



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, City Administrator

CC: Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator  
Matthew Horning, Interim Financial Services Area Administrator/CFO  
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator  
Nick Hutchinson, City Engineer  
Brett Lenart, Planning Manager  
Molly Maciejewski, Public Works Manager  
Marti Praschan, Chief of Staff, Public Services  
Tom Shewchuk, ITSU Director  
Missy Stults, Sustainability & Innovations Manager

SUBJECT: January 19, 2021 Council Agenda Responses

DATE: January 14, 2021

---

**AC-2 – Response to R-18-291 FY21Q2 Equity and Inclusion Report**

**Question:** The report states that one housing choice voucher participant purchased a home. Is the home in Ann Arbor or Washtenaw County? (Councilmember Disch)

**Response:** Ypsilanti Township

**Question:** Did AAHC expend all the HUD funds by Dec 31<sup>st</sup> or was there a balance available to reimburse the City? If so, how much? (Councilmember Disch)

**Response:** All HUD CARES Act funds were expended, however, the AAHC was awarded additional funding from HUD related to COVID for CY2021. Rather than reimbursing the City for funds spent in the previous fiscal year with these new HUD funds (because that is not an eligible expense), the AAHC stopped drawing down its monthly general fund allocation. We have \$66,666.67 left to invoice on the \$160,000 city general fund allocation for FY21. These funds will remain in the general fund at the end of the FY. In addition, we are reducing our annual \$160,000 general fund allocation to \$100,000 for

FY22 and FY23. This will provide an additional \$120,000 in general funds to the City budget.

**Question:** It seems like it is good news that there was no need to pay late fees and court fees for tenants living with private landlords (budgeted 25k, spent 0)—any reason for that other than that there was no demand? (Councilmember Disch)

**Response:** The eviction moratorium is still in effect and Congress has provided several allocations of funding for eviction prevention to the State and County. Consequently, we have not needed to expend those funds for our voucher tenants. Now that Congress allocated another \$20,798,000 to the County for eviction prevention, these funds are not anticipated to be needed.

**CA-2 – Resolution to Approve a Purchase Order to Azteca Systems, LLC for CityWorks Enterprise License and Annual Maintenance and Support Agreement for FY2021 – FY2023 (\$198,000.00) (8 Votes Required)**

**Question:** Does this contract include the “web-based service request application. allowing citizens to request online (for example, sidewalk repair and pothole fill requests)”? Is this a duplicate or replacement for A2FixIt? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** This contract does not provide a replacement for A2FixIt but rather provides the ability for A2FixIt (a separate application) to communicate directly with our Cityworks application. This contract is solely for the Cityworks application. Sorry for any confusion.

**Question:** Will this investment replace any of the functionality provided by SeeClickFix or improve the interface between SeeClickFix and CityWorks? (Councilmember Griswold)

**Response:** No – this investment extends our relationship with the Cityworks vendor an additional 2 fiscal years and provides us with two additional modules (Inspections and Inventory) to help the operations be more efficient. The interface between SeeClickFix and Cityworks will continue to function as it always has.

**Question:** Will this investment provide an interface with DTE’s work order system for streetlights? (Councilmember Griswold)

**Response:** No – this investment only considers the City’s Cityworks application.

**Question:** The resolution includes the statement, “A CityWorks web-based service request application is also available, allowing citizens to request and track service requests online (for example, sidewalk repair and pothole fill requests). Do we currently have or will we be purchasing the module for citizen reporting of sidewalk repair or pothole fill requests? (Councilmember Griswold)

**Response:** No – this contract does not provide a replacement for A2FixIt but rather provides the ability for A2FixIt (a separate application) to communicate directly with our Cityworks application. This contact is solely for the Cityworks application.

**Question:** Will this investment allow for aging reports and exception reporting, for example streetlight outages over 10, 20, 30, 60 and 90 days? If so, will this be available for citizens to view? (Councilmember Griswold)

**Response:** Yes, Cityworks tracks when tickets are opened and closed and can generate an aging report. With regard to streetlights, this does not necessarily correlate to when the outage occurred and when it was repaired - but rather when the ticket was reported open and closed. Streetlights are also complicated because roughly 2/3 of the streetlights are owned, operated, and maintained by DTE and outages of their assets are forwarded to them to address. This data will be made available to the public.

