

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT

CITY OF ANN ARBOR
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MAY 3, 2021
6:30 P.M.

Captioning Provided by:
Alternative Communication Services
www.CaptionFamily.com
Phone: (800) 335-0911

* * *

REALTIME CAPTIONING AND/OR CART (COMMUNICATIONS ACCESS REALTIME TRANSLATION) ARE PROVIDED IN ORDER TO FACILITATE COMMUNICATION ACCESSIBILITY AND MAY NOT BE A TOTALLY VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS.

* * *

>> Mayor Taylor: Join us for a moment of silence, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.
>> I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the republic for which it stands: One nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.
Would our clerk please call the roll of council.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Hayner.
>> Councilmember Hayner: Here.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Disch.
>> Councilmember Disch: Here.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Griswold.
>> Councilmember Griswold: Here.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Song.
>> Councilmember Song: Here.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Grand.
>> Councilmember Grand: Here.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Radina.
>> Councilmember Radina: Here.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor Taylor.
>> Mayor Taylor: Here.
And I'm in Ann Arbor.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Thank you.

Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Here.

In Ann Arbor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Here.

I'm dialing from Ann Arbor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs:

Here.

In Ann Arbor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi:

Here and in Ann Arbor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: I assume that the others who did not mention that they are in Ann Arbor.

>> Mayor Taylor: I see a thumbs up from the others.

Do we have communication from our city administrator.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Thanks, mayor.

I wanted to let you all know that this is public service recognition week and I wanted to take a moment to thank all of our employees and electeds and everyone who contributes to public service to make this a better city and a better world.

And it's been a long year.

I want to say thank you to all the employees.

That's all.

>> Mayor Taylor: Excellent.

Introductions.

We have our monthly update from the chair of the independent community police oversight commission, Dr. Jackson.

Dr. Jackson, you have the com.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I will move her over and I believe we missed the approval of the agenda.

>> Mayor Taylor: So we did.

My apologies.

I was so eager to hear from the two of them.

May I have a motion to approve the agenda moved by Griswold and seconded by Radina.

Discussion of the agenda.

All in favor?

[Chorus of ayes]

Opposed.

Dr. Jackson, you are worth waiting for.

Thank you for your patience.

>> Thank you guys for having me.

For those of you who don't know me, my name is Lisa Jackson and I'm the chair of Ann Arbor's independent community police oversight commission, also known as ICPOC.

It was established as an independent body not only to improve relations between the community and the Ann Arbor police department, but also to examine policies and facilitate cooperation between the many different stakeholders involved in keeping our community safe.

Before I get into my main topic for today, since the Derek Chauvin verdict was announced, I would like to ask you to join our commission in a moment of reflection on both our country and our community.

The acts of violence that have been perpetrated against minority communities have been utterly disturbing, however, to use the word "Disturbing" would suggest that those events have shaken a status quo, a notion that many black and brown people will tell you is untrue.

Violence against minority communities is and has been the status quo.

An accurate telling of our nation's history states that the events of the past year are the most recent to disenfranchise those from being a united state of America.

Although many people were looking for a sense of justice and in the outcome of the Chauvin trial, it's important to note that George Floyd's chance at justice ended when his life was taken from him.

There is no justice for George Floyd.

The guilty verdict is a start at accountability.

It's not true accountability, because that would, in part, require that the Minneapolis police department, for example, acknowledges that the initial police report that George Floyd had suffered a medical emergency was false.

They should then explain to the public what they are going to do to route out and prevent false police reports in the future.

Here in Ann Arbor, it will be critical for our police department to do the same.

When they make mistakes, they need to show us how they will prevent them going forward.

That is accountability.

The main point to which I would like to speak this evening regarding opportunities present westbound the city's upcoming budget.

For those who are not aware, council votes soon to pass the city's annual budget and it's clear that while 2020 brought financial challenges, it also highlighted social challenges that have to be addressed through intentional public investment, such as police reform, and environmental equality.

It seems that the city plans to make a significant investment in its A2Zero carbon neutrality plan, and to be very clear, environmental sustainability and a reimagining of public safety are not mutually exclusive.

Therefore, the independent community police oversight commission sees this budget as a unique opportunity for the city to live up to its promise to reimagine public safety by also funding unarmed response programs in Ann Arbor.

In fact, there is an impressive ever growing collaborative group of stakeholders from all across the city, from housing people, to public health experts to activists to religious leaders to policing scholars who are all coming together to examine the prospect the unarmed public safety responses in Ann Arbor.

Some are focused on unarmed responses to mental health calls while others are

focused on unarmed traffic responses.

Traffic stops are the single most common way that people in America come in contact with police, and we all know that those turnout deadly far too often.

Dante Wright, who was killed in Brooklyn center, Minnesota is not even the leadist in the time of tragedy that seems endemic at this point.

It has never been clearer that we need to rethink our reliance on police as a cure-all to societal issues that they are ill equipped to deal with, homelessness, substance abuse and mental health issues.

It also seems unnecessary to have armed police as traffic enforcers of what are civil are, not criminal, infractions.

Over 24 million people each year come in contact with police during a traffic stop, according to the Department of Justice, and the Stanford open policing project shows the traffic stops are especially dangerous and discriminatory for People of Color.

Black drivers are 20% more likely to be stopped than white drivers and as much as twice as likely to be searched according to a survey of 100 million traffic stops.

What about in Ann Arbor?

Well, we don't know.

But we would like to find out.

Since 2020, our commission has been in possession of anonymized traffic stop data for the city for the years 2017, 2018, and 2019.

But due to the city attorney's office, we have been unable to partner with social scientists to have it analyzed.

Why?

Because the city attorney's office has insisted on onerous non-disclosure agreements, the latest version of which does not even give ICPOC permission to discuss the findings.

We have been working in good faith with the police department and the city attorney's office for a year to no avail.

Now the southeast Michigan criminal justice policy research project at eastern Michigan university has agreed to partner with us in this work and we don't want to lose the opportunity to work with them by waiting another few months to iron out who has permission to talk about these data and their analysis.

So council, I come to you to ask you, to have the city attorney free up these data sets.

We think the public deserves to know if there is bias in traffic stops in the city.

The public deserves to know if there's no disparity in young people, or women, or

People of Color being issued tickets as opposed to others being issued mere warnings.

One could argue that these data already belong to the people, since they are the ones who have been issued these tickets.

In any case, I am not convinced that there's a reasonable argument for having a non-disclosure agreement at all.

So I urge you to impress upon the city attorney the need for us to do one of the most important jobs you have given us to facilitate the transparency of the Ann Arbor police department.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you, Dr. Jackson.

We now come to public reserve time.

Public comment reserve time is an opportunity for members of public to speak to council and the community about matters of municipal interest.

To speak at public reserve time, you need to contact the city clerk.

To speak at public comment reserve time after having signed up, please enter the number on your screen, 877-853-5247.

Once you have connected please enter meeting I.D., 94212732148.

That is 94212732148.

Once you are connected, please enter start nine to indicate that you are here and that you wish to speak.

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

When it is your turn to speak, you will have 30 seconds in -- pardon me, when it's your turn to speak, you have three minutes in which to speak.

Pay close attention to the time.

Our clerk will notify you when 30 seconds is remaining.

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

Our first speaker is Shannon Houtamaki.

>> I'm Shannon Houtamaki, I'm calling in about the healthy streets resolution.

There's a lot of reasons why, the vision zero goals are climate.

I will focus on one particular segment of our city's population, children.

I know we are all really happy and excited for the vaccines and possibly a return to normalcy happening sometime soon.

So some of you may be wondering if these changes to our streets and the costs associated with them are necessary.

But for families with young children, I don't see a return normalcy quite that quickly.

Vaccines for young children are months away.

Cases of COVID are still somewhat high.

The kids in Ann Arbor public school have barely gotten a hybrid of in-person school.

And it's at risk of disruption if there's a known case in their cohort.

Trust me, I had small panic attacks every time our phone rings in case it's day care director to notify us of an impending quarantine.

I think the children will have to do most of their socializing outside where transmission of COVID is extremely unlikely.

Outside is really all kids have until all able adults in our community do the duty of getting themselves vaccinated to get this pandemic under control.

The libraries are still closed.

Play spaces like the hands on museum are still closed unless you can afford to rent it out by yourself.

And kids are not a welcomed presence at many of downtown restaurants.

Honestly I don't want to take my kids to a downtown restaurant right now.

My 6-year-old son and his neighborhood buddy spent hours last summer and fall racing each other on Brooklyn avenue where we live.

The bike lanes will be useful for our family bike rides this spring and summer.

So I really don't think this amount is too much to ask for especially after all children have

been given -- all children have given up this year to protect adults.

I don't think it's too much to ask drivers to slow down to be more aware and maybe just 10 or 15 miles per hour instead of the usual 25 or better yet find a different road to take so children can have some joy on their neighborhood slow streets.

And I know it would really like to thank the parks department for their excellent work in maintaining our lovely parks and playground equipment for children.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> And they plan to open up all three city pools for youth camps and family swimming appointments this summer.

So everyone, please, please, go get vaccinated so these unvaccinated children can a life.

Maybe we can get a splash pad set up for them.

All right.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Michelle Hughes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Michelle Hughes, phone number ending in 677.

>> Hello.

I'm here to talk about healthy streets.

Please don't bulk at the large number you see before you.

You might see that \$350,000 and start thinking about other things you would like to end sympathy the money on.

I know I did.

Affordable housing, unarmed responders, I even heard the suggestion could go to the center of the city, but it can't!

Healthy streets will be funded by the major street fund and the local street fund.

This is gas tax money and must be spent on transportation per state law.

The only question is: Do we want to make this another drop in the bucket exclusively for cars or on the sidewalk and the bikes where it will make a future difference.

I heard that the pandemic is wrapping up and run to the status quo of thinking only about -- but this will make us less safe and it won't help us meet our A2Zero goals by 2030.

[Garbled audio]

We did healthy streets on the cheap and a lot of people complained about it.

So this time the proposal is to do it the right way and all it takes is for you to vote the right way on CA-14.

I would also like to talk about DC-1, the resolution to improve council effectiveness, performance and communication.

Debate this proposal will have the effect of further harming our LGBTQ community, making us more intimidated to approach the government.

On April 11th, councilmember, Jeff Hayner homophobic slur online.

He was removed from his committee assignments because that was the only tool they had to assure the LGBTQ that the government did not condone the hate speech.

[Garbled audio]

The action was not addressed -- it was created in the greater LGBTQ but not any

particular party in council unless you want to identify yourselves as the party of bigotry. Could Hayner's bigotry could have been dealt with in a different way.

They chose to talk about partisan options.

As your own lawyer explains to you this was not an overreach.

It was well within council's right to do.

And I heard the phrase due process for Jeff Hayner but there was no additional process that was due.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> Whatever additional processes you might imagine.

Please just remove this item from the agenda and never mention it again.

If you want to communicate better amongst one another, simply do so.

Don't do it at the expensive of the LGBTQ community.

Debate about this proposal will only remind us how quickly the sponsors of this proposal brushed aside and minimized our concerns.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Our next speaker is Ralph McKee.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mr. McKee, phone number ending in 556.

>> Hi, this is Ralph McKee can you hear me okay?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Fifth ward is where I'm from.

I have the opposite view of the two previous callers.

I sent you a detailed email last night.

I agree with making Ann Arbor more bike and walker friendly, however, the neighborhood streets program no longer makes sense and is a waste of money when you have a \$2 million budget shortfall.

The original reasoning was to make it safer for walkers and bikers to traverse neighborhood streets.

Then we didn't know much about COVID transmission.

Now expert consensus is that risk of transmission from passing encounters outdoors is infinitesimal.

We are well on our way to have people vaccinated and the being outside is justified.

I couldn't discern the estimated cost of that part of the program from the agenda materials.

This is troubling.

At prior meetings staff couldn't answer questions about last year's costs and asked for more time and money to study cost data.

We shouldn't be spending \$1, let alone \$50,000 on a program that has no remaining reason for existence.

My email gives several examples of why that program is at best useless and counterproductive on safety, significantly so.

Please eliminate it.

Next topic.

Council rules.

When I first saw the proposed changes, I thought you had done the right thing and got rid of the part that nick of the ACLU had criticized and then I read farther down where

you made them even more vague.

Conduct unbecoming a councilmember.

Always be fair to everyone.

Better make sure your work colleagues think so.

No denigrating land.

Don't make a snide comment back to the guy who insulted you at the bar.

Candidly, these are ludicrous.

And your failure thus far to even address the mayor calling MLive beneath contempt for filing a FOIA request or the serious charges against Councilmember Eyer, shows that you are going to collectively apply these rules anyway.

Finally, give that you actually came up with these rules amid all the other bad process going on at these meetings you could use some professional help, that's DC-1.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> And I would quote my favorite song, gotta get it worked on, gotta get myself some professional help.

I hope you take that advice to heart and thank you very much.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Aria Schugat.

>> Aria Schugat.

>> Thank you very much for your time.

I believe DC-1 is a waste of time for this acting body.

Members of this council have to want to work together before they can be coached on how to more effectively communicate and work together.

Members of this body have threatened to sue the city if they were reprimanded by council and other members have a traceable pattern of unacceptable behavior and little acknowledgment of the harm that was done.

Please move on from this.

And consider real policy that helps the city as a whole.

Thank you very much for your time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Zachary Storey.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Zachary Storey, phone number ending in 936.

>> Hello, this is Zachary Storey.

So the resolution sponsored by Griswold, the first one, to bring this whole thing back up again.

Well, first of all, I want to make a comment on record about an interaction I had with Councilmember Griswold at the farmer's market a couple of Saturdays ago.

I game up to Debbie Dingle while she was at the farmer's market to express my concerns with what's happening on Ann Arbor city council.

Specifically about Hayner's use of the homophobic slur to denigrate journalists and attack the free press like he loves to do any chance he gets.

And Griswold just brushed me aside and said, oh, Debbie doesn't want to hear this.

Debbie doesn't have time for this.

And that is very unbecoming of the councilmember and you should be very ashamed of yourself Griswold.

You have a lot to be ashamed of.

You have never apologized to me like you said you -- you personally said you would to your part in the despicable conversation in which you were joking about housing density and comparing poor people to chickens.

So bringing up this resolution to spend \$20,000 to fix your despicable behavior is abhorrent and it's just a tactic to bring this up again and it's harming our LGBTQ community.

It's harming people.

A lot of friends of mine don't want to call into these meetings because of how you act. Like, I took a couple months off when Hayner exploded at me after I called for his resignation.

And also Ramlawi and Griswold also jumped on that and prompted me to file a report with the ACLU.

Because they were just stepping all over the first amendment.

So we have initiated a recall for Hayner.

And here's what some people on the street are calling you, they are calling you a homophobic fascist, conspiracy theorist wielding, first amendment trampling despicable human being and you should be shamed.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is petals sandcastle.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Petals Sandcastle, phone number ending in 469.

You can press star six and unmute yourself.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> One second.

I had there.

Petals Sandcastle, global citizen of planet earth.

I'm calling in about the resolution to improve council effectiveness, performance and communications.

Truthfully, think it's a larger conversation than council's ineffectiveness to communicate.

