



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, City Administrator

CC: Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
John Fournier, Assistant City Administrator
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Nick Hutchinson, City Engineer
Mike Kennedy, Fire Chief
Brett Lenart, Planning Manager
Marti Praschan, Chief of Staff, Public Services
Brian Steglitz, Water Treatment Plant Manager
Missy Stults, Manager, Sustainability & Innovation

SUBJECT: April 5, 2021 Council Agenda Responses

DATE: April 1, 2021

CA- 1 - Resolution to Appropriate and Amend the FY21 General Fund Budget for Technical Support Related to the Gelman Litigation (\$10,000.00) (8 Votes Required)

Question: Per the resolution: *This work includes the theoretical review of a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for a proposed discharge into the First Sister Lake. Why are we studying a discharge into the First Sister Lake when the public resoundingly rejected a discharge into the First Sister Lake? (Councilmember Griswold)*

Response: This work was requested to support the City in the ongoing litigation with Gelman Sciences. This work does not change any legal strategy, and neither contradicts nor impacts City Council's (and the public's) rejection of a discharge from the proposed Parklake Extraction Well into First Sister Lake.

CA-4 - Resolution to Award a Two (2) Year Contract for Right-of-Way Mowing and Landscaping Services to RNA Facilities Management, ITB-4662 (\$122,918.00 annually; \$245,836.00 for two years)

Question: Q1. Please correct me if I'm wrong, but I assume that the reason we contract out for these services is because City staff believes it is more cost effective to contract for these services than use City staff to perform these tasks. (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: This is correct.

Question: Q2. Did City staff ever perform these services? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: Right-of-way mowing has been contracted out for approximately 25 years.

Question: Q3. Do City staff mow City parks or do we contract for these services? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: City parks are mowed by City staff.

Question: Q4. There is a significant opportunity cost to contracting for this service. This works spans the entire City frequently through the summer months. Ideally, the personnel performing this task would serve as the eyes and ears of the City, observing small little problems (broken signs, excessive litter, overgrown vegetation on private property, etc.) and reporting those issues on A2Fix It. It does not appear that the contractor has the responsibility to report issues in their contract. Are there any other City personnel that serve this role? In general, are City staff asked to report problems they observe? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: Community Standards is responsible for the enforcement of City codes and ordinances. Public Works staff report problems they observe within the right-of-way in the performance of their daily duties.

Question: Q5. Do we know what the cost would be if City staff performed these services? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: Staff does not know the cost to perform these services at this time, but an analysis can be completed if requested by the Council.

Question: It does not appear to me that the questions pertaining to the responsible contractor policy were included in this ITB. Did I miss them? Or were they omitted as in the case of CA-5? (Councilmember Disch)

Response: The Responsible Contractor Policy (RCP) questions were not included in this ITB since it is not a construction/public improvements project, and therefore not required.

CA-5 – Resolution to Award a Construction Contract to Doan Construction Company for the South Industrial Highway Concrete Pavement Repair Project (\$1,071,197.58)

Question: I see a line item for Audio Message Device and it is described as “intended for use in Temporary Pedestrian Alternate Routes (TPAR) to assist pedestrians with visual impairment.” Are audio message devices part of the plan for the permanent installations of crosswalks? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: The contract line item ‘Audible Message Device, Temp’ is to maintain access to all users, when existing crosswalks are impacted by construction and detoured. These devices will be removed after the crosswalks are restored. The project does include the installation of permanent signal upgrades at the intersection of Stimson & S. Industrial. The existing pedestrian signals will be upgraded to accessible pedestrian signals. The pedestrian signal devices for the permanent installation have been purchased separately by the City. Therefore, these items are not included in the list of line items in the contract.

Question: Is there a reason why the city should not request that bidders complete and submit the inadvertently omitted questions related to the RCP prior to awarding this contract? (Councilmember Radina)

Response: Yes, the City should not request bidders to complete and submit additional responses to the missing Responsible Contracting Policy (RCP) questions because the competitive bidding process for ITB 4655 is already complete and cannot be changed at this point. The City has no way to require bidders to provide additional information after bid opening and tabulation. If there is a desire to ensure the contract award includes consideration of the RCP criteria, the ITB would have to be re-issued with the RCP questions included. All ITBs reserve the City’s right to reject all bids and re-bid the project, but re-bidding the same project after bid opening will delay the project and can have financial consequences. The City Attorney’s Office will also provide separate legal advice.