**Question:** How will Azteca's GIS modules be integrated with A2 Fix It? For example, will we be able to visualize requests over a period of time in certain areas of the city? (Councilmember Song)

**Response:** This investment extends our relationship with the Cityworks vendor an additional 2 fiscal years and provides us with two additional modules (Inspections and Inventory) to help the operations be more efficient. The interface between SeeClickFix and Cityworks will continue to function as it always has. In addition, when the request is submitted with geo-location, it can be displayed geographically and over time.

**Question:** Will this link to eTrakit? (Councilmember Song)

**Response:** No – the two systems perform very different functions.

**Question:** Will there be exportable data that's available to the public in relation to this purchase? (Councilmember Song)

**Response:** There is no specific additional functionality being purchased to allow for exportable data.

#### **CA-4 – Resolution to Approve Amendment No. 1 to the Professional Services Agreement with Wade-Trim Associates, Inc. for General Civil Engineering and Surveying Services (\$168,729.00)**

**Question:** Funding for this work will come from Public Services Area Capital Budgets. Given this location, has there been any discussion about or is there any cost-sharing with the Downtown Development Authority (DDA)? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** The City typically pays for 100% of street resurfacing and watermain maintenance costs. Exceptions to this include projects lead by the DDA that advance

walkability, safety, and downtown operations and access. In these cases, the DDA pays a larger share to help the project proceed and to cover costs related to/resulting from DDA work. As this project does not include such elements and is not lead by the DDA, the DDA does not have any financial stake in the project and has not been asked to budget for these expenses.

**CA-8 – Resolution to Accept Grant Funds from Michigan Saves and Appropriate to the Office of Sustainability and Innovation for Aging in Place Efficiently Program (\$14,000.00) (8 Votes Required)**

**Question:** The awarded funds are \$14,000 over 2 years and I appreciate explanation that it will support the hiring of two part-time program coordinators. Does the \$14,000 fully fund these two new positions or is there additional expense? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** The \$14,000 will fund roughly 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of the salaries for these positions. The other 1/3 will come from the existing OSI budget for FY21 and be included as part of the FY22 OSI budget request.

**Question:** Is the expectation that these new positions will be ongoing (and adopted into future budgets) or just for the two years? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** At this point there isn't a clear expectation about how these positions will evolve. The intent of the pilot is to explore how best to support low-income seniors with aging in place by combining social services, physical home improvements, and efficiency upgrades. We've purposefully chosen local and regional partners with expertise and interest in these areas so that we can collaboratively design the pilot and, hopefully, design a program that builds on the pilot and supports low-income seniors throughout Washtenaw County. If the pilot is successful, we'll then have to evaluate how best to scale to a full program. That might mean a new initiative at the City. It might mean something housed at the County. But it also could mean a program supported by our nonprofit partners. Overall, it's too early to know exactly how the pilot will go and what that might mean for future staffing.

**Question:** If this could be administered by current staff in the Sustainability Department, are there any non-administrative, non-staff related expenses that would support the Aging in Place Effectively program? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** OSI has been administering the project to-date, but it needs dedicated attention as we move into program design and implementation. The Coordinators, which were explicitly identified in the grant application and requested by the funders, will provide this focused attention. In addition to the grant funds discussed in this resolution, OSI has programmed funds (approx. \$5,000 per FY) to support training, marketing, outreach, and engagement with low-income seniors.

**B-1 – An Ordinance to Amend Sections 5.16.6.D, 5.17.4, 5.17.6.C, 5.26.2.A, and 5.28.8, and Tables 5.15-1, 5.15-2, and 5.15-3 of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor (Marijuana Processor, ADU, Security, Building Materials, FAR Determination, Fence Graphic, Use Tables) (ORD-20-34)**

**Question:** I do not quite understand how including right-of-way for public sidewalks in the lot area for calculating FAR would serve to encourage developers to increase setbacks (as desired by the Land Use Element and Street Design Manual). (Councilmember Disch)

**Response:** Currently, a property owner or developer may be reluctant to dedicate additional property to the public ROW for sidewalk use because of reduction in Floor Area Ratio and corresponding development potential of the site. For example, if an additional depth of sidewalk is desired and allocated to the City, that dedication of land reduces the land area of the lot, which translates to a reduction in available floor area for development. This has the most impact in the downtown districts, where FARs up to 900% could be significantly impacted by even small changes in lot size. The City applies a similar approach to the dedication of open space component to a development proposal (e.g. the dedication of land to parks/open space can be counted toward density calculations for development).