It's a difficult lens for our sweet little unicorn Ann Arbor to look through, but our willful ignorance and our wildly unchecked privilege and our not so soft bigotry, it's a toxic wasteland that straight, wealthy, educated white people will never understand unless we get a really honest gloves off conversation going.

A quick little story, over this past graduation weekend, we were set up downtown on state street with our giant love and breathe trailer and we were hosting space for whatever wants to get fed.

We had art supplies and tents and open mic and it was really just a decadent yes vibe.

And it was a smashing success but several truly bizarre things happened, including thousands and thousands of white people walking by us quote/unquote crazy hippie artists and crazy queers and all the marginalized folks that pseudo-woke Ann Arbor cannot bring itself to see and appreciate.

Parents would turn their kids' heads.

At one point the cops came and they wanted to arrest this delicious unicorn performance artist, who was writhing on the ground really channeling the divine.

And I tried telling this white cop 20 years on the force that the African American was simply being convicted by a higher artistic power.

And he man explained to me that he knows for certain that he's on drug and dangerous.

He like Councilmember Hayner he didn't mean any harm.

He's just working with what he's got.

Unfortunately, he is ill equipped for the job.

And the corporate faux Christian that eats all the nonnormative quivering in the margins who will stop being the victims of willfully ignorance privilege that doesn't know how to act itself.

I challenge the council to walk some high heeled steps in someone else's shoes and removing Councilmember Hayner is like voting in Biden and it's really time to get us in the same room.

I offer you our space and our studios to facilitate a deeper, live stream conversation to tackle some of the subtle soft bigotry that's so insidious in woke Ann Arbor.

I thank you and I yield my time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Blain Coleman.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mr. Coleman, phone number ending in 941.

You can press star 6 to unmute yourself.

Mr. Coleman, phone number ending in 941.

Mr. Coleman, if you press star six, you can up mute yourself.

>> Hello?

Hello, can you hear us?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can hear this phone number.

>> Hold on one second.

This is Blaine Coleman.

>> Thank you.

This is Blaine Coleman.

Councilmember Grand, when you threatened to become a seek and destroy missile against the one Palestinian member of Ann Arbor city council, did you want to frighten him so badly that he would never vote for any Palestinian human rights resolution for the rest of his life?

Councilmember Grand, Julie grand, when you deployed the language of missile and massacre against the only Palestinian member of city council, just how comfortable do you think the mayor's slate was to hear it?

I guess you saw that they were very comfortable because not one of them has condemned your murderous threat against Ali Ramlawi.

Everyone can look up the MLive article, where you threatened you can become a seek and destroy missile.

Now, when the mayor's slate tonight outright lies and tells everyone that city council won't discuss international matters well, it's a big lie, because city council has already passed numerous resolutions on global issues.

When the mayor's slate lies and tells you that they will not discuss divisive issues, it's a lie because the city council has passed resolutions on extremely divisive issues already.

When the mayor's slate lies and says they would rather discuss ora Rosser.

They could have discussed them if they wanted, and they should do it now.
What is keeping them from discussing the killing of Aura Rosser.
Are you going to blame Palestinians for your own racist violence.
Are you going to blame Palestinians for your own wall of silence.
I have to ask the mayor's slate, the whole slate, why do you want Palestinians to die?
Why do you want Palestinians to starve, to be caged up in tinier and tinier spaces in the Israeli military.

Why do you want to shoot guided missiles at Palestinian so badly.
Why is your finger always on the trigger when Palestinian human rights are even discussed?

Why is your finger always on the trigger?
When Palestinian human rights are even discussed?

I would like some answers.

>> Mayor Taylor: The next speaker is Mozghan Savabieasfahani.

>> You're up.

>> Hello?

>> Mayor Taylor: Hello.

>> Hello?

Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> All right.

Thank you.

Hi, my name is Dr. Mozghan.

Two major human rights organizations Beth Salem and human rights watch called Israel what it has been since its inception, an apartheid state.

A country that maintains one group over another.

They commits human inhumane act.

That's an apartheid state.

You know the jig is up when members of U.S. Congress who until recently would enthusiastically run their grandmother over to praise Israel, thought to demand justice for Palestinians.

The jig is up, Ann Arbor, because it's no longer possible to pretend Israel is a democracy or that Israeli occupation is temporary or equitable.

It is a fact and can no longer be denied that our tax dollars support a system of racial segregation that destroys Palestinian property, and continues to expand and violates international law.

If we are as we claim to be a progressive community, an antiracist, antisexist, antiviolence community who abhors prejudice and race violence, we must spearhead the movement to withdraw support from apartheid Israel.

Not stifle it.

If we are against gun violence, we must stop arming Israel.

If we are against abuse of children, we must stop arming Israel.

If we are against abuse of women, we must stop arming Israel.

If we are against torture, we must stop arming Israel.

If we believe children deserve to live in peace, we must stop arming Israel.

If we believe children deserve to live happy and healthy lives, we must stop arming Israel.

If we believe children deserve three square meals a day and clean drinking water, we must stop arming Israel.

I'm here to ask you to take heart, stand up for what is obviously the most important human rights issue of our time.

Stand up and demand an end to Israel.

Do not lose this chance.

If you miss this chance again, your children will read about it in time, and they will know that even after Israel was declared an apartheid state, you kept the flow of guns to that racist state.

Be the first city council in the United States to declare that we are against military aid to Israel.

You will be remembered for courage and honor if you do so.

If you don't, you will end up in the dust bin of history, shamed and dishonored as you deserve to be.

And the fight for Palestinian human rights will continue.

>> Mayor Taylor: Our next speaker is Odile Hugonot-Haber.

>> Ms. Haber, phone number ending in 971.

Go ahead.

>> Hello.

Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Okay.

My name is Odile Hugonot-Haber, and I am speaking to community conversation, on Palestinian human rights that is long needed in Ann Arbor.

I want to introduce you to HR-2590.

2590.

It's 2590 about Palestinian children prisoners.

This is to promote and protect the human rights of Palestinian children living under Israeli military occupation.

And to ensure that the U.S. taxpayers funds are not used by the government -- are not used by the government of Israel to ship off the military detention of Palestinian.

This was introduced on April 15, 2021, by Betty McCollum, she is a democrat from Minnesota.

It's also called the no way to treat a child bill.

Each year, there are 700 Palestinian children, please help us send this.

The children are from 9 to 18 years old and they are often put into isolated confinement. They are blindfolded and detained.

They are coerced into confessions.

It is physical and emotional violence.

The Americans is leading a coalition to end this practice and for children international.

The Israel is the only country that does this.

It's unthinkable to think that children that young are put alone into solitary confinement, and they often are not able to have access to their lawyer.

So please help us to end this practice and thank you for the conversation in Ann Arbor.
Thank you for what you can do.

Thank you.

Bye-bye.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Henry Herskovitz.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mr. Herskovitz, go ahead.

>> Good evening.

Much praise is due for Councilmember Griswold to hold a conversation about the
Palestinian people, about Palestine.

She has taken a principled stand with this resolution.

She has shown bravery.

Her action reflects the bumper sticker, "speak up, even though your voice shakes."

I wish her good fortune in this endeavor.

Her test will come when the pushback arrives and I see by the MLive article, that the
pushback has already begun.

Some say it's not a local issue please consider.

Of the \$3.8 billion all Americans pay to Israel each year, Ann Arbor residents, the
residents you all represent put up \$1.4 million.

That sounds local to me.

Some members of council think the issue is divisive and I agree.

The question is on which side of this divide, between an aggressive racist nation on one
hand and the unwilling victims on the other will you choose?

It sounds like Ms. Griswold doesn't know the answer, yet she's willing to learn more
about this issue by presenting this resolution.

More pushback from the resolution itself.

It claims the situation is, quote, extremely complex.

This is false.

And designed to terminate discussion.

The situation is extremely simple.

European Jews came to Palestine with a clear intent to replace the Indigenous
Christians and Muslims living there with Jewish immigrants.

Plain and simple.

And no amount of obfuscation will erase this point.

Ms. Griswold appears to be in the same position I was 20 years ago, when like her, I
had so many questions and so few answers in.

My case, I visited the Holy Land to find out what was going on like her, I wanted to start
a conversation.

The pushback started immediately.

The local Jewish community, the community that most strongly supports the Jewish
state refused to grant me an audience.

We met this pushback by initiating peaceful protests, we are in the 18th year.

The longest street running protest in Ann Arbor history.

How Ms. Griswold handles this pushback will be determined by her responses.

I'm encouraged that she plans to proceed with this needed conversation, with or without

council's support.

Thank you, Kathy Griswold.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Further communications today from council?

Councilmember Nelson?

>> Councilmember Nelson: I have a few announcements of things going on in ward 4. The police department is sponsoring a community meeting that's for ward 4 and ward 5 on May 6th at 6 p.m.

I have the link on my website if you are trying to track it down.

I'm sure it's on the city site.

I'm not sure about a quick link to find it.

Also construction on south industrial highway will begin on May 10th.

And there is a link on the city site to read updates about that.

And we have a public meeting for the proposed water treatment facility on May 13th at 6 p.m.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

I just wanted to give a quick thank you and shout out to all of the teachers and staff at the Ann Arbor public schools that welcomed our kids back today, including both of mine. And they had a great day!

And so thank you for all the logistical work and hard work that went into welcoming all of our kids would chose to go back to school today or this week.

It was a wet -- even in the rain, we managed the logistics.

So thank you for that.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I want to apologize for leaving the Zoom webinar.

I lost my sound and had to reboot during public comment.

Next, I would like to mention the u of m commencement exercise.

It was given by Brian Stevenson.

I felt he was directly talking to city council and many in the Ann Arbor community.

He talked about fear and anger.

He talked about the need to have conversations he talked about how we frame discussions.

And the example he gave was the genocide of the Native Americans.

Our founding fathers made that okay because they simply identified the Native Americans as savages.

They were not human.

They were not worthy and it was okay to move forward and wipe them out.

He talked about how we have a justice deficiency and lastly, he talked about the need for hope in our community.

I encourage everyone to watch his address.

It was just 15 minutes.

I will listen to it a few more times.

Lastly, I want to acknowledge that Judge Connors had a hearing today.

He did something that was most unusual.

He actually asked the community members, dozens of community members and Councilmember Hayner was there, and we were able to provide some recommendations to him.

So we'll be hearing more about it, but from a process standpoint it was a really positive experience and it's given me hope.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

I wanted to say that the Ann Arbor police are having engagement meeting for wards 1, 2 and 3 on Wednesday at 5th at 6 p.m.

Similarly, I know they shared the information on social media but if anyone is hoping to participate and needs the link, they can I'm sure reach out to many of us and we will be able to provide it as well.

I also just wanted to give a really quick shout out and thanks to some of the staff in O.S.I. for their really great work for the last month.

They had a free tree give away around arbor day.

Most of the trees were given away within five days and so that's really excited.

But then they also participated and hosted a community conversation here in the Bryant neighborhood to talk to Bryant residents about needed improvements and things like that, to figure out ways that they can help as we continue to look at our sustainability goals and some of the biggest needs that might exist in some of neighborhoods that most need some additional support.

And then I also wanted to briefly mention that Councilmember Song and I met for first time with the joint human rights commission ICPOC working group on potential facial recognition technology ban.

I believe the next meeting is scheduled for Monday the 10th.

But I'm going to work with staff to make sure that that's on the calendar as well so the public can participate if they would like.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks, Mr. Mayor.

Since we are supposed to use this time also to report for boards and commissions, I don't have any of those.

So I will share with the community what I have been doing for my own personal growth and just kind of what has been happening the last couple of weeks.

And it's been a most interesting time.

I have been speaking with lots of friends and community members, business owners and so on and every time I talk to somebody, I feel compelled to bring up the issue that was, you know, happened a couple of weeks back.

You know, inappropriate use of language for which I apologized.

And the thing that has been so really interesting to me and I want to speak specifically to one part of it, but just generally has been the -- generally broad response from people saying what the heck is going on at city hall that they are saying this about you, because we know you are not a homophobe or bigot.

It's reassuring that people do care about what happens at city hall and they are paying attention to what we do and what we say.

And that you know what can I bring back from my being out there trying to learn to help make the city a better place, not just for residents but at city hall and city hall staff. And I want to just quickly share this.

I was speaking with a woman who I had been helping them steward some projects through the city with a group of folks.

Real nice diverse group of folks and working hard with them and closely with them. And so when I spoke to her this week, I launched in my apology and, you know, it's really been great having these conversations and listening and learning from people. And so you know, what was curious about our conversation.

She said, you know Jeff, you don't have to apologize to me.

I would rather be working with you than anybody else, because when I deal with people at the city and other city councilmembers and just people generally at the city -- and this was the shocking part -- she said to me, she has to code switch.

She has to pretend to not be a lesbian and part of that community because she feels that some people on city staff treated her differently.

And that's a word that's been bouncing around for a couple of years.

It's new to our language and I hadn't really thought about it much.

We talked about that at length about her feelings to switch up when she interfaced with the city, with councilmembers and various staff.

That concerned me a lot.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I couldn't imagine that was happening.

>> Mayor Taylor: You are over time.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I wish we had one more minute to talk because everybody has a lot to say.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: Attended last week -- the county launched their opportunity index and this is work with their equity office and I encourage folks to take a look at it. The website is www.opportunityWashtenaw.org.

And they talked about just -- they just walked us through how this tool can be used for grant writing and assessing the gaps when it comes to health, job access, economic well-being, education, community engagement, and you can see some distinct ties to race along our borders throughout the county.

It's the report is incredible.

This is work that has taken years to pull together.

So kudos to the county and the county commissioners and the county staff for putting it together.

Hopefully we can learn a lot from it too.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further communication from council?

I will observe that there are a set of resolutions with respect to various members of various council nominated boards and commissions that will be -- for our consideration at our next meeting, unless I'm much mistaken.

Excellent.

I have a couple of communications the following appointments to members of boards

and commissions, folks not presently.

This is all for consideration at our next meeting, Kelly Burst, and Mike Pettigrew, and Marti Praschan.

The Commission on disability issues, Debra Poster. To the Housing and Human Service Advisory Board, Ella Hall. And to the Human Rights Ayesha Ghazi-Edwin, and Molly Maciejewski. And Local Finance Authority, Michelle Mueller.

To the Public Market Advisory Committee, Jeff Nemeth and Stephanie Willett.

And the following nominations for your consideration of the Ann Arbor Public Art Commission

John Kotarski, Sarah Fuller.

Building Authority, Anthony Ramirez, Doug Smith.

Building Board of Appeals, David Arnsdorf.

City Planning Commission, Councilmember Lisa Disch, Sarah Mills, Lisa Sauve.

Commission on Disability Issues, Rachel Hawkins, Zachary Damon.

Design Review Board, William Kinley, Lori Singleton.

Downtown Area Citizens' Advisory Council, Carolyn Arcure, Peter Honeyman.

Downtown Development Authority, Mary Klopf, Jessica Letaw, Rishi Narayan.

Elizabeth Dean Fund Committee, Kenneth Westerman, E. Merrill Dudley.

Energy Commission, Charles Hookham, Robert Joerg, Noah Levin, John Mirsky.

Historic District Commission, Jessica Quijano.

Housing and Human Services Advisory Board, Paul Sher, Skylar Woodman.

