide some other detail about the average overall time for that review.
But as, I think -- and then if you could clarify your last question about buy right zoning.
>> Councilmember Song: I mean, the dashboard covers affordable housing, covered buy right development.
It doesn't include that as part of our -- cutting into our housing stock.
Is there --
 >> Yeah, yeah.
Yeah, that dashboard is specific to this, the goals identified in the 2015 equity analysis and affordable housing report.
And so that is a metric about the City's goals toward meeting its affordable housing goals.
Those are specifically towards those units that are preserved and maintained in an affordable status, so it doesn't count overall market affordability, if you will.
So I don't have that kind of dashboard, but, again, I could also anticipate a second reading and try to put some numbers around some of the site plans, and since referenced by council member Disch, how many housing units that referenced.
Unfortunately our data, it's not always as easy as we'd want it.
Or I'd want it, speaking for myself to spit out the data points that we like, what we can work towards providing some of that.
>> Councilmember Song: Perfect.
The dashboard itself is public, right?
That's not just for city council members?
>> Yep.
>> Councilmember Song: So at least we can track two things that are going on in our community.

Market rate development as well as our affordable housing work.

Great.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Thank you.

I have a question for Leonard.

I know that council member Banister was working with the angelinis on trying to streamline site approval.

Is this related to or the result of their work?

>> Yes.

Missangelini was one of the stakeholders engaged and hearing sort of their feedback.

I think it's honest to say that I don't think this goes as far as everybody on that stakeholder group would like to see.

There are also questions about, I think, concerns about our application of standards being too onerous to any project of any scale.

But we have heard some positive comment that this is Ghently moving in a positive direction.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Okay, thank you.

And I hope you continue to improve the process and the application process as well.

And since we're on the subject of storm water management, I just want to mention that I spent many, many hours this summer looking at storm water management issues or the lack of storm water management, and anything that will take a burden off the staff that are working on this, I think, is a positive, and I discussed this before, but I want to mention it again.

As a result of climate change, we know we're getting more precipitation, and I think that we need to look at our staffing level to make sure that we're being as proactive and professional as we can.

And I just want to say thank you again to the staff members who do work on this.

They're very professional and thorough, and I've been very impressed.

Sometimes they just -- the problems are outside the scope of what they can do, especially with climate change.

So thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Thank you.

I fully support these changes, and I'm really excited to see them coming before us.

I did want to just point out a couple of things.

One, to the extent that it's useful for us to hear some of the concerns about certain developments that are buy right, we, of course, as council members are always have the ability to watch a planning commission meeting and learn from the discussion that happens there.

It doesn't need to happen at this table for us to learn from it.

And for us to engage even in conversation with planning commissioners and the city staff about those concerns that constituents may bring to us.

The other thing, I do want to just back up, when we talk about dishonesty in regards to some of these buy right approvals and, you know, the arguments that we saw with the Concord Pines development was just such a great example of, you know, certain

arguments being put forth that really did, you know, that were not honest, that really gave the impression that we could do something about that.

>> Point of order.

>> Councilmember Eyer: We've been told over and over again by staff that we simply would not have a leg to stand on in voting down a buy right proposal.

>> Can I get a judgment on that?

I mean, to suggest that people were dishonest when they voted against that development is impugning --

>> Mayor Taylor: Council member, I'm going to allow it.

>> Councilmember Eyer: I said some of the arguments that were put forth were not honest.

>> Were dishonest?

>> Councilmember Eyer: It's not honest --

>> Your own council rule permits characterization of our limits.

>> Mayor Taylor: Council members, the names are not being mentioned.

The reference is to arguments.

>> Please, Mr. Mayor, please.

>> So those who voted against it were dishonest.

>> Mayor Taylor: That's not what the council member is saying.

The council member is referring to arguments.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I'm getting used to this.

Don't worry about it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Council member, proceed.

>> Councilmember Eyer: That's really all I had to say.

To sum up, I think it's really important to make these changes and to put the decision where it belongs because it's an administrative decision.

Not a (indiscernible).

>> I could also use manipulate, mislead, maybe lie to --

>> Point of order.

[Multiple speakers]

>> I have a right to respond to it.

>> Mayor Taylor: You know, I guess --

[Multiple speakers]

>> References to lying is off key.

The balance, I think, is okay.

>> So I'm talking about communication between council members historically and their constituents.

And I believe that there are many examples because I've sat in this chair for seven years, where I have seen former and current council members mislead their constituents by telling them that they can vote against a buy right development.

I also heard council member Ramlawi earlier this evening say that he believes it's advocacy sometimes for people from the ward to vote against a development that they know is buy right because his colleagues will cover for them and vote it through anyway. That is ethically problematic, from my perspective, and this is why one of the arguments for why we should be putting this forward a month from now, because we shouldn't have buy right developments coming to council because council members can mislead

constituents and believe -- and lead them to believe -- and they think it's okay.
Some people -- we heard from council member Ramlawi.
It's fine if someone from the ward votes against it because you know that the other nine will cover for you, and that's just advocacy.
That's not my definition of advocacy at all.
And I think we're going to see a pattern -- I won't get into that.
We'll have that discussion later.
But this is a really important development.
I want to thank staff again.
And I think even tonight's discussion is I will just traitive is why to move this forward.
>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.
>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I'll speak to the resolution and the -- not to the most of of others.
You can vote against a buy right development.
I've done it several times.
There's nothing wrong.
It's not illegal.
I voted against the Trinitas which has turned out to be a disaster.
Ask the people who live at the one how it's going.
Not very well for those people who signed leases to that development and didn't have anywhere to live.
Regarding an existential climate crisis, we are going to ask voters next year to pony up money to fend it off.
So it's not disingenuous.
It's not manipulative.
It's not lying, or however you want to call it.
It's not right.
You might not like it, but it's my right.
It's my constituents' rights.
This is our voice.
Everyone has a voice.
I know it's kind of strange for some people to deal with discord and difference of opinion, but that's a democracy.
It's shocking sometimes to hear what comes out of our mouths.
We have something here that's -- it's going to get supported 11-0, but yet it's got to end this way because we're calling people liars and manipulators.
Unbelievable.
Play on, players.
>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.
>> Councilmember Briggs: Yeah.
I have a question for Mr. Postema if it he is able to weigh in.
I was just curious if he could provide just a brief update on how -- a reminder about how that Trinitas lawsuit went for the city.
>> I'm really not going to talk about the lawsuit.
A lawsuit is not appropriate for me to discuss in open session.
The basic facts are known that the case was resolved, and the council approved a

resolution of it.

But other than that, details of a litigation, I'm just not going to -- I can provide in writing to the council, but I'm not going to walk through the details of that.

>> I'm sorry.

Maybe I wasn't being -- I didn't expect to you walk through it.

I was just curious if I was looking, were we successful in preventing this project from being developed in our community.

>> That is not an answer that I can give.

The council voted.

There was a lawsuit.

The council voted again.

And so whether we were successful or not, there are 11 council members.

They can determine that for themselves.

But in the end, the council, and I seek to remind the whole council again, speaks through a majority vote and the vote of its members.

And so sew on that I have to respectfully decline that request.

I do understand that if you're asking me, did the council eventually vote to resolve that matter, the answer is absolutely yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Disch.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Disch?

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Griswold?

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Song?

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Grand?

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Adina?

>> Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Taylor?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Eyer?

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Briggs?

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Ramlawi?

Ramlawi yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Chapter 113, regulation of use of model glues of Title IX of the code of the City of Ann Arbor.

Discussion, please, of C3.

Council member Ramlawi.

>> CouncilmemberRamlawi: Thank you.

I see our prosecutor is on the line.

I would just take the opportunity to ask and thank, actually, I know she sent us a memorandum explaining that there is going to be a series of ordinances that are going

to be coming forward that need to be updated and corrected and brought into the 2022s.

Can you explain to us real quick with this one and maybe the next one what are the big differences for the viewing audience and maybe for the rest of us with these two that you're bringing first forward.

Thanks.

>> Hello, my criminal justice reformers.

I am also very proud of you for taking on this initiative and just accepting it and having the opportunity and the appetite for Jill justice reform is just amazing to me, and I'm so excited to bring forth all of these ordinances for you.

We will have probably close to 80 amendments coming forward in the coming months.

And do not be alarmed.

You guys can handle this.

So we're going to have to put on our progressive muscles here.

And what we're talking about is three or four main objectives.

The first one is simple.

It's to increase accessibility and understanding.

We're not going to be using hereunto, contemporaneous with.

We are using plain language drafting to make it most accessible for most of our residents and those who come to hang out and play in Ann Arbor.

We're also making amendments to use gender-neutral language as a standard form within our code.

You'll see in the next ordinance in Chapter 108, there's this really scary sentence in there that says all pronouns will be used masculine and that means he or she.

Yikes!

We're moving on from that.

So we're going to get rid of all of that and using gender-neutral language.

Number 3.

We want to be consistent as we can with state.

Many things have been repealed.

Times have changed.

We need to make sure that we are not violating any laws, that we are not having preemption issues.

And the most important part is that people can expect the same laws as they travel between here and Pittsfield and Ipsilante and laws that are inconsistent with what you have a mile away.

And the fourth and probably the most important and the probably nearest dearest to all of your hearts is to ensure that we have conformity with the City's commitment to equity, inclusion, and procedural justice.

There is an opportunity for all of us here to put on our progressive hats and really get the job done.

So I'm starting with two, one small and one a little bit larger.

We have regulation of model glues also known as huffing tonight and then the weapons ordinance as the preview.

You'll have disorderly which is Section 962 out of Chapter 108.

That will be coming forth next.

It's a little bit of a heavier lift but I know you guys all got it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Excellent.

Ramlawi thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: For my part, I would like to say, you know, Ms. Slay, thank you so much for the work that you are doing with respect to the ordinances that we have here today and the ordinance that we will be enjoying downstream.

Obviously, you know, the code is a received document built over time, and it does require overhaul now and again to ensure that it better reflects our intentions and our aspirations and, you know, we're in the process of doing that thanks to you.

So many thanks.

Council member Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks.

And thanks to Slay for doing this.

And I know we had a couple phone calls about this and correspondence.

I like reading through these and seeing what the changes are, what we had in place.

You know, my concerns about this one were the substances that I am most often encounter the remnants of their use, especially in preparing abandoned buildings for demolition in the county here.

There's a lot of dusters and a lot of whippets going on.

And as an example, I mean, there was 200 empty dust cans in the crab shack that they tore down out there in Pittsfield Township.

And all in the bushes all around it and so on.

When these buildings become aband.

Ed, they become places that attract crime and unlawful uses.

So people were in there doing the dusters and the whippets.

And is that covered by this?

I was looking for the ingredients on a can of spray dust.

I couldn't find it.

But clearly that's an issue in our community because I see these cans everywhere.

I see the whippets in the curbs laying there in the gutters.

They're very recognizable.

The metal canisters you see around town, CO2 chargers.

Is that covered by this?

>> It is covered by this as an inhalation or fumes prohibited.

However, the one that we're probably going to use, if there is a violation of it, comes in Section 108.962, which is to be disorderly and intoxicated.

Whippets, for those of you who don't know, that's kind of colloquial for the aerosol.

You would commonly see them.

They're like a legal thing to buy if you use whipped cream at home.

So they're the little nitrous containers that you slide in when you're making homemade whipped cream.

And so we can't prohibit those because, you know, everyone would be really sad when they can't add whipped cream to their pie at their next family gathering.

And we want to be able to keep that all legal.

But I think council member Hayner, to answer your question, to be covered under the inhalation of fumes which is prohibited which is no person shall inhale, drink or

otherwise introduce into their respiratory or circulatory system anything that is defined as an intoxicated substance.

So whippets perfectly fine with whipped cream.

>> The community may not know that they sell them by the flavored case in head shops.

>> Yes.

But then they also do in very legitimate purposes, too.

>> Sure.

>> Like restaurant supply stores.

>> Yeah.

All right.

I just want to make sure we're covering it.

>> A little tricky.

>> It's clearly a problem on the street.

And when we touch these people into the system, I think the idea is not a punitive thing, but we want to get them in the system so that we are able to improve their lives and give them something better to do than sneak into an empty building and huff, right?

>> Yes.

So these are cases that if they were to come in front of the city prosecutor, which right now that's myself, if they come -- what we're looking at is a diversion out of the criminal justice system, but that is accompanied with assessments not just for drugs and alcohol, if that's an issue, but we also are looking to make sure that housing is appropriate, if there's any mental health concerns that we're addressing those, and to making amends to the community.

So as with all of our prosecutions, we are looking at restoration and a hand up, not a hand out.

>> Mayor Taylor: Council member Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Okay.

Thanks for that comment because I received a couple of questions about are these amendments to our resolutions criminalizing more behavior?

And knowing you, I knew that wasn't the intent, but I wanted to publicly ask that.

And I also just Googled CO2 cartridges because as I was getting -- going through security this weekend, a military-type guy was pulled over by security, and it was because he had CO2 cartridges in his carry-on.

And according to Google, you can also use these cartridges to inflate a flat bike tire.

So council member Hayner, maybe some of them you're seeing are for cyclists.

>> That is great -- I have that wishful thinking, too, that hopefully people are using them for their bike tires.

It increases the walkability and ridability of our city.

However, with the -- to answer your question as to whether or not we are increasing criminal penalties, absolutely not.

What we are seeing throughout not just this set of amendments is that these are penalties that are already in place.

What we are doing is adding the penalty after each section for Eaves of user -- for the user.

I'll tell you, there's criminal defense attorneys that I have been working with who have

been in the works for 20 years, and they call me and they say, I can't find the penalty for this offense.

So what we're trying to do is to make it very easy for everyone, criminal attorneys to, you know, my daughter who is a seventh grader right now, I've read every ordinance for her to make sure that she understands and can tell me what we're saying is prohibited. And I feel like that's our goal right there.

>> Great.

Thanks for that great work.

>> Sure.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yeah.

I think Arian needs to start wearing a cape.

She's like a superhero.

I appreciate what you do for us here at the City.

You know, thanks again for the work and taking the lead on these issues and doing the work, doing the heavy lifting that's involved and not just the lip service.

So thank you.

>> Thank you, council member.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Adina.

>> Thank you, mayor.

I just want to echo my thanks for her work on this entire project.

This is not a small task, and I know that you are in many ways working extra hours to get this project done and to bring these back to us.

And so I really appreciate the work that you're putting into it.

I do have one question.

And I probably should have asked this ahead of time.

So I forgive you if you do not have an answer for me.

Under the penalty section, so I noticed that this is a misdemeanor punishable up to 90 days in jail and a fine not to exceed \$500.

I guess in this particular case, what is the likelihood of somebody who is prosecuted under this actually receiving a misdemeanor sentence or the fine as opposed to getting treatment, and what does the City do in order to ensure that, you know, individuals are actually going to be treated in substance use cases?

>> So under the City code, the majority, the overwhelming majority, I'd say probably over 80% of the cases that come in front of the City attorney's office are diverted out of the criminal justice system.

So we're not talking about fines of \$500.

We're not talking about any jail time.

We're not talking about fingerprinting.

The cases that are not being diverted out are drugs and drunk driving which has a public safety component to it which are handled a little differently.

I don't have the numbers on that.

I can tell you since I've been at the City Attorney's office, in October of 2017, I actually have not prosecuted a single case under the -- this chapter under 113.

But for like instances of disorderly-type behavior, disorderly intoxicated persons, which

deals with substance abuse, the goal is always to try to get somebody into treatment and get them help if that's what they need.

There are a few different ways.

One is a diversion capacity if the appetite is there.

