

**Ann Arbor City Council Regular Session: October 21, 2019
 Email Redactions List Pursuant to Council Resolution R-09-386**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	<u>Sent Time</u>	<u>Received Time</u>	<u>TO</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>CC</u>	<u>Redactions</u>	<u>Reason for Redaction</u>
2	8:15 PM		City Council	Kity Kahn		Email address	Privacy
3	8:47 PM		City Council	Amanda		Email address	Privacy
4	11:01 PM		City Council, Christopher Cheng, Brett Kenart	Karen Wright		Email address	Privacy

Journal Archive

From: Kitty B. Kahn [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2019 8:15 PM
To: CityCouncil
Subject: Open position on Planning Commission

Mayor and Council- As I was watching tonight's City Council meeting, I heard the mayor announce nominations for various City commissions, but I have yet to hear a nomination for Planning Commission. Council Member Ackerman's position on the Planning Commission was not renewed, which leaves an open spot. What is the hold up? I'm sure there are people who would like to serve on Planning Commission. Why is no one being nominated? I would appreciate a reply. -Peace, Kitty

Journal Archive

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2019 8:47 PM
To: CityCouncil
Subject: Deer Cull

Ann Arbor's senseless deer cull continues with no end in sight. This is the 5th year of deer killing, but City Council originally approved only 4.

The City says their success measure is 75% acceptance of the deer management program, and the 2019 resident survey says, including the margin of error, we're there.

The #1 concern Ann Arborites have about deer (according to the City's own survey) are collisions. But deer-vehicle collisions are higher than 2014, before the cull started! Some wildlife biologists believe culls make road safety worse because they disrupt normal patterns of movement and adaptive behavior taught to does by older deer.

The City says they're shooting to help residents with lawn care, and the 2019 resident survey says over 75% of residents in Wards 3, 4, and 5 feel their landscape is acceptable; nearly that same number in Ward 1 do; and in Ward 2, they're nearly satisfied.

So far, Ann Arbor has spent \$750,000 of our tax dollars on deer management, with an additional \$250,000 for the next two years. Should we spend more than \$1 million on killing a few deer in parks and in specific wards, when we have so many more pressing matters (roads, schools) affecting all citizens.

Our warnings that culling would never solve the problem, rather would become an endless and growing expense on the City budget were ignored. And here we are.

It's time to stop the cull. It's not helping, and it's wasting taxpayer dollars!

Amanda

Journal Archive

From: Karen Wight [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2019 11:01 PM
To: Ackerman, Zach; Grand, Julie
Cc: Taylor, Christopher (Mayor); Eaton, Jack; Bannister, Anne; Ramlawi, Ali; Lumm, Jane; Smith, Chip; Nelson, Elizabeth; Cheng, Christopher; Hayner, Jeff; Lenart, Brett; Griswold, Kathy
Subject: What I should have said at tonight's City Council meeting

Hello Zach and Julie:

I appreciate your thoughtful comments about zoning, development, affordable housing, parking, transportation (if only by car) at tonight's City Council meeting. I do believe these issues are all intertwined, and I hope that we can clarify how to walk and chew gum in order to address all these important issues simultaneously.

What I want to make sure my Council 3 Ward representatives hear from me tonight:

My neighbors and I still believe that the rezoning of 2857 Packard was a mistake. A mistake by the previous CC 'team,' but a mistake that you as our reps, and as part of THIS CC team, will need to correct. I am NOT the only person, or the smartest person, or the most aggravated person, or the most politically active person in my neighborhood who is still profoundly disappointed, and even angry at the way in which this is being handled. We feel that our strong voices are counting for far too little in council deliberations, and we are alarmed that we continue to feel we are not being represented in the legal deliberations occurring behind closed doors and in closed session.

Several of us have either reached out directly to the property owner of 2857 Packard, Robert Weber, or are in active conversations about how we might form a representative resident group to work with Mr. Weber in crafting a win / win solution going forward. We would welcome involvement from our Ward 3 representatives as well. We do not want Mr. Haeussler's lawsuit to close the opportunity for creative solutions. Frankly, we think it would be better for this site if Mr. Haeussler would take this development proposal and his poor business model elsewhere.

My own further concern is that our PROPOSED / NEW / MASTER planning and zoning processes MUST incorporate meaningful ways for citizens to petition for redress of MISTAKES like the rezoning of 2857 Packard. It is not acceptable to tell residents and voters (as we have been told - repeatedly - publicly, privately, in writing, and in meetings - that OUR mistake in not being present to object to what sounded like a boilerplate city council agenda item three or four or ten or FIFTY years ago means that we have no grounds for objecting when the full ramifications become clear. As Zach pointed out at the time the rezoning was being considered, such decisions simply tempt fate as developers all too often roll out unacceptable site plans that will raze beloved parts of our neighborhood, our city, and our environment - irrevocably and forever. We can all be in support of rezoning in theory, when the only discussions are the public goods that may result. That does not mean we must accept bad development proposals, that do NOT achieve anything like those theoretical public goods, just because human mistakes remain uncorrected.

Please do not let Mr. Haeussler's bogus lawsuit, or your fears, prevent you from representing us in your deliberations tonight or going forward. I WANT my city to fight Mr. Haeussler's lawsuit. My neighbors and I actually agree on wanting good development. We are NOT 'NIMBYs" or Pollyannas.

Thank you for your careful consideration,
Karen Wight



--
Karen Wight