

From: [Lenart, Brett](#)
To: [Amanda Wyse](#)
Cc: [Gale, Mia](#)
Subject: RE: Citizen Participation Ordinance
Date: Monday, June 29, 2020 8:18:17 AM

Hello Ms. Wyse-

Thank you for your comments, they will be shared with the Planning Commission. Any proposed site plan for this property will include a public hearing with an opportunity for public comment. No application has yet been submitted for this site, the meeting you reference is intended to provide an opportunity for dialogue between the property owner and adjacent properties and residents.

Any development would be required it meet all applicable requirements, which would not allow for stormwater from this site to be discharged onto adjacent properties.

Sincerely,

Brett Lenart, AICP | Planning Manager

City of Ann Arbor Planning Services
301 E. Huron Street, P.O. Box 8647
Ann Arbor, MI 48107-8647

blenart@a2gov.org | Direct (734) 794-6000 #42606 | General (734) 794-6265 | www.a2gov.org

From: Amanda Wyse <pelicanbreath@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 28, 2020 10:37 AM
To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Subject: Citizen Participation Ordinance

Hello,

I am a resident of Ivywood Dr. in Ann Arbor near 2060 W. Stadium. I received a postcard from NorthStadium, LLC about a Resident Participation Meeting for a project that a developer wishes to develop adjacent to mine. I am planning on attending this meeting but I am also wondering what else I can do to get help from the city about this. I spoke with several neighbors and we all agree that this proposed development is a very bad idea for our neighborhood. The development is far too tall for this residential area, nothing on West Stadium is four stories tall. It is too close to our property lines, other businesses sit closer to Stadium. We are also concerned about changes in water drainage coming towards the houses and into our basements. Please notify me if this project is placed on a City Planning

Commission agenda. Is there anyone else in city government I can contact to register my concern?

Thank you.

Amanda Wyse
1937 Ivywood Dr.
Ann Arbor MI 48103
517-290-0111

From: Carol Spencer
Sent: Sunday, June 28, 2020 1:52 PM
To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Subject: 2060 W. Stadium

City Planning Commision

I would like to make the commission aware of my strong objection to the proposed use of this property as office space and a storage facility. The height of these buildings would negatively impact the use and enjoyment of my property and that of my neighbors. It would negatively impact property values of the entire neighborhood, and is inconsistent with other businesses on West Stadium.

I urge you to find more appropriate use for the property.

Please notify me of any upcoming meetings regarding this matter.

Thank you,
Carol Spencer
1940 Ivywood Dr.
Ann Arbor

From: Jay Zocher

Sent: Monday, July 06, 2020 7:57 AM

To: Kahan, Jeffrey <JKahan@a2gov.org>

Cc: Anna Stefanopoulou; Wayne Appleyard; Charles Griffith; Jane Chen; MacDonald, Joshua; Hookham, Chuck; robert gordon; Craig Toepfer ; Colvin-Garcia, Carlene; Mirsky, John

Subject: Re: EV web page with info

Jeff,

I'm writing in advance of the Planning Commission meeting tomorrow, to offer my support for the EV Readiness Ordinance. I have been on the Energy Commission for about a year and a half, and have helped out with the Committee developing the Ordinance Proposal (though not as much as many of the people on this email that have put an amazing amount of work into it.).

I am super excited about the impact that this Ordinance will have to help hasten the rollout of EV chargers, and encourage the adoption of EV vehicles, to help to do our small part to lower global carbon emissions.

Thank you so much for your help with getting the Ordinance to this point in time (the website looks great too!), and I hope that the Ordinance passes through the Planning Commission meeting tomorrow, and the City Council in the near future.

Thanks,

Jay Zocher

Sent from my iPhone

From: Siria Gamez
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2020 10:28 AM
To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Subject: Valhalla Multifamily Development

To the city planning commission,

I am reaching out to express my support for the proposed Valhalla development project on Main Street. This is precisely the kind of housing that is sorely needed in our city.

Multi-family developments on main transit routes such as these address housing needs and promote growth in an intelligent, sustainable way.

I urge the commission to support and move forward with this development project.

Thank you,
Siria Gamez
1502 Plymouth RD
Ann Arbor, MI 48105

From: Darren McKinnon
To: Kahan, Jeffrey; Lenart, Brett
Cc: Delacourt, Derek; Gale, Mia
Subject: RE: EV Parking Amendments Staff Report w Attach 7-7-20.pdf
Date: Monday, July 06, 2020 8:48:51 AM

Thanks. I do have some suggestions that are more "in the weeds" but mostly I would not make this a requirement at all (unless you are getting into FAR premiums).

This could be a suggestion or a trade opportunity for some other difficult to obtain item. My primary concern is the introduction of electrical design at a very early stage, this brings in a new consultant and associated costs when the project is not at that stage of design.

In the weeds includes:

- It mandates empty conduit and unused breakers, that is ripe for abuse and very difficult for planning staff to verify at site plan closeout.
- The location of these stations is driven by proximity to the electrical gear and wire distance/voltage drop.
- The part about HC parking spaces really makes things unnecessary complicated. This could lead to buildings designed with main electric rooms near the front door which is prime space. No one will put an EV in the back corner of the lot because it is not practical.