But there are people who are not really ready yet.

They haven't hit their point where they're ready to accept help from the community or even admit they have a problem.

They could be coming to court drunk at a 3.0 as a blood-alcohol limit, and they don't want to get help.

In those cases, what we try to do is work on a probation term, if there's a finding of guilt, and those are structured so all of the probation requirements are centered on

addressing the reasons why the person might have a substance abuse issue.

It could be mental health, could be housing, could be employment.

So it's really a restorative and individualized probation.

So what you've probably seen over years past in prosecution just isn't happening in the City of Ann Arbor.

And I can tell you affirmatively since I've been here and since we started our diversion program in 2018, we haven't had that issue.

And just to give yourself a pat on the back, council members, you have the first diversion program in the county for adults.

So keep leading the way on this.

You guys are doing a great job.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Well, if that's true, Ms. Slay, it's only because we have staff to inspire us.

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

C4, an ordinance to repeal Chapter 115, weapons and explosives of Title IX, regulations of the code of the city of Ann Arbor.

Seconded by Councilmember Hayner.

Discussion, please, of C4.

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks.

I'll be real quick.

Again, I appreciate the conversations we had about these ordinances.

And, yeah, I was talking to a constituent about it today.

I want to thank you for what you said over the phone is that these kinds of things like when we have these conversations about them even though they're minor changes that it leads to situation where's you're able to improve the education around our laws.

And I think that's an important part of what we're doing here.

So thank you for that.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

It's 9:34.

Let's take a short break.
Meet you all back at 9:45.
[Gavel]

>> Mayor Taylor: We are back after a short break.
D B-1 to approve site plan at 106 north fourth avenue moved by council member Grand
seconded by Councilmember Disch.

Discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

DC1 resolution to approve the 2022 council calendar moved by?

Councilmember Briggs seconded by Councilmember Ramlawi.

Discussion?

All in favor?

I'm sorry.

My apologies, Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Related to the calendar, is there any chance that we will
not be required to meet in person or that we'll adjust the calendar as a result of that
requirement?

>> Mayor Taylor: I do not believe that there is a likelihood that we will be permitted to
meet by Zoom.

My understanding and I guess I'd be, of course, eager to be corrected on this, that it is
our legal obligation, ourselves and some other of our bodies and commissions to meet
in person.

I have spoken on a, you know, district call with Congress -- Representative Dingle, but it
also is, you know, members of the delegation and a lot of the 12th district delegation as
well.

That group understands, our certainly concern about an amendment to the Open
Meetings Act.

I know that ambassador Irwin -- Senator Irwin has offered such an amendment.

There is, I gather, another week in which it is possible that that could be taken up before
the end of the year, but people in the call didn't think it was -- didn't think it was
particularly likely.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Okay.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: In terms of the calendar itself being altered, with the advisory boards,
that's an interesting question, whether that is something that we could do, whether we
could alter the calendar accordingly.

I suppose that would be postponing.

I think we have an obligation to have two meetings a month by charter.

Of course, we would be corrected by Clerk and attorney.

Today, you know, I have over the course of the past couple inquired of staff as to what
their proposals were with respect to maintaining safe distance for council members and
staff during meetings and then, of course, too, by extension members of the public who
are there.

There is a couple of ideas under way for that, and I would expect staff to come back with something for council's information fairly soon.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Great.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Dohoney, do you have anything you wish to lay over that?

>> Thank you, Mayor.

I did appoint a team to look at different possibilities for the chambers, the team met this afternoon.

They had advised two or three options.

We will circulate that and see if there is a preference.

We have been in communication with some of the boards and commissions.

Some of their members have expressed concern about the requirement to meet in person.

And I can't say it's a majority, but there are some people who have been pretty direct that they don't intend to do that.

So I think we are going to lose some people.

How many, it's premature to say.

But that's where we are at the moment.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Okay.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of DC-1?

I will note for folks, information with respect to Juneteenth, as people may recollect, the City designated Juneteenth as a holiday last summer in advance of the federal government's designation, we, in the course of our resolution, designated Friday to be the date of observation, whereas the federal government chose Monday, unless I'm much mistaken, we have -- although, you know, Ann Arbor does exhibit a certain amount of exceptionalism.

Perhaps this is an interest in which we can tow the line with the rest of the country.

And so we have moved our Juneteenth observance to Monday.

Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

DC-2 resolution to approve 202 council committee appointments.

Moved by Councilmember Grand seconded by Councilmember Disch.

Discussion of the appointments?

Council member Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Well, this is somewhat stressful, but when I'm dead, I want to be remembered for what I did, not for what I failed to do.

So I just want to say how very, very troubling this is.

It's a trend throughout the world.

If you read anything by Ann Applebaum including her latest book "Twilights of Democracy," we have statements that are really unsubstantiated, accusations based on speculation that we're now being asked to take action on.

I hope that after we get all of the communications, including the privilege and confidential communications, we will have a much better idea of what actually

happened.

And as someone who's been involved for many, many years, I can say that this action tonight is consistent with prior behavior including when one of my statements was referred to as Quanon nonsense.

Another time I made reference to housing policy, and I was labeled a racist.

I think that it's always important that we do our homework, due diligence, and clearly understand what the situation is before we take action.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yeah.

I am extremely disappointed with this coming forward the way it is.

When I checked the agenda on Monday of last week, I had the same boards and commission appointments as I had for the last 11 or 12 months.

I got the agenda on Friday.

And I am off the two most powerful committees that are in this government.

I feel this is retaliation, punitive, Trumponian, and poor government.

I have received dozens of emails, calls, in support.

I remember being called beneath contempt earlier this year as well.

I've done nothing wrong.

There has not been an investigation on my actions.

It's been a one-sided story.

In fact, the investigator talks about how the observations are outside her scope that she was hired to come and do.

And in the end, I get terminated.

We have four Councilmembers who are going to have collectively 41 assignments.

How is that possible?

How are you able to make all your meetings, do all your work, be there for your constituents, and still have a day job and a balanced life?

I remember my first two years on council.

I had nine assignments.

And they were easy ones.

Audit, budget and labor that doesn't meet that often, especially back then, and a few others.

Liquor license doesn't meet that much.

But when you start talking about these other boards and commissions, there are considerable commitments if you're going to do the job right.

And I feel that our community will not get what it deserves.

It will not get the responsiveness -- I already get emails from folks that say, I never get a response from my council member in this ward, in that ward, in this ward.

It's not Ward 5, I'll tell you that.

I know council member Briggs does a good job of getting back to her constituents.

But this is alarming, and I urge the body and I urge the Mayor to reconsider what they're putting forward here because this right here is very divisive, and it's not going to be good for our community.

It's not good government.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I'd like to move that we postpone this for two meetings

until we have all of the facts surrounding this and we're not just basing it on speculation.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a second?

Seconded by Councilmember Ramlawi.

Discussion?

I'm going to be voting against the postponement.

If it turns out that the report is entirely -- if it turns out that the report is entirely baseless, then I would be happy to revisit these things.

But for the time being, I'm willing to move forward on the basis of what is in the report.

Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

I want to concur with that.

(Indiscernable) this is not something I personally want to spend my time reail indicating committee spots and asking people to step up and spend more time.

This is because it's true.

It was outside the scope.

And even though it was outside of the scope, there was an ethical concern that was so grave that our attorney outside independent investigator that we hired felt that it was important to bring this to the body's attention.

That's how serious this is.

And I can tell you from experience that I've seen this happen before.

I'm not saying by the council members who are being charged, but this is -- this is something that I've seen happen before.

But we have an attorney with a sterling reputation.

There's nothing fanciful about this.

Why -- what would their motivation be to bring this forward unless they felt that it was a significant ethical breach that needed to be brought to the attention of this body?

And when it was, we can't ignore it.

So what can we do?

We can act, and I believe that there will be other actions.

There will be investigations.

If there are findings of those investigations, there will be other actions.

But this is what we can do this week.

In response to what, to me, is not just disappointing but just incredibly serious.

And you can deny it all you want.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Thank you.

I'm actually going to opposed postponement because I think that this resolution sort of stands on its own.

And I think the deprivation of all appointments entirely from a council member, basically on a whim, having -- we had a council discussion about what was an appropriate response to something that happened six months ago.

And there's just sort of discretionary, hmm, no, we're just going to, like, keep it going, because you can.

I actually oppose the postponement because I think the mayor should stand by this and I think a majority of council should stand by this.

And I think the community should be shocked.

I think that the confidence in making these decisions that are bad for the community, bad for our democracy, totally disrespectful to all of the people who voted for each individual person sitting at this table.

I think it should stand.

I think it should stand on its own, and I think that -- I think the community should see it because I think it's time for people to be shocked.

And if that doesn't happen, then I guess we're in one of those situations where we all step back and go, wow!

What a community we live in.

This is okay.

And I think we all experienced that a few years ago on a national level and I think maybe it's time for us to experience it locally.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: On the postponement, please.

I know there's very little chance to get support from my experience.

There's going to be reasons why it's a terrible idea.

I will just say that our community is being punished.

It's not me.

You know, it's going to make my life easier.

You think, like, I had much influence in those boards and those two committees?

It was a 3-2 vote every time.

But at least I was there to ask questions.

I was there to bring my insight, my experience, a different set of eyes, a different perspective.

What we see here is less inclusion.

There's so much double talk on this table about inclusivity.

Politically it's not.

It's an oligarchy.

I'm the only Person of Color who works for a living.

I got elected on my own two feet.

I went door to door and knocked on doors and talked to people.

I've been a part of this community --

>> I'm sorry, point of order.

I'm the only Person of Color who works for a living?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: And so --

>> I'm sorry, no.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I bring perspective.

I bring experience.

And, okay, the justification here is taking off the closed session heavy assignments, and you're doing it without conclusive evidence of any sort.

You haven't done an investigation on what happened.

The City Attorney's office violated the ethics.

You're talking about ethics being violated.

Mr. Postema violated the most in any of this.

Okay?

I get a true independent investigator involved.

I can hire -- yeah, I wish I could hire my own investigator, too.

That would be nice.

Like hiring my own health department inspector.

So what I'm trying to get here is that I was not assigned to different committees or commissions.

Hey, you know what?

We'll put you back on our commission.

We'll put you back on liquor license.

We'll put you back on audit.

No.

There was no addition.

There was just subtraction.

Put me on some committees.

Put me on some assignments that are not closed session in the time being.

That's not what happened here.

You have four council members with 41 assignments, and one of those is planning commission.

Tell me how the work of the people is going to get done.

It's frankly not.

They're not even getting emails responded to them.

>> Mayor Taylor: Got Hayner, Briggs, Adina on the postponement.

If you're actually talking about the postponement, I'm going to charge you against it.

But if we're not, I'm going to charge you on the main motion in terms of speaking times.

So I've got Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks, Mr. Mayor.

I'm going to speak to the postponement.

I understand the intent of asking to postpone it, but I agree with what Councilmember Nelson said, that I think we should just have this vote because there's other important votes coming up even tonight further down the agenda.

And I think it would be good to see where folks stand on a matter that's as essential to our democracy as this is before we go ahead and ask for a millage and ask for their trust in other matters.

I think it's important that the residents see what the makeup of this body is all about.

So I'm going to reject the request for a postponement.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

On so this postponement, it sounds like there have been two issues raised around Councilmember Hayner's not being reappointed to committees and commissions.

And I think that we have, you know, I am, quite some time ago, Councilmember Grand asked Councilmembers if they were willing to serve on any of the additional committees, and I would say that, you know, I reluctantly raised my hand because I do believe that those committees and commissions, you know, deserve representation on them.

Even though it is going to be requiring additional time on my behalf.

I do think that the community members who serve on these commissions deserve to be -- that know that we respect our DEI work.

Regarding sort of this report in terms of why we would postpone, I'm not sure what information I would be looking for more on that.

I mean, we have an independent investigation conducted by a trained attorney who has raised -- has presented information that it doesn't seem disputable.

The sentence that I'm reading that has led me to think that it's appropriate is even more troubling.

The characterization of the closed session discussion that was given led him to conclude that the City's legal department had prejudged the merits of his complaint.

And what was relayed at that meeting seems to be the contributing cause feeling the need to suddenly remove himself from the work environment on October 5.

An act that, while perhaps understandable in context, was disruptive to City business.

This is -- there's -- I don't know what more information we would get to dispute that.

I don't serve on either of these committees.

I wasn't -- I didn't serve last year.

I'm not going to serve this coming year.

Not all of us get to serve.

That's part of this body.

But those that do serve and represent our body should be doing so appropriately.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I'd just quickly point out this notion of postponement, if it's to gather additional information, I still don't support it.

In the council resolution that, you know, denied me appointments for six months, which I respected, and asked me to do certain things, which I did, there was no mechanism for me to report back to this body, and no one was appointed to fill those empty seats for those six months.

So it wasn't a grave consideration over the representation of the residence then, and it certainly isn't now either, clearly.

So let's take this postponement vote and move on with the main motion, please.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of postponement?

Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Disch.

>> Clerk Beaudry:>> Clerk Beaudry: Disch?

>> Councilmember Song: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Griswold?

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Song?

>> Councilmember Song: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Grand?

Councilmember Grand?

>> Councilmember Grand: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Adina?

>> Adina: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor Taylor?

>> Mayor Taylor: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Eyer?

>> Councilmember Eyer: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Nelson?

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Briggs?

>> Councilmember Briggs: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Ramlawi?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Hayner?

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion fails.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion on the main motion?
Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: If it were acceptable to the body and to the Mayor Pro Tem, I would propose an amendment that would add Councilmember Ramlawi to the liquor commission and take me off.

>> That's (Inaudible) to me.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a second?
By Councilmember Song.
Is that firmly the body?
It's not friendly to the body?
It's been moved and seconded.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I was Chair of liquor commission.
If we're going to start swinging stuff amendment-wise, I'll add myself back to everything I had.
If we want to play amendment games.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I will need to recuse myself from that commission in the upcoming months.
I don't want to serve on that commission.
Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Perhaps we can consider that amendment withdrawn with the acquiescence of the group.
Councilmember Adina.

>> Councilmember Adina: Thank you, Mayor Taylor.
Councilmember Ramlawi is right in a sense tonight that serving on additional committees is more work.
It is not making life easier for me by any means to be asked to serve on more committees, and debating this tonight is not how I want to spend my time on this body.
But service on these particular committees requires trust.
What is not in question is that two council members who have since self-identified themselves to be Councilmember Ramlawi and Nelson, conducted an independent investigation and immediately thereafter that employee removed himself from employment, causing a disruption to city services and impeding the investigation itself.
By contacting and meeting with the complainant about the subject matter of his complaint, after council had reviewed it, and appropriately authorized an external independent investigation to be conducted, that trust has been broken.
Any such contact with a complainant or witness or subject of an independent investigation about the matter of the investigation, especially in a way that clearly impacts the course of that investigation, is in my view inexcusable and has the potential

to jeopardize the validity of the investigation itself.

So, yes.

In response to one of my colleagues, the community should be shocked tonight.

But by my judgment, it should not be shocked by council's response.

It should be shocked by the misconduct.

So I will be supporting these, like the Mayor should, evidence come forward that these allegations are untrue, I am happy to revisit this.

But the language that we have received from the independent investigator seems fairly conclusive to me.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I thought that democracy was under attack tonight for other reasons, but now I find that we are also following the policy of guilty until proven innocent.

As I've stated before, I have employment law training and management experience.

I raise concerns about the first report that was done by Attorney Salvatore.

What she has provided is simply speculation that other people -- excuse me -- have disputed.

There's an issue with the time line.