Housing Commission, Lee Meadows.

Human Rights Commission, Leslie Stambaugh, Dilip Das.

Huron River Watershed Commission, Cheryl Darnton.

Richard Norton.

Leslie Science and Nature Center Board of Directors, Paige Morrison.

Local Development Finance Authority, Heather Grisham.

Park Advisory Commission, Rachel Skylis, Lauren London.

Transportation Commission, Julie Boland.

Zoning Board of Appeals, Candice Briere, Nicole Eisenmann, Michael Brent Daniel, Charlotte Wilson.

And that is the sum of that.

For myself I have very few communications except to say as folks know, Juneteenth is upcoming in June.

And I'm working on a resolution to make Juneteenth a permanent municipal holiday and I look in order to having that resolution ready for council and community at our next meeting.

We now have the consent agenda.

May I have a motion to approve the consent agenda.

Moved by Councilmember Ramlawi, seconded by Councilmember Briggs.

Discussion of the consent agenda?

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you, mayor.

CA-14, I would like to pull.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the consent agenda?

All in favor the consent agenda, with the exception of CA-14, please say aye.

[Chorus of ayes]

All opposed?

The consent agenda with the exception of CA-14 is approved unanimously, with 11 councilmembers present, satisfying the eight quote requirement with respect to CA-3. And that is all.

CA-14, resolution to award contract in the amount of \$215,030.64, to P.K. contracting for the 2021 healthy streets deployment, and to appropriate 320,830, from the major street fund balance and \$33,143 from the local street fund balance.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Mayor, if I could.

We have some late questions.

We have with us our transportation director, Raymond Hess to address them.

>> Mayor Taylor: I appreciate the forceful reminder.

Thank you.

>> Yes, good evening councilmembers, Raymond Hess transportation manager.

I will read off the question and give a quick response to it.

So the question was: What triggered the choice implementation of the healthy street last year?

What kind of notification was offered to residents versus what triggered the choice/implementation this year?

I see that we are reimplementing all of the same 26 streets as were implemented last year, plus eight but skimming the responses in the surveys, some installations received completely negative response.

The methodology we used was fairly similar to last year's.

We launched an online comment tool which enabled members of the public to possibly healthy street deployments.

They could comment in support as well as opposition.

Last year was more like a suggestion tool.

The driving force and the identification of neighborhood slow streets was if we heard from residents along that street and if we heard from about a half dozen or more then that street was carried for into the program.

That's how Chapin qualified last year.

The identify of heeding the voices who live in response of a roadway, to members of city council last year which suggests those living along the road had the best interest in mind for the neighborhood.

And it should be noted that many of the comments in opposition to some of the neighborhood slow streets in particular are from those who don't live on the street.

We took those under consideration but we were really looking at the voices of those who live along the street.

And then I should also note that after discussing with both an internal team and subcommittee of the transportation commission, we decided to propose to carry forward the healthy streets -- the neighborhood slow streets from last year to this year.

We could have zeroed it out and started from scratch.

We decided it made sense to bring those forward for discussion, again put them on the

online engagement tool and solicit feedback from them and if there was opposition from people living along that street, it would be taken off.

Are along that note, there is an advance notification signage that will be deployed.

Prior to the neighborhood slow streets we will put out a yard sign at the book ends of the project and if we hear opposition from people living along that street, we'll take the healthy street down.

When we hear from 20% who live along that street.

The other thing, there were some additional streets added to the program this year.

In addition to those that were suggested by residents living along that street.

A good example is we heard some concerns last year about spillover traffic that a lot of cut-through traffic was going over on the spillover street.

And so we tried to go through and look at the network of streets that were identified and identify those parallels.

A good example is rosewood was added because harps to the north was in the program and Jewitt was included in the program and it made sense for rosewood to be included in the program as well.

And then the second question we got is the Broadway bridge the only implementation eliminated based on the survey?

Broadway bridge was not advanced for several reasons.

There was noticeable opposition to the deployment last year.

There were things related depot and other things that exacerbated the experience on Broadway.

And the Broadway bridge was scheduled to have maintenance scheduled for it.

And for that are reason we didn't pursue it.

And lastly Broadway bridge would no longer connect to a receiving facility.

And since the division was not being pursued this year, Broadway bridge was not being pursued either.

The only other implementation that was not pursued was Swift and Pontiac.

It was meant to be a connection to the Broadway bridge to connect to division and without that link in division, we didn't pursue that.

The others of the division, Miller, Katherine, they are D.D.A. deployments and they may be deployed through a separate initiative.

I believe that responds to the questions that we received today.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you very much.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you, mayor.

I have some concerns on this, because when we brought it last year, it was as a result of COVID and the need to increase social distancing the concerns our community had regarding the spread of the virus.

Now we are entering a different phase where vaccination rates are over 50% and restrictions are easing.

We are moving in a different faction collectively as a nation, as a community.

Even if the ones who are very cautious of what we are doing.

I feel this is mission creep and it's also taking away resources that need to be applied so to our C.I.P. which we are behind on.

You know, we have a goal of 80% of our roads to be rated 7 or better on the pacer system.

And this is as late as the resolution of August 19 of '19.

And we're taking 300, \$400,000 from act 51 that would go into fixing our roads in our neighborhoods as well.

Into a temporal program that's now gaining steam and gaining a bigger budget.

Last year it started with a nominal ask that actually ballooned into three times the first amount.

And now we're looking at an amount that is north of a quarter million dollars.

And the rest of our infrastructure is -- is in bad shape.

We hear from our constituents constantly, the conditions of the roads and when will they get fixed.

In my area, I have a lot of bad roads, which it's brooks, whether it's Virginia, whether it's Lutz, whether it's Arborview, there's so many bad roads that are still years away from being resurfaced.

And these are the same roads that people will bike and walk down just as well.

I mean, you can trip and fall and hurt your ankle or fall off your bike riding down some of these other roads that will take a back seat because we are diverting more money away from the funds that would repair those pavements and the infrastructure in these other parts of our neighborhoods.

So I have a question regarding this.

Is there any way of teasing out the repairs that are permanent and keeping those in place, and if so, how?

>> Mayor Taylor: Your question came at the three-minute mark if I can ask you -- if you want to ask that question when you come in on your second go around.

Thank you.

Councilmember Briggs?

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thank you very much.

I wanted to thank Mr. Hess for providing answers to those questions.

A lot of them have been raised by councilmembers and community members as well.

And so I wanted to draw council's attention if you haven't seen it yet to the email from Molly Kleinman, the chair of the transportation commission who sent in a note to us in support of this resolution.

It's in support of this resolution at our last meeting, and we did so as Mr. Hess mentioned, there was discussion at both the transportation commission and the subcommittee about the merits of this program moving forward.

I have heard concerns that this is no longer warranted, as one of the public commenters mentioned.

Our kids are not vaccinated.

Kids are definitely very much in need of additional space to be able to utilize the summers and the adults are as well.

But kids are still not gathering indoors and this still remains a pandemic need for many members of our community, but it also advises our carbon neutrality plan and proposed transportation plan, one of those key goals in our climate action plan was the 50% reduction in car trips by 2030 and part of that is about shifting behavior.

And so these projects, both the neighborhood slow streets which get to slowing down traffic, getting people to think about their behavior in the neighborhoods is an important step.

That direction in addition to making things more pleasant for our kids, but also these permanent installations both on main street and Packard -- well, on Packard, the permanent installations which have been there with a lot of support and then main street, staff really took the input we received from last year that was a lot of -- a lot of criticism about how that installation went in and it's putting in a much better -- I would say, more thought out installation which has not such a construction-like feel which will allow us to pilot sort of a different roadway configuration to see if it's warranted for different installation.

That's an important test case for our community.

I will share more thoughts later, if that's important.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes, thanks Mr. Mayor.

I think some of these comments are right on target.

The idea that they are permanent installations, that can that have value and can be tested we have something to show for it, I think is a lot more palatable instead of putting up and taking down the barricades that kind of goes away and the notion that we are vaguely somehow modifying people's behavior.

I think it's easier to spend a quarter of a million dollars on something that's permanent and has longevity it is than for the temporary installations, especially when you have situations like we have up on Broadway where we will have people drinking water that's the color of beer but with much less clarity and they have been for 25 years and we are waiting for Broadway to be resurfaced and these resurfacing funds have to come through.

So when we have extraordinary needs for resurfacing and other projects that hold up or are in play only with water main replacement projects, it's hard to hey yes, sir to spending this type of money on that.

So Councilmember Ramlawi was talking about separating the permanent from the temporary installations.

Is it possible that the resolution could be split so that the permanent resolutions -- I couldn't agree more that Packard needs to be -- we need to focus more on specific transportation corridors in and through the city to facilitate this notion that there are places that need to be safe for all mode shares and maybe it's not everywhere.

Maybe it's focusing on proper corridor treatment.

Is there a way that the Packard can be voted outside of closing these neighborhood streets?

That's my question to whoever might want to answer.

>> Mr. Mayor if I may, and councilmembers.

>> Mayor Taylor: Please.

>> I'm sorry.

We are looking up the cost for the main street so the neighborhood slow streets is easy to decipher from the resolution because it's the amount that correlates with the local street fund.

That's the \$33,143.

So that one stands out.

For the remainder, we are looking at the bid to see what the contractor proposed because main street.

Hold tight and we should get an answer for you shortly on that.

>> Mayor Taylor: We will cycle back to you on that, and in the meantime, Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes, one of my issues is that the culture within city hall seems to be very much project oriented and consultant project oriented, not accountability oriented.

I sent all the members of council a crosswalk that I encountered yesterday.

It went from the west side of Barton Drive with an A.D. ax compliant ramp, it was newly painted and on the other side of the street was a bush and a mailbox.

Now, I don't think our staff would ever do something like that: I just don't believe they would.

So I hold our council responsible for all of the special programs and projects that we approve, but it's time to look at what we need.

Look at what we need in terms of sustainability and we can wish all we want.

But the aspiration of letting children play in the street when they cannot even safely cross street, based on our crash data and I just got the data today.

Children need to be able to cross the street safely, and that should be our priority.

They can not do that to the extent that they deserve in the city of Ann Arbor.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Are you ready?

No worries.

Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: I wanted to mention to Councilmember Griswold, there was a proposal to put a sidewalk that that crosswalk -- to which that crosswalk would join. But that sidewalk would have run through the backyards of several properties.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Right, mm-hmm.

>> Councilmember Disch: And the front yards some of others and it became extremely complicated and was taken off the table.

I'm not sure if by us or -- by council which I was not on at the time or by staff.

However, the neighbors vociferously asked for this access ramp and crosswalk because otherwise, they had to climb over guardrails to get on the very popular Argo pond path.

So I think this was a compromise.

I don't think --

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.

No.

No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Well, maybe we can ask staff to refresh our memory for why they chose what they did.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi or rather Mr. Hess, are you --

>> Yes, I have a response to the question that Mr. Ramlawi posed.

The neighborhood slow street is \$33,143.

And then for main street, it was \$82,718.44.

So if you add those two together the temporary portion of the program is \$115,861.44.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you for coming back.

I might have another follow-up on those numbers.

But I don't believe -- I don't have the A2Zero plan in front of me, but I don't believe the healthy streets were a part of our adopted plan.

I understand that we have those stated goals but we did adopt a very complicated 82-page plan, and healthy streets, I don't remember it being a part of that plan.

And so, please correct me if I'm wrong but I think we should stick to the plan.

It's a very comprehensive plan and we shouldn't try to add things to them as we see fit.

We should tick to the plan.

I will say that kids did go back to school today.

I understand it's been very hard on children as well as the rest of us.

But this need to spend this much money on this concern, it takes away from other priorities and feeds that we have as councilmember had pointed out with water replacement, sometimes we can't do that unless we have the money with this resurfacing.

So we really have to tie these monies together in order to maintain our infrastructure.

I just don't see the -- the fact that we have this extra money to spend on temporal programs.

I would rather see it put into permanent programs that protects safety and the welfare of our citizens and there year after year and not just disappearing after three or four months.

So I would like to make a motion that we split this and then -- to that we have the \$33,143, be separated from this for the neighborhood slow streets versus the rest of it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a second?

Seconded by Councilmember Griswold.

Is that conceptually clear enough that we do not require a formal amendment or rather a formal written amendment?

>> Councilmember Nelson: I have a question for clarification.

Did the -- we were given two totals Councilmember Ramlawi about the temporary and it was slow street and main street a total of 115.

Did you mean to just take the 33 or did you mean to take out both of those numbers?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I have a question on the balance.

Unfortunately we don't have a whole lot of time to discuss.

I could move to postpone it, but I would rather just not and deal with it if I could.

But the neighborhood slow streets is one program that I feel comfortable supporting for the \$33,143.

The temporary -- the temporary installations, I'm not supportive.

The other types.

>> Mayor Taylor: Do you folks understand that proposed amendment?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: So the \$33,143 coming from the local street fund, would be its -- would be on its own.

>> Mayor Taylor: Separates from the 215 and the 320?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Separated from the 215, I believe.

>> Councilmember Hayner: This is a contract award.

I'm not sure we can separate this, if Mr. Hupy would like to weigh in.

>> Taking myself out of mute.

This is a unit contract price.

So if the full contract is not awarded, we would have to go back and tease out how those unit prices would adjust.

As I'm speaking, I'm trying to think about mobilization, demobilization and overhead, how that would be dealt with because I'm not -- I have to ask Nick Hutchinson or Raymond, or Cyrus, are those items in the contract and are they lump sum items? Cyrus, if you can answer?

>> Mayor Taylor: You are on mute, or at least I can't hear you.

>> Apologies.

I un-muted the wrong device.

Mobilization is one unit.

One item and a lump sum.

>> Yes so it's not as simple as just taking out the local streets.

They would be required some negotiations with the contractor about mob, demob and overheads.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

So what I hear you saying is that this amendment will not work in this context?

>> Yes, correct.

>> Mayor Taylor: May I infer that the amendment is withdrawn, councilmembers?

I have an acquiescence from Griswold.

I think you are the seconder.

Thank you.

On the queue, Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Thank you.

I was cosponsors of healthy streets in 2020, and I can't help but think back to where we were at when this was a good idea, and this felt like a good idea.

We were in a situation where our city staff were literally putting up signs in public parks telling children not to play there and we had residents who were making phone calls or sending emails to us concerns about gatherings of teenagers playing basketball at public basketball courts.

That's where we were at when this felt like a really good idea.

I was concerned about this when I read the survey results and I was curious how we were taking input from residents who are -- I have heard from many of them, were like me, not in the same mindset that we were in a year ago.

I want to push back about having money directed to pavement that's exclusively for cars.

Councilmember Ramlawi and I are in agreement that the pavement we put open streets is used every bit as much for bicycles.

So I guess I would push back on that being single purpose expense.

The other thing I would point out, since a couple of people mentioned is, one of the proposals in ward 4 is actually going to force cars to drive around.

And so in -- in the sense that some of these streets are diverting traffic away, we're

actually causing people who are already in their cars to be driving further.

And in some ways it's a little counterintuitive.

I wanted to comment that I'm concerned that we are making a decision in a very different set of circumstances without as much meaningful input as I would like.

And it concerns me, like, reading the survey results that it doesn't feel like we are taking into account some of the decisions that maybe were better choices last year and not so good choices this year or choices that were not as helpful and creating hazards last year.