There is just a lot to work through, I like the idea but not as a mandate. I am happy to discuss more.

Darren McKinnon, PE

First Martin

[115 Depot Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104](#)

O: [734.994.5050](tel:734.994.5050)

C: [734.904.5044](tel:734.904.5044)

E: dmckinnon@firstmartin.com

FIRSTMARTIN.COM

[FACEBOOK](#) | [TWITTER](#)

----- Original message -----

From: "Kahan, Jeffrey" <JKahan@a2gov.org>

Date: 7/5/20 3:31 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: Darren McKinnon <dmckinnon@firstmartin.com>, "Lenart, Brett" <BLenart@a2gov.org>

Cc: "Delacourt, Derek" <DDelacourt@a2gov.org>, "Kahan, Jeffrey" <JKahan@a2gov.org>, "Gale, Mia" <RGale@a2gov.org>

Subject: RE: EV Parking Amendments Staff Report w Attach 7-7-20.pdf

Hi Darren.

We'll share your comments with the Planning Commission.

Do you have specific recommendations for how to improve the proposed amendments?

Thanks.

Jeff

From: Darren McKinnon <dmckinnon@firstmartin.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 04, 2020 10:02 AM
To: Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>; Kahan, Jeffrey <JKahan@a2gov.org>
Cc: Delacourt, Derek <DDelacourt@a2gov.org>
Subject: EV Parking Amendments Staff Report w Attach 7-7-20.pdf

Gentlemen-

Happy 4th of July! I applaud the effort that has gone into the EV ordinance to date. Please do not advocate for its passage as drafted. This is far too complex in an area that is still evolving. This will add more cost and complexity to an already challenging site plan review process. I am in favor of EV stations. I used to drive plug in Ford Fusion and have installed many EV stations, including one at our office. I am in the middle of installing two more at 2300 Traverwood. This ordinance needs significant work before it is approved.

Happy 4th!

Darren McKinnon, PE

First Martin

[115 Depot Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104](#)

O: [734.994.5050](tel:734.994.5050)

C: [734.904.5044](tel:734.904.5044)

E: dmckinnon@firstmartin.com

FIRSTMARTIN.COM

[FACEBOOK](#) | [TWITTER](#)

From: Jon Cassino
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2020 5:48 PM
To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Subject: 454 apartments are proposed on Valhalla Drive

Greeting and Salutations,

I am sending the planning commission this email to voice my support for this project.

Jonathan Cassino
514 Gott St, Ann Arbor, MI 48103
517.206.7743

From: Stults, Missy <MStults@a2gov.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 02, 2020 10:41 AM
To: Kowalski, Matthew <MKowalski@a2gov.org>
Cc: Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>
Subject: RE: SP19-018 84 VALHALLA DR

Hi Matt –

Thank you for chatting yesterday and for sharing these materials. I've reviewed the content and have the following thoughts (which you can use or disregard as you see fit):

- It looks like they are close to maximizing the solar potential on site – which is good. They might be able to squeeze a few more panels in but not sure that is worth quibbling over.
- The all electric building is a great thing as it is far cheaper and easier to build the building as all-electric up front than having to pay for retrofitting.
- While going all-electric is great, we need to know they are investing deeply in energy efficiency of their units. Are they doing air sealing? Insulation? What are they doing to make sure this new all-electric building is as efficient as possible. And not generally, but specifically what are they doing?
- They note going for LEED Silver. In conjunction with the point above, what criteria are they looked to emphasize in their quest towards LEED Silver? You can get LEED accreditation without really doing anything substantial. I'd want to see nearly all points for energy efficiency taken in order to make this building as green as possible. Regardless of my preference, the point is I'd want to see what they are proposing to do to meet LEED silver certification. That would heavily influence my thinking.
- They note wanting to potentially have natural gas as a back up for the building. I think that's the wrong call. I think they should be investing in batteries. It makes the infrastructure far more resilient than being dependent on the centralized energy system.
- They mention EVs but how many charging spaces are they actually providing (and I believe they have way TOO much parking in their proposal).
- To the last point, I'd highly recommend putting in a carsharing program onsite and lowering the number of parking spaces. And it would be fabulous if this was electric car-sharing program (happy to help support them in doing this).
- Lastly, the number of affordable units is really, really small. 15 in a project this big? I'd push hard for more but then again, I don't know what opportunities we have to push --- maybe a lot since the site is out of step with the current master plan.

Again, not sure how valuable these thoughts are but they are my initial thinking. Happy to share any other thoughts as they emerge or talk about any of the above. Regardless, thanks for the opportunity to review. I appreciate it!

All the best,
Missy

Missy Stults
Sustainability and Innovations Manager
City of Ann Arbor

From: Kowalski, Matthew <MKowalski@a2gov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 5:12 PM
To: Stults, Missy <MStults@a2gov.org>
Cc: Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>
Subject: SP19-018 84 VALHALLA DR

Hi Missy,

Thanks for the call this afternoon, appreciate the follow up. Here are some of the documents I mentioned on the phone. The Valhalla Benefits letter to the PC mentions the all-electric project. If you could do a quick review and offer any advice/feedback/questions it would be helpful.