I have additional information regarding the weekend between the first complaint and the second complaint, I was not interviewed.

It is not an independent investigation.

At this point I am prepared to take legal action because as I said before, when I'm gone, I want to be known for what I did, not for what I overlooked, which often leads to crises in communities because people don't stand up.

There are two accusations that have been denied, and council members can say whatever they want.

It does not change the facts.

Two accusations that have been denied.

That is the basic facts.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you, Councilmember Griswold, for taking a little bit of thunder out of what I was going to say that, yes.

I am guilty now until I prove myself innocent based on the testimony I'm hearing from this board.

I will have to prove myself here.

Not that they're going to prove that I committed something improper and unethical.

There's such a double standard here.

What's going on here is a mischaracterization of the events, Councilmember Radina.

Maybe you want to launch an investigation and get things straight before you start accusing people, tarnishing their reputation.

Stressing them out.

But that's not how we do business here.

We protect our own, and we manipulate investigations to have the outcome that we choose to desire.

In fact, I did not reach out to Mr. Gawardo.

He came to me.

And you know what?

He's not the only Person of Color to come to me since October 4.

There's been two other City employees who have come to me, complaining about workplace discrimination and harassment.

You know, so how is it possible for this investigator to even know what we said or at least hear our side of the story when she never even asked us if we talked about closed session?

She did not.

We did not reveal anything about closed session.

But yet there is potential, maybe, and this is the reason why he didn't come back.

No, the reason why he didn't come back to work is because we didn't put John Fournier on paid leave and put a separation, because the no-contact clause was voided, was violated.

He didn't feel safe --

>> Mayor Taylor: Your time.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: That's why he didn't come back to work.

Don't blame me for your mess.

>> Councilmember Radina: --

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Thank you.

Just to clarify some points.

That seem to be getting lost here.

Our independent investigator already found that Councilmembers Nelson and Ramlawi disclosed information from a closed session council meeting, relating to the legal advice that was given to council by the City Attorney's office.

This was an extremely serious offense, one that --

>> Point of order, Mr. Mayor.

Point of order.

>> Mayor Taylor: On what possible basis?

That we have -- the last four, five comments have been speaking to details of Ms. Salvatore's report on HR matter.

They haven't been speaking in any way to the matter before us.

>> Mayor Taylor: That's not --

>> Appointments.

Are we debating DC-2?

>> Mayor Taylor: Council member, that's obviously related, and in the fanciful world in which it's unrelated, it's been -- the door has been opened by Councilmembers contesting the validity of the report.

>> And so instead of discussing the list, we're going to discuss the reasons that you didn't put people on the list.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Okay.

>> May I start the clock again?

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember.

>> Councilmember Eyer: This -- what's been alleged that -- it -- what is being discussed

here is not an allegation.

It is what the independent investigator found.

That these two council members disclosed information from a closed session.

This is an extremely serious offense.

One that the investigator found disrupted city business, damaged working relationships of key city officials, caused unnecessary harm, and potentially interfered with the investigation.

In case people are unaware of how serious this is, disclosing information from closed sessions may be a violation of two state laws.

The Open Meetings Act and the state Ethics Act.

These council members are there for not being reappointed to committees that deal heavily with closed sessions and privileged legal information.

This isn't about politics.

This is about protecting City employees.

It's about upholding our fiduciary responsibility to the city.

We can't have council members on sensitive committees who can't be trusted to keep confidential information private.

And who take actions to harm City employees and cause the City unnecessary expense.

In my view, it would be just wholly irresponsible to place these two council members back on sensitive committees given what we know.

So I'm voting for the committee assignments as they are presented to us in order to protect City employees as well as residents and taxpayers from potential further harm, by council members who have demonstrated that they can't be trusted.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

I'd just speak to a couple now to the main resolution and what went into some of the conversations behind these decisions that were not made lightly and certainly not on a whim.

To Councilmember Hayner's lack of appointments, it's incredibly important, I know Councilmember Briggs brought this up earlier, that our boards and commissions remain places as we work towards the goals to continue to further diversify our boards and commissions that are places that are welcoming.

And if we want to be able to continue to recruit people to volunteer that reflect our community, we need to keep those places safe, and based on the behavior in the last year, you know, the pulling of committees was first rule number one.

And this council came to some conclusions based on slur round 2 that still hold.

From my perspective.

In terms of, you know, I think Councilmember Eyer articulated very clearly that when we look to this information that has come out over the past, you know, week or so, we looked, you know, in the immediate term to committees that have closed session on a regular basis.

This is certainly not the end, you know, as someone who serves on the council administration committee, I will certainly be bringing forward a call to investigate this further, and then we'll have actions if, you know, if there's further information from the investigation.

This is serious.

And I also just want to draw attention to Councilmember Ramlawi's calling out not only of our colleague Councilmember Song in a way that was totally inappropriate and uncalled for, but --

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Can I get clarification on that?

>> Mayor Taylor: No.

Councilmember, don't interrupt.

>> Councilmember Grand: And also accusing our City Attorney's office of all sorts of misdeeds.

I don't think you can find a staff member in the City that has more integrity than Mr. Postema.

I guess that's all I'm going to say about that.

I just really appreciate his service to the City and his character.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks, Mr. Mayor.

I'm going to speak directly to the resolution and ask my colleagues to reject DC-2 and ask the mayor to bring back a list that includes everyone.

Approving these appointments, it harms the community that we all serve by reducing and denying representation, and it's very rude.

It's undemocratic.

And anybody who tries to justify this exclusionary action will be, in my view, morally bankrupt.

That's what I see here.

So let's move on with this, please, so we can get a sense of the body that sits before the public.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: --

>> Councilmember Radina: Councilmember, you are inaudible.

>> Councilmember Song: I have the view that this is something that we do (Inaudible) at this table.

So if we don't (Inaudible) with each other in committees, we are certainly available to work with each other outside of committees and here at the table.

So should council members -- I mean, it's unfortunate, I am on the license review.

It would have been interesting to serve again alongside Councilmember Ramlawi, as we do on other committees.

But if there's want for additional work, you know, again, Councilmember Eyer has said before that, as many of us have done and continue to do, is to watch meetings, participate, call in for public comments, so the democratic process is still available to all of us.

Just as we encourage our constituency participates.

There's nothing stopping us from participating.

So I look forward to it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I would encourage my colleagues to join me as the charter allows and participate in the parks advisory commission meetings.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi, you have used your speaking times.
Further discussion?
Let me start my clock.
You know, I tend to turn the other cheek a fair bit in the face of critique.
You know, I don't -- and getting blamed for the consequences of other people's actions is part of the job.
But, you know, I'd like to engage a little bit here.
You know, I don't very much like being involved in conflict.
It is not my way, and that is, I think, demonstrable and obvious.
But when you're faced with transgressions and concerns of the natures here, our response is obligatory.
Inaction is acquiescence.
You know, I'm not okay with anti-gay slurs by anyone, much less from elected official, and no person should be.
I'm not okay with what I read in the report.
Concerns raised by an absolutely unimpeachable investigator regarding closed session and attorney/client privilege, concerns about the investigation.
No person should be okay with this.
I don't believe that we should -- well, with respect to the anti-gay slur and the taboo, I don't believe that -- I believe that the voicing of those terms by elected official is not acceptable, and I do not accept it.
It severs the community from their government.
And I don't believe that we should require community volunteers or persons with business before the bodies to have to work in an environment with that elephant in the room.
And as to the administration community and the budget labor committee, these are closed session attorney/client privilege heavy where trust and adherence to duty are at a premium.
I'm not the person whom the investigator -- independent investigator raised questions with, raised material and important concerns.
I care about the professional administration of the City on behalf of our community members.
I care about our legal obligation to maintain closed session, the duty to observe attorney/client privilege.
I care that investigations, internal investigations, when they are necessary, are performed without interference.
I care about staff members all the time being treated with dignity and respect.
You know, we have serious work to do, and that work requires that we act within the rules.
Work that requires us to act in a manner that welcomes all members of our community.
Work that requires us to respect staff.
For me these conditions are nonnegotiable.
And the fact that those conditions have been breached lead us to where we are today.
I look forward to continuing to do the work on the committee with absolutely everyone and absolutely anyone, as always, whether or not they agree with me or not, who can meet those terms.

Act within the rules.

Welcome all members of the community.

Respect staff.

Further discussion?

Roll call vote, please, starting can Councilmember Disch.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Disch?

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Griswold?

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Song?

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Grand?

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

Councilmember Adina?

>> Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor Taylor?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Eyer?

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Nelson?

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Briggs?

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Ramlawi?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Council member Hayner?

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seconded by Kuala Lumpur Song.

So I propose that we bring this resolution a couple of times ago and wanted to just reflect upon it briefly again.

You know, we have a plan to achieve or reduce carbonwide carbon neutrality.

It's A20.

It's a plan to improve basic services and enhance quality of life for everyone.

Clean, reliable, local electricity, a drive to zero waste through year-end composting and recycling.

Weatherization programs.

Energy programs in homes and businesses to save money and increase comfort.

Miles of new bikeway and pedestrian infrastructure.

Transit infrastructure.

Neighborhood resiliency hubs, aggressive, easy support, thousands of trees.

But what we do not have in the presence of this plan is the resources to achieve it.

And that's why I'm so glad that we're going to be bringing this forward today.

A one mill, 20-year millage proposal to raise the funds necessary for people in Ann Arbor to enjoy the safety, comfort, and affordability, frankly the moral benefits of a carbon neutrality economy.

Pardon me, a carbon-neutral community.

The community carbon action millage will cost the average homeowner about \$2 a week, but the benefits that they will receive will be true value for money. Citywide programs to reduce energy costs, increase comfort and safety, improve lives now.

As we know, every person alive today will spend more due to climate change.

That is a fact.

The question is how will we be spend that money?

Will it be investment in the future?

Or new spending that bloats tenfold in a further degraded world?

I believe in Ann Arbor that we value science and value for the money that we believe in common action, for common purpose, and that's why I'm confident that residents are going to ultimately support the community climate action millage, to improve our basic services and enhance quality of life, to achieve equitable, affordable, community-wide carbon neutrality.

There have been -- there is a change to the resolution, which you have received, which I want to note for you.

And that is rather than place the amendment -- pardon me, rather than place the millage on the May ballot, to place the millage on the November 22 ballot.

This will give us all time to reflect upon the importance of this, of this effort.

It will give us an ability to detail and communicate again and again the -- our very thorough A20 plan, and will give all of our partners in and out of the organization time to appreciate what it is that the A20 plan has to offer, both in terms of, of course, primary goal of carbon neutrality, and the provision of service, but, you know, important issues of equity and benefit to all.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Well, thank you for the introductory information and placing this on the November ballot.

That was one of the biggest issues that I had early on was calling out a special election with a very low turnout to decide something that affects us all, and not just here in Ann Arbor but globally.

I do appreciate this, and it does give us more time to really fully conceptualize everything that we're going to need to do and how to do it in the right order, to where to get the most for our money in reducing our carbon emissions.

In ways that we're not just trying to buy ourselves out of this problem with offsets and other ways of transferring our pollution from our conscious onto some other poor soul.

An issue that I have, though, is that we're relying this and basing this on a plan, on a living document that expires in ten years or less.

But yet we're asking if we're a 20-year millage, for something that we haven't embarked on doing yet.

We haven't spent the money.

We haven't been responsible.

We haven't had the experience of doing so.

I really have a hard time giving government such a long leash.

I would like for our government to check back in with its residents, its citizens periodically just as we have elections to make sure that we're doing the right job and that we have the best reform of representative government, in the form of taxation in

this case.

So I will have something more to say, but a 20-year mill on a 10-year plan seems a little odd to me.

Without checking back in with the taxpayers a little bit before 20 years from now.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Council member Griswold?

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

I was prepared to vote no if it was a May election because I think it's extremely wasteful, and the cost of a May election could have filled a lot of potholes.

I want to raise a few operational issues that we have with some of this infrastructure, and I am confident that Mr. Dohoney is going to improve our day-to-day operations, our metrics, and most importantly have a feedback loop.

So when we do something, we know if it was a success or not rather than just the type of rhetoric we heard tonight regarding accusations being facts and a bike lane must be wonderful.

The Williams Street bike lane next to the crosswalk ramp was below water because the slope -- the cross-slope is not adequate for proper drainage.

Now, I hope that someone will deal with that.

We also have federal resources that we need to evaluate in all of this.

Some of our new bikeways are slippery.

Before we put in any more green paint on our roadways, we need to make sure that it's the proper mix of paint and sand or whatever they put into the paint to create some traction.

I also looked over on industrial , and it looked like they just took a jackhammer to the street to make it rough before they painted it green.

I am sure that's not best practice.

So I hate to nitpick, but let's get it right when we only -- when we have one or two bike lanes before we put in another ten.

Otherwise we're going to have cyclists riding with the cars rather than in the bike lane. So thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yeah, thanks, Mr. Mayor.

I have, for some time, clearly and unsuccessfully promoted policies in this body that are in keeping with Dr. Stoltz ideas in the A20 plan.

Viewers might recall that I ask for all our housing commission properties to be considered net zero.

That was voted down by this body.

That I asked for TC1 to have storm water, net zero, and affordability components baked into it before we gave those bonuses away.

That was voted down by this body.

That I worked with former councilwoman Banister, my council colleague, tree protections which are going away soon and haven't been acted upon by this body.

So if you'll excuse me for being skeptical that this is going to work out for us, because we haven't done the things we can do for free, but now we're going to reach into taxpayers' pockets.

And higher taxes equals sprawl.

Higher taxes equal unaffordability, and the driving out of seniors on fixed incomes and other low-income individuals without huge efforts to remediate that situation somehow in all this mix.

So without too much hearing negativity because I recall attending the 2018 lady lecture which was titled no victory without optimism.

And of course in our case it's no victory without a billion dollars.

And it will still be no victory because we have a federal government whose interior department discounts co-leases on public lands and is stalling on all kinds of other things.

You know, we have a global community and a global atmosphere.

So I'm skeptical that we're going to get to the end of this, and by 2030, I hope that we do, but I'm skeptical.

And I see these tiny trees we're planting and they're not trees that that are going to grow up to be giant trees.

So I'm really concerned about that.

If we had a community benefits ordinance, I'd be more comfortable with some of these things as it could have applied to our planning.

Is there a reason that it's 20 years when our plan is supposed to be over in ten years?

Is that something that Dr. Stoltz could answer?

>> Sure.

Thank you for the question.

So if you'll recollect, in A20, the way the plan was adopted is that offsets play a role to the 2030 goal but we know that we're not done.

And so the idea is that we're going to have to keep working.

We don't sort of stop at 2030.

We've got to keep moving and we also have to sustain the programs that we have and the initiatives.

Otherwise emissions will go right back up.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Okay.

So is there any consideration that we do a ten-year millage and we see we're making progress and we're able to analyze a return on investment and our progress moving forward and renew the millage like we do for so many millages?

20 years seems like a long time.

>> I think that's a political question.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Okay.

Then I'm going to move to amend the charter language to say from 2022 through 2042, to say 2022 through 2032.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a second?

Second by Councilmember Ramlawi.

On the amendment, I'm going to vote against the amendment.

I think it's incredibly important that we give staff the confidence of a long-term -- you know, as Dr. Stoltz indicated, you know, we have -- we will have work to do after we have achieved our particular goal.

That is to say we will continue the work.

Further, if for some reason it turns out mission accomplished and it's all taken care of, the ability to levy a millage is not an obligation to levy a millage.

Council future can make that decision downstream if it wishes.