**B-3 – An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Zoning), Rezoning of 7.23 Acres from R1C (Single-Family Residential District) to PUD (Planned Unit Development District), Lockwood of Ann Arbor PUD Zoning and Supplemental Regulations, 2195 East Ellsworth (CPC Recommendation: Approval - 7 Years and 0 Days)**

**Question:** “The City of Ann Arbor also has a payment in lieu of taxes (PILOT) ordinance requiring that all units maintained at 60% AMI pay \$1 per unit a year in taxes.” (From the [2017 Washtenaw County Assessment of Fair Housing](#)). If applicable, how will this ordinance impact the proposed Lockwood development? (Councilmember Radina)

**Response:** Ann Arbor has two different types of PILOTS \$1.00 and 4% of market rent. The Lockwood Development will most likely fall into the 4% of market rent. If the Lockwood Development has state or federal funding that restricts leasing to 60% AMI, then those specific units would be eligible for a \$1.00 per unit PILOT.

**Question:** In my conversations with Planning staff, I was shown a likely map should the 2195 E. Ellsworth property remain R1C and be redeveloped as a single-family subdivision. Can you please provide this map for an easier comparison of the impact on natural features vs. the proposed site plan? (Councilmember Radina)

**Response:** The map is attached.

**Question:** Some residents have suggested that once approved, the developer could increase the number of units within the Lockwood proposal and build a bigger/taller

structure? Is that possible and if so, what is the process by which this could occur? (Councilmember Radina)

**Response:** The proposed zoning limits the height to 3 stories and 45 feet in height, and no more than 170,000 square feet, but does not specify a maximum number of units. The building as proposed is slightly under 170,000 square feet, so it is possible that a larger building be submitted that added an additional 1,870 square feet. The developer could increase the number of units within the building, however, the minimum number of 65 affordable housing units would need to be maintained, regardless of the final number of units.

In order to increase the maximum height or maximum building size, a rezoning/amendment to the PUD would be required. If the petitioner desired to increase the size of the building up to the 170,000 square foot limit, or increase the number of units, both would require Planning Commission Site Plan review.

#### **DC – 1 – Resolution to Adopt the Board of Review Guidelines for Poverty Exemptions from Property Taxation of Principal Residence Pursuant to MCL 211.7u**

**Question:** Is there any further information regarding the feasibility and budgetary impact of increasing the income eligibility threshold to 2.5 times the Federal Poverty Level? (Councilmember Disch)

**Response:**

1. The City Assessor's Office is meeting with the Housing and Human Services Advisory Board (HHSAB), Thursday evening, January 14, to review the assessor's office proposed 2021 Poverty Application for the City of Ann Arbor.
2. The City of Ann Arbor received 88 poverty applications in 2020. 66 applications were approved. 24 applications were denied for various reasons. Of the 24 applications that were denied, two applications would have qualified for poverty at 250% of the FPL (Federal Poverty Level). These two properties were single family residences and would not have had a material impact on city property tax receipts.
3. Regarding the 2020 budgetary impact of the poverty applications that were granted based on 200% of the FPL, below is a financial review of lost revenue for all taxing jurisdictions and separately for the city.

2020 PRE taxrate				2020 City Tax Rate			
0.0504649				0.0156215			
taxable value prior to poverty adjustments				Property Tax prior to poverty adjustment			
\$ 7,488,997				\$ 116,989.37			
property tax				Property Tax after poverty adjustment			
\$ 377,931.48				\$ 76,295.23			
taxable value after poverty adjustments				Difference			
\$ 4,883,989				\$ (40,694.13)			
property tax							
\$ 246,470.02							
Difference							
\$ (131,461.47)							

### **DC-3 – Resolution to Rescind R-19-139 (Community Engagement and Approval Processes for City Related Improvement Projects)**

**Question:** Since the passage of R-19-139, have there been any difficulties, denials, or delays in the implementations of road diets which city staff have experienced when seeking council approval prior to implementing any lane reduction actions on major streets/corridors? If so, please describe. (Councilmember Ramlawi)