I -- I'm just very -- there are a couple of streets that I'm -- if they had been pulled off, I would have been more reassured that we were learning from past experiences.

I don't know that I can support that this year.

To support healthy streets this year, just because of the money and the process that I don't think we necessarily went through this year.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thank you.

I appreciate the discussion on this.

Just to address some of the issues that have been raised.

Yes, certainly street resurfacing does have some benefit for cyclists but we did just without discussion approve \$6 million of street resurfacing funds which primarily do serve our motorized community.

The healthy streets initiative is different in terms of how it's focused in on really trying to slow traffic in our neighborhoods, which obviously advances our transportation goals, which are coming towards us, but they are -- we are still seeing strong public support for this.

And we can look -- there has been substantial public engagement on this project, 457 community members voiced their support for this.

393 against and 111 other comments.

There's still the option for if this -- you know, we have gotten something wrong, transportation has gotten something wrong, the -- the redeployment doesn't work, community members can still go out and say, we really didn't like how this worked on you're street and it will be removed from the -- from the program.

So there's still that safety outlet if there's a street that's gotten in there.

That shouldn't be there.

But there's a lot of good in this proposal.

A lot that's moving towards our goals.

The deployments on Packard, the permanent installations are really, really important for our community against our non-motorized goals.

The installation on main street, we are not sure what's going to work on main street in the future.

We need to have a strong pilot.

>> Mayor Taylor: That's two minutes.

>> Councilmember Briggs: To be able to get good data.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Councilmember Griswold?

>> Councilmember Griswold: Sorry.

I got somewhat animated when Councilmember Disch was explaining the history of that crosswalk.

I'm intimately familiar with that and unlike other councilmembers, I have come to this council as a community member time after time, begged and begged the community to improve crosswalks and then experienced one death at a crosswalk that I had prioritized and a seriously debilitating crash at another one.

I'm intimately familiar with this.

So when we make decisions it's sometimes a life and death decision and I don't want to be overly dramatic.

But there's never an excuse to end a crosswalk at a bush.

There is a way to do it and I won't put my engineering hat on.

I will leave that to the engineers but we know what that is, and it's not what we have on Barton.

What I would say is there are many good things in this program and we can achieve those positives without the additional overhead financially, as well as consultants and contractors by having local traffic only signs, by implementing the project on main street, by implementing the project on Packard road.

We can still do some of those, but if we vote it down tonight, then staff can come back with the positives in this project and we can closely monitor them so that we don't have some of the problems that we had last year.

And so that would be my recommendation.

So there's a lot to support in here, but there's another way to do it that will be less disruptive and regarding the slow streets, again, we can have local traffic only.

I don't know how we can send kids out into the street, rather than to a park, when we have school buses as well as Amazon deliveries on all of our streets.

It just doesn't seem like reality to me.

It seems wishful.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Councilmember Grand?

>> Councilmember Grand: I just, you know, wanted -- Councilmember Briggs didn't get to finish that point, and I don't want to speak for her exactly, but -- but spending a relatively small amount of money to potentially pilot an expensive and permanent solution to improving non-motorized safety in our community, I think is good policy and it's a good investment.

So regardless of the initial intent, you know, in the past, we have had arguments a number of years ago about similar kinds of pilot projects that were relatively inexpensive, but that could, you know, give us good data.

And so even if it doesn't line up with the initial intent, there are many things that I'm hoping we're learning from this time during the pandemic that will be instructive for other positive policies going forward.

So I'm planning on supporting this.

If we don't have the votes to support it, I do think there are other ways to bring back things with six votes later.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks, Mr. Mayor.

Setting aside the notion that eight votes required for things out of budget for a reason and that we should work around that, to only have six, yeah, I will just remind my colleagues that we had a very painful presentation on the structural deficit that the city is running and if this notion of all this, and I -- like councilwoman Griswold said, some of them are right on track and right on target and some aren't.

Why wasn't this placed in the budget for this year?

Why didn't we consider it?

And is it considered in next year's budget?

We are not going to overcome a structural deficit by making every single thing in our community a priority, and by seeking the eight votes because it's out of a budget cycle. And acting like a relatively small amount of money.

Relative to \$448 million budget, yes, this is a small amount of money.

But relative to a 3.5 to \$4 million structural deficit, it's a large amount of money.

And so there's a line that we all have to walk between fiscal responsibility and wishing all the great things that we could have.

And everybody walks that line a different way.

And if -- you know, if this doesn't pass because the votes can't be raised, then I would encourage the sponsors to bring it back in a way that might be more amenable to fiscal responsibility.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Councilmember Grand?

>> Councilmember Grand: Oh, yes.

Sorry I thought I was unmuted.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion fails without eight votes.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

We thousand come to public hearings.

This is an opportunity to speak about a specific item, a specific actual matter of the public hearing.

To speak at a public hearing, you need not sign up in advance, but it needs to relate to the specific subject matter of the public hearing.

That is to stated specific item on the agenda.

Call 877-853-5247.

877-853-5247.

Once you have been connected enter 94212732148.

94212732148.

Once you are connected, please listen to the public hearing that you are interested in and then enter star nine.

Star nine to indicate that you wish to speak at that public hearing.

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

When it's your turn to speak, you will have three minutes in which to speak.

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

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

Public hearing number one.

An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Zoning) of 3.56 Acres from TWP(Township District) to R1B (Single-Family Dwelling District), 2260 Traver Road.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see any of the callers with their hands up for this hearing.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing, no one this public hearing is closing.

Public hearing number two, An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) Rezoning of 1.1 Acres from TWP (Township District) to R1A (Single Family Dwelling District), 3411 Geddes Road.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see any hands up for this hearing.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing no one, this public hearing is closed.

Public hearing, number three.

An Ordinance to Amend Table 5.15-1, Table 5.15-2, Sections 5.33, 5.37.2.P and 5.37.2.S, of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see any hands up for this hearing.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing no one, this public hearing is closed.

Public hearing number four.

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.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor -- I don't see any callers with their hands up at this hearing.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing no one this public hearing is closed.

Public hearing number five.

An Ordinance to Amend Section 2:69 of Chapter 29 (Stormwater Rates) of Title II of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see anyone with their hand up for this hearing.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing no one this public hearing is closed.

Public hearing number six.

Resolution to Approve 614 South Ashley Site Plan.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 488.

You can press star six to unmute yourself.

Mayor that caller hung up.

I don't have any other callers with their hands up.

>> Mayor Taylor: Let's wait for a moment since we seem to have perhaps one taker.

Let's move on.

And if you can keep track, and if that person calls back, we will make a separate inquiry.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mm-hmm.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

And then perhaps reopen the public hearing, if the person wishes to speak.

That public hearing is closed.

Public hearing number seven.

Resolution to Approve New Fee for Fairview Cemetery.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 083, do you have a comment?

You can press star six to unmute yourself.

Caller 083, phone number ending in 083.

Caller with the phone number ending 083.

>> This is not hearing I wanted to speak on.

I wanted to speak on ten, sorry.

>> Clerk Beaudry: No problem.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing no one this public hearing is closed.

Public hearing number eight.

Resolution to Approve FY 2022 Fee Adjustments for the Community Services Area.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see anyone with their hands up for this hearing.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing no one, this public hearing is closed.

Public hearing nine.

Resolution to Approve Fiscal Year 2022 Fee Adjustments for Public Services Area - Engineering, Systems Planning, Public Works, Water Treatment, and Waste Water Treatment Units.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see anyone with their hand up for this hearing.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing no one this public hearing is closed.

Public hearing number ten.

Resolution to Adopt Ann Arbor City Budget and Related Property Tax Millage Rates for Fiscal Year 2022.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 733, do you have a spent -- a comment?

>> Yes.

I'm Glen Nelson, one of the leaders of the citizens for mental health and public safety.
I thank you for this opportunity.

I want to make three points this evening.

The first, the initiatives on the unarmed public safety response and the diversity equity inclusion have great potential to improve our community and I urge you to give them the support that they need to be successful.

The second point is there are two parts of our budget dealing with human services that are very important and that have small cuts that seem to be sim Pollock.

One of them is Washtenaw coordinated funding.

Also called human services and homeless prevention.

That has a cut of \$50,000 this year.

I recognize the \$50,000 is -- was part of the nonrecurring budget last year, but it still is a cut from last year.

I strongly urge you to keep that funding at least as high as it was last year or in the current year.

The second one is supportive services from the county mental health millage for residents of publicly supportive housing.

This is a little confusing.

On page 218, the recommended budget, it shows clearly that community mental health support from the county health millage falls from \$300,000 in '21 to \$234,000 in fiscal '22 to zero in fiscal '23.

This afternoon, we got a clarification which I very much appreciate from Mr. Crawford and I know you received it too, which says that we have highlighted a portion of the funds that were inadvertently accounted for.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> I cannot find the numbers that Mr. Crawford state in any case.

If I were you, I would insist that there be an addendum or a correction issued so you are not voting on a budget no one understands or at least no one can see in the printed version.

Finally --

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> I will leave it at a two-point presentation.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 078.

>> Hello, my name is Jeremiah Simon.

I live in ward 2 in Ann Arbor and I'm here representing the Michigan chapter of public health awakened.

We have 66 members who live in Ann Arbor.

Public safety is a public health issue and we were happy that Ann Arbor is taking steps to reimagine public safety and is developing an unarmed public safety program.

The American public health association has passed its own solution, of how it harms health and encourages municipalities to create alternatives to police.

Given the mayor and the councilmember's commitment to the public safety system.

We were dismayed that the current proposal increased the budget by \$30.7 million to

\$31.4 million in 2021-22 and \$32 million in 2022-23.

Our Michigan chapter urges you to do three things.

First there should be an unarmed public safety program that separates away from the police.

And to find more life affirming public safety services.

The AAPD police chief identified \$1.6 million in possible budget cuts and according to the budget party survey, residents agree the police funding should be cut.

The city should shift responsibility not -- for mental health and to a new autonomy unarmed crisis program.

And there should be community involvement in the unarmed public safety program.

We know that any successful program needs to be created in partnership with communities most affected.

During this whole dedicated funding to ensure that the community members most impacted by substance abuse, ending without higher police would utilize a new and unarmed safety program.

And you should reorganize.

And this directs the root causes of violence.

Police respond after harms occur and in many cases create conditions of harm.

It uses 26% of general fund expenditures.

And it promotes the public safety.

The A.P.H.A.'s policy emphasize that creating a safety community for all requires ensuring people's dignity and basic needs should be met.

Treating public safeties a public issue.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> Thank you.

A copy this statement has been emailed to you.

We would like to open the communication with you.

Thank you for your time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 677.

>> Hi, this is Michelle Hughes and I'm calling to say that we should have more money spent on unarmed responders this year and shifting the burden of enforcement of traffic things away from the police and this budget would be a great way to do that, to -- and the best way to do that is to move money away from the police budget and towards these other programs the amount we have on our budget for the new unarmed response while nonzero, and I very much applaud that is much closer to zero than I would like it to be.

I don't applaud that.

Please take money away from the police budget and put it towards unarmed response.

Secondly, I want to make sure that the healthy streets 2022 is in the budget for next year so we don't have people who are able to stop the proposal from next year.

Make sure healthy streets is in the budget and also unarmed responders and take the unarmed response money away from the police.

Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 411.

>> Good evening Mayor Taylor and members of council.

Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> This is James Demore, and I speak to you tonight as a former member of the city planning commission.

I wanted to share my remarks over the budget regarding the city commons.

It has come to my attention that there's currently no funding for the commons.

I realize, and I can understand that, there's still considerable resistance to the very notion.

Commons.

I find that rather unfortunate that after two and a half year after proposal of a, that there's still this resistance.

I believe the city needs to acknowledge and fully embrace the passage proposal a in 2018 that amended the city charter designated the public land on the library block for the development of a central park and commons.

I should note that the council of the commons appointed earlier this year by council has begun to meet and develop plans for the establishment of the parks and the commons. Now we have the potential opportunity to realize successful commons.

I think next step would be for the city to provide funding for successful commons.

This funding can help to jump start a strong public/private partnership that will be needed in order for the park and the commons to realize its full potential as community asset.

Public support can encourage private individuals and organizations to provide additional financial support for the parks and commons.

It needs seed money.

I understand that many of the more continued vocal opponents of the commons are also at the same time the more vigorous proponents of a larger more dense downtown.

I'm perplexed at this in regards.

With these new developments already underway, these future residents will need a place to breathe.

The commons can help to fulfill this.

Furthermore, a successful Ann Arbor makes Ann Arbor that much more successful to host a world-class university.

Now speaking only for myself and I'm doing this consciously, normal my friends, I think funding for the commons can be obtained by diverting funding for the deer cull, which I always thought was petty and unnecessary.

It would not be difficult to derive this funding from other sources as well.

The city really has a major opportunity to get this right.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> Let's fully embrace this commons and provide the initial funding to rent the world of voters.

Mayor Taylor and members of council, I thank you for your time and thanks for considering my comments and observations.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 518, do you have a comment?

>> Thank you, I'm Tommy Higgen door and I'm here to speak on the deer management. Ann Arbor has never been overpopulated by deer.

This is about human population growth.

There is no deer crisis, ecological or otherwise.

Our first area count showed 168 deer and after five years of culling, the number has barely changed.

Culls are costly, short-term fixes to create vacuums and population rebound.

We also know they don't reduce Lyme disease and there are better ways to make our roads safer.

Plus the cull has frustrating park closures and puts sharp shooters next to our homes and schools.

We -- land development, climate change, a single species attack cannot solve complex problems and do more harm than go.

Deer are not pests.

They are a native species that also offer see could logical benefit.

Our planet has lost 60% of its wildlife since the 1970s.

96% of them mammal are left on earth, and animals raised to feed humans.

Some are finding ways to survive the mess we have created.

Compassion should be embedded in our public policy.

Perhaps \$240,000 is a drop in the city's budget, and maybe you don't care about deer.

Are we supporting an agenda of fear and lies that scapegoat animals for human-made problems?

Are we fueling a morally challenged wildlife management industry, using violence to control and dominate nature?

Are we saying it's okay to shoot when we are annoyed?

Are we setting a good example for other communities and our young people.

Is shutting down public parks to kill animals bothering a privileged view in line with our nonviolence, tolerance and justice.

And what does it say about our community when we spend three times as much to kill an animal as we do to save one?

Ann Arbor rushed to cull, never trying any humane strategies first.

As leaders spending other people's money, it's important not just to get trapped in a bad investment.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> To prove to ourselves that we were right instead of doubling down, let's take a step back.

Let's try humane, inexpensive ways to protect plants.

Let's promote kindness for our wild neighbors and put our resources into the many more pressing matters facing our community.

Thank you.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 163, do you have a comment?

>> I would like to address the deer call.

Dear Ann Arbor councilmembers please consider the message that we as community send by culling deer, because they are eating plants.

What does it say about ewe manty, our morals our ethics our values?

What does it say about us as a community that we are ready to spend \$120,000 on, quote, deer management.

When clearly, there are more important issues as the city has a \$2.1 million budget deficit.

What are we passionate about.

Surely there's a way to promote coexistence than killing one of nature's most innocent creatures.