CA-6 – Resolution to Approve Construction Contract Change Order No. 1 with CB Asphalt Paving for Street Cut and Miscellaneous Pavement Repair - ITB No. 4624 (\$500,000.00 increase, total contract \$1,000,000.00)

Question: Given these circumstances, does True North’s unresponsiveness impact their ability to bid on or receive contracts in the future? (Councilmember Radina)

Response: True North will still be able to bid on projects, but they may not qualify as a responsible bidder.

CA-7 - Resolution to Establish the Newport/Sunset Sidewalk Gap Project Budget and Appropriate \$120,000.00 (8 Votes Required)

Question: Q1: Will every sidewalk gap project come before Council for a vote (8 votes required) or is this unusual because we are using Street, Bridge, and Sidewalk Millage funds (that will then be reimbursed)? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: This is a special case due to the need for interim funding until revenue is available through the New Sidewalk Millage. These projects typically will not come to Council for formal action until the approval of the construction contract; or in the case of this project, the City-State Agreement (which will be required due to the Federal funding being used on the project).

Question: Q2: How are residents engaged/informed about projects to fill sidewalk gaps now that the funding mechanism has shifted? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: Public engagement is a critical component in these types of projects. One of the first steps of this project will be to inform the public and hold a public meeting to further discuss the project and receive input from the residents. The exact format of this meeting has not yet been determined

Question: Q3: How are these gaps prioritized? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: More information on sidewalk gaps can be found on the City's website [here](#). City staff developed a prioritization system for sidewalks gaps, [details](#) of which were presented to City Council on January 11, 2021. While this system is currently being revised based on feedback from Council at that meeting, under the current system these gaps fell into the "High" and "Highest" prioritization categories, which led to their inclusion in the Capital Improvements Plan.

Question: Q4: The map provided doesn't show any project details. Will this project:

- Impact the bike lane on Newport?

Response: While design work has not yet begun on this project, it is unlikely that the bike lanes on Newport will be permanently affected, although they could be temporarily impacted during construction.

- Narrow the ROW on Sunset? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: While design work has not yet begun on this project, it is unlikely that this project will affect the width of the public right-of-way.

Question: Q5: What will the impact of this project be on natural features on Newport and Sunset? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: Design work has not yet begun on this project, so it is premature to speculate on the impact to natural features. However, staff will work with residents during the design of the project to minimize impacts on the natural features to the extent possible.

CA-9 - Resolution to Authorize Acquisition of Easements for the LynAnne-Arbana Sewer Project (aka Huron West Park Sanitary Sewer, Phases 2 and 3) (8 Votes Required)

Question: Q1. Have any property owners expressed concerns about providing the land for these easements? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: It should be noted that there is an existing county storm sewer and a City sanitary sewer running along the project corridor, in close proximity to the proposed new sanitary sewer. Property owners have generally expressed understanding of the need to replace the sewer in approximately the same location. There will be minimal impact to the owners' use of the land with the new sewer, as it is located mostly along the rear of the properties in an area already encumbered by these existing sewers.

Question: Q2. This project will have a substantial impact on natural features in this corridor and the impact will be ongoing. Staff reports a 8-10 foot maintenance path between Arbana and Revena will be needed. Currently, this is anticipated to be maintained as a "green corridor", that will discourage public access. There are linear parks on Arbana and Revena, why does this project not add a connecting path to those two parks if this corridor needs to be maintained for access? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: In meeting with residents between Arbana and Revena, staff has heard from the adjacent residents that they are generally not in favor of creating a pedestrian path through their property in that area.