**Response:** Three road diets/road reconfigurations were brought before City Council since the passage of R-19-139:

- Earhart Road from US-23 to South Waldenwood Drive
  - first presented to City Council on 6/17/19;
  - City Council referred it to the Transportation Commission who recommended approval on 7/17/19;
  - defeated by City Council on 8/5/19.
- Green Road from Burbank Drive to Plymouth Road
  - first presented to City Council on 6/17/19,
  - City Council referred it to the Transportation Commission who recommended approval on 7/17/19;
  - defeated by City Council on 8/5/19.
- Traverwood Drive from Huron Parkway to Plymouth Road
  - first presented to City Council on 6/17/19;
  - City Council then referred it to the Transportation Commission who recommended approval on 7/17/19;
  - approved by City Council on 8/5/19;
  - reconsidered by City Council on 8/19/19 with direction to reconsider the design (bike lanes on both sides vs. bike lanes on one side with parking on the other);
  - postponed by City Council on 9/3/19;
  - amended and (re)approved by City Council on 9/16/19.

In addition to these three, the 2020 Healthy Streets projects could also be considered to fall under the auspices of the road reconfiguration requirements of R-19-139, albeit as temporary installations. These resolutions ([R-20-261](#) and [R-20-262](#)) were first presented on June 15, 2020 and approved by City Council on July 6, 2020. Part of the deployments in R-20-262 (outside of downtown) were then suggested for removal as identified in Resolution [R-20-393](#) which was first introduced on September 19, 2020. Action was postponed until October 19, 2020. However, City Council took action and approved Resolution R-20-393 on October 5, 2020.

**Question:** How many city lane reduction projects were implemented between 2010 and April 21, 2019 under staff supervision alone, including “public engagement components”? Please list each project and date. (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** The City’s [Non-Motorized Transportation Plan](#), adopted by City Council, sets the policy framework by which road reconfigurations would be advanced. This document identified a series of lane reductions for the purposes of achieving safety benefits and installing facilities for people to walk and/or bike. The table below lists these locations and their status (as could best be estimated by staff within the timeframe available to respond):

Location Proposed in Non-Motorized Plan	Status
N. Main St – Depot to Huron River	MDOT; outstanding
Packard - Stadium to Anderson	Installed prior to 2010
Packard – Anderson to Eisenhower	Installed 2013
Stone School – Packard to Eisenhower	Installed 2018
Green Road – Glazier to Gettysburg	Installed prior to 2010
Green Road – Plymouth to Burbank	Outstanding; last evaluated 2019
Green Road – Plymouth to Larchmont	Installed 2011
Earhart Road -north end of Blvd to south End of Blvd section	Outstanding; last evaluated 2019
Glazier Way – Green Rd to Earhart Rd	Installed prior to 2010
Huron Parkway - Plymouth to Nixon	Installed around 2010
Jackson Rd - Maple to Ravenna Blvd	MDOT; installed 2015
South Industrial – Stadium to Stimson	Last evaluation 2019; infeasible at time
South Industrial – Stimson to 800 feet south of Stimson	Possible installation with upcoming project
South Seventh St - Stadium to Scio Church	Installed prior to 2010
Maple Road – N. Circle Drive to Carbeck Dr.	Installed 2018
William St – Division to Thompson, First to Main St.	Installed 2019
N. University – Thayer to Washtenaw	Installed prior to 2010
Catherine – State to Fifth Ave	Installed around 2010



Platt Rd - Ellsworth to Packard	Installed prior to 2010
Platt Road - Packard to Canterbury Rd	Last evaluation 2019; infeasible at time
Oakbrook - Ann Arbor Saline to S. Main Street	Outstanding; last evaluated 2019
Geddes Ave – Huron Parkway to Hickory	Installed prior to 2010
Long Term Resident Request	
S. Main St. - Madison to Stadium	Outstanding
Platt – Huron Parkway to Packard	Last evaluation 2019; infeasible at time

The implementation of many of these projects have occurred opportunistically – that is to say, that when a road was scheduled for resurfacing it would be evaluated for reconfiguration or to implement other aspects of the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan. This is an important distinction because such projects have public meetings to discuss the project and receive feedback. The Non-Motorized Transportation Plan also solicited feedback before adoption.

**Question:** Is there any category of traffic/road reconfiguration that typically (as best practice) does not include “public engagement components”? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** It is important to note that public engagement practices have changed over time. The contemporary public engagement protocols for transportation projects are spelled out in a [staff response to R-18-275](#) shared with Council in October 2018. Any lane reconfiguration projects that would be advanced in the future would include public engagement components.