And so I'm going to be voting against it so as to give us the ability to plan over the long term.

On the amendment, I've got Hayner, Briggs and Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yeah, thanks.

Typically the I think the person who brings amendment gets to speak, but that's okay. I know we're throwing all kinds of formalities out this year.

>> Mayor Taylor: I'm sorry, I thought you spoke on it.

My apologies.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I withhold a lot.

I know you think I'm your big critic or whatever and you're going to punish me for it, but, you know, I hold back.

And, you know, because we've had a reasonable relationship here.

But --

>> Mayor Taylor: Per prior, I thought you had established a rationale for your amendment and were finished.

You are correct.

The person who offers the amendment should be able to have the amendment, have the first speak.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thank you.

I've never seen a millage go away.

Has anyone ever seen a millage go away?

No.

Never.

So that's not going to happen.

That's why I'm asking for ten years with a renewal for another ten years.

And there's plenty of time to consider that.

And ten years is a long time in planning.

2030 is only eight fiscal years away.

Actually, seven.

By the time this comes into play.

And so, you know, ten years is three years planning beyond that date.

Now, is it true that in my reading of the A20 plan, and this will be my last question, this is why it's a ten-year question I'm putting forward here.

That when we get to 2030 and we see where we're at, if there's no more improvements to locally, we're going to take this millage money and purchase carbon offsets on the global market?

>> Also A20 as adopted.

Yeah, but they are not offsets on the global market.

This is part of the energy principles and criteria that were adopted earlier that really determine where those offsets come from.

So I don't want to eat up your time.

I'll just share things like the virtual power reduction agreement that we got out of the intervention with DTE is about getting energy, waste reduction offsets in Michigan in inner city schools, in churches.

So we're working on policy tools that help us make investments right here in Michigan

that would be those kinds of offsets.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Okay.

That's a good reason to do ten years because then we can see where we're at. And hopefully the dynamics have changed in southeast Michigan and everyone's moving in this direction.

And we can say to ourselves, hey, here's some schools or whatever that we're going to -- we want this other, you know, these offset markets are set up to help people regional, locally, and we need more money to do this and we'll ask again.

I think ten years is plenty for us.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: On the amendment, we've got Radina, Briggs, Ramlawi.

>> I'd like to just stay in queue for the main motion.

I have no comment at the moment.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yep.

Briggs?

Councilmember Briggs?

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: On the amendment?

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes, on the amendment.

Yeah, I don't support ten years.

I would love to support ten years.

I'd love to believe that we were at a point in ten years where we had actually implemented all of the elements of our plan.

And while I am incredibly impressed by our City staff, this is an ambitious plan.

And I think that every single one of us around the table knows that it's not going to be -- the work is not going to be completed by 2030 if we just simply look at strategy, number 4 of reducing the miles we travel in our vehicles by at least 50%.

That is a huge lift.

It's going to require a lot of work in our community just to get there, and that's just one of the seven goals.

We have a lot of work to do in our community, and we have these funds -- nobody wants to see another millage in our community, but the reality is that, you know, we should have been doing this, this work decades ago.

Right?

So I continue to support recognizing that we're going to need this funding for an extended period of time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi on the amendment.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yeah.

I do support the ten years.

I mean, just like I have a 20-year lease on my building here.

It comes in five-year segments.

Every five years, you re-up.

You make sure that everyone's doing what they should be doing, and you still need it.

And you re-up again.

We have something here.

We have no track record.

We have no track record.

We're asking the voters to cough up 1 mill on top of everything else we're paying, and not everybody in this community can afford it.

That's just the fact.

And, you know, I don't see what the hesitation would be if we're doing what we're supposed to do with this money, that in ten years from now voters would not reward us or whoever is in these seats with another ten-year renewal.

It adds the accountability factor.

We must be accountable to the taxpayers, to our residents, to the people that vote for this.

How do we know, as voters and taxpayers, that this is actually going to go to what it should do and be successful?

In answer to Councilmember Hayner's question, no, I have not seen a millage that ended prematurely just because the mission was somehow accomplished sooner.

So this ten years allows us to make sure that we build in the metrics, we build in the accountability, we do what's right, and when we go back to the voters in ten years, they will support it once again because they know what we did the first time.

I just, you know, I'm perplexed, you know, by all of this, and we should be trying to build support ultimately so this passes in November, just like the affordable housing millage passed.

If we can get this so everybody can support it and it doesn't lose by 1 or 2% because people are freaked out by the 20 years, but they saw ten years and said you know what?

I can live with that.

That's reasonable.

But if this millage goes down by 1% or 2% because it's at 20 years versus 10, we all lose.

And I think what our -- what we should be trying to do here is to get a millage that passes, that gets the support of the voters.

And I think a ten-year would give us a better chance at a success.

And, again, build in the accountability.

Build in the metrics.

Build in the trust.

Because right now I'm not sure it's all there to get this thing over the finish line.

Let's make it -- let's market this and be able to make it succeed.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: So as I understand it, these millage efforts are supported by campaigns, campaign efforts, to get their messaging out to encourage folks to get out to vote.

So clearly, you know, I'm assuming that, given the comments, that we're all volunteering for this severity if we're in support of this millage.

My question is for timing.

You know, if (Inaudible) to how we think about infrastructure and how we plan for that work for a multi -- in multiple years, I don't think it's really outside the realm of possibility of doing -- approaching it in a similar way.

I won't be in support of a ten-year effort.

We're already, what, two years in from having work funded by the mental health village rebate, the county rebate.

So we understand how far we've come and how far we've got to go.

It's clear beyond ten years, so I'm not in support of the ten-year.

>> Mayor Taylor: Ms. Beaudry?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, because the charter amendment language was amended, that this would be on the November ballot, I think the years are off by one tax year.

So it should be 2023 to 2043, and the amendment would then be to 2033 because we won't be able to make the '22 tax roll with a November millage.

If I can just make that administrative amendment.

>> Mayor Taylor: I'm okay with that administrative amendment.

Let's see.

Let's do this.

Is that -- perhaps this, Ms. Beaudry, let's vote on this amendment and then we'll take -- make sure that we'll take yours separately so that there's no question.

Is that all right?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Yes.

I'm sorry, I meant just like a clerical correction.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yeah, prior to it it describes May election in the language prior to the body of the resolution.

And I think that's okay.

>> Mayor Taylor: Fair point.

Thank you.

Thank you, Councilmember.

Ms. Beaudry, if you can make all date-related modifications of the nature that you've described.

Is there any objection to that in the body?

I see no objection.

On the amendment, Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Ms. Beaudry just brought up the year 2033, and I think that's the same year that the green belt millage expires.

So I think, again, more support, get people to buy in, get this approved so we can get to work.

We need to get this millage passed, and I feel a 20-year millage out of the gate is going to get people to vote no.

And we don't have 20 years.

We don't have 15.

We need to act now.

And the purpose of reducing this to 10 is to get this supported by the voters, again, and, you know, 2033, sounds like a good year.

It's already there with the green belt.

So I just decided to mention that again.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion on the amendment?

Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Disch.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Disch?

>> Councilmember Disch: No.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Griswold?
>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Song?
>> Councilmember Song: No.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Grand?
>> Councilmember Grand: No.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Adina?
>> Councilmember Adina: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor Taylor?
>> Mayor Taylor: No.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Eyer?
>> Councilmember Eyer: No.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Nelson?
>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Briggs?
>> Councilmember Briggs: No.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Ramlawi?
>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Hayner?
>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion fails.
>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the amendment, Councilmember Adina.
>> Thank you, Mayor.

And I have spoken about this in the past.

And so rather than, you know, repeating a lot of the comments that I have made previously, you know, I just want to -- I want to emphasize, I, too, was not supportive of this in a May election, so I am glad that we have moved this out to November.

And I am incredibly cautious about, you know, asking residents to invest even more in our city.

I do think that we are approaching a bit of a saturation rate.

But in reviewing the information about this, I think that this is an incredibly important effort.

And if approved, it would empower us to invest in a cleaner and more resilient future for the City by focusing on things like better basic services that residents want and need already.

So, like, expanded compost and recycling.

Improved transportation infrastructure.

It's going to allow us to develop more reliable and sustainable clean energy options for our community, help lower income residents and seniors save money by making their homes more energy and water efficient, improve our emergency preparedness efforts, and help to mitigate neighborhood flooding.

So I think not only are all of these things critically important to our climate goals, but they are also critically important needs for our city.

And so while this may get a little bit more into the second but obviously related amendment, I wonder if Director Stoltz could talk maybe briefly a little bit more about

some of the other services that this money would be utilized for.

If approved.

>> Yeah.

And so the quickest answer is it really parallels A20.

So we have been working on our plans to support, you name it, extension of the weatherization program.

Right now we have a lot of Ann Arborites just outside the threshold to receive those types of services and we can use this to match and improve the health, safety and comfort in their homes.

We can use this to help support the transition to electrification, helping people make the right choice which I know Councilmember Hayner has been doing for a long time and really thankful for that too.

Helping people walking and biking, infrastructure expansion, and I think Councilmember Griswold for naming we need to do that the right way the first time so this funding can help make sure that we don't have to skimp where we can but we can invest in the right infrastructure at the right time.

It's helping make sure that we think about, as we're, you know, things that are pretty mundane.

But as we're replacing roads, cycles look different than they did before.

And so how are we using the right materials that might be a little more expensive up front but actually can withstand the climate we are experiencing so we can leverage this kind of funding to do those kinds of services.

And there's -- I mean, every year will be different.

We looked at the first year, what we prioritized the funding for.

But basically it's everything A20 with the exception of bus electrification, which we are spreading federal dollars for that.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

I want to recognize Dr. Stoltz for her leadership and her advocacy and just state one more time, we cannot be successful unless we have the operations to back that up and the staffing that's needed.

I also have a question.

I worked on a number of millage campaigns.

And will we have the opportunity to have some surveys done to make sure, if we're listing six or seven or ten components of this millage, we want to make sure that there was -- isn't one in there that's going to cause, say, 10% of the people to vote no.

We don't -- you know, we want to make sure that we have the building blocks to get to a yes.

And the other thing I want to mention is that staff can educate about this millage, but they cannot campaign and advocate for it.

And so we need to make sure that once we have a millage identified and passed, that that staff is careful about what they say.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I know we're supposed to -- we're supposed to lead with ourselves.

You know, I guess because I was coming on board in 2018, it just meant a lot to me

when I went to this lecture.

It -- Cristiano Fedaris who they call the architect of the Paris accord spoke here.

Actually, it might have been at -- it doesn't matter.

It was here in town.

It was the day before the climate action rally which I had the privilege to attend.

She said five easy things we can do to fight climate change.

Cut back on eating beef.

I did that 32 years ago.

Buy local foods that don't rare fossil fuel.

Sell any high-carbon stocks we own, so we should look at that again with our City investments if we haven't already.

And buy into renewable energy companies.

And support student strikes in global action, and don't be despondent about this.

And so I constantly see things that we can do without a collective raising of the tax rates.

And I just -- I mean, I guess we're going to move this forward, and it will be decided at the ballot box.

But I'm -- I'm disappointed that it seems like whenever we identify a crisis in our community, perhaps that we've created through our own inactions, that our first solution is always write a check.

And so I think what we have going on here is a community that majority of people, because of their relationship with the university and tech and other high-paying jobs and the general long-standing wealth that is our community is people who are going to assuage their guilt over not acting early about climate change by writing a check.

And it doesn't matter to somebody that they pay another 500 tax year because they're not getting another 1290 a month from security social.

They're getting kicked out of their house.

I'm sorry to all the residents who are going to be gentrified by these actions to try and make our world a better place.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: Thank you.

This millage is going to save people money.

Right now it is a known fact, statistically shown, that folks with lower incomes pay disproportionately high amounts to heat their homes.

And a core piece of this millage is going to -- as Dr. Stoltz just said a few minutes ago, is going to be able to help more people or provide the resources to more people to weatherize their homes.

And that in itself is huge.

And it saves people money.

The other -- another thing that this millage is going to do is spread basic city services like composting and recycling more equitably.

Right now we are doing a very good job composting, recycling for single-family homes.

And I am not saying that as a denigration.

I totally respect the work that our solid waste area does.

But we have not figured out how to do this well for multifamily homes.

Excuse me, either one of those.

We also can't afford to extend composting to commercial, to businesses.

Think of all the restaurants we have.

We should be carting off those food scraps and either getting them into compost or taking them to farms and feeding them to pigs.

There's so much we can do to recapture the value that's in the things that we waste right now.

And this is what this millage will pay for.

It will pay for things that actually add and create value.

This is not just a virtue tax, if that's the way people are thinking about it.

It is a move that is going to save people money.

It's going to make it easier, help people buy electric stoves, and we can reduce indoor air pollution, which is awful.

The other thing that this millage will allow us to do is get big into offsets and Adam Simon at the University has given a couple of talks.

I wrote about one two summers ago where he talks about these behavioral changes are slow.

They take a long time to make a dent.

But you can offset a ton of your emissions by -- with money, with large amounts of money, and that, then, gives you time to create the infrastructure and the culture for behavioral change.

This is what we need this millage for.

This is what we need 20 years for.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I appreciate the enthusiasm Councilmember Disch brings to the conversation on this.

But the reality is, it's a drop in the bucket.

Ann Arbor is just one little tiny speck on a giant blue ball.

So we have to be cognizant of that, you know.

This problem's going to have to be solved by China, India, the United States and other big nations.

Yes, we need to do our part, but I'm concerned.

I'm concerned that this millage may not get passed.

First, again, like I said, 20 years, I think, you know, as Councilmember Radina said, we're at a saturation point.

And so who knows what the economy's going to be like next year?

But I know a lot of people are struggling.

When we talk about expanding compost, it's already going to be done this year, from what I understand, from the City staff that sent us the memo.

This year we have the money in the budget to do composting year round.

So if somebody can correct me if I'm wrong on that, but we're going to be doing that already.

Also, it just goes to me to think about where do we put our money first?

It's as if we have a bunch of debt.

We've got to pay down those high-interest credit cards first.

Unfortunately composting is very low on the emissions percentage-wise and the cost that it's going to take to deal with that.

So correct me if I'm wrong again, but it's under 1.5% of our carbon emissions, but yet costs a lot of money to run that program.

You know, we don't talk enough about reducing our consumption.

We don't.

Everybody here, myself at times included, just think we're going to buy ourselves out of something.

We're not -- there's no buying another planet.

There's no --

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilor?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: There's no buying things that are gone.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: I do not disagree with Councilmember suggests that there is a great deal of individual action and individual responsibility that will make progress for our community.

But the reality is that around the council table here, we are talking about the actions that government can take.

And there is a lot of work that needs to be done and a lot of investments need to be made to make progress on this.

You know, I, too, am concerned about how making sure that our community remains a place that is affordable.

Is a place that is affordable for everybody to be able to access.

We know that we're getting more expensive.

We know that that's why parts of our climate action plan talk about building additional housing, creating additional transportation options because transportation is the second highest cost in individual budgets.

But we've also taken meaningful action this year, and we can do more of this in terms of looking at our tax exemption guidelines.

So as you'll recall, we voted to set new income limits at 2 1/2 times the federal poverty levels, raising the personal asset limit to \$50,000.

We've taken meaningful action to make sure that the burden to those who are paying property taxes at the lowest income level had some relief in our community, and we'll have to continue to look at that.

We may need to continue to raise that threshold to make sure that our community is affordable to live in.

But that doesn't stop us and stop our responsibility from taking meaningful action here and making sure that we have the resources to actually implement our plans.