Question: Q3. Groundwater was sampled in three locations for this project. Groundwater Sample B-102 recorded 1,4 Dioxane at 18 ppb. When groundwater samples are collected for projects and 1.4 dioxane is detected, how is this data shared with interested parties/regulatory bodies? Is this data publicly available other than in the project presentation (e.g. elsewhere on the City's website)? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: The sampling is being shared internally with the Water Quality Manager and the Wastewater Treatment Plant engineers in order to develop an effective dewatering plan for the sewer construction work. The project area is within the limits of the known, mapped, dioxane plume area. The sampling was performed to determine to what extent dioxane contaminated groundwater might be encountered during construction, and if that level were above the 7.2 ppb drinking water criteria. The groundwater elevation at sample B-102 (west of Wildwood) is below the proposed sewer excavation and would not be encountered during construction. Staff is continuing monthly monitoring east of Revena where groundwater is expected to be encountered and have found Dioxane levels less than 0.2 ppb. The data was not shared with regulatory bodies, as it is not a requirement

of any current permit or mandate. The data was collected solely for the purposes of information to potentially dewater the construction project area.

CA – 11 – Resolution to Approve the Professional Services Agreement with Ann Arbor Architects Collaborative, Inc. for Architectural / Engineering Services for New Fire Station 4 (\$451,100.00)

Question: It does not appear to me that the questions pertaining to the responsible contractor policy were included in this RFP. Did I miss them? Were they omitted as in the case of CA-5? Do they not apply to contracts such as these? (Councilmember Disch)

Response: Correct. The Responsible Contractor Policy (RCP) (and related definitions) do not apply to professional services such as architecture. CA-11 is for the design of the building only (this item is not for a building/construction/public improvement). RCP will be included in the eventual formal solicitation used for the construction of the design requested in CA-11.

B-6 – An Ordinance to Amend Section 4.60 of Chapter 47 (Streets) of Title IV of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor (ORD-21-09)

Question: Q1. At first reading, Councilmember Ramlawi reported that there is a \$40 processing/admin fee in addition to the citation price. So the total cost to a property owner for failing to shovel their sidewalk would be \$100 (\$60 citation + \$40 fee). Is this correct? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: Yes, generally. Code Section 4:61 states that the City shall give notice to the owner or occupant who then has 24 hours to remove the snow or ice or else a citation, “may be issued and the city may cause such snow and/or ice to be removed at the owner’s expense.” A ticket for a first offense would result in a \$60 fine, plus the state-mandatory Justice System Access (JSA) fee of \$40, both payable to the 15th District Court. For second offenses, the City is not required to issue a 24-hour notice, but may immediately issue a citation or have the snow/ice removed and assess the property owner the actual costs of the removal plus a \$50 administrative fee. For first offenses, the civil fine shall be “not more than \$100”; for second offenses, the fine shall be “not more than \$250”; for third and subsequent offenses, the fine shall be “not less than \$500 and up to \$1,000”. Second and subsequent offenses would also be subject to the \$40 JSA fee. Should costs and administrative fees be assessed, the Administrator has the authority to allow an installment agreement, or to reduce or cancel the charges upon proof of financial hardship, per Section 4:62.

Question: Q2. When a large commercial property owner on a transit corridor (e.g. Stadium Blvd) fails to shovel their sidewalk a penalty \$60 (or even \$100) isn’t much of a slap on the wrist. Currently, financial penalties for failing to comply with Section 4.60 of Chapter 47 do not shift based on property type (e.g. residentially zoned vs. commercial), location (e.g. transit corridor) or other factors (e.g. linear feet of sidewalk). Is it possible

to have a different fee structure based on zoning (e.g. higher for commercially zoned than residentially zoned properties or other considerations (e.g. proximity to transit/linear feet of sidewalk)? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: More time is needed to research the issue of assessing different fines against owners of different parcels based on zoning, especially because there are often single and multiple-family residential buildings located within commercial districts and there are some businesses located in residential districts. Changing the structure would require Community Standards officers to know the zoning type of the parcel and/or the length of the sidewalk at issue. As stated above, the City may cause the snow or ice to be removed and assess those costs against the owner, along with \$50 administrative fees, in addition to the fines associated with the issuance of a civil infraction.

Question: Q3. On March 1, Council passed R-21-084 which directed the “City Administrator review the City’s snow removal policies and strategies and recommend adjustments to our operational model to address identified deficiencies that would make the pedestrian transportation network safe and consistently accessible to all users during the winter.” Financial penalties for are obviously one of the policies we employ as a City to encourage compliance with our ordinances. From staff’s perspective, would it be helpful to consider the fee structure in conjunction with the comprehensive review of other policies and strategies the City is undertaking and provide those recommendation in the report due to Council on September 6th? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: Yes. Regarding the “fee structure”, the ordinance sets forth three types of financial obligations for those who fail to remove snow and ice: fines, in increasing amounts based on the level of offense, payable to the 15th District Court; actual costs assessed against the owner if the City has the snow and ice removed; and a \$50 administrative fee should the City pay to have the snow removed. There is also the mandatory \$40 Justice System Access (JSA) fee established by the Michigan Supreme Court Administrative Office and assessed by the District Court upon the adjudication of a civil infraction.