**Question:** What might those be? (I am thinking specifically of the intersection reconfiguration at Scio Church/South 7<sup>th</sup> from 2019) (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** As stated above, the staff response to R-18-275 spells out current protocols for public engagement on transportation projects. To clarify, Seventh Street and Scio Church was reconfigured as part of the Scio Church resurfacing project. The project had public engagement for the entirety of the Scio Church project. There was supplemental public engagement on the intersection reconfiguration in a series of workshops and online surveys in March/April 2019 (more information is available on the [project website](#)). It is important to note that the intersection reconfiguration did not eliminate any lanes – it simply narrowed excessively wide lanes.

**Question:** How many lane reduction projects were subject to Resolution R-19-139 since it passed? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** Three road diets or road reconfigurations were brought before City Council since the passage of R-19-139:

- Earhart Road from US-23 to South Waldenwood Drive
  - first presented to City Council on 6/17/19;
  - City Council referred it to the Transportation Commission who recommended approval on 7/17/19;
  - defeated by City Council on 8/5/19. (RH NOTE: is defeated the right term here? That's how Legistar identifies the status)
- Green Road from Burbank Drive to Plymouth Road
  - first presented to City Council on 6/17/19,
  - City Council referred it to the Transportation Commission who recommended approval on 7/17/19;
  - defeated by City Council on 8/5/19.
- Traverwood Drive from Huron Parkway to Plymouth Road
  - first presented to City Council on 6/17/19;
  - City Council then referred it to the Transportation Commission who recommended approval on 7/17/19;
  - approved by City Council on 8/5/19;
  - reconsidered by City Council on 8/19/19 with direction to reconsider the design (bike lanes on both sides vs. bike lanes on one side with parking on the other);
  - postponed by City Council on 9/3/19;
  - amended and (re)approved by City Council on 9/16/19.

In addition to these three, the 2020 Healthy Streets projects could also be considered to fall under the auspices of the road reconfiguration requirements of R-19-139. These resolutions ([R-20-261](#) and [R-20-262](#)) were first presented on June 15, 2020 and approved by City Council on July 6, 2020. Part of the deployments in R-20-262 (outside of downtown) were then suggested for removal as identified in Resolution [R-20-393](#) which was first introduced on September 19, 2020. Action was postponed until October 19, 2020. However, City Council unexpectedly took action and approved Resolution R-20-393 on October 5, 2020.

**Question:** Reverting to past procedure (without Council approval), does best practice include any public engagement components post-project, for feedback or assessment? Please explain any examples. (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** Staff continues to monitor changes to the roadway after implementation to make sure the desired effect is achieved. Staff receives and responds to feedback from the public and will consult this feedback to help determine if modifications are needed. Some examples of this monitoring include: the [annual crash report](#) which staff uses to identify areas of concern; a recent change to the merge condition on Stadium just west of Seventh Street which was a suggestion that came from residents; and the [N Maple performance analysis memo](#) identified the need for enhanced merge notification at Dexter and Miller - which were installed in the fall of 2020.

## **DC-5 – Resolution to Direct the City Administrator to Proceed with the Design of a**

**Healthy Streets Deployment for Spring of 2021, and to Appropriate \$40,000 from the General Fund Fund Balance? (8 Votes Required)**

**Question:** What has been the basis or rational is being used to calculate the request for \$40k? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

**Response:** The \$40k request is based on a staff estimate to design and possibly collect data for a spring Healthy Streets deployment. There were requests last year from members of Council to receive engineering plan sets for the fall Healthy Streets deployment. This is meant to be responsive to that request with a further acknowledgment that modifications to the fall deployment would be advantageous.

**Question:** What is being proposed as to the scope of the preliminary design work? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

**Response:** The starting point of the design work will be to evaluate the fall Healthy Streets deployment and see what modifications can be made to improve upon them. This will be informed by the memo and technical report (available on the Healthy Streets [website](#)) which detailed the fall deployments. Furthermore, staff is looking at other opportunities informed by documents such as the Transportation Plan, Non-motorized Transportation Plan, A2Zero Carbon Neutrality Plan, and the draft Transportation Plan Update (aka “Moving Together Towards Vision Zero”). It is premature to speculate which specific projects could be folded into a Spring Healthy Streets deployment - but in addition to evaluating the fall deployments, staff is looking at other “quick build” opportunities which could enhance the safety and experience of people who walk and bike (examples could include bumpouts at crosswalks, protecting existing bike lanes, hardened centerlines, etc.).