Otherwise we have adopted a beautiful plan, but, you know, it's not meaningful unless we are able to fund it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

Councilmember, you are inaudible.

>> Councilmember Disch: Correct.

I will just say very quickly that, yes, Councilmember Ramlawi, you are right.

There will be an extension of compost service through the winter months, one tip per month in the winter months.

That is an extension, not an expansion.

The program is not getting -- we're not adding more people.

We're not adding more carts.

We're not adding -- you know, maybe we will.

We did last winter.

That would be fabulous if we can do it again.

But that is not bringing in multifamily households to the program.

And 40% of greenhouse gases are involved in the consumption economy, which includes stuff that gets composted, stuff that gets recycled, stuff that gets bought.

So the figures on the tiny contribution that composting makes are not correct.

They are not taking into account scope 3 emissions.

When you do that, you see that the things that we are talking about in strategy 5, which we have made very little progress towards so far, those things are big, but they are the behavioral changes.

And I'm not talking about buying our way out of this or buying another planet.

I am certainly aware of that.

But there is -- there is what you can achieve right up front through offsets, and then there is what takes this slow behavioral cultural and infrastructural change.

And I am so in it for the long term, and that is why I want a 20-year millage, and I want it yesterday.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

In closing, I guess I'd like to express my enthusiasm as well.

I think we all understand that -- let me get my clock started -- I think we all understand that the problem will not be solved by our community alone, but I also think that inaction is irresponsible.

And I also think that our action in this regard, the creation of the A20 plan already has inspired others to take action and take note.

The proposal of a millage, the passing of a millage to support that plan will further that work.

And, you know, we often like to think of Ann Arbor on the front foot and in some respects that's not quite there.

But in this respect, it is.

And I'm just so delighted that we are able to take this step, that we're able to present to the voters a set of proposals to provide real value for the dollar to all of our residents, which will swiftly save residents money through government programs.

That's what we're here to do and that's what we will do.

I will say further that with incredible and profound gratitude that none of this is possible without staff who work in the office of OSI.

I mentioned Dr. Stoltz, of course, but understand that she's standing on several shoulders there.

That the work of the office is in the process of transforming our government and inspiring the community itself to transform.

And I couldn't be more grateful and proud of them.

Further discussion?

Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Ramlawi.

You have used up your time.

Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Disch.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Disch?

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Griswold?
>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Song?
>> Councilmember Song: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Grand?
>> Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Adina?
>> Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor Taylor?
>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

TANIF Eyer?

>> Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Nelson?
>> Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Briggs?
>> Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Ramlawi?
>> Mayor Taylor: Discussion, please, of DC-4.

Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I appreciate that this has been moved to November and I believe we have more time to have a little more community decision about the specific resolution of intent.

I would like to move to postpone this resolution and send it to the energy commission and the environmental commission.

I actually had some conversations with members of those commissions.

And it just felt like this was in their wheelhouse.

And so that's -- I propose that we postpone this to meeting in February.

I don't know which one.

So that there's an opportunity for them to discuss it at their January meetings.

>> Councilmember Radina:.

>> Mayor Taylor: --

>> I don't know if it's something that they would like to discuss more.

We have a lot of time now.

We could postpone it to March if liaisons to those commissions have some idea about how maybe they want to set up a subcommittee or something.

It just feels like this is something that is exactly why we have our commission set up to advise us.

>> Mayor Taylor: Dr. Stoltz?

>> I just wanted to add to the discourse that the January meeting of the energy commission is a working session, so they won't be taking any action on vote, if that is useful information.

>> Mayor Taylor: Do you know when the February work session -- February meeting is?

>> It will be the second Tuesday of the month.

And if you give me a second, I will tell you the exact date.

It should be the 8th.

Yep.

It's the 8th of February.

>> Mayor Taylor: Okay.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I think we're Tuesday the 22nd due to Presidents Day.

>> Mayor Taylor: All right.

Council member Nelson, is Tuesday, the 22nd, the date of the postponement?

I didn't track it.

My apologies.

>> I didn't actually peg a date.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Sorry.

That's the second meeting in February.

>> Mayor Taylor: Perhaps a postponement to the second meeting in February, then.

>> So February 22?

That's it, Jackie?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Okay.

All right.

And -- as part of that postponement, can it be sent to those commissions to get some input?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Okay.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a -- I got my brain went aflurry.

Was there a second on that?

>> Griswold.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Griswold seconded it.

>> Mayor Taylor: All right.

Thank you.

So postponement to the second meeting in February for the purpose of environmental commission and energy commission providing some input.

On the postponement, perhaps this can be swift, because I think this is generally uncontroversial.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

I would ask for more time on this.

I don't think there's some sort of statutory requirement to have this done any time soon.

We might have some troubles with some commissions meeting because of the vaccine mandate, being in person.

We have a lot of work sessions to begin the year.

I don't even know -- I think these commissions probably see this twice, you know, not just at one meeting but perhaps two meetings.

I would suggest, you know, pushing this back to maybe sometime in March or April to give enough time, some time to really let them, you know, have some influence on this and come back with something.

We're not in a big rush.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I think February is reasonable, but what I wanted to speak

to is that there is a methodology to the passing a millage, and we've been very fortunate in the past.

But this is a very, very heavy lift.

I was one of the advocates for the quarter billion dollar millage bond that built Skyline High School.

And a lot of research was done.

And I hope that we will take the time to do that because I'm also concerned about the 20 years, and we -- if this does not succeed, we're going to be off by at least six months, if not another year.

So I would just caution that we need to be very methodical.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I'll support a postponement.

Will we have an opportunity to -- what do you suppose is the best way to put forward the questions that we'll want to have answered potentially by these committees?

I know that they're on energy, there's a challenge of the municipal ownership, the people power versus SEU versus whatever method we're going to use to potentially reach strategy 1 and so on.

Is that the kind of thing that we expect these groups to weigh in on?

If so, that's an important application of this postponement, and I will support it.

>> Mayor Taylor: I guess if you have questions as to what the commission could or should be or recommendations to what you'd like them to look at, I would channel them through Dr. Stoltz who will get them to the two committees.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Well, yeah.

I'll do that if this passes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Or do whatever you wish.

>> Yeah.

And just in response to that, the resolution mirrors A20 in that space.

And so there isn't extreme specificity, but there is more specificity.

And so it would be helpful to understand specific questions we want the commissions to take up because they've already supported A20, and the strategies.

That detail would be helpful for me.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yeah, that's a little bit my question as well.

On the energy commission.

I'm looking at this use, and it's really laying out sort of the strategies that are in the A20 plan.

And so -- and, you know, stressing, for example, point number 2, that the millage to the fullest extent possible will be used to advance equity by ensuring (reading).

I mean, the reality is is that, I mean, I'm not sure that it's more discussion is always good, but I -- the point of this millage is to implement our climate action plan.

I would welcome some more feedback from Councilmember Nelson about what you would expect -- how energy commission might weigh in on this in a productive way or environmental commission.

What were you thinking?

>> Councilmember Nelson: Can I respond to that?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yeah.

Well, I guess, Councilmember Eyer, any objection to that?
Councilmember?

>> Councilmember Nelson: Sure.

So I have had conversation with members of the commission, and I know that there is a range of opinions about it.

But municipal power is a topic that they are talking about.

And I know that they were not consulted or included in conversations about the SEU, and that was somewhat surprising to them to have that sort of sprung on them.

And I feel like this is an opportunity to be a little bit (muted) more inclusive and allow them to participate in -- I know that to me, that, for instance, if we do move forward, as it looks like we will move forward with a feasibility study for municipal public power, the finances of that look different as the years go by.

The -- when you're spending the money either front-loading and at the tail end of it, municipalities that have found that they're saving money because they have invested or pursued a municipal public power.

So, I mean, these are in the weeds questions that I am -- I have conversations with others about, but I am less personally informed about myself.

And so I am asking that the people who are dedicating time to this issue wrestle with it a little bit to help us.

So that's what I'm looking for.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer on the postponement.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yeah.

I'm not in favor of it.

I think that the -- what's before us, as Dr. Stoltz said, closely tracks with A20, which is a plan that was thoroughly engaged with by these commissions and the community at large, and which passed unanimously by council.

What we are losing -- you know, it's been said that we have tons of time.

We don't.

We have, you know, a matter of several months to communicate to residents what this millage will pay for.

And how, you know, the tangible benefits that they will receive from it.

This postponement means we lose two to three months of that education.

And as somebody who has worked on a lot of millage campaigns, that's really significant.

So this really feels like reinventing the wheel.

And I'm very comfortable passing this tonight because it mirrors A20, which has already been vetted and passed.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Well, I'm here for education.

I've got a list of questions here, if Councilmember Eyer wants to respond to them.

So I can get out there and educate my constituents.

Here's a few.

What are the measures of the success?

How much will go into materials versus installation?

What proportion of administrative expenses will be included in each?

Which one of these -- which of these programs is already budgeted for?

There are many questions.

We're just speaking in vague terms.

I mean, the specific actions that are listed here are very vague.

For me, it's just like, we're going to throw a bunch of money and hopefully something sticks.

And I guess that's all right when it's taxpayer dollars.

But I would want to have some accountability and some metrics and some answers and some assurances to some of these questions.

Because right now there's a lot of fill in the blanks, and there's not a whole lot to go on.

Buzz words.

But you've got \$7 million here.

And I'm all about it.

I'm all for it.

But we need more detail.

So if you can explain to some of these answers to me, now or later, that would be great because I need to tell them to my constituents, ones who really care about climate.

Ones who have been doing it way before it was trendy.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I just ask, you know, that we fill in the blanks here so we can get this millage passed.

And then we can have success because what I see right here, throw a bunch of money at things and hopefully something works.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: As a member of the environmental commission, I'm really confident that we have had several discussions even in the short term that I've been on the commission with Dr. Stoltz around both the provisions and the principles of the A20 plan and the environmental commission has been -- has offered feedback at every stage and is -- the environmental commission is working away on initiatives that this millage would fund.

So while I'm sure if you wanted them to look at it, they would be happy to.

But they've really already vetted and endorsed this.

And I think that they would probably prefer that we all have what we need to get started with messaging, which is going to be the big thing that we need to be doing.

So I really don't support the postponement, and it's not because I don't believe in participation.

It's that I believe that we've -- the environmental commission has had it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thanks.

When I read this language, I look at it as potential, right, for not -- we're not locking ourselves into spending X dollars on A, B or C because we know that A20, well, you know, based in science, is a living document, you know.

And I was initially thinking that, you know, postponement sounded reasonable until it seemed like the motivation was largely about this municipal power discussion, which, you know, I'm -- anyway, I have feelings about.

So I don't know if Dr. Stoltz could give us just a little more background on this language. You know, the potential -- or Mr. Thomas, perhaps.

I understand it mirrors the A20 plan, but is it also true that A20 is a living document, and so this could shift and change over time?

>> Yeah.

I'll take the first part and then (Inaudible) if you want to pop in.

It mirrors it.

Because it's over a long period of time, 10 years, 20 years, this resolution is meant to mirror that.

They would obviously, we would go through the budgeting process.

You would see that.

So you would know exactly what the millage was being spent on year over year.

But we wanted to provide flexibility because what we invest in in year one will be different proportionally than what we invest in in year 20 of the millage.

And so flexibility is important.

I do also want to point out that in the renewable energy category, one thing that is not in A20 but to council member Nelson's point is thinking about power and how we generate it including municipal power.

So it doesn't explicitly state the path, but we put it in these resolution regardless of where the community goes so we have that flexibility to move forward.

I just wanted to name that that's the only thing that's a little bit different than what's in A20.

>> Okay.

Thank you.

And I would assume that as we move forward on the budgeting process, that these commissions would want to weigh in on how we spend that money as well.

So it would be probably more of an iterative process, just like we're hearing from some boards and commissions about how we want to spend our fund right now.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thank you to Councilmember Nelson for explaining a little bit more, your thoughts on this.

I mean, I think the energy commission is working hard to come up with a recommendation for council around the feasibility study, and that should be coming back to us in January.

And so those discussions are happening, and I think we're going to be getting some, you know, good recommendations on that.

I don't think this is necessarily the place to further that conversation.

To Councilmember Ramlawi's point, it seems -- I don't think that you're wrong in the sense that there are still a lot of questions about this, and I do -- but I don't know that the energy commission or environmental commission would necessarily be equipped to answer those questions.

That seems to me that some of them, at least, are mostly staff questions.

And I think that we might want to be able to think about, you know, what questions we have for staff that could help flesh out how, you know, from a practical standpoint, how this might get utilized in the first couple of years so that it would provide the community with a better sense of what this looks like in a meaning -- you know, at the beginning of the process.

And I do think that our community deserves to have those answers.

I think they deserve to have more substance than this.

I just don't know that our commissions are equipped to answer the question.

The type of questions that you are posing, Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I was searching -- when I was talking about this millage in the resolution of intent with people this weekend, I was trying to locate an email that I think we received from Mayor Taylor about plans for spending it, and it was quite a bit more specific than any of the documents that we could find on Legistar.

An amount of money that was directed specifically to McCann to administer a resilient center.

And I guess I would like some help in finding that document again, or maybe somebody can refresh my memory.

Maybe I'm misremembering.

I mean, what we're really talking about here is the amount of information that people are looking at ahead of this millage.

That's what we're talking about.

We're not disputing the fact that money needs to be invested in this.

We're just talking about how well people are going to understand what they're voting for.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I think it's critical that we do survey research.

If we simply say we're going to fund A20, I don't think 50% of the public even supports or understands A20.

And I don't mean to be negative, but there will be organized opposition to this.

There are other millages that are coming along including AAATA, and I think we need to be very strategic about how we bring this millage forward or it will not be successful.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of postponement?

I have you having spoken twice in the postponement, Councilmember.

Is that correct or incorrect?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: It doesn't matter.

I'll be beating a dead horse.

>> Mayor Taylor: Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Disch.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Disch?

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch, this is on the postponement.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

No.

>> Mayor Taylor: I'm sorry.

>> Councilmember Disch: Correct.

On the postponement, I am voting no.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Griswold?

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Councilmember Song?

>> Councilmember Song: No.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Councilmember Grand?

>> No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Adina?

>> No.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor Taylor?
>> Mayor Taylor: No.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Eyer?
>> Councilmember Eyer: No.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Nelson?
>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Briggs?
>> Councilmember Briggs: No.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Ramlawi?
>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Hayner?
>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion fails.
>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the motion?

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yeah.

It's clear that what we have going here is a full-bore PR campaign that's going to move forward to try and sell this millage.

And, you know, that's why we wouldn't postpone it because we need every minute to influence the voters.

And that's great if you're really into this millage, and I'm sure a lot of you are, obviously.

I find these strategies and specific actions a little vague, but, I mean, when you look through what's happening here, I find it a little disturbing.

I think if this passes as it is, people will take a look at it and say, really?

A million a year for that?

A million a year for this and a million a year for bike lanes?

Are we going to undo the spending we're giving Dr. Stoltz office from the mental health millage, or is the county going to come back and ask for a county mental health millage again?

Because they're not getting services we need out of the City of Ann Arbor because we're spending ours on bike lanes and OSI.

Are we going to undo that in our budget, council?

I ask the body.

Are we going to -- are we going to define this in such a way through our PR efforts that it details groups in our community that stand to benefit from this funding and thereby creates inherent mass of voters enough to pass this and they know that they have to get out there and support it, or their group, their special interest, their social service organization isn't going to get this millage money that's coming to them?

Because that's kind of what people see when they see these strategies.

Strategy 5, maybe that's going to RAA ecology center.

Strategy 1, we're not sure.