C-1 - An Ordinance to Amend Section 8:530 of Chapter 105 (Housing: Entry to Show Premises and Time for Rental Agreements) of Title VIII (Building Regulations) of the Ann Arbor City Code

Question: Q1. When was the provision of 70 days added to Section 8:530 of Chapter 105? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: On March 20, 2006, the initial version of Section 8:530 passed, establishing the waiting period to either show or re-lease premises at 90 days. On January 22, 2008, Section 8:530 was amended to decrease the period to 70 days.

Question: Q2. What was the process used to arrive at 70 days? Were other time frames considered? Who was engaged in the process? Was it formal or informal engagement? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: The initial ordinance contained a provision mandating that City Council review the operation of the provisions of the section and recommend changes that Council deemed appropriate. Council Resolution 07-0871, approved on January 22, 2008, stated that the amendment, “comes to you with the unanimous recommendation of the City Council-Michigan Student Assembly Committee at its October 9, 2007 meeting. All five landlords present at the meeting also supported the following amendments to Code Section 8:530 of Chapter 105.” A Michigan Daily article from January 23, 2008 stated that, “In a compromise between students and landlords, the Ann Arbor City Council unanimously approved revisions to the city’s lease-signing ordinance last night.” The article contained comments by a Council Member and the MSA President and can be read here: <https://www.michigandaily.com/uncategorized/city-council-passes-change-lease-law/>

C-4 – An Ordinance to Amend Sections 7:651 and 7:654 of Chapter 97 (Short-Term Rentals) of Title VII of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor

C-5 – An Ordinance to Amend Table 5.15-1, Table 5:15-2, Sections 5.33, 5.37.2P and 5.37.2.S, of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor (Short-Term Rentals) (CPD Recommendation: Approval – 8 Years and 1 Day)

Question: Q1. What type of information and data is staff actively gathering during the time period of March 1, 2021 - March 31, 2021 as it relates to STR’s in SFZ before March 1st, 2021? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: Evidence that the property was leased for less than 60 days prior to March 1, 2021.

Question: Q2. When will the information that staff is currently gathering on the number and location of STR’s be verifiable and ready for public and council consumption? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: Preliminary information will be available prior to the City Council meeting on April 5, 2021. Verification of all information may take longer.

Question: Q3. Would properties that are granted non-conforming status in SFZ be guaranteed those same property rights into perpetuity, even after transfer of ownership? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: Yes, non-conforming status typically is not lost with a change of ownership. Non-conforming status typically continues in perpetuity until discontinuation of a specified time period.

Question: Q1. Amended section 5.33.6 references section 5.32.1. Please share the text of section 5.32.1. (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: 5.32.1 Nonconforming Use

A Nonconforming Use may be continued and shall be maintained in good condition, but it shall not be:

- A. Changed to another non-conforming use, except, after approval of the Zoning Board of Appeals. When granting such approval, the Zoning Board of Appeals shall determine that such change in use will have a less detrimental effect on neighboring property than the existing non-conforming use.
- B. Structurally altered so as to prolong the life of the Building.
- C. Expanded or increased in intensity of use (for example, such as by the addition of one or more Dwelling Units, by providing additional Manufacturing or selling area, or the addition of facilities that would allow the establishment of another use or other uses).
- D. Re-established after discontinuance for a period of at least one year.
- E. Re-established in cases of residential usage in any "R" dwelling district after damage or destruction of the Building or Structure devoted to such non-conforming use if the estimated expense of reconstruction exceeds 70% of the appraised replacement cost (as determined by the Building Official) of the entire Building or Structure exclusive of foundations, prior to its damage or destruction. In cases of other than residential usage in any "R" dwelling district, the limitation on the expense of reconstruction shall be 50% of such appraised replacement cost.
- F. Re-established in any zoning district other than an "R" dwelling district except under the same provisions as in Subsection A.5 above, providing that the limitation on the expense of reconstruction shall be 70% rather than 50% of the appraised replacement cost (as determined by the Building Official) of the entire Building or Structure exclusive of foundations prior to its damage or destruction.