From: Craig Toepfer
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2020 1:45 PM
To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Subject: EV Readiness Improvements

Having provided professional technical leadership in the development of national, international, and industry EV charging standards, I was invited to contribute to A2Zero and provide electric code advice to the EV Readiness Working Group. The Ann Arbor carbon neutrality goals are vital to sustain Ann Arbor's desirable community environment and a livable future. Electric vehicles are the primary technology to achieve the challenging goals. Although the proposed EV readiness code has seen improvement over time, the present proposed code contains significant issues that should be addressed and resolved prior to approval by the Planning Commission. Specifically:

1. The required EV space requirements are excessive with minimal immediate effect and contrary to the WG's projected EV market share. Specifically, the projected median EV market share for 2050 is 35% and the required EV spaces is 100% for multi-family residential and hotels/lodging - with only 10% and 25% functional respectively. The proposed EV spaces for retail and general public parking are also excessive and contrary to "real world" EV owner experience. Anecdotal experience is that an EV owner wakes up to a fully charged vehicle and goes about their day. EV performance allows full daily functionality and the EV owner returns home to recharge the miles used over night. Fast charging compliments home charging and is limited to extended travel needs exclusively.
2. The EV Capable (EV/C) classification represents poor engineering practice and can not be administered or enforced effectively. The designation is based on false and misleading documentation comparing new construction vs. retrofit costs. Installing empty "conduit" that is "capped for future EV parking space(s)" combined with the noted excessive requirements above simply drives costs up with no measurable benefit. A detailed technical description of the classifications and reasonable applications can be provided on request. Additionally, a complete menu of means is available to developers that reduce or lower EV infrastructure installation cost.
3. The profound implications of EV charging on electric power and energy have not been adequately considered. An EV represents the largest single increase in electric demand since air conditioning on the 1950's. An EV can increase the maximum home power demand by nearly 100% and increase daily energy use by 33% for the average daily commute of 37 miles. A full overnight EV charge can power the average home for 3 days. The tripling of EV efficiency over a conventional vehicle is negated by the incurable inefficiency of the central station coal/nuclear steam turbines and methane gas turbines that waste 2 to 3 times as much energy as they produce. Moving 'tailpipe' emissions to "smokestacks" in the communities surrounding the 26 electric power plants on the US shore of Lake Erie reduces overall EV emissions by 20%. It is scientifically and intellectual dishonesty to believe that faraway solar generated energy will find its way to Ann Arbor. To the contrary, onsite solar energy for EV charging, direct or displaced, is truly "carbon neutral" and the only means to achieve the goals of A2Zero. A solar panel the size of a standard parking space, 10' x 20', will produce enough average energy daily to provide up to 40 miles of EV range - 3 more miles than the US automobile average. Furthermore, the solar array doesn't produce any emissions or waste heat and has a life expectancy of 75 years. A means to encourage the broad scale use of onsite solar energy for EV charging should be incorporated into the code requirements. Many innovative methods are being used successfully to increase solar utilization in other cities, states, and countries.
4. Time is an important consideration in EV charging and links power and energy demand to the unique needs of EV charging. The full range of EV charging equipment should be available for code compliance. A table of the range of suitable power ratings and expected EV range with respect to time should be considered.

The following recommended changes to the proposed code can reduce overall EV infrastructure cost - 50% or more, reduce peak power and demand while maintaining the delivered energy, improve consumer access to EV charge energy, and contribute to achieving the carbon neutrality goals of A2Zero.

1. Set reasonable EV space requirements as shown in the table.

2. Eliminate the EV/C classification. The EV Ready (EV/R) and EV installed (EV/I) classifications should be required as shown in table.
3. A complete analysis on the power and energy impacts of EV charging and the means of managing the increase effectively should be an important input to the code development process - including emphasis on clean energy solutions.

Respectfully submitted,

Craig Toepfer
cbta2@me.com

Type of Development	EV-Ready	EV-Installed
Residential: Single-family/Condominium	100 %	
Residential: Multi-family		35 %
Parking: Public, Commuter, Workplace		25 %
Hotel and Lodging		25 %
Recreation, Institution		10 %
Office, Health, School		10 %
Retail, Food Service		10 %

EVSES Charge Rate v. Miles

Voltage (1)	CB / A	kVA	Miles / hour (2)	Miles / 2 hours	Miles / 8 hours	Miles / 10 hours
				Home / Public	Workplace	Overnight
120	20 / 16	1.92	7.7	15.4	61	77
240	20 / 16	3.84	15.4	30.7	123	154
240	30 / 24	5.76	23.0	46.1	184	230
240	40 / 32	7.68	30.7	61.4	246	307
240	50 / 40	9.60	38.4	76.8	307	384
240	60 / 48	11.52	46.1	92.6	369	460
DCFC	EVCS	240 kW	1000			

Notes: 1. 120/240 and 120/208 VAC supply
 2. EV energy efficiency = 4 miles/kWh