We don't even know if we're going to own those solar panels that are going to be shared on our microgrid roofs.

That's an answer that I haven't gotten yet.

Strategy 6, that's going to go to social service support groups and so on and so on.

So it kind of looks like these breakdowns are designed to create a positive voter base for this, and that's how it's written.

That's how it's going to go down.

I'm going to -- I'm going to vote no on this, too.

I think the voters can, you know, the voters will get their seven postcards or whatever it's going to be and decide for themselves.

There's going to be a lot on that ballot.

You know, we'll see what they think.

You know, it's one thing to support a millage like the housing commission millage because we're going to see something bill.

It's another thing to support a millage that talks in loose terms about what we're going to try and do to solve a global catastrophe.

We have the La Palma volcano going on inside of Spain.

There's a lot going on that this isn't going to help, I'm sorry to say.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yeah.

Unfortunately the recent actions that we took here tonight, I think, have jeopardized the success of this millage.

There will be a cloud of suspicion as to the process that it was brought to us and then to the voters.

Both of these resolutions, this one and the prior one, did not appear on our agenda until Wednesday.

Maybe Tuesday.

Very little time to get questions in, to disseminate it to others.

We've rushed it.

I think there was a sense that, hey, we'd better put this till November because if we have it in May, it might not -- it might not succeed at all.

So I thought that was a wise decision.

But the use and intent resolution doesn't need to be rushed.

There's so little appetite for buy-in on conversations.

Maybe it's just me.

Maybe it's just -- maybe folks just think when we want to refer these things, that we're procrastinating, dragging our feet.

For me it's about buy-in.

You know, I remember -- in fact, when I brought a resolution for snow clearing this time last year, that I had to have that resolution sent down to transportation.

For a pilot program in downtown.

When Jeff Hayner brought something up about vegetation, it took a year in the disabilities commission and others to clear it before we can approve it.

Here we have something where we're going to be spending \$7 million for 20 years. \$140 million.

Without even having a track record of doing any of these things yet.

And we can't take the time to allow buy-in, trust, and faith and some skin in the game for this to succeed.

I hope you all are right.

I hope your strategy is right.

But I've got an inclination, you might have -- you might have rushed things.
And if this thing passes, it's not going to be a 70/30, you know.

It's not.

And I'm not going to get out there on every corner.

I'm sorry.

I've got a day job and everything else.

I'm not out there, you know, doing other things, okay?

I barely have time for my own self.

So this thing needs to sell on its merits.

This needs to be solid, good government policy-making.

And -- what I'm experiencing is not that.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Adina.

>> Councilmember Adina: Thank you.

I'm going to preemptively apologize because this is also not likely on the merits of the motion before us, but I want to address a question that was asked by my colleague Councilmember Hayner, which I think a piece of which is a common repetition of something that support accurate, which is that we are spending as a city mental health millage funding on things that are not mental health.

If folks remember correctly, it was a mental health and public safety millage.

I want to correct the record here.

We do not receive a rebate for the mental health portion of that millage.

Mental health dollars are being spent on mental health by the county.

Because we provide our own public safety, we did not receive -- or we do receive a rebate for the public safety portion of that millage.

Rather than investing that money into additional police, we chose to invest that money in other priorities, something that we stated as a council prior to it passing.

So I wanted to clear the record up.

Mental health money is being used for mental health services.

And I think it's important for the public's trust to note that.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thank you.

That was one of the pieces that I was going to speak to as well.

I think further that, you know, those -- portion of that public safety rebate was dedicated to areas where we knew we had a lot of work to do, and we were underresourced on.

As we bring in additional resources, if something like this millage passes, I think there are opportunities to be able to reallocate funding from its general fund dollars, but to consider how we are able to use general fund dollars on other projects.

There were a couple of other points that I wanted to make, which I have now promptly forgotten.

I will let others, pass to Councilmember Griswold.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I'm going to be voting for this because I think it's important to let the voters decide.

But I think that we need to face reality, and worst case, this is an arrogant act by a dysfunctional group.

And that's how some perceive us.

Now, we're going to get the vote of the students, but I really have concerns about being able to build up the level of community support that we need to pass this.

And A20 is not looked upon favorably just as a term, and to not do any survey research and just go based on our past success is very problematic for me.

And I've been approached already.

There will be organized opposition to this.

And so we're going to be in trouble if we don't do it right.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: Can you speak to how work in your office impacts the community at large, specifically on your DEI work and how even here in Ann Arbor, we do -- I mean, we've spoken before about environmental racism in our community.

Can you elaborate a little bit that and the needs for additional funding to support that and extend that because environmental racism and the impacts of climate change probably won't be remedied in 10, 20, 50 years.

>> Yeah, thank you for the question, which is not a small one and not being prepared to go into detail, you're going to get what's front of mind, the kind of initiatives that we're working on especially around DEI and environmental justice work.

So a few things to name are our work in the Bryant neighborhood to make that the first decarbonized community in all of America.

And that is our largest concentration of kind of low-income BIPOC residents, and that's all about working with the residents themselves to design what equitable

decarbonization looks like and all of the brands we have secured so far staying in the neighborhood to pay for people's time, using the principle of targeted universalism.

If we figure out how to solve the climate crisis in a way that centers those neighbors, we're going to figure out how to do that and scale this throughout the whole city.

That's one initiative that's centering people and their concerns.

Another is this kind of continuing with the justice 40 initiative, that we commit to centering equity but also in the dollars.

So at least 40% of the dollars should go to address our lowest-income kind of most energy burdened residents.

We have a lot of people that are paying more than 6% of their income on energy-related expenses.

And that's considered an energy burden.

It's actually considered a pretty extreme energy burden.

And those households are the leakiest, the draftiest.

And so anything that we can do through the millage to help lower those expenses by, you know, doing efficiency work doesn't just save money, it improves health, comfort, safety and well-being for people in those homes.

That's part of the millage.

I don't know why but this is in my head.

I just wanted to name this.

We are organizing an event with the neighborhood associations on January 19 to talk about racial covenants and their history.

So that we can also start daylighting some of the issues that exist that people don't see all the time, to understand that history and try to rectify it, too.

So that's part of the work which is a softer.

It's really more education.

But that's also a really critical piece.

And I don't think I did your question justice, but that's just what was front of mind.

>> No, I appreciate that.

You talked about city services, but I would also hope to think that we are investing not just in infrastructure but a culture change and how we prioritize our goals of the City.

So thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yeah, thank you.

I was remembering my comment, which is that there's the language that's being used at the table tonight, I guess it's intentional, but it's -- you know, the cloud that's being created is being created here tonight, you know, the language around an arrogant act by an arrogant body.

There's some really concerning language discussing moving forward, a plan that was unanimously adopted by this body, by this community, that has had extensive buy-in from our commissions, environmental commission, energy commission in the formulation.

And this is with the intent of this statement says.

So I don't think we need greater buy-in when it comes to the intent.

We need maybe greater detail and I think that some of the questions that, you know, Councilmember Ramlawi's asked, I think we should be getting additional information so that we can educate ourselves and educate the community as we go on about how the resources will be spent.

But there has been actually an extensive amount -- you know, you talk about buy-in.

There has been -- I have heard from this table in previous meetings that there was concern about this proposal going forward to the voters in May instead of November.

And what you see before you is the mere listening to that and responding and putting forward a different proposition to build greater buy-in from this body.

So that's happening.

It's just not being acknowledged.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I think it's very important that we are objective, that we look in the mirror, and that we assess the situation.

And we tend to be surrounded by people who are more affluent, who are politically engaged, and are more likely to support an additional millage.

I voted for A20.

I also took the time to amend A20 twice.

However, let's make sure we're moving forward with our eyes wide open and we're able to sell this.

We don't want to be commiserating come November because we weren't as objective as we should have been.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: Dr. Stoltz, I want to add two things to your list, and correct me if I'm wrong.

But there's a composting pilot at Highcomb between Cannes and chew We Labs.

I think that's another thing that you're supporting.

And there's an energy project in Arrowwood which I think maybe you have a detail. But I think it's doing a neighborhood -- will help.

But we'll just call it an energy project in Arrowwood, which is, as anyone knows who's canvassed there, very sunny.

[Laughter]

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

You know, I was one of the council members who did vote for A20.

But in those discussions, we didn't talk about a 20-year 1-mill tax.

Now, I don't want to reinvent the wheel and say let's do it all over again because that's a very extensive set of documents and goals and work that was gone into that.

But what we see here today, with all due respect, is too loose.

We're playing it fast and loose.

We're asking for \$140 million without a work plan.

Without and that has accountability to it, metrics to it, and definitions to it.

You know, a vote for A20 was not a vote to raise taxes.

I don't see very much here about reducing our consumption.

Recently I read that anywhere from 21 to 37% of CO2 emissions come from food production.

Of that 21% to 37%, 70% of it is from cattle.

I don't see any mention here of, hey, folks, pass on that half-pound burger once in a while, you know?

Forgo that, you know, milk shake or whatever.

I mean, there's just, again, there's a sense that I have, and it's just me, that we're going to be somehow washing our conscience with this 1 mill because we're paying something, so we can go on and continue to do what we do.

I see it all the time.

I see people talking about it, and then they hop a plane to Chicago.

You know what I mean?

I see it everywhere

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: You know, so unfortunately the way this is tonight, I can't support it.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Adina.

>> Councilmember Adina: Thank you, Mayor.

I guess I view this a little differently than my colleague.

When I read through this, I see this as high-level guidelines.

These are buckets of the types of things that we're going to spend this money on.

That doesn't mean that there's not more detail.

Obviously there's going to be more detail into how each and every dollar and cent is spent throughout the course of if we are lucky enough to have this pass, and have this additional revenue that we can invest in this plan, we're obviously going to get more detail, or we're obviously going to be spending it on much more specific things than the bullet points that are laid out here as high-level guidelines.

And so I guess my question is to Dr. Stoltz, I mean, are you anticipating that you're going to put together a more extensive strategic plan on how these dollars would be spent?

Are the questions that have been asked by my colleagues that I do think, like, council member Briggs, I think are reasonable questions for council to ask but not necessarily pertinent to the high-level bucketed items.

Is that all coming, and do you anticipate a time line on when we'll receive that?

>> Yeah.

Thank you for the question.

So two things to that.

The simple answer is yes, absolutely.

We have to go through -- we could do that whenever you want, but we have to go through the budgeting process regardless if we're lucky enough to be trusted, the taxpayers trust us with this.

And so every year we will be doing that budget that indicates in detail.

The second is we actually already have a lot of it because when we adapted A20, we did a line item for every single action in A20 and we looked at operational costs, staffing costs, year over year what it would take.

So it's actually something that we can pull together, you know, want to put some intentionality in the additional structure behind it, but we have a foundation for that to move forward.

And the metrics, we have in A20.

It's about breaking those metrics down year over year because we adopted the high-level -- we had smart goals in A20.

That was one thing the council really encouraged us to do in the vision plan.

>> Councilmember Adina: Thanks.

And very briefly, I am comfortable voting and moving this forward.

I view this as the starting point.

I think it is responsible for us to tell the community as we are voting to put a millage on the ballot, high level how do we intend to spend those, and as more details become public, or will become available, we will release those to the public as well, but I don't think we start this process by saying we're putting a millage on the ballot but we're not telling you how we're going to use any of this money even high level.

Even if additional details are coming later.

I think we can do both.

And so I'm going to support this tonight and look forward to more information as Dr. Stoltz continues to do the exceptional work she does along with her team.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Thank you.

The idea (muted) --

>> Mayor Taylor: I think you're back.

Sorry.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Sorry.

It's my AirPods.

The idea that passing A20 was not a vote to raise taxes just defies logic.

I mean, as Dr. Stoltz pointed out, it was passed with the full knowledge of what implementing it might cost.

And, you know, unless the -- unless the idea was to pass it for things and then let it -- (muted) and then let it sit on the shelf, you know, the intent all along must have been to have to raise taxes and fund it.

And I fully support that.

This is something that enjoys wide support in the community.

And I don't want this plan to just sit on the shelf.

And we can't just let it sit on the shelf and pat our backs, ourselves on the back, that we pass this plan.

We have to implement it.

And I'm going to do everything I can to try to educate voters and residents about the real benefits that they will receive.

This is not pie in the sky.

This is not -- this has nothing to do with volcanos in Spain or whatever someone said earlier.

This has to do with real city services that people will receive that are going to be beneficial for the planet.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of this resolution?

For my part, I, of course, am supporting of the use resolution.

The use resolution is, as far as these things itself, it is on its face more detailed than your regular -- a standard use resolution.

And furthermore, because it references the A20 plan, which as Dr. Stoltz has, you know, very ably indicated, was the result of substantial community engagement, substantial commission engagement, full-throated support from this council and incredibly detailed plan that includes metrics and timings and work plans and goals and what it takes to achieve those goals and anticipated funding, rather anticipated costs.

There is incredibly -- there's an incredible amount of work that's been done by staff, this council, and our volunteer commissioners and the community at large to get us where we are today.

And suggesting that this is -- well, and to say otherwise is simply not accurate.

And frankly does a discredit to the work that has been performed so ably by so many.

You know, we have an opportunity here to provide a -- an incredibly -- a suite of services to residents that is incredibly beneficial to them on the regular and does our part to fight climate change.

We will achieve, through this millage and through the further implementation of A20, communitywide carbon neutrality in a manner that provides tangible benefits to ourselves and does our part.

You know, our greatest global challenge.

I don't think you can ask for from a local government.

I am excited about the prospect.

There will be a full-throated detailed and objective campaign.

I will be involved in it, and I am myself fully committed to it.

And, you know, I couldn't be more excited about talking to voters about the good things that we can have and the good things that we can do through the A20 program.

And, you know, I would encourage council members to adopt that level of positivity as

they move forward here.

This is an opportunity for us to have a great community success, and I fully believe that we will.

Further discussion?

Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Disch.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Disch?

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Griswold?

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Song?

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Grand?

>> Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Adina?

>> Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor Taylor?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Eyer?

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Nelson?

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Briggs?

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Ramlawi?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Hayner?

Councilmember Hayner?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Councilmember Hayner had a family emergency.

He stepped away.

He sent us an email.

He had a family emergency.

>> Clerk Beaudry: The motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: DC-5 resolution to encourage and accelerate the use and of low embedded carbon building materials in construction.

Discussion of DC-5.

Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I know that Councilmember Hayner had to step away, but I do have a question about why he's not a co-sponsor of this because this is an area where he has talked about this many times over his term.

And so I'm just wondering if he was involved in this at all.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Adina?

>> I can answer that and I assume Councilmember Briggs will speak to it as well.

This is coming to us from the Energy Commission, and it is work that the energy mission did and council member Briggs and I are bringing it forward from them.

So that is why we are listed as the sponsors.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes, correct.

I think we welcome additional council sponsors, but it was not an intent to exclude. It was just something where it came from.

So this was a resolution, you'll see the full attachment that the energy commission passed.

But essentially, you know, energy commission passed this in July, I believe, and we've worked to make it a little bit more implementable in terms of how we might take next steps in terms of taking a look at our own building and trying to use low embodied carbon materials where possible when it doesn't increase the cost to delay those projects, but at least beginning to ask those questions I think will be important for our own city work.

And -- well, I assume everybody has read all of the result clauses, so I won't go into each and every one of them.

But a fair amount of this is working to send a signal to the market that this is important work that needs to be done.

The reality is is that it's going to take a while for the market to get to where we want it to be.

But that we can be influential as a leader in our community and also create -- provide the resources to those who are doing work in our community.

There are strong guides that have been developed and that we can make those available and readily accessible to those who are doing building and try to see these projects move forward.