There are better ways to protect our shrubbery.

Killing deer, it's fiscally and otherwise irresponsible.

This is not a deer crisis.

This is not a situation of biological overpopulation.

Please recall your survey that the city of Ann Arbor initiated.

Further more deer vehicle collisions remain less than 2% of the total crashes and deer are not a public health or safety threat I believe are parks are for children and dogs and not sharp shoots to protect plants from native wildlife.

We have witnessed and knows that nature finds its own balance.

Culls are not effective.

To residents distraught over their landscapes there's deer-proofing methods.

And we can reduce speed limits.

This would be the sixth year, when does this senseless expensive policy end?

When do I as a resident get to stop spending money on something I'm wildly opposed to instead of doing something good in this community to benefit those truly in need or to fund a worth while project for which all Ann Arbor residents benefit.

The city council's own survey confirmed that the majority of Ann Arbor residents enjoy having deer in our community.

Please hear our voices and vote to end this practice.

That is extended even beyond what the council proposed.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> Please hear our voices and end this practice of needlessly killing creatures who truly are doing no real harm in our community, except being a beautiful part of the nature that so many of us move to Ann Arbor for.

I have lived my entire life in Michigan and we have raised four children in Ann Arbor over the last 30 years.

Please do the right thing, and vote to end this practice today.

Let us live in this world peacefully and enjoy the natural beauty all around.

Thank you for your time and attention.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 345, do you have a comment?

Caller with the phone number ending in 345, you can press star six to unmute yourself.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Hi.

Okay.

My name is kitty Khan.

I live in the fifth ward and I'm addressing my comments not only to the mayor and the city council, but to all the residents of Ann Arbor.

I was very disappointed that there is absolutely no mention of funding for the center of the city in the budget, although city council passed a resolution on November -- December 2nd, 2019, which does mention funding.

I'm going to read a few of the pertinent resolve clauses from that resolution.

The second resolve clause says: Resolved, that the revenue from the library lane surface parking will help to fund the center of the city improvements.

The city administrator will work with the downtown development authority to recover or replace the revenue for this purpose starting on November 6th, 2018.

The value of the library lane surface parking will be based on the downtown development authority's announced per diem value of \$876, six days per week.

The third resolve clause talks about helping to get funding, resolved, that the city council the city administrator to maintain a separating for the applicable revenues from the library lot surface parking operations to provide for the initial planning costs based upon the recommendations received from the center of the city task force.

The city administrator will also collaborate with the downtown development authority to seek capital funding for planning and design efforts.

And here's another one.

Resolved that the city council direct the city administrator to collaborate with the downtown development authority to plan and fund improvements to the center of the city site that may include the following.

Internet connectivity, at both library lane and liberty plaza, utility services, electricity, water and wastewater on site, public restrooms, temporary and/or fixed, performance space, temporary and fixed, passive use furniture, tabled, benches, et al, play and game areas for all ages, and barrier free.

And solar electricity to be incorporated into the design elements.

I have posted a link to the entire resolution on my Facebook page and I encourage everybody to read it.

It is public.

And it is under Kitty B. Kahn.

K-a-h-n.

Please keep your promise and put money in the budget for the commons.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 083.

Phone number 083, please star six to unmute yourself.

Caller with the phone number ending in 803, do you have a comment?

-- 083, do you have a comment?

Caller with the phone number ending in 778, do you have a comment?

>> Yes.

Yes, I do.

My name is Rajeef, and I'm concerned about our tax dollars going towards the culling of deer, and we are supposed to be a progressive city.

It needs to promote the environment, the nature, and nature includes its creatures, creatures, meaning not humans but also the wildlife in which I have been around before we moved in.

We built our homes here.

But the city government needs to end this business of deer culling in the name of population management.

No deer-related fatalities have occurred, not only in the city, but also in the whole county Washtenaw.

That's data that was available, yet the city council is so eager to kill these innocent features in the name of population management.

I'm sure you will not manage human population in this way.

I hope so.

Managing should not mean killing but preserving life.

The city needs to enforce speeding which will curbe the death of the deer.

Most city streets have a speed limit of 25 or 30 miles per hour.

At these speeds -- [Garbled audio]

We don't want our tax dollars to kill these peaceful living beings.

We love these animals visiting our backyards of our neighborhoods.

So please, please, stop this killing.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 644.

Do you have a comment?

>> Yes, my name is Kathy Boris.

I live at 1726 Charlton in the fifth ward.

Dear mayor and city council and Ann Arbor neighbors.

The budget as proposed as no line item for the center of the city commons.

Zero dollars.

Nothing.

This is surprising because Proposition A was passed handily by Ann Arbor voters almost two and a half years ago.

The ballot language made no mention of how the center of city would be funded, but I think would be reasonable to assume that most voters expected the city project to have some city funding.

And so I urge you to add 75 or \$100,000 to this budget for tables, chairs, plantings and temporary restrooms for the center of the city, so that everyone can begin to enjoy the space as soon as possible.

Remember too that many units of affordable housing and market rate housing are planned for the downtown area in the next few years.

People who live in these developments will need a place that's open, green and public.

A place to get outdoors.

Enjoys trees and flowers and enjoy a falafel or an ice cream cone.
I encourage you to add to the budget some funding for the center of city.
Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Clerk caller with the phone number ending in 736, do you have a comment?

>> Yes, my name is Trishe Duckworth.

Good evening to you all.

I just wanted to speak very briefly about the budget and the line item for the marijuana tax revenue.

I really want to make sure that this money and this funding is used specifically for things concerning black and brown people.

You know, the even at the resolution state, as it's done to the black community.

Even though there are some councilmembers that don't like reparations and what that stands for, and they don't want to correct harm, but we also understand there are those that do.

We want to make sure that these funds are used for that purpose.

We need to be backing our black-owned businesses.

Who even right now are being bullied.

We need to be giving grower lines to potential black business owners.

There's so much money that can be done to level the playing field and close that wealth gap in that industry.

And we believe that these tax dollars should be spent there.

If it's not going to correct the black and brown people, it's almost like the words in the resolution were just fluff and we don't really mean it, but I believe that you all mean it and I'm just asking that you will use this marijuana tax.

And the black-owned businesses that are already existing in the marijuana businesses.

Even the black-owned business owner that was basically booted out of his own business.

We want to make sure that we uplift our black-owned businesses that are in marijuana this industry.

They deserve the boost.

They deserve the boost.

I yield the rest of my time.

Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 936.

Caller 936.

>> Hello, violin monster here.

Just real quick about the deer issue.

Let's -- too many deer, not enough predators.

Let's reintroduce some wolves into our environment.

I assure you, we are much more peaceful creatures and all the fairy tales make us out to be.

More importantly, I want y'all to defund the police.

I saw several of you at the protest last summer.

I have been doing more researching and reading everything I can about Aura Rosser's murder and for those of you who were on council at the time, if you did not respond -- did you not respond well at all, from what I can see.

And I also have some questions.

There's an MLive article that David Reed, the officer who murdered Aura Rosser back in November of last year, so 2020, apparently kicked in somebody's door that was the wrong house or something.

I don't know what gives the police justification to just kick in somebody's door and apparently the city is settling it for \$50,000.

And, know, there are a lot of activists who poured in a lot of time and effort into you know, cutting -- coming one ways that are -- that the money could be better used to service people who need services rather than guns and badges and ever present threat of danger and death to some temporary installations.

So this is an issue that is not going away.

If you haven't noticed, it's the largest Civil Rights movement -- worldwide movement of -- in history, and I will be pressing y'all to defend the police.

It's just --

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> I couldn't even pay for Aura Rosser's funeral.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with 684.

>> This is Eric Sturgis.

I will make it quick.

I know one councilmember said they were exhausted.

I don't want to overwork any of councilmembers tonight.

But for funding, I was surprised there was no funding for center of the city.

I thought of a great funding mechanism and that would be to end the deer cull and use that money to help fund the center of the city.

So let's -- let's do what the will of the people and what progressive thinkers do, and let's support the center of the city and let's not act like Trump republicans and try to deny the will of the people when they voted to support the center of the city.

So we need to fund the center of the city and a perfect way is to end the deer cull, take that money, put it towards the center of the city.

I'm also in support of having unarmed responders.

I think that's a great idea and I would like to see more funding for that.

Thank you.

Have a good night.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 205.

>> Wow!

Budget.

Um, this is Joe Spalding, by the way.

I would simply not pay a police officer that shot Aura Rosser to death anymore, if it were up to me.

That's awkward.

But anyway, I did want to congratulate and thank the city for not including center of the

city as a line item in the budget.

I haven't talked about this issue at all.

But to me, standing from the outside, it's been very, very grotesque.

I'm glad a previous caller -- I don't remember his name, mentioned Trump republicanism, because to me the center of the city is symbolically similar to Trump's wall politically.

Now Trump's wall is more damaging for more people, but the way the center of the city gets deployed in the context of Ann Arbor politics, I mean it really is just politically emotional investment for its own sake in order for a group of individuals to feel like they were satisfied in doing something politically.

It really is about power.

It's not about helping anybody out.

It's ashamed about the -- everybody knows what happens.

The voters of Ann Arbor were sold a bill of goods.

They were told that private interests would fund this boondoggle and now the private interests are not going to do it because it's obviously a really terrible idea and I'm not even getting to what was possible there previously.

It's obviously a really terrible idea.

And private interests aren't going to fund it.

So now folks are coming back hat in hand to council on this specific thing, when that should have been in the proposal, and believe me, I know a thing or two about ballot initiatives and ballot initiative language.

You put the funding in it, because that's probably two-thirds of the most important part, because if it's going to get stopped, it will get stopped in the funding.

And the people who knew that, knew that.

They wouldn't pay for something like that.

Frankly, I'm just super happy that Ann Arbor city council has the good sense not to play along with that silly political game which is absolutely Trumpian.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 534.

Do you have a comment?

>> Good evening, this is Tom Stulberg.

I'm calling from lower town.

I would like to talk about the budget.

I was thinking about it a lot this evening, as I was taking a stroll with my dog to one of the many gems of the lower town area.

Trust me, we're not full of gems but we have plenty.

There is Riverside park which right now I hope you can all go and enjoy.

Beautiful flowering trees of many different colors.

I'm proud to have led an adopt a park there for several years.

I stood up to city council and received the recognition for the mayor for our group's work adopting that park and we planted some of those wonderful trees.

Imagine if people who live at the new development, at the y lot, that we citizens say we want to fund affordable housing on, we voted for two things.

One of them was for a millage for affordable housing.

The one place, I think everybody is most excited to see that affordable housing is on the y lot and we know it will be affordable and market rate housing that will go on that lot.

Right across the street from the center of the city commons.

And we know a block away, or two, we have got Palio's lot that's on the list, for affordable housing with our taxpayer money that we voted to spend for that purpose. Private money is going to build the standard, which is at main between Packard and Williams.

Significant number of units.

And there's some other units that will also be approved near there and some already built not too far away.

Imagine those citizens all adopting a park at the center of the city commons, and what we now call the library lot.

What does it -- what needs to be the catalyst to make that happen?

Well, a commitment from the city.

It doesn't have to be a huge commitment at this point.

But the citizens need to see that the city is behind them.

The citizens voted for that.

Why is the city not funding it?

If you want to have a public private partnership, we all know, you need a catalyst.

People have started to raise private money.

They need to see a commitment from the city as well for that funding.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

That's part of what makes it happen.

So we will have a whole lot of people moving into downtown, in addition to the ones that are already there and we citizens voted to spend our tax dollars to create affordable housing, combined with market rate housing downtown.

So those people can live there.

And enjoy downtown.

Let's not just warehouse them.

Let's give them a downtown to live in.

Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 556, do you have a comment?

>> Hello, Ralph McKee speaking from the fifth ward.

I would like to echo what Mr. Stulberg just said about the seed money that be well-used to jump start the center of the city.

I don't think it's a boondoggle.

I think actually this could be used as an olive branch to sort of try to get through some of the divisiveness between the current what I would see and most people would see as factions on council.

Let's at least try to find some issue with some small amount of money that we can use to try to join people together.

We are not talking about a lot of money.

That's one item.

On the item that Eric Sturgis raised and maybe using deer cull money, I would second that too.

I used to be in favor, slightly of the deer cull, the deer have trashed my backyard which has a woods in it.

There's a woods down the street.

There's a lot of deer in my neighborhood.

After a while, watching the deer come in the backyard, I come to the opposite conclusion that the -- I find deer resistant plants.

We can live with that.

The cull is not really working anyway.

Let's use that money for something that's better.

On the police funding issues.

I would encourage you.

I'm sure you are listening to Dr. Jackson, but I would really urge you to engage her in-depth, on that article, because -- on that item, because I think she has studied that.

Most of the rest of us are part-timers.

We have looked at it but we have not studied it like she and other activists in that arena have.

I would encourage you to follow them and her guidance on that item.

Thank you for listening.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Clerk caller with the phone number ending in 340.

>> Yes, greetings, city council.

Louis Vasquez from the first ward.

I would like to see you amend this budget to include a funding for healthy streets and slow streets this year.

I think it's a tragedy it did not get voted in this time and I'm recalling last year's votes on healthy streets that were delayed and delayed and delayed by the previous council to the point where the effort was merely impractical and you did not gain the data that you should have, if they were approved earlier on in the season.

Secondly, I would -- I'm glad there was to funding put in for the library lot this year, and I hope you continue to not fund it, because my feeling is that that whole proposal was a bait and switch.

The supporters of Proposal A in 2018 promised that there would be private funding for anything that was to go -- that -- you know, to for a park to be put on top of the library lot.

Well, here we are, nearly three years later, and these supporters have managed to raise, oh, \$35,000.

Well, that's not enough.

And we do already have a park on that block known as liberty plaza.

Liberty plaza should be improved, activated, you know, money should be put there before one cent of taxpayer money is put into the library lot.

Yeah.

I'm -- I'm also -- I'm cool with the deer cull.

You know, I think it's a way of keeping down the population of deer, which keeps down

the number of deer/car crashes and also keeps the number of deer ticks down.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> So that we don't wind up with Lyme disease, in Ann Arbor's future.

Thank you so much for your time.

Have a great fight.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see any other callers with their hands up at this time.

Caller with the phone number ending in 971.

>> Hello, hello.

Hello, hello?

Am I here?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Anybody hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: We can hear you.

>> Oh, thank you.

I tried before and I couldn't figure out how to unmute.

This is Allen Haber, as you all know.

I have been involved in the center of the city community commons for its beginning when it was first proposed as a place to advance the culture of peace and nonviolence to the children of the world to relay to the movement of self-government all over the world, a community commons.

Where mutual aid becomes the link among people and when I proposed this, it is -- it was my view and it remains that most of the funding of this is going to be from the people, the people who use it, the people who fund programs to develop it.

They certainly needs a commitment from the city, recognizing in the city charter that this is a central park and civic center.

And that while part of that money has been raised, it's more difficult when -- when there's -- when there's no sense that there's any backup from the city at all.

And there certainly should be.

The city administrator has many duties to provide some support and while the best thing that would happen to activate this as a public place is to get the cars off and allow people to begin to use it and develop activities there.

But there does need to be a downtown public restroom, composting toilet, something that really recognizes a center of the city advance.