Question: Q2. In past discussion, we established that an STR (with short-term tenants) does not create a "resident" for the purposes of and definitions in our residential zoning. How do the short-term tenants now qualify as residents, permitting a "lawfully established" commercial business in residential areas? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: There is no definition of resident in the UDC and this proposed ordinance does not change that. The non-conforming status of existing rentals in the proposed ordinance is based on the use of the property as a rental prior to March 1, 2021 and not on the status of the tenants.

Question: Q3. What evidence does staff accept a proof of an STR business "lawfully established" under the terms of 5.33.6? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: This is not prescribed explicitly, however, executed lease agreements, listing agreements, other evidence of listing for short term rental may be considered, in

addition to the City's records that the rental property had received a Certificate of Compliance prior to March 1, 2021.

Question: Q4. How many responses has the City received since sending the postcard to landlords alerting them to this opportunity/loophole for "legal nonconforming use"? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: To date, 120 properties have been submitted for consideration if any non-conforming ordinance provision is enacted.

Question: Q5. Was March 31 a hard deadline to assert "legal nonconforming use"? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: No, this was established to try and learn the extent of possible impact prior to City Council consideration.

Question: Q6. If March 31 was not the hard deadline (and a property owner might still assert a "legal nonconforming use" moving forward), does staff believe there should be a hard deadline? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: No, the nature of a Non-Conforming Status is that the property either meets the test, or does not. This determination can be made at any time.

Question: Q7. At what point would it be too late to assert "legal nonconforming use" for a specific property under this ordinance? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Please see response immediately above.

Question: Q8. At this point, does the City have any way of knowing the specific number of long-term housing units that would be lost to this category of "legal nonconforming use"? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: No.

Question: Q9. Has staff established guidelines (or have any guess about future policy) for revoking an STR license? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: This is established in Chapter 96 Short Term Rentals:

7:655. - Prohibited acts and penalties.

(1) Prohibited acts.

a. It shall be unlawful for any person to:

i. Violate any provision of this chapter or any condition of any license granted pursuant to this chapter.

ii. Make any changes or allow any changes to be made in the operation of the short term rental unit as represented in the license application, without first notifying the city by amending the application.

(2) License revocation.

- a. The city finds that the suspension or revocation of a license may be necessary when an owner fails to operate the short-term rental unit in accordance with the provisions of this chapter. A license issued under this chapter may be suspended or revoked for any of the following violations:
- i. A license holder is convicted of or found responsible for violating any provision of this chapter;
 - ii. A license application contains any misrepresentation or omission of any material fact, or false or misleading information, or the license applicant has provided the city with any other false or misleading information related to the short-term rental unit;
 - iii. The short-term rental unit is operated or is operating in violation of the specifications of the license application, any conditions of approval by the city or any other applicable state or local law, rule or regulation;
 - iv. The short-term rental unit is determined by the city to have become a public nuisance;

(3) Revocation not exclusive penalty.

- a. Nothing in this chapter shall be deemed to prohibit the City Administrator or designee from imposing other penalties authorized by the Ann Arbor City Code or other ordinance or to file a public nuisance lawsuit or to take any other legal action authorized by law.

(4) Penalty for violations of chapter 97.

- a. Any person who violates a provision of this chapter shall be responsible for a civil infraction punishable by a civil fine of not more than \$500.00, plus costs and all other remedies available by statute. Each day of violation shall be a separate violation.

Question: Q10. Is there a comparable category of city license where complaint/nuisance/other negligence can trigger revocation of the license? If so, please explain approximately how many city licenses in that category are revoked every year, under what circumstances? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Most City-issued permits and licenses provide for revocation or suspension in some form. However, the procedures and discretion of the City to do so vary, so there may not be a directly comparable category. In general, the focus of enforcement is on compliance, therefore when issues arise they are typically resolved through notice of a violation and a demand for compliance. In cases of continued noncompliance, civil infraction tickets are issued. In rare cases of further noncompliance, revocation or suspension occurs or, in nuisance situations, a court action is filed.