I'll let Councilmember Adina may have more to add.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you for the commission and the sponsors bringing this to council.

As Councilmember Griswold has said, this is something that's been talked about quite a bit and maybe not exactly like it's being presented tonight.

He just quickly want to be added as a sponsor and just thank the people that made it easy for me just to do that.

And unfortunately Councilmember Hayner is not here to add himself if he wanted to.

But I appreciate, again, the work and the direction that this has taken and just wanted to be added as a sponsor.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Adina.

>> Councilmember Adina: Thank you, Mayor Taylor.

And I just wanted to first thank Councilmember Briggs.

While we are both liaisons of the energy commission, she really carried this one to us here after the energy commission did the initial work and worked with staff to make sure that this was something that was ready to bring to the council table.

I also really want to emphasize the good work that the energy commission did itself and thank them for their patience, even sometimes begrudging patience with us as we brought this to you because it was not necessarily -- there were a lot of other things that came up that delayed this getting to this point tonight.

And so I just want to thank them for their work and their patience.

And then the last thing that I want to emphasize is actually in the content.

Something that we really wanted to make sure we emphasized, and that was a topic of discussion at the commission level and afterwards was really about the point that this is not something that we encourage.

If it compromises the construction's integrity or safety.

And I think that's really important to point out because I think we wanted to make sure -- we wanted to make clear that while we are taking these tangible steps to implement decarbonization, they are not coming at the expense of costs or safety in a building project.

And so people can continue to be confident in the developments that take place here in the City if this passes.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I'd like to be listed as a co-sponsor, and while I don't have the power to add Councilmember Hayner's name to this, I do want to acknowledge all of the work that he has done in this area, and I know that sometimes when I've had personal conversations with him, he's brought this up.

So I want to thank him for educating me and for keeping this forefront.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thanks.

I should have mentioned this in my initial comments.

I also just wanted to very specifically thank Chair Mersky who has been an incredible partner and the global CO2 initiative at the University of Michigan.

Those are some really key partners that have been working on the guide book but also working this forward, so I just wanted to make sure I acknowledge them tonight.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: I would like to be added as a co-sponsor.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

DC-6, resolution requesting the DDA to extend the curbside carryout program until May 31, 2022, moved by Councilmember Ramlawi seconded by Councilmember Briggs.

Discussion, please, of DC-6.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

I'm bringing this forward because the DDA has decided to end the curbside bag meter program it deployed days after COVID broke out in March of 2020.

As we know, many variants now have evolved, and we are still under constant stress in all sorts of ways, public safety being one, but that has had -- manifested itself in many different other things.

This resolution simply asks the DDA to continue the curbside parking program in concert with its repurposed on-street parking program which is tied to the sidewalk occupancy permit calendar, and that would extend it until the end of May.

This would give downtown businesses an extended life line to the carryout and to-go business.

I can just speak for myself.

That is one part of the business that has gone up and has stayed up.
We do not have the dine-in business that we had before COVID.
We do not have many downtown employees working in the downtown area.
People are coming from outside of downtown in many cases to support our downtown businesses.
It's cold out.
It's snowy.
It's wet.
And as much as we like to promote cycling, the fact of the matter is, most people are using their internal combustion engine at times.
Some electric but mostly on four wheels to come and get their provisions.
So I've asked the City Attorney whether I have a conflict of interest here.
I would like to recuse myself from this vote, to not make it seem like there is a conflict of interest in this matter, but I think I add a valuable perspective for the downtown community.
And what we're experiencing.
And I'm here every day, sometimes 14 hours a day.
So I have a pretty good idea of how things are down here.
So I will recuse myself if the body allows me to in this matter.
>> That's not how it works.
You can't recuse yourself.
You can request the body -- there is no conflict.
And we've told you that.
Now, there is a rule that says that you can -- you can ask the body --
 >> Councilmember Ramlawi: I did, I'm sorry.
I'm sorry.
I did ask the body.
>> You can ask the body if you believe that your vote on this, that you have other obligations or other things so that you can't vote on it.
And if that's your position, then you can ask the body, and they can recuse you.
>> Councilmember Ramlawi: And so I do ask the body.
>> Is there a motion to recuse the council member removed by, Briggs, Adina, discussion?
>> And just so I'm clear, Mayor, it's council ethic rule 4.
We spent a lot of time on ethics rules.
And council member may be excused if the Councilmember asserts that he or she has a personal relationship with the matter at issue that impairs his or her exercise of independence of judgment on the matter or creates a situation with conflicting fiduciary duties.
That's the rule and to the extent that the Councilmember has stated that he believes that this is met, you can certainly rule on that.
>> Mayor Taylor: Is there any discussion?
As a matter of courtesy, I'm happy to vote in favor.
I will say I don't believe there is any conflict whatsoever.
And I don't want this extension, this recusal, to lead others to suggest who might be similarly situated in some parallel way, that there is some expectation that they do so.

This council member has asked to be recused.

That's fine with me.

But bottom line is there is no conflict, no conflicting duties, no, in my view, harm in the council member voting on it.

And so with that precedent, I'm happy to provide consent, but I don't think it rises to the level.

Any further discussion about the recusal?

All in favor?

I'm sorry, Councilmember Nelson?

All in favor?

>> Councilmember Nelson: I do want to speak.

>> Mayor Taylor: Oh, I'm sorry, I thought you were waving me off.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I oppose the recusal for much of the same reasons that I think you framed and a little more gently than I would have.

And I think that Councilmember Ramlawi was particularly kind in not pointing out that (muted) suggest he had a conflict, which what I heard I was highly amused by.

We are actually an active member of the business community and works as hard as he does in our downtown to give us a window on what's happening in the downtown.

It's no secret that he has a restaurant and that is perspective that he brings.

And I appreciate Mr. Postema's clarity in articulating that nears nothing -- to there's no conflict in fiduciary duty about him having a business and working for a living.

And giving us perspective on this issue.

He -- the issue that we are voting on has a broad benefit across all of the downtown restaurant businesses.

He's a tiny sample of that whole segment.

So I plan to oppose the recusal because I believe that Councilmember Ramlawi was sort of badgered into proposing this to prevent people from accusing him of something that is simply not true.

I think it's really a shame that somebody would have suggested that Councilmember Ramlawi was trying to do something underhanded based on -- I mean, basically ignorance of how conflict of interest works.

But I want to go on record opposing this.

I don't think it's a favor to Councilmember Ramlawi.

This is an unfortunate response to a really, like, unkind thing that was said to him.

>> Mayor Taylor: All right.

I'm going to clear the queue and then we can talk about this.

Is that all right?

If we must.

So I've got on this matter -- on the recusal, Councilmember Ramlawi, then Eyer.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Well, I appreciate the consideration that the body has given me.

As I remarked earlier, often I don't feel there is a safe space for me to express myself, and this is one of them.

In fact, I was asked to remove my name as a sponsor to not discuss this in addition to recusal.

And this is coming from a colleague.

That I will leave nameless out of respect, that the mayor knows who it is.
Councilmember Song knows who it is because she CC'ed both of them.
I feel under attack constantly.

That's the nature.

I don't want to have any suspicion since now I'm under suspicion for a lot of things that I didn't do, that I'm bringing this to somehow enrich myself.

So for the folks on Twitter and for others who think I have everything I do is to somehow benefit myself and my business, I ask to be recused.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Oh.

Mayor?

I'm sorry.

I was next.

I was next, but I had -- I had my hand lowered.

Yep, yep.

And I will be very brief.

I just wanted to say I'm just going to vote no against -- I'm going to vote against this recusal because I just don't want to set a precedent in anyone's mind that it's necessary.

I think we should keep recusals for situations where it's actually legally necessary.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the recusal.

Councilmember brigs.

My apologies.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Absolutely.

Since it seems to me that I have been the one that has offended you today or yesterday, Councilmember Ramlawi, I apologize.

I have already sent you an apology note today saying that I was incorrect.

And acknowledging that, you know, I had received some questions around this, and I had been corrected.

So to that air, I have already apologized to you in writing.

I'm happy to do that here in this public forum if that makes you feel better.

I certainly welcome your discussion since I have been given better information than I started with yesterday.

So if you are recusing yourself to appease me, please do not.

I welcome your participation.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion.

Councilmember Ramlawi?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: That is not the reason.

I'm not here to appease you.

In fact, I've been greaterly insulted by something other you did over the weekend, and this is nothing compared to what you put in your newsletter about me.

So no apologies necessary.

You can apologize about something else but not this.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the recusal?

Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Disch.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Disch?

>> Councilmember Griswold: Song?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Song?

Oh, no.

Councilmember?

>> No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Radina?

>> No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor Taylor?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Eyer?

>> Councilmember Eyer: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Nelson?

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Briggs?

>> Councilmember Briggs: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Ramlawi?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Hayner, absent.

Motion fails.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion on the main motion?

Councilmember Radina.

Councilmember, you are inaudible.

>> Councilmember Radina: Thanks.

I know in the original queue Councilmember Briggs was ahead of me.

She hasn't raised her hand again, but I would be happy to yield back to that queue.

Okay.

I just had a quick question about this.

I am -- I am supportive of this.

I think that this was a good program that a lot of people used.

I saw folks using them regularly.

I wonder -- I know to the extent that this significantly reduces parking revenue potentially.

I wonder if there's been any conversation, and maybe I ask this to our DVA liaisons, about modifying it to reserve some of those spaces as kind of 15-minute spaces or 30-minute spaces as opposed to completely blocking them off.

I don't necessarily have a strong preference one way or the other.

I know that the free space makes it easy for people to jump (muted) so I wonder to the extent that (muted) coming because of such decreased revenue as a result of the lost parking.

>> Mayor Taylor: Ms. Thompson, are you in a position to respond?

>> Sure.

Sorry.

And I missed a little bit of your question as I was being brought in.

So can you -- you wanted to know about reducing --

>> Councilmember Radina: Yeah.

I just wondered to the extent -- I think this is a valuable program.

I saw lots of people using it.

I wonder to the extent that there had been any consideration of, like, changing some of these spaces to a 15-minute timeframe or a 30-minute timeframe, knowing that coming to an end may have been a result of decreased parking revenue and how that impacts DBA.

>> Sure.

So all of the 148 carryout spots are 15-minute spots.

So they are already limited.

When the DDA made this decision back in August, you know, it was at a time when vaccine rollouts were happening, really increasing, you know, U of M was back, football was coming back.

And at the time when we communicated this to the area associations, we got very, very limited feedback, and really even now we've gotten limited feedback, but it's been equal on both sides.

So we've had the same amount of people who say please leave them on.

Others who say please take them off.

So, you know, I think either way, whether we take them off January 1 or June 1, in the grand scheme of things.

(Muted)

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: Ms. Thompson, can you speak to how if we keep this going, you know, the one thing that we did was the closure program on November 1, I think partly in cold weather, because the area association was kind of split as to whether to continue during winter.

Do we know if continuing this, will this impact the conversation that we revisit closing the streets -- closing the streets again in the spring or hopefully the spring or summer?

Like, how would this program work if we continue to do this?

Is there any connection?

>> There's no connection.

I mean, the curbside carryout program continued during the street closures.

We just relocated them on the blocks where streets were closed.

So there really wouldn't be any connection to closing the streets.

These carryout spaces would not impact that one way or the other.

>> Councilmember Song: And there have already been discussions, like, how we did with the street closures employing the main street, employing the associations?

(Inaudible) it's easily split again?

>> Yeah.

So I reached out to the four associations, state street district and main street were both supportive of removing the (muted) and then just today Tarrytown district reached out to me to say they actually prefer that we leave them on until June 1.

>> Councilmember Song: Okay.

Great.

Thank you.

>> Yep.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It's approved.

Mr. Postema, closed session.

Ms. Thompson, thank you.

>> Mayor, we do not have a closed session tonight.

>> Mayor Taylor: We have a Clerk's petitions, may I please have a motion to approve.

Councilmember Griswold seconded by Councilmember Disch.

Discussion of the Clerk's report?

All in favor?

Opposed?

The Clerk's report is approved.

Do we have communications today from our City Attorney?

>> I do have communications, Mayor.

I'd like the council to listen very carefully to what I have to say.

I appreciate the council's interest in what City Attorney Slay is doing when we make ordinance changes, we work very hard on them.

We look at the legality.

And we bring resolutions to you that you eventually pass.

You're quite happy about that.

And you should be in this case.

We do it not only in the criminal context, but we also do it in the civil context.

Let me give you a case in point.

The early leasing ordinance.

You all adopted that unanimously.

Now, during the course of the adoption of that, we had threats from landlords.

(Muted) despite those threats.

They brought a lawsuit.

And we went to court on that.

We carefully prepared the resolution, and we carefully prepared the defense.

And you know what?

A couple weeks ago or last week, we were in court, and we defended that.

And the judge signed a preliminary injunction, upheld the ordinance, and said there was a likelihood of success on the merits.

We filed a motion now to dismiss the case.

And I think we can all agree, we can all agree that that case was carefully prepared by this office.

You trust our office to do that.

You trust us to do it ethically.

You trust us to do it professionally.

And we've done that.

Now, during the course of that, if an employee says I've read the landlord's threatening letter, I've done this, so on and so forth, I'm not going to adopt -- I'm not going to enforce this resolution ordinance that the council has done.

And wants me to stop and not do that.

It's of no consequence to me.

We've carefully looked at it, and we're proceeding.

If he wants me to stop the City Administrator from doing what the council by unanimous action has asked us to do, I'm not going to do that either.

And we could all agree tonight, this late, that that would be quite unwise for us to do.

That would make no difference to me if that employee in the early leasing ordinance said, council, the city attorney or the city administrator doing something illegal.

I agree with the landlords.

Please stop them.

It would make no difference to me if they went to you, every right to go to.

It makes absolutely no difference to me because we've looked at it carefully.

We might get a second opinion.

We might do something else.

(Muted) a council member who didn't like the early leasing ordinance attacked me, attacked the office, did any of those things, those are of no consequence to me.

My focus is on the unanimous resolution of the council, what the law is, what the professional obligations are to defend an action in the federal court, and then to go to federal government and receive a determination from the court.

That's what's done, and I think we all can agree that that is the proper thing for the City Attorney to do in those circumstances.

So that's case number one a week ago.

Two weeks ago, coincidentally, we also went to court in the vaccine mandate case.

Again, a mandate that you all unanimously approved of, that was important to the city.

And, again, we had a situation where the police officers union disagreed.

They threatened with litigation, threatened that it was illegal.

The city was doing illegal things.

And we looked at it.

We looked at it carefully.

And we disagreed.

They took us to court.

Again, it was on a preliminary injunction motion.

And, again, the judge said, don't even meet the likelihood of success on the merits.

And, of course, we can all agree that the same process was filed.

It doesn't matter to me if an employee believes the police union's position, wants me to stop something that the council, by resolution, has unanimously endorsed, that we've looked at legally, and we've looked at a double -- a second time with outside counsel.

It makes no difference to me.

It makes no difference to me if somebody complains to the council that they're right.

But it's not going to change my view.

I'm not -- I suppose it could if they raised something that -- but if it doesn't, I'm going to go forward, do what we all agree I need to do, and that is go forward with the ordinance.

With cases in court, I'll defend that case.

But none of the things that you're talking about, none of the threats from a lawsuit, none of the chiding, no personal attack can get me to change that.

And you all need to know that.

You should know that after 18 years.

So tonight we'll leave on a unified note that, look.

You all have a resolution.

We'll look at it carefully.

We'll look at the law.

We'll go forward.

We'll deal with it in court.