It should be in the center of the city public toilets that you don't have to, you know, find some are restaurant to go to and the library is closed or the bus station is closed.

That should be a city function.

All the resolutions that city councils have passed that say do this and do, this and do this.

Most of the people can do this stuff themselves but it needs some recognition from the city, not no, no, no, we deny the city people's votes but yes, let's look at the best of it and put something into it to stimulate private support.

Considerable money has been raised, \$35,000 is not nothing.

There would be considerably more if there was private money and seeing the city is supporting this and not being a roadblock.

And that the staff would help us to develop, and the D.D.A. would recognize this is now a public place, another a parking place.

It would be helpful for everyone.

So I wish that James Demere and Kitty Kahn has put several statements record.

And they actually studied what the commons was about, they came out with a unanimous proposal, and recommendations to support this, to let it go forward.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> The city council and the staff should be recognizing and affirming those resolutions, those recommendations and putting them to practice.

A little money into the pot would be just an honest way to report that the people's vote does count in Ann Arbor.

Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Brandon Dimcha, do you have a comment?

>> Yeah.

Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Hi.

I live in the 4th ward on harp street and I was disappointed that healthy streets did not get renewed for this year.

I realize that it sort of became entangled with COVID related relief stuff.

To me, it's a much longer term thing and I think we should be doing as a city to make the roads safer for the pedestrians and cyclists and stuff.

So if we can't get it now, I would love to get into the budget for 2022.

It was nice on our street with kids running up and down it and having, you know, slower and fewer cars running around.

I know the four of you who votes against, you can bring it back to reconsider.

If we are not going to do that, then please get it in the budget for the future.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 464, do you have a comment?

Caller 464.

>> Yes, can you hear me?

>> Yes, this is Linda deWyler, and I'm speaking about the budget.

I encourage you to follow through on what the majority of the voters directed you to do with the center of the city.

I ask you allocate a modest amount, perhaps \$100,000 towards making the center of the city a welcoming place for people and activities in summer.

The first step is to get rid of the cars on the surface lot and coming to an agreement with the D.D.A.

Even the former city administrator had a plan to do so.

This could install, tables, chairs, benches and other simple amenities to make it a welcoming place and this should be done as soon as possible so the place can be used.

I have not taken a personal position on the deer cull.

I can see both sides equal.

I hate to see the deer killed, but I also see the plants killed.

It strikes me odd that it has been initiated to a deer cull that so many residents vocally opposed were not getting anything for an initiative that was approved by 53% of the voters and is now part of our charter.

Please review this and the number of specific steps that the city should take.

I believe a previous speaker quoted from that resolution.

And I urge you to follow Lisa Jackson's recommendations for police oversight and funding.

She spoke eloquently as she always does.

Her committee needs to be taken seriously, and their ideas implemented.

Not just listened to politely.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, there are no more callers with their hands up.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing no one further, this public hearing is closed.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I do have one more.

Caller with the phone number 326 do you have a comment?

>> I do.

Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Okay.

My name is Jeff Crockett.

And I want to echo the statement of a number of people earlier this evening that support moving forward with the city of the center commons.

I happen to live not far from Kerrytown and if anyone has gone by Kerrytown on nonmarket days, you will see that many times the seats and the benches that are there are full because there is a need for people to get together.

And I am pleased that -- I wished more people who were speaking against tonight would have come to Earth Day on the commons to see a beautiful performance and a celebration of Earth Day and also to see some of the political approved signs that were there and the expression of democracy.

And a couple of days later, there was an open mic, where people could get up and speak and I did and it was wonderful.

Now, I what was really wonderful about the open mic in the public commons it presents an alternative for the way much communication can be done.

And that's through social media.

He know how nasty social media is.

People who frequent social media are either there for attention or to amplify, but ask yourself, how often is anything actually solved using social media and that's the wonderful thing about a commons because you get to go and talk to people in person.

I personally worry a lot the people who are on social media and don't have the opportunity to talk to people in person, because it's talking to people in person, you can find out what you have no common with them, not who you have different with those

people.

And it's a great feeling.

It's a way of accomplishing things.

I will also remind you that in terms of funding, you have two huge developments not far away that will generate tax money.

And that tax money can be used to help fund the commons.

And keep in mind that the people who are there deserve some kind of amenity.

I will say that New York is a great city, not because of its density, but because of its parks so please move forward with funding the city of the commons.

Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, there are no other callers with their hands up.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing no one further, this public hearing is closed.

We have before us the regular session meeting minutes of April 19, 2021, moved by Ramlawi and seconded by Disch.

Discussion of the minutes?

All in favor?

[Chorus of ayes]

Opposed?

The minutes are approved.

B-1, An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Zoning) of 3.56 Acres from TWP(Township District) to R1B (Single-Family Dwelling District), 2260 Traver Road.

Moved by Councilmember Ramlawi, seconded by Councilmember Radina.

Discussion, please of B-1.

All in favor?

[Chorus of ayes]

Opposed?

B-1 approved.

B-2, an Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) Rezoning of 1.1 Acres from TWP (Township District) to R1A (Single Family Dwelling District), 3411 Geddes Road.

Moved by Councilmember Griswold, and seconded by Councilmember Disch.

Discussion, please of b-2?

All in favor?

[Chorus of ayes]

Opposed?

It is approved.

It's 9:35.

Let's take a sort break.

Let's come back at 9:45.

Thank you.

[Break]

>> City Admin. Crawford: We have community services administrator, Derek Delacourt to respond to some late council questions.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> I apologize.

Hopefully you can hear me, mayor.

It appears my Internet is working for some reason and I'm not sure why.

Let me see if I can resolve that here in a second.

Can a rental property prove use as an STR before March 1st and establish legal non-conforming use at any point in the future, regardless of whether or not they have complied with the new requirements in this ordinance.

Without a legislative change of council, adding a cutoff date for that establishment, the answer is yes.

Second question is provide clear and specific description of what will be accepted as evidence of use as an STR and what staff will require property owners to offer as proof. Currently what is being requested is first evidence that we keep on file here and that is the property is a certified rental property in good standing prior to the March 1st deadline.

So that's something that is easily obtainable by us at the city, and the second piece of evidence we're requiring is an executed contract, at the property demonstrating a lease term or a rental term of less than 30 days prior to March 1st.

Those are the two pieces that we are currently requiring as staff.

Again, that's based on what we feel is necessary to establish that.

Council could add additional criteria to that if they saw fit through legislative action.

The third question is, in the case of a rental property, assumed to be the principal residence of the tenant on the lease, what prevents a landlord from renting a piece of property to a friendly partner to use that as an STR in a residential neighborhood?

The short answer is nothing but if the property is not grandfathered in by legislation would not be legal and would be subject through enforcement through the traditional enforcement actions of the ordinance, ticking court order to cease and desist that action.

So under the scenario of the if I understand it correctly.

So even under the rental situation, it most likely would not be -- and would be subject to enforcement.

Those are the three questions I had, mayor.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Discussion of the main motion.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: It will come as no surprise that I don't support this resolution or the next resolution.

It's inconsistent with the direction that was given to staff back in December as to what to do with investors who have interest in short-term rentals and how we could protect their interests.

What this does is it creates a class of non-conforming properties that will continue into perpetuity regardless of the ownership of the property.

I do not believe that was the intent that was given to staff, the direction that was given to staff.

What we got instead is creating a commodity of properties that can be bought and traded and sold like any other commodity.

And I don't think that was the intent originally, unfortunately, this is not pretty as it says by the mayor.

I don't think this is the right answer.

It's not the right solution to the problem that we first tried to solve.

In fact, I think this creates more problems, not fewer.

So the loopholes that are there to be used are as big as they can be.

It really -- what this does and the following does, is really nullify much of what was put in place in September of 2019.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: I think the two ordinances that staff have developed and approved by the planning commission make an important step forward in regulating STRs in this town.

They clarify the zoning code to make a legal distinction, between short-term and long-term rentals which we did not have prior to this.

They differentiate among the various types of short-term rentals and they resolve uncertainties about the districts in which the STRs are permitted.

None of that existed prior to these ordinances and, of course, there is the provision as Councilmember Ramlawi, to grant legal non-conforming statuses to STRs that were lined to operate as rental before this the city's housing code began to distinguish between a short-term and a long-term rental.

Legal non-conforming status recognizes a use that was in existence before rules were imposed or changed.

It's a zoning designation, like all zoning designations that applies to properties, not property owners.

This status for which approximately 141 properties does not and cannot be made to sunset upon a transfer of ownership.

And so regardless of what council may have thought, it was directing staff to do in December, this is the only thing staff can do to protect people who had invested in these kinds of properties.

So if we don't wish to do that anymore, we can vote this down.

But there is no other solution to that problem of people who had made investments in this kind of property.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: It feels like it was quite a long time ago, the impact that these units that had on neighborhood and the housing that was going away by dedicating these units to essentially tourism.

But I think it's worth pointing out that -- and it's been pointed out to council that there are other solutions before us.

Some of the discussion that was passed last summer, when we passed the ordinance was the idea that there were individual people for whom this regulation felt unfair.

It felt like it was a burden for them to have to transition out of the business.

And conversation around that issue, the small number of people for whom there was some sense of unfairness, that they couldn't use their property in the most profitable way anymore.

We know at first reading, people at this table were surprised and unaware that the legal

non-conforming use was going to follow with the property.

I also remember public meetings last summer when we were being lobbied, please, please, don't regulate us.

Some of the same people who were threatening to sue us, they said, well, have it sunset with us.

Let us continue our business and let it end with our business.

The solution that others have suggested to council and those of us would supported this ordinance from the beginning is to let the courts decide this and let the courts decide what is enforceable and negotiate a settlement with the small number of people who have been benefiting from this business model that we didn't previously regulate.

We actually do have another solution before us.

And it -- those of us who voted against proposing these amendments in December had some idea of what the solution would be that would be more -- a better compromise for the benefit of our housing situation in Ann Arbor, and a better solution that balanced the issues of fairness and not have this business run rampant.

We do have huge loopholes in the legal non-conforming use.

Staff cannot give me a date at which we would actually even know how many housing units qualify for this exception because at in I point in the future somebody can say, oh, oops, I forgot to register!

But way back when and all of a sudden, there's a short-term rental that we didn't even know about that would carry on forever.

I will not be supporting this amendment.

It is not the best solution.

It's not the solution that addresses the problems that we started out trying to solve it. Doesn't address the problems that were brought up when we came up with the first solution.

It's a bad idea.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thanks.

This isn't, in my eyes, a matter of fairness or being fair or not being fair.

It's a matter of law.

Non-conforming use -- the Michigan State university extension office, this is independent from -- independent entity, notes that when talking about non-conforming uses a fundamental part of zoning in Michigan is that a zoning ordinance cannot be made retroactive.

The reality is -- is that we allowed these in our community.

They were registered.

They were certified as rental properties and people were operating them under the assumption that they were legal, because we were -- we had made them we did not make a distinction in terms of short-term and long-term rentals.

Council made an error last September and sometimes when council makes errors, we go back and correct them and we have other items on our agenda that we are observing decisions that we have made, such as our rules where we learn and we do better.

And this is what we are doing tonight.

We are recognizing that as much as council at the time wanted to go back and make this retroactive, that's simply not possible.

Now certainly we could let the courts decide what is reasonable, but in my opinion, that's not a good use of taxpayer dollars to decide to get sued and, you know, lose.

So I will be voting in favor of these amendments.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Unlike the rules that we can change later, this is an issue that we can't go back and change.

I push back on the issue that this was an error.

We knew -- we fully knew the ramifications.

We understood the outcomes.

It's a mistake to call it a mistake.

We cannot go back and fix this once we create these non-conforming properties.

They will be non-conforming into perpetuity.

Unlike the rules and the error that was made with those.

I will say the operators of these short-term rentals were operating outside of our zoning ordinances, governing single family zoning.

It's only now that prior council took action that wasn't taken before, to enforce that was not being enforced.

That's what we did.

We are enforcing things that were on the books but were not enforced.

Before what this does is creates more problem.

I suggest -- I agree with Councilmember Nelson, unfortunately sometimes the court is where these things need to be decided.

Take it to court.

Have a settlement, make everybody whole, and be done with it.

Not create problems that will continue into perpetuity.

That's what's going to happen.

This is going to be more messy, than it would if we just were to settle it through courts and the attorneys and make the people whole who need to be made whole.

We waste far more money at this table getting far little out of it.

So I push back on it.

I don't think that's a waste of taxpayer dollars.

I think that's what they are there for.

Further discussion?

>> Mayor Taylor: I will vote in favor of the resolution today for -- you know, in my view this does not create non-conforming properties.

What it does is it recognizes that non-conforming properties exist.

And it recognizes the reality that they are here and they have been here since the business got started.

The set of regulations creates a downward ratchet.

I think it recognizes that the world is imperfect and it's complicated and that sometimes we are just stuck.

And here we are, I think, stuck.

In September we passed an ordinance that would have prohibited nonowner occupied STRs in residential areas.

You know, we have received legal advice.

We received legal advice arguments from third-party attorneys and in the course of my research, I believe that advice to be accurate.

And that assessment of the facts on the ground, the legal situation to be true.

And so I believe we are looking uphill at a lawsuit.

And while there are all sorts of different reasons why it's okay to accept the risk of some lawsuits if you feel that your arguments are good, if your argument -- if you feel like your risk is low, if you feel like there is a moral imperative to fighting the good fight, but these things do not exist in any view.

The arguments here of third-party counsel are sound.

We have little likelihood of success and a material likelihood of damages.

And so I think just the wise and candid -- the wise thing to do is be candid about the imperfectness of our situation and cut our losses and move on.

I would like to state that the folks who have been operating STRs have been doing so in good faith.

They made their investments based on the city law at the time and received a certificate of compliance from the city of Ann Arbor.

And you know, they have been cuing to the law and we can't change the law on them. It's not within our authority.

And, you know, it's not something we ought to do.

And so this is an imperfect solution to an imperfect problem but I believe it's ultimately the wise thing to do.

Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Thank you.

I wasn't going to speak, but there were a couple of things that were brought um that I do want to address.

Personally, I take no relish in this vote, particularly as I -- you know, I was one of the people who did believe that these STRs would filter out of the system via attrition.

But be that as it may, the law here seems clear.

The previous council did make a mistake and acted, you knoll, I believe the previous council majority, I should say acted irresponsibly, ignoring the advice of our attorneys, advice that I and others have seen that was given at the time and by the way, previously councils going back years failed to, you know, proactive with regulating STRs and so that has put us in the position that we are in today.

Now if we don't fix this, we will most surely be on the losing end of the lawsuit, because you cannot retroactively zone away somebody's existing legally recognized property rights.

We are not creating a class here.

We are just recognizing that it exists.

The other thing I want to say is if people are concerned about the proliferation of nonowner occupied STRs in our community and resulting loss of housing, why is there no discussion of capping them across all of our residential districts in the tunnel vision focused on the 150 units in single family neighborhoods has the appearance of

neighborhood protectionism.

I'm concerned that as transit-oriented development begins to occur, we may see apartment buildings go up in my ward, say near the stadium, that are totally nonowner occupied STRs.

So, you know, I think we should be discussing in the future, that issue as the next phase of STR regulation.