Question: Q11. Does the legal nonconforming use attach to the property (i.e. when the property changes ownership, the use may continue)? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Yes, Non-Conforming status does not depend on specific ownership.

Question: Q12. Under what exact circumstances would the legal nonconforming use be extinguished? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: If the use were discontinued for a period of one year.

Question: Q13. If a property qualifies as a legal nonconforming use, but the license is revoked due to complaints/nuisance, after what period of time (months? years?) is the legal nonconforming use extinguished? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Please see response immediately above.

Question: Q14. As discussed during the Planning Commission meeting: if an STR owner of a legal nonconforming use loses their license due to complaints/nuisance/negligence, can that owner transfer the property to someone else – a business partner, a family member – in order to preserve the legal nonconforming use under a new/different license? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Yes, ownership is not specific to Non-Conforming status.

DC – 2 - Resolution in Support of the University of Michigan President’s Commission on Carbon Neutrality’s (PCCN) Recommendations

Question: Q1. Why would Ann Arbor endorse a program that has a goal to achieve carbon neutrality in 2040 when the city’s target date for carbon neutrality is 2030? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: Q2. The President’s Commission on Carbon Neutrality proposes two goals: carbon neutrality using offsets by 2025, and a goal of full omission of all GHG emissions (technical neutrality) by 2040. The City’s plan calls for carbon neutrality, inclusive of offsets, by 2030. The City does not have a goal of technical carbon neutrality.

Question: Q3. Offsets are included in the first goal listed. Describe how offsets will reduce GHGs and where. How much GHG reduction will happen in A2 based on the UM offsets? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: This isn’t discussed in the Plan. Instead, the Plan provides principles to guide offsets under the “carbon offset recommendations” box (see page 127 of the report).

Question: Q4. How will the A2 Zero plan be modified to reflect the actions proposed by the UM PCCN? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: Since these are only recommendations which have not been adopted by the University and given that the University has made no formal plans to implement specific actions in the plan, City staff do not currently plan to make changes to A2ZERO. Once formal actions are announced, City staff will revisit A2ZERO and the associated programs, plans, and projects.

Question: Q1. What role does DTE play in the UM plan through 2025 and through 2040? (Councilmember Griswold)

Response: The report wasn't written specifically outlining a role for any given actor. As such, it doesn't appear any specific role was given to DTE.

Question: Q2. How will Ann Arbor collaborate with UM given the much later timeframe for UM? (Councilmember Griswold)

Response: The President's Commission on Carbon Neutrality proposes two goals: carbon neutrality using offsets by 2025, and a goal of full omission of all GHG emissions (technical neutrality) by 2040. The City's plan calls for carbon neutrality, inclusive of offsets, by 2030. The City does not have a goal of technical carbon neutrality. As such, the University's goal could be construed as being before the City's. Additionally, the University sits on the Carbon Neutrality Coordinating Committee, which was identified in the A2ZERO Governance Plan as being an important body to coordinate work between the University, City, AAPS, TheRide, Washtenaw County, and Michigan League of Conservation Voters. The City will continue to explore opportunities to collaborate with the University (and others partners) through the CNCC as well as other avenues such as monthly check-ins.

Question: Q3. Will the A2Zero plan supersede the UM PCCN plan? (Councilmember Griswold)

Response: No, because the two plans are separate, but related. The City will continue to work with the University (and other stakeholders) to achieve the goals outlined in both plans.

DC – 3 - Resolution Directing the City Administrator to Develop an Unarmed Public Safety Response Program

Question: Q1. What professional services would be useful in pursuing in the development of the programs being asked for in this resolution that are not currently available by staff? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: It is unknown at this time what professional services may be needed, however one could imagine some circumstances where a consultant could help identify better dispatch strategies or help develop new social services support. These needs are purely speculative at this point, however, and we won't know if there is a desire or need for professional services until we have more thorough engagement with our county and community partners.

Question: Q2. What are the cost estimates in achieving the goals in this resolution? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: Staff will endeavor to do the work without professional services support, however if it is identified as a need we will seek to do so at the lowest reasonable cost.

Question: Q3. Is it advisable to include the cost of a yet to be determined plan, such as this, as part of the General Fund FY'22 budget? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: Please see above responses.