But I am immune from suggestions that I will do something to thwart that because an employee wants that.

It won't even happen if a council member wants it.

Two council members.

Three.

If it's a resolution by the council and it's in good faith, I have my professional obligations.

I'm immune from all of the other things, and I will move forward.

You all know that.

And we can all agree that that's the right thing to do, and I will continue to do that.

I can assure you.

I can assure the city.

They all know that.

So let's move forward, and thank you for listening tonight.

Okay?

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Now we come to public comment general time.

It's an opportunity for members of the public to speak about matters of municipal interest.

You don't need to sign up in advance.

Please enter the number on your screen.

That is 877-853-5247.

877-853-5247.

Enter ID94212732148.

94212732148.

Once you're connected please enter star 9.

Star 9 to indicate that you wish to speak.

When it is your turn to speak, our Clerk will identify you by the last three digits of your telephone nobody.

When it is your turn to speak, you'll have 3 minutes.

So please pay close attention to the time.

Our Clerk will notify you when 30 seconds are remaining.

When your time is expired, please cede the floor.

Is there anyone who would like to speak in comment?

>> Councilmember Griswold: Caller with the phone number 556.

Press star 6 to unmute yourself.

>> Hi.

This is Ralph McKee, Fifth Ward.

It's been a long night.

I appreciate your time and attention.

I have a couple comments in response to some of the things that were said this

meeting.

There was a lot of interesting and heated dialogue tonight.

I wanted to respond to the comments I think made by Councilmember Eyer about Trumpian.

Let's talk about some of the things that are truly Trumpian.

I would start with Mr. Fournier's tweet, saying the complaint was completely fabricated.

That's pretty much exactly like what Donald Trump did after the muller report and after the impeachment vote.

Do any of you even care about that?

This is a City -- a leading city staff person who's basically calling a former highly regarded employee a fabricator, a liar.

That's what he did.

It doesn't seem like anybody cares.

I guess he's one of yours.

He's perfect.

He's a staff person.

Not going to criticize that.

And the other thing, I mean, this is classic circle the wagon behavior.

Protect our own.

That's reminiscent of the Trump White House and the bill Barr Department of Justice.

We go after those who try to help a whistleblower.

We go after those who might -- we think might have leaked.

We'll make them pay.

That's just like Donald Trump.

He's very good at that.

Let's move to Jennifer Salvatore.

She's not the Delphi truth or Carell, okay?

AV rating or not.

I spent a lot of years fighting highly rated lawyers from the big national firms.

They put their pants on one leg at a time just like you do and I do.

They make mistakes.

They do bad jobs.

Rudy Giuliani used to be highly rated too.

Sidney Powell also.

The righten house judge, too.

The Supreme Court justice.

You need to evaluate what she actually did.

Not what her rep is.

And until the points that I made in the email I sent you are answered by her, Mr.

Postema or you, when that happens, I'll shut up.

Until then, her rating means nothing.

And there's no one accusing anyone of blatant corruption here.

It's usually way more subtle than that.

Dan Adams made a good point.

He said she had a fiduciary duty to her client.

That's right.

Who is her client?

It's you.

Not Mr. Postema.

And he's the person, though, who hires her.

It's human nature if you want to be -- get a regular job with a big client, which it is here, that you aren't going to slam them.

That's just human nature.

It happens every day.

>> Councilmember Griswold: 30 seconds.

>> I'm not accusing her of being corrupt, but it's stunning to me that she barely touched on the biggest issue of what happened between Mr. Postema and Mr. Gahardo in that weekend.

And the lack of protection.

That was the biggest issue.

And it's staggering to me that Mr. Postema didn't even think that there was a complaint being made against him.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Phone number ending in 604, do you have a comment?

Go ahead.

>> Hi.

This is Eric Lipsen calling from Rosewood Street.

I always like to start on a high note.

I was walking the other day on the tunnel underneath the railroad tracks at the depot and thinking what a great thing that was for the City as far as storm mitigation.

You know, that was a timely thing by the City to do that.

It will save in the long run a lot of grief and a lot of flooding.

I would propose you call that the Jerry Hantack tunnel because he was the City staff person who worked when I was even on planning commissions for many, many, many years, like ten years to get that accomplished, and many others did that.

Moving on, as a member of the juried public here who is watching what's going on in the battle between the council factions, I find it alarming to watch City government disintegrating.

We are removing from their committee assignments several very qualified people that we're paying to be our city council people, and you're taking them off.

You're removing the personnel for that office.

And as far as they're concerned, they're on paid vacation or paid leave if they don't have to go to all those obligations.

And I'm sure the rest of the staff -- or I should say the council is just pleased as punch to totally pick up all of the slack that's left behind by those con sill members that are taken off those committees, and for reasons which, again, looking at it by a preponderance of the evidence, I don't think that the Mayor and his allies have proven their case beyond -- excuse me, for just a preponderance of the evidence, just by 51%.

There were too many open questions despite what I have to say was a brilliant closing by the Mayor.

A great quote.

Inaction is acquiescence.

Brilliant.

Really well done except I don't think you actually have it by a preponderance of the evidence there.

People who are in the room --

>> Councilmember Griswold: 30 seconds.

>> Two council people involved denied flatly that they said anything that was alleged in the manner that it was said.

You know, what's wrong with you guys?

Can't you have, like, a good trash-hauling scandal or something?

It has to do with who said what when?

They were accused by other council members of crimes.

That's pretty defamatory, and I agree this case, with councilperson who said further -->>

Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> Who said further investigation is warranted and I agree.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor, could you potentially mute your mic and others?

I can hear your typing.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Michelle Hughes?

You can unmute yourself.

Go ahead.

Michelle Hughes?

>> Hello?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Hi.

>> Hi.

Okay.

So I read the sidewalk snow removal report, AC-1, and I am very excited for next steps to be taken.

And, you know, I think the sidewalk snow removal is going to be very important thing for helping with nonmotorized transit, for creating accessibility in the City, and therefore equity.

The -- so the report lists some high numbers of dollars.

And I don't think we should be intimidated by them.

I don't think we should limit the scope of our imagination because we see these numbers.

We should understand that comprehensive sidewalk snow removal is simply a service that the government must provide.

In that context large numbers are not an argument against doing things but simply a point of information.

This is how much money we must raise.

It's something that we've got to know when we're drafting a millage or looking where in the budget it could take money from.

It's definitely not something that we should take a lower level of service just because the numbers would look large.

If we do less, we'll leave more residents behind.

And potentially trap more disabled people in their houses all winter.

We shouldn't be doing that.

Anymore.

So the report notes that sidewalk snow removal, even the most expensive option is less expensive than the current operations that are in place to clear snow to assist people that are driving private automobiles.

We have to start prioritizing things differently.

For the climate and for safety, which are our highest goals according to the council resolutions.

So, now the report suggests that we have some extremely -- we might have some extremely difficult time hiring staff to clear all the sidewalks.

But that's not a reason to -- that's not a reason not to try to do it.

If we can't clear all of the sidewalks because we physically can't hire that many people, well, then we can just prioritize the streets at that time.

But we shouldn't aim for a lower level of service just because it sounds more achievable.

We should aim to clear every sidewalk and just do our best.

As to the question of whether to hire staff internally or use contractors, I'm not sure clears a clear answer.

But I might suggest hiring staff directly because the report says that it would -- that it would take a lot of work to build up the capacity of a contractor to do this work, and I'm worried that if we do that, then we'll be locked in with that vendor forever because we can't just rebid that to somebody else -->> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> -- because we don't have that experience and capacity.

I think it would be better to build capacity in our own organization.

But I could be wrong about that.

I could still support the RFI process because I think we should explore every option.

It sounds like council action to move sidewalk removal forward.

Please take that action without delay.

I mentioned public engagement process, start that right away.

We should start clearing sidewalks as quickly as possible.

It makes our city safer, more accessible and more climate friendly.

Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 396.

Press star 6 to unmute on your phone.

Go ahead.

>> Hello.

So I just wanted to say this, and my comments are directed to my council member, Ramlawi and Nelson, and I'm very concerned by y'all breaking closed session confidentiality.

I also want to speak more to Councilmember Ramlawi, that in a discussion with online about one of your posts that led you to block one of your constituents.

You can't do that as a government official.

I just wanted to read you something that you might have forgotten or maybe you didn't

do your homework last time you trampled on it.

But it says Congress shall make no law establishing religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press or the right of people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for grievances.

You're taking somebody's right to redress of their grievances when you block them on your social media platforms that you use as a government official.

You are the government.

Just think on that because you're representing the government, right.

So the things that you do to the residents by limiting their contact and participation in government is an infringement on the First Amendment.

And from your last infraction against the first amendment case filed with the ACLU.

So if you continue to go after me personally for these comments, I do have a case against Ann Arbor City Council, specifically Councilmember Ramlawi already open with the ACLU.

You know, I guess -->> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> You can take that as a dare to respond to me.

But you really shouldn't.

I'll give you a hint.

Just don't.

You know, maybe don't defecate on the First Amendment again.

That could be cool.

Thanks.

Peace.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 047.

Press star 6 to unmute your phone.

Go ahead.

>> Hi.

This is Lisa Jackson from the independent community police oversight commission.

I just wanted to be sure to go on the record to reiterate that our commission is interested in reviewing any and all contracts related to the Ann Arbor Police Department.

That includes professional assistants and other collective bargaining agreements as well as the AAPD budget allocations.

Mayor Taylor and council clearly opened the door to that process in June of 2020, and I want to assure you that even though we are volunteers, we have never, never shirked our responsibilities.

We have never indicated that we were uninterested in reviewing any collective bargaining agreement at any time, even when given impossibly short periods of time to do so.

Those of you who know us, that probably doesn't even sound like anything we would do.

We would never refuse or be uninterested in doing so.

Further, Mr. Fournier stated earlier that because we didn't offer changes to the PSS contract in August of 2020, he assumed we would not have any suggestions regarding the police professional assistance contract in 2021.

That is incorrect.

And it's another example of how there's no enforcement of agreements regarding our commission.

We were sworn in in 2019.

You guys are new, but that we were sort of ignored in that process.

It's not really reflective of our length of service anymore.

We're certainly not new any longer.

It appears rather to be a reflection of the lack of regard of our commission.

So council, if you could please, please, please give City offices some incentive to bring those contracts to us for review such that we can do our job and review them, we would be grateful to do that work.

Not only does it provide expertise to council, but it also provides transparency to those who live, work, and visit Ann Arbor.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Adam Jascowicz?

>> Hi.

I'm a Fourth Ward resident.

There's a few things that I did want to talk to -- talk about.

But really I just want to emphasize we really need to be listening to the independent citizens police oversight commission and make sure that we're taking their work seriously.

I think we need to consider all of the work around the unarmed nonpolice responses in all of that and all of the work that they're doing around the various contracts, and I think that's something that we really need to consider.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see any other callers on the line with their hands up.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing none -- oh.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number 083, do you have a comment?

Go ahead.

>> Hello?

Hi.

This is Allen Haber from the Fifth Ward.

And I'm also on the council of the commons and the initiating committee.

And I'm very glad to welcome Lisa Dishon to the council of the commons.

And at first recommendation of the task force that I think you have a learning curve to familiarize yourself with the work of the center of the city task force was to develop the council of the commons and the first item in the action on the council of the commons is if the members should educate themselves as to what are the commons and what is commoning and to explore decision-making processes that recognize the nature of commoning as a form of municipal organization where commonly pooled resources are self-managed by the users.

And that is a different form of organization than the City is usually familiar with.

So it is new and also it is different from having a corporation or some organized profit-making agent determine how the resources should be used.

It's a form of organization based on mutual benefit of the people that are using the

resources.

That is the land, the library surface lot, library lane, liberty plaza, camp house and other land that might be adjoined to the commons.

And the resources such that might be given by the City or the people independently give, including people's talents, which is the greatest resource.

And so I encourage you to to come and encourage your fellow council of the commons members to educate yourself on what really is the commons in this form of municipal organization that is developing all over the world and what is called co-cities on page 10 of the resource of the report of the task force and especially 16 and 17.

There is information on the commons and in the resource -- and in the appendices.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> And I want also to address Dohoney, new City Administrator, that one of the essential functions assigned to the City Administrator and the recommendations of the task force is to convene a bloc group of the partners all around the commons so that we begin to have a cooperative working together and understanding where everybody is coming from.

That has not yet been done, and it is a necessary function to help us move forward.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> And it is the City Administrator.

So welcome, Lisa.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> And I hope you can move this along and thank you, city council.

And I wish you all peace and love.

You need it.

Bye-bye.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see any other callers with their hands up.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing no one further, public comment is closed.

Are there communications today from council?

Council member Song.

>> Councilmember Song: Some state bills that came through, I think, was a really timely (Inaudible) 637 and 638.

That creates a community crisis response fund (Inaudible) jail diversion fund which aligns really nicely with what we would like to see come forward.

Due by the end of this month, recommendations on how we approach our crisis response.

I'm excited to see this work.

We have, I think, all of us have already been in contact with community organizers on this and Dr. Jackson, Dr. Fleming, Esther White.

I'm really looking forward to this partnership, nonprofit (Inaudible).

>> Mayor Taylor: I'm sorry, Councilmember Song, I interrupted you.

>> Councilmember Song: Sorry, I was distracted by movement on the screen.

I wasn't really sure what was happening.

I just wanted to say that I'm looking forward to the report.

I think I'd like to see what comes out of our administrative office.

And I'm really encouraged to hear that folks are responsive and working together.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.
Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: In response to the caller who suggested I blocked somebody from my social media account, that is false.

He did -- the person did reach out to the City Attorney, the Mayor and myself and then followed up with another email to say that he was able to access my account or they were able to access my account.

That's not a practice of mine.

But apparently when you're an elected official, anything can be said about you, and it's okay.

You know, again, I just want to talk about this nasty closed session on October 4.

I will say that was the worst closed session I've ever been in.

We didn't have a city administrator there.

It was a shouting match.

It was a 2 1/2-hour shouting match in which we were supposed to get a memorandum, a letter, from the City Attorney's office describing how we need to go about ourselves in closed session because it was such a disaster.

In fact, we had to get two different legal memos sent to us later because what was told to us in that meeting needed to be clarified.

There was so much confusion going on.

Okay?

I got a sense here from this report, I believe, based on witness interviews and the review of the legal memo that was discussed, a mischaracterization and/or misunderstanding of what was communicated by legal counsel.

When you look at that and you think about it logically, like Ralph McKee did, spent his whole weekend, I would hope each one of you will read his analysis.

You might learn something.

That you're looking at one side of the equation here.

The investigator never asked me what was discussed in closed session?

There is -- this report has so many holes in it, it should be called Swiss cheese.

And if you plan on having more investigations, I hope you also will come with a subpoena, because I'm not going to show up without my own personal attorney.

I will be going after this report and the people that have come after me with it, because democracy is under attack.

>> Mayor Taylor: Council member Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yeah.

I just want to say that we cannot pass another millage in this community unless we have a functional body here, and we all have to own it.

And I want to say that I will reach out to Mr. Postema and Mr. Dohoney before taking legal action.

But I want to make it very clear that I was not interviewed by Miss Salvatore and that I had additional information that is relevant to this case.

And lastly, what she did is similar to what has been done for many years for political gain, and it needs to stop, or we are going to jeopardize the future of this community and the future passage of this millage.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Pardon me, further communications from council?

May I have a motion to adjourn, please.

Moved by Councilmember Song.

Seconded by Councilmember Disch.

Discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

We are adjourned.

Mr. Dohoney, Mr. Postema (muted).