**Question:** What aspects of the Healthy Street Program of 2020 will not be pursued? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

**Response:** As stated above, staff and the consultant will evaluate all 2020 Healthy Streets deployments to determine which will be suggested for a spring deployment – but it is unknown which will be pursued or not pursued at this time. Keep in mind, that a future request for funding for implementation will come back before City Council which will afford Council the opportunity to weigh-in on what is proposed. If the \$40k is approved by Council for design, staff intends to solicit feedback from City Council on what changes they would like to see to a 2021 deployment

**Question:** What aspects of the Healthy Street Program of 2020 will be maintained? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

**Response:** As stated above, staff and the consultant will evaluate all 2020 Healthy Streets deployments to determine which will be suggested for a spring deployment – but it is unknown which will be pursued or not pursued at this time. Keep in mind, that a future

request for funding for implementation will come back before City Council which will afford Council the opportunity to weigh-in on what is proposed.

**Question:** What aspects of the Healthy Streets Program of 2020 be emphasized and or expanded? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

**Response:** As mentioned above, staff is looking at other “quick build” opportunities which could enhance the safety and experience of people who walk and bike (examples could include bumpouts at crosswalks, protecting existing bike lanes, hardened centerlines, etc.).

**Question:** Where has staff identified “congestion points at bridges and food stores” referenced in this resolution? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** The “congestion points at bridges and food stores” language was carried forward from [R-20-158 Resolution to Promote Safe Social Distancing Outdoors in Ann Arbor](#) adopted by City Council in May 2020. There was mention at that time that the Broadway bridge posed a challenge to social distancing. No other significant congestion points have been identified to-date.

**Question:** Where has staff identified “potholes, trip hazards, overgrown vegetation and construction debris” that interferes with sidewalks, pathways, and bike lanes? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** The “potholes, trip hazards, overgrown vegetation and construction debris” language was carried forward from [R-20-158 Resolution to Promote Safe Social Distancing Outdoors in Ann Arbor](#) adopted by City Council in May 2020. Before the Healthy Streets on arterials in downtown and outside of downtown ([R-20-261](#) and [R-20-262](#) respectively) were implemented, staff conducted a field review to identify and address these issues. The same process is anticipated to be utilized to identify these issues in a future deployment.

**Question:** How does staff anticipate that this funding will be used to address these specific challenges? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** The \$40k request is based on a staff estimate to design and possibly collect data for a spring Healthy Streets deployment. There were requests last year from members of Council to receive engineering plan sets for the fall Healthy Streets deployment. This is meant to be responsive to that request with a further acknowledgment that modifications to the fall deployment would be advantageous.

**Question:** Will the \$40,000 budget for the Design Phase be adequate to provide community engagement at the neighborhood level? Recent reviews of slow streets have called for greater, targeted community engagement. For example, a Jan 6, 2021, [Bloomberg City Lab article](#) states, “Sometimes people in marginalized communities are very caught off guard by what is seen as priority,” said Ortiz. “I knew if slow streets

were implemented without dialogue and consent and co-ownership, people would resent how it unfolded, and it'd become another example of how some people matter and others don't." (Councilmember Griswold)

**Response:** Staff has not started any engagement on a 2021 Healthy Streets program, pending City Council approval of the design phase. Staff anticipates conducting some sort of engagement as part of a future roll-out, but the mechanism for that engagement has not yet been determined. It should also be noted that in order to meet the April 2021 rollout date, there is not a lot of time to have an extended public engagement campaign, design the deployments, issue an Invitation To Bid (ITB), select a contractor, and get City Council approval for the contract. Staff sought community-wide feedback on the 2020 Healthy Streets program through an online tool which generated nearly 1,000 suggestions. Staff has had internal discussions about how to augment these efforts to do more focused engagement in order to get feedback from low income populations, populations of color, or other vulnerable populations.

#### **DC – 7 - Resolution to Approve the City of Ann Arbor Membership in the Washtenaw Regional Resource Management Authority (WRRMA)**

**Question:** What has been the response of the operators of the Ann Arbor MRF to the city joining the WRRMA? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

**Response:** Recycle Ann Arbor (RAA) operates the Material Recovery Facility (MRF). The City is unaware of RAA's position in regards to the City of Ann Arbor joining WRRMA.