I will be voting for this tonight because it's the right thing to do.

It's the fiscally responsible thing to do.

Those who vote against it may have no qualms about wasting city tax dollars on a lawsuit that we will most certainly lose, I do.

I don't appreciate being put in this position by previous councils who failed to regulate STRs before they proliferated.

I don't appreciate being put in this position against the previous council majority who acted against the attorney and those who are trying to rewrite history.

Let's fix this once and for all and let's move on to important things.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Point of order.

I mean, there's so many things that were just said that violate the current council rules.

>> Mayor Taylor: Sorry, I was on mute for that.

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks, Mr. Mayor and thank you, councilman Ramlawi for that, because it was pretty outrageous.

I'm speaking only to go on the record as one of the persons who did not support this in the previous council, that is trying to be demonized here, and I did not support this notion of interfering with otherwise lawful and decent commerce that was going in our neighborhoods and downtown areas as well.

And we all know and the reports from last year even showed that 141 is not the number here in the city.

That it's much, much higher than that.

And so I think some of the concerns about this are reflected in the difference between the expectations of knowledge from the reports that were given in the previous decision opportunities and what is before us today.

And so we are waiting for the rest of them to crawl out of the wood work here.

We will see if that happens.

I'm not sure if it will happen or not or if we will just drive people to operate underground.

Either way, I didn't support it then and oddly I don't think I will support it now because I don't think it's the right solution.

I don't think we should be dealing with these types of rentals in our zoning code.

I think it's an inappropriate way to attempt a regulation and I don't support it.

I just want to get that out there.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch?

>> Councilmember Disch: May I ask a question of staff.

>> Mayor Taylor: You can do whatever you want.

>> Councilmember Disch: Is there a reason that the planning commission or staff did not write a deadline beyond which you could no longer become established as a legally

non-conforming STR and would you advise that we do that by amendment tonight or soon?

>> I can speak for the conversation at the planning commission.

As part of the council direction it was to look at Chapter 97, the licensing ordinance and Chapter 55, the unified development code, by creating that framework of non-conformities recognizing those.

That follows a wide range of convention and case law in state of Michigan that says just as was referenced by another resource, you can't take away actions from the past through prospective zoning actions.

So the short answer is it would not be appropriate in my perspective to be consistent with what our legislative authority grants us to do.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion.

Roll call vote, starting with Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> I can.

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: B-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.

Moved by Councilmember Disch and seconded by Councilmember Eyer.

Discussion of b-4.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Mayor, Derek Delacourt has some additional questions to respond to this item.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you very much, Mr. Delacourt.

>> As far as I'm aware, I answered all the questions related to this prior to the previous item.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Ah, thank you.

>> Yep.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Just for the record, I would want to I want to say that I believe this will have to be decided in the courts regardless of the vote this evening, and that's based on the fact that this has been a very messy process.

It's rapidly changing and as Councilmember Eyer said, there's a lot that we need to look forward to in terms of the future changes and activities and so I think it needs to be settled in the courts.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I want to say we did follow our legal department's advice when we adopted the ordinance in 2019.

We did not go against it.

We listened to staff.

We listened to our legal department.

We understood the challenges with this.

To say that we were irresponsible or we did things in error we went against legal advice, that is rewriting history.

That is -- that's rewriting history because if you go back and you listen to those meetings and you look at the documents, you see that what I just said was true.

What this does is creates a giant loophole and I would -- if I was one of the other owners of the 21,000 rental units I would be rushing out tomorrow to get under this umbrella.

Because you just minted some commodity value with these properties.

And if I was a bit wiser and I had some properties, I would be going out and trying to make them all str's tomorrow.

Why not?

It only makes sense.

I wouldn't be sitting on it.

Tomorrow I would be making mine an STR if I had a long-term rental unit.

That's where the money is.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Just to clarify for the record, planning staff has told us that to be -- to qualify as a short-term rental prior to March 1st, there needs to be -- one, it needs to be certified as a rental property.

And two, there needs to be executed contract as a short-term rental.

This needs to exist before March 1st, 2021, there's no opportunity for new short-term rentals to be created in our community in residential neighborhoods after March 1st of 2021.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Councilmember Briggs pretty accurately summed up what I was going to say.

There's no ability for people to run out and make -- apply for this if they didn't already have proof that they were doing it previously.

You know, that would involve forgery of documents and we are getting really outlandish here in our -- in our arguments against what we are doing.

And I would also just say that I read the documents that were provided to council previously, to the previous council.

So I stand by my statement.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: There's this notion that there will be documentation and verification of contracts of operators of STRs.

What has staff used?

In order to identify the ones that you are currently being listed as non-conforming, potentially non-conforming?

I found it that we didn't have much documentation to begin with.

We just knew that there were rentals.

We didn't know what type of rental property it was.

What are we using to vet this?

Can it just be on the back of an envelope?

Hey, you know, does it need to be motorized?

-- notarized?

What will be acceptable or not under this requirement?

It seems pretty loose.

What are we using if I can ask and what would be excluded?

>> Again, I will do my best answer.

We are requiring and executed contract between the property owner and the guest.

That demonstrates the address.

We will include the guest name and other things to be redacted but all of these that have operated legally can easily provide an executed contract either through Airbnb or some other providers or even individual contracts.

I'm sure we will get some interesting pieces of information when it comes to those things but today what we have seen is exactly what you would expect to see, a legal contract between a guest and an owner with the address identified.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I apology, Derek, they could use any document, any property within the 22,000 that are listed rentals.

At one point, at any point, they rented it as a short-term rental, they would qualify?

>> Any property that has a certified certificate of rental with the city and that falls within one of the zoning districts that's being discussed.

One the subject zoning districts and has a contract, an executed contract between the property owner and the guest, that's what we are setting the bar at as staff.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

>> You're welcome.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: I want to specify one thing so there's no confusion.

It will be possible for new owner occupied short-term rentals to be created in residential districts.

That's owner occupied short-term rentals where you -- where you use it for a home stay, which means you stay in my extra bedroom, or where you have a whole house rental for a weekend.

I think I said that right.

Yes, whole house rental.

But it's not -- there will be no opportunity for nonowner occupied, that is to say commercial in residential districts.

Just a clarification.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks Mr. Mayor.

So these 140 odd ones, I guess when you check against the rentals that the assumption -- hopefully is that hopefully you are checking against their property tax settings and so that if you have a rental that's a commercial business, it's a nonowner

occupied situation, that they are at a higher tax level than somebody who has a homestead exception, is that correct, Mr. Crawford?

Is that accurate to say that?

>> City Admin. Crawford: I think that's the regular course of business to do that.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Is there anything.

If this is going to pass tonight, and, you know, seemingly on the heels of the other one, because we are doing it through zoning designations here and classifications, are we prohibited in any way from in the future seeking additional revenues from these people like we might with a hotel fee or a room tax or if the state allows us to do additional charges in the future?

Is the method we are using to regulate the location and type of STRs in the city going to prohibit us in the future from potentially gaining extra revenue from them?

Does anybody have an idea on that?

I think that's something we should look at.

These supplant hotel rooms.

They are a substitute for hotels.

County doesn't get the benefit and the city doesn't get the benefit of the hotel room taxes and things.

I want to throw that out there as we look at regulation.

I'm wondering if this type of regulation is prohibiting us from the benefits that might be allowed to us in future either through state's actions or our own council's actions.

>> I wouldn't thing so.

Chapter 97, it allows the city to establish fees associated with that and that gives the city the opportunity to determine what is appropriate.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Okay.

I wanted to make sure that we have everything in order here.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion.

Without wading too deep in the back and forth, I will direct council's attention to a memo we received on September 3rd.

I think it's pretty clear.

Further discussion?

Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: B-5.

An Ordinance to Amend Section 2:69 of Chapter 29 (Stormwater Rates) of Title II of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor.

Moved by Councilmember Disch.

Seconded by Councilmember Grand.

Discussion, please of b-5.

All in favor?

Opposed?

B-5 is approved.

Sorry, Councilmember Hayner, did I rush you?

>> Councilmember Hayner: I would like to be on the record to oppose our stormwater rates.

>> Mayor Taylor: My apologies.

With 11 councilmembers present and 10 voting in the affirmative, Councilmember Hayner voting in opposition.

DB-1, Resolution to Approve 614 South Ashley Site Plan.

Moved by Councilmember Disch and seconded by Councilmember Eyer.

Discussion of DB-1.

All in favor?

Opposed?

DB-1 is approved.

DS-1, Resolution to Approve New Fee for Fairview Cemetery.

Moved by Councilmember Hayner, seconded by Disch.

Discussion of DS-1.

All in favor?

Opposed?

DS-1 is approved.

DS-2, Resolution to Approve FY 2022 Fee Adjustments for the Community Services Area.

Moved by Councilmember Grand, and seconded by song.

Discussion, please, of DS-2.

Councilmember Hayner?

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks.

I just want to say I -- I just appreciate the hard look that our park staff went through to try and, you know, review these fees and they really looked at how long it had been before we reconsidered these fees and so on and they really -- we really tried our best to keep these low and make sure that those who don't have access to the parks and programs and just a shout out to our park staff for taking a hard look at that and bringing forward something that was reasonable and I think wholly appropriate for the services that we provide.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

It's approved.

DS-2, Resolution to Approve Fiscal Year 2022 Fee Adjustments for Public Services Area - Engineering, Systems Planning, Public Works, Water Treatment, and Waste

Water Treatment Units.

Moved by Radina and seconded by Hayner.

Discussion, please of DS-3.

All in favor?

[Chorus of ayes]

Opposed?

It is approved.

DS-4, Resolution Authorizing Summary Publication of Ordinance No. 21-12 - An Ordinance to Amend Table 5.15-1, Table 5.15-2, Sections 5.33, 5.37.2.P 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).

Discussion of DS-4.

All in favor?

All opposed?

It is approved.

11 councilmembers present, and 10 voting in the affirmative.

Councilmember Ramlawi voting in opposition.

C-1, An Ordinance to Add a Temporary Emergency Ordinance Section 1.327b (Third-Party Delivery Services) to Title I of Chapter 15 (Emergency and Disaster Management) of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor.

Moved by Councilmember Grand and seconded by Radina of the discussion of C-1.

Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

Just to start this off, I believe that we are going to need to make this have a second reading based on advice from Attorney Blake.

I don't know if I need to do anything procedurally to make that happen.

But I wanted to put that out there.

And I will take advice from council attorneys if they want to --

>> Mayor Taylor: I got a shake of the head from Ms. Beaudry.

>> Councilmember Grand: Okay.

Great.

I want to thank attorneys Jen Riser and Betsy Blake.

This initiated from an email that I received from a manager of a third ward restaurant. Phil Clerk, and he really -- Red Hot's manager and he laid out how damaging these third-party delivery fees were.

I listened to what he had to say and I saw that we have many peer communities and larger cities in the country that brought forward these caps and then I handed it over to our capable attorneys who really did the heavy lifting here.

Mr. Azure is incredible and he reached out to so many different businesses in the community and not only received confirmation that the majority of these businesses would like us to do this but discovered that we have a second problem which was the publication of old menus and that was causing a number of issues for our local restaurants.

We were able to, with our skilled attorneys, help move -- merge those together.

Into this and try to -- you know, looking at other cities use our emergency powers to give

some of our restaurants some relief.

If not all the things they need, some of the things they need, so thank you to both of those attorneys for your incredible work on this.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I appreciate the work that staff and counsel have done, and Councilmember Grand moving it forward.

I expressed my concerns with third-party delivery services as I'm a small business owner who runs a restaurant and have been doing so for over 30 years.

Or nearly 30 years.

The issue that I have here is multi.

The most important part of this resolution or ordinance change is protecting and governing the menu of the proprietors and the businesses.

What happens often is they are taken without permission and they are used inaccurately and it causes problems for us at this level where customers are confused and upset with us, because they are getting menus that are not published by us. They are eater taken without our knowledge and then used on these third-party platforms in ways that create conflict and issue for us.

This resolution, ordinance change was -- had a sunset provision, which made it temporal which I think is an issue.

I would like to see some permanent changes made in our ordinances governing this and I spoke to the one that I feel is most important.

To get into the arena of capping fees on businesses, I feel is a slippery slope for local governments.

These arrangements are voluntary and they are not compulsory, you know, we don't need to engage with these third-party services if we feel economically disadvantaged to us.

So this will result in a second reading to think about things but we are getting closer and closer to the exploration of these emergency orders unless something unexpectedly happens to change that.

By the time this ordinance were to go in place, I think it would be a moot point.

So I did reach out to Doordash today.

They actually rolled out packages that cap their -- their rates at 15% already.

So I appreciate the work that has gone too this.

I think there's some good things that come out of this, but there are some issues like I just stated that make it moot.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I wonder if I could ask a question of our resident restaurateur here, with his -- with these delivery services.

Councilmember Ramlawi, so as a restaurant owner, you can choose to allow Doordash to deliver on your behalf and there's a contractual agreement.

Can Doordash and others proffer up your delivered product without your consent?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

And they have done that many times.

They -- they kind of tease you.

>> Councilmember Hayner: So they take a menu -- they take your menu -- because I have seen that with our local Chinese place up here, and -- with Lucky Kitchen. So I just brought my own menu home because we always pick up any ways. I was just wondering how is that possible that someone can kind of front for your business and put a -- put an expense on top of it.

That seems something that I would be interested in regulating.

That seems like a takeaway.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: That's exactly my point and concern, Councilmember Hayner.

And they do that.

They put it out there as a teaser.

To show you how much business they can bring and then they pull the plug.

And they say, do you want us to bring you this business, sign this contract.

But they first have a trial period, where you just start getting orders, and you are like, oh, I didn't staff for this.

I don't know what's going on.

And many times you've got two orders coming in for the same customer because the driver puts in an order, and then the customer calls and puts in an order and then you are stuck holding the bag because no one is going to pay for that second order.

And so it's very problematic for our industry and I would rather have a -- have it regulated better and -- and that's the part of this ordinance that really interests me most.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thank you for answering it.

I appreciate it.

Yeah, that's -- that seems to me that that represents.

Doordash suggested amendments and they said they do have a 15% cap like we are suggesting.

Thank you.

I have a lot no think about on this one.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: Again, I would like to ask our attorneys if we were not acting under emergency powers do you think it would be possible to regulate the appropriation without consent of the menus by these delivery services?

Is the question clear?

>> It would just be to regulate what is on the menus, like whether or not it can be appropriated.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yeah, when they don't have a contract with the restaurant and they take whatever menu off web and they advertise prices that might be outdated. Are current -- the ordinance that we are proposing now.

>> So that would not require emergency powers, the government's ability to regulate false and misleading speech, we have authority to do that.

And we can do it outside of our emergency powers.

>> I would also add that there's some litigation commenced by restaurants against these third-party delivery systems that are pending in federal courts right now.

So we really need a little more time to see what the arguments are or to look at those individual suits against these companies and advise on the merits of those.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: I would like to thank Councilmember Grand for bringing this forward.

I know we started in conversation with this a few weeks ago with the intention of doing what Councilmember Ramlawi was suggesting is making some of these pieces permanent.

Based on the advice of counsel, some of this is coming under emergency powers tonight.