**Question:** Has city staff reached out to the new management of the MRF for a formal response to the effects it will have on their interest in the mutually beneficial collective goals of layer out by them and the WRRMA? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

**Response:** City staff has not reached out to RAA for a formal response regarding the impact of the City joining WRRMA on recycling goals jointly held by the City and RAA.

**Question:** What are the consequences of joining WRRMA as it relates to the contracts that are set to expire on June 30, 2021 that include the collection of recycling? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

**Response:** City staff will continue to bid and secure new contracts or extend existing contracts for solid waste collection and recycling services currently set to expire on June 30, 2021.

If the City of Ann Arbor joins WRRMA, we may participate in contracts involving the management of recyclables as a member of WRRMA, and we may additionally have City of Ann Arbor-only contracts regarding the management of solid waste. Additionally, the Authority would not have the power to contract on the City's behalf without approval or impose unilateral directions or contracts on the City's behalf.

Subject to details regarding a specific proposal and legal review of the specific contract and applicable WRRMA documents and policies, it may be possible to arrange for WRRMA to take on a City contract whether through assignment, amendment or termination and substitution or replacement or other actions, any of which would likely need all parties involved to agree to the arrangements.

**Question:** Can you please include previous Q&As from the 1/4/21 agenda response memo on the Washtenaw Regional Resource Management Authority (WRRMA), including those that staff was seeking additional information on before this meeting? (Councilmember Radina)

**Response:** Here is a link to the January 4, 2021 Agenda Response Memo: [January 4, 2021 Agenda Response Memo](#). The bylaws have been attached to the [Legistar file](#). Below are responses to questions that we stated that were seeking input from Washtenaw County and would provide a response at a later date.

**Question:** Does staff have answers to the following questions that were unresolved from the last round of agenda responses? (Councilmember Disch)

- 1. Would joining the WRRMA supersede Council's anti-privatization policy? (Councilmember Grand)
- 2) Is it true that Ann Arbor could "opt out" of a regional contract supported by the majority of WRRMA members, especially if that contract were to outsource to a company that does not use union labor? (Councilmember Grand)
- 3) Does the WRRMA have plans to expand its scope to commercial waste, residential waste, and/or organics? (Councilmember Grand)
- 4) What is the role of RAA in the WRRMA? (Councilmember Grand)

**Response:** Please see responses below to the above referenced unresolved questions from the January 4<sup>th</sup> Agenda Response Memo.

**Question:** Would joining the WRRMA supersede Council's anti-privatization policy?

**Response:** No, joining WRRMA does not supersede Council's anti-privatization policy. If the City of Ann Arbor became a WRRMA member, City Council would need to approve any contract made by the authority on the City's behalf. The City is always in a position to reject contract language and not move forward with any proposed contract that the City determines is not acceptable to the City. The City will always have the opportunity to present contract requirements of the City at WRRMA meetings. Any contract is subject to negotiations and the particular needs of the City. If appropriate terms cannot be reached, the City would never be compelled to be part of the contract. As a final step, the City would always have the right to withdraw from the Authority.

**Question:** Is it true that Ann Arbor could “opt out” of a regional contract supported by the majority of WRRMA members, especially if that contract were to outsource to a company that does not use union labor?

**Response:** Yes, the City could “opt out” of any WRRMA contract that City Council does not deem acceptable. The goals and objectives of the City will be communicated during any contract negotiation process. The particular needs of each WRRMA community member will also be considered. The City will never be forced to participate in a contract that is not acceptable to the City.

**Question:** Does the WRRMA have plans to expand its scope to commercial waste, residential waste, and/or organics?

**Response:** WRRMA’s initial goal is to increase the quantity of high-quality (in other words, uncontaminated) recycling through analyzing data, standardizing communications and media, and implementing a cohesive and comprehensive messaging campaign. Long-term, WRRMA’s goal is to analyze and pursue services as a group of member communities. WRRMA also plans a long-term focus on monitoring and supporting a regional full-service Drop-Off Station(s) to increase access. Any change in focus areas will be determined by WRRMA board members and may be reflected in the Authority’s strategic planning.

**Question:** What is the role of RAA in the WRRMA?

**Response:** WRRMA does not currently have any contracts with Recycle Ann Arbor (RAA). RAA has presented to WRRMA on their plans for the Materials Recovery Facility and is providing quarterly updates on their progress. RAA will also provide updates on the Drop-Off Station operations and metrics.