I think as we just heard, we may be able to use this as first step in testing this knowing that it is short term, seeing how it works and impacts the market and then exploring what we can implement long term, to potentially continue to, you know, protect some of our local businesses from these bigger national you know, apps coming in and services that are coming in.

I wanted to address.

I believe we all received the Doordash email.

They have a 15% option and based on that, wanted to be exempted from the ordinance, but their fees go up from there.

And so they have additional fees where they essentially similar to what others have mentioned, it's kind of like a -- oh, well, if you pay more, we will give you more, like we'll give you -- your customers more access to certain things and things like that.

I think they have demonstrated that they can clearly do it at the 15% and I don't think -- what I hate to see is for so many of our local businesses kind of suffering from these service companies coming in and taking the profit increasing costs on customers and frankly often many times folks also don't know that when they tip, none of that tip is going back to the restaurant staff.

That's being kept by the staff at the delivery service as well.

And so the one thing I will add to this conversation is for those of you who do have the option to order directly from your local restaurant or to pick up curbside, please continue to do that as well because that's best way to support the local industry, and to make sure that you are supporting them.

But I think this is a great step toward taking some action to protect the industry from some of these exorbitant fees.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion.

I have -- so this is at first reading.

Move forward for second reading whenever it's appropriate.

All in favor?

I'm sorry, Councilmember Hayner?

>> Councilmember Hayner: Because it's a two-reading ordinance, will there be a public hearing automatically scheduled?

>> Mayor Taylor: There will.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Okay.

Thank you.

All in favor?

All opposed?

It is approved.

DC-1, Resolution to Improve Council Effectiveness, Performance and Communications for Professional Services in the Amount of \$20,000.

Moved by Councilmember Griswold and seconded by Councilmember Disch.

Discussion, please, of DC-1.

Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: The \$20,000 is really just a place holder.

If there's interest in doing this, I am more than willing to work with the city administrator on an amount that is significantly less or consider a friendly amendment to reduce it.

For the record, I want to say I have been working on something like this even under the former city administrator.

While we like to rewrite history, especially on social media, this is an ongoing project of mine and I'm very interested in organizational design and original improvement methods.

We talk about wanting a diverse community.

I question how can we sent a diverse community when we have no diversity of thought on council.

It seemed like we have moved -- and I hate to be harsh, but this is reality.

We have moved from negative campaigning to what I would term negative governance. Again, if there is an interest in this, and it's just going to be a matter of the majority rules, the majority sets the rules and the majority can do whatever they want, whether they are following the rules or not following the rules, then let's just agree to that tonight and not move forward with this resolution, because if there is not a commitment for improvement, then we are just wasting some people's time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: I have spent a lot of time thinking about this resolution, and I find that -- sympathize with the motivating force that is behind it, one of them.

I believe that my colleagues and I get stuck in some patterns of communication that make it difficult for us to hear each other with generosity.

We also have patterns of communication where we make a lot of snide remarks and jabs and those are really unfortunate, because everyone shuts down in the face of those.

I also think that it is possible that these patterns could be improved by the intervention ever outside expertise.

It would be easier to vote for this resolution if it had been built better.

It lacks broad cosponsorship.

It attributes our difficulties to a lack of effective meeting management, which is contentious.

And it calls for us to be taught discourse methodology, which -- well, I don't know what that is.

Nonetheless -- or I'm sorry.

What I meant to say, is the resolution exhibits some of the quirks that plague our communication, at the same time it tries to put us on a path to solving that.

I plan to vote for this resolution, which I do not expect to pass.

Because I want to signal my support for engaging outside expertise to help us develop

polite and collegial communication patterns.

I'm voting for this to signal just that.

I understand that there may not be broad support for this resolution and that is okay.

But if there is, I would participate -- wait, not -- broad support for my signal, frankly.

If there is support for this signal, I would participate with others in a collaborative effort to build a better resolution.

And I'm sure that's the weirdest speech in favor of a yes vote that you ever heard.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: To Councilmember Disch, no, that's not the strangest explanation.

I appreciate your words, and articulation on your thoughts regarding this resolution.

I feel -- I was not the author, but I'm the cosponsor.

I feel like we are a relatively young body.

Nine out of the 11 members here are in their first term.

We haven't had much onboarding, leadership skills, conflict resolution.

We haven't gotten much.

We have just been kind of thrown in, and expected to lead with many different personalities and backgrounds who were not given any type of structured support in training and communicating and working together.

Nine out of 11 here are first term.

We deal with nearly \$500 million budget.

And we are raw at best.

You know, so a \$20,000 price tag I don't know why that's raising eyebrows.

It's a rounding error with a budget our size.

We won't come close to spending that much money.

I invite my colleagues to introduce any amendments they would like to strengthen this resolution.

And I would also like to make a motion to strike out the last resolve clause.

I don't think it belongs in this resolution.

I think it weakens it and I think it would be stronger without that.

I feel we need some outside help so that we can function better as an executive board.

And I think it would be a wise investment to do that.

And I would -- if it's still available, I would pledge the \$500 we get a year towards offsetting the cost of this.

You know, we get \$500 allowance a year for professional development, let's say.

I would put my \$500 towards this.

I would like to work beyond our impasse and learn how to be a better communicator and work for the people, work for the reason that we ran to be in office.

And get beyond some of the petty impasses that we find ourselves in.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is that a second on the amendment, seconded by Councilmember Briggs.

Discussion of the amendment?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Was that to strike the last resolve?

>> Mayor Taylor: It was.

Is that amendment friendly?

Any objection to that amendment?

The amendment is friendly.

Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

I spent an early part of my academic training studying behavior change, and there are things that need to change.

A look, one that we did have a retreat where we already came up with some norms that we seem to forget that only a few months ago, we did have a pretty skilled facilitator who was talking about ways in which we would communicate with one another and somehow even though it was just a few months ago, we have forgotten that that's happened, because it's never referenced at this table.

I think we have material that we can work with to guide our communication.

But I'm a believer you don't -- behavior change is really hard and you can't do it without some structural support, but you also have to want to change your behavior and you also have to be confident in your ability to change your behavior.

I don't think the problem is the lack of a consultant to learn how to speak to one another.

I would be happy to support something like this later if I believed that even if we look at the way I think Councilmember Disch, the way the resolution was written, doesn't speak to me from my perspective -- I'm not speaking to the actual intent of the person writing it, but the way that I read it, and interpret it, makes it difficult to support.

So I will be voting no because I don't -- I think it's imperative that I see an indication of wanting to change that behavior before we come together and -- and work towards meaningful change.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

I will also be voting no on this tonight, but not because I oppose the concept.

For many of the same reasons that Councilmember Disch brought forward.

I think there are a couple of things that make this maybe not quite the right resolution, and maybe not quite the right time.

And for me, I think part of that might be that I think it could be potentially significantly more effective if it was something that we could hold when we were back in person with one another and knowing that that may still be some time off, that may be too far down the road, but I think it can -- I think the mere fact that some of us don't spend a lot of time together in the same room together, contributes to some of the problems in communication around the this table and outside of meetings.

But I also think this resolution, in particular, perhaps gets a bit too specific for me and I think what I would -- if I would get to a space where I was spending taxpayer dollars to professional development which is relatively standard for elected officials and government employees alike is I would like to see that professional maybe as part of this process review a few of our meetings and review the work session that we had back several months ago, and then have that individual make recommendations about what the courses of actions are.

I think I would be more comfortable with a professional provide a plan and I would like to see it be more comprehensive.

I think to Councilmember Grand's point, there's a lot of personal responsibility in making

sure that we communicate effectively and communicate respectfully with unit another. And so if we are going to go down the path of having some professional development and some training, I would like to see us get into other training as well, like antiracism and antibias training.

I think we have identified this for the needs for the body.

I will be voting no on this, but that doesn't mean I won't be supportive of an idea like this in the future.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I want to apologize by some of the language in this resolution.

Some of it I was taken aback by.

The history is I tried to get this done quickly, and I don't even remember exactly who else worked on this.

And I had hoped it would to the admin committee but we all know what happened and it didn't.

Some of what I had in mind with almost like a coach.

I this that I we don't always see ourselves the same way our colleagues this and I would see this as an opportunity to see someone observe our meeting and meet one-on-one and tell us, how long did we talk?

Maybe you used a certain phrase and you could have used something that was more concise, and more positive, I think the dynamics with zoom, it tends to bring out the worst in me and I get angry and frustrated, and some of it is just the technology.

I see this sort of -- and I have participated on something like this when I was on the school board.

So I agree it needs to be refined.

One option would be to have the administration committee take a look at what we might need.

I know I discussed with the mayor some of the issues that we have and I tried to work on them myself with other councilmembers and it's beyond me.

I think we need a coach.

We need someone who will collect data on how long we talk, are we deliberating, are we speaking for some other reason and how we can improve our communications and our deliberations.

So that was my intent.

I would be more than welcomed to bring that back to the admin committee or the subcommittee who are interested in some type of improvement plan.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I'm encouraged by the conversation we are having on this.

I invite my colleagues to provide amendments, guidance, to strengthen the resolution, to get what was suggested included.

All of our meetings have been recorded.

We can have a professional go back and review those.

That information already exists.

I would ask Councilmember Grand what indicators is she looking for to measure the

seriousness on this issue.

I don't know what else to say but I joined council to become a better person, to learn more, to grow, and at times I feel the opposite is occurring and that's unfortunate. I again ask my colleagues to strengthen this resolution with their ideas and everything that has been suggested.

It seems fair.

It seems like it's pointed in the right direction.

I think it's something that we can all use and perhaps we can refer to the admin committee to be -- to take a deeper dive and put more meat on the bones of this resolution so that it comes back and it satisfies the needs of the body.

>> Councilmember Grand: I think I heard a motion two times.

>> Mayor Taylor: No one said anything.

They said I wonder if --

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Well, can I -- if I can make a motion to refer to the admin committee?

>> Mayor Taylor: Seconded by Councilmember Radina.

Discussion.

Referral?

Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes, I struggled with this resolution for a number of the reasons that Councilmember Disch stated.

I think we can all agree well whereas clause that we have adopted -- at least we have desired to improve the quality of communications at council meetings and we -- there may be some language in this resolution that I find concerning in terms of where it seems to appropriate the root of the problem.

I honestly thought I had my hand raised earlier and I was going to propose an amendment to change the second resolve clause to \$5,000 so that we were moving it down to a much more reasonable amount of money for this fiscal year so that maybe we could get started on an endeavor like this and remove the second to last resolve clause, now the last resolve clause that has resolve around the improvement plan on facilitating and coaching at council meeting and administrative council meetings.

Simply because I think the first resolve clause is fairly broad about where it might lead us and \$5,000 seems like a fairly small amount for us to start working with.

But since this is -- we are now in postponement, maybe as I'm happy to work with folks on, this and maybe a lot of folks are.

Maybe we can bring something back in the next budget that seems like everybody would support.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand on the referral.

>> Councilmember Grand: Very quickly, I'm hoping that we will be able to discuss this in the context of our attention to process about bringing things forward and best practices about bringing things forward to council.

And the check list that Councilmember Eyer and I have been working on.

Councilmember Ramlawi, that's a really long answer to the question that you asked me about what of the things we can do.

One of the things is try not to fix things on the fly and bring things that are fully cooked

and ready to go.

I think that will go a long way to improving our communications without a consultant but happy to talk about that at admin.

>> Mayor Taylor: On the referral.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: You know, I don't know what degree things become fully cooked.

You know, we talked about I prior resolution about third-party delivery services.

Nobody talked to me until the city attorney's office called me about it.

You know, so here you have a resident expert about that topic, no one bothered to bring it by me until the city attorney called me.

It slices both ways.

>> Councilmember Grand: Happy to have an offline conversation with you about that.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I don't know how we measure that in a democracy.

How you measure that it could be brought to the table.

I think it's ongoing process.

It's a continuous process in whatever we do.

We take an idea that maybe isn't fully baked and bring it to the table and talk about it, and improve it.

Not just shoot it down.

We have the ability to bring amendments and change these resolutions.

And we have to be able -- you know, because of O.M.A. violations, we are stuck, we can't talk about things without breaking the law.

And so we'll talk more about this at the admin meeting and fully vet it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion for referral?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is referred.

DC-2, Resolution in Support of Michigan Senate Bill 352 of 2021.

Moved by Radina and seconded by song.

Discussion of DC-2.

Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: I wanted to speak very tell live briefly.

This is a resolution that I brought forward to the policy committee and we are recommending unanimously to the body, ultimately currently state laws prevents municipalities from governing firearms on city property and publicly owned properties.

And in municipal building.

And this law change that's being brought forward by state senator Irwin is -- would essentially allow local governments to regulate firearms.

That's something that municipalities have had.

That's something that the state has taken away from us and ultimately, I think this would allow us to make not only our municipal buildings and our public properties safer.

We know unfortunately that from an incident just a few years ago in Virginia beach where municipal employ Les were killed by someone who entered the building with a firearm that this is a real problem and a real danger that faced municipal employees and

so I think this is a step towards showing our support for a law that would not only empower us as local legislators who the closest to the potential problem, but would also help to keep our community safe.

So thank you very much and I hope you will all support it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thank you.

I have the arguments about the safety that comes from this kind of thing be played out from this type of thing but it dovetails nicely with the previous policy agenda committee's where we asked state to set aside the relaxation of similar time and place restrictions that were being proposed under CPL laws as one example where they would remove the restriction, all of a stud, the CPL holder could take a firearm in a bar or a tavern, a sports coliseum, and all of these places that they are rightly prevented.

And it dovetails nicely with the amicus brief and the AAPS, many of you may recall the Michigan gun owners and AAPS and our primary argument was that the court of appeals properly found an NCL-123 that it prohibits only local units of government.

So it was -- you know that was a very strong argument that we made in that case that we don't have the authority and the state doesn't allow us.

That authority may be coming back to us and I think that's probably welcomed by a lot of folks.

It was pretty shocking to find out that the state had removed the requirements to say, for example, for our police department to if it you wanted to seek to purchase a pistol, you had to go to the police department, and then you had to bring the pistol and have it checked and do the firearm safety.

All of that is gone.

It's been removed by the state.

And so these are not removing these restrictions are not the right direction for a community that's seeking to, you know, get some type of control over the firearm problem we have here in the country.

So I appreciate you bringing this forward.

I think it dovetails nicely with what we have been doing in the past and we will see if it makes it through Lansing or not.

And if it does, I don't know, I think we would probably have to ask our attorney to see if a ban of that type would uphold the constitutional scrutiny.

You know if we close to implement it here at city hall, for example, well, here at city hall, but, you know, we'll see if it goes through.

Thanks for bringing it forward.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

DC-3, Resolution to Request the Michigan Department of Transportation to Address the Frequency of Commercial Truck Crashes on the Eastbound M-14 Bridge over the Huron River.

Moved by Councilmember Briggs and seconded by Disch.

Discussion, please DC-3.

Councilmember Briggs?

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thank you.

So hopefully this is fairly uncontroversial as well.

The -- the reason behind bringing this resolution forward really came about from taking a look at -- at least for myself anyway, looking at a Facebook post by the police department -- or the firearm on April 8th or 9th where they were kind of outlining the problems that we're having in this area.

So essentially for those who may not have seen that, or read the resolution, on April 8th, just after 4 p.m., there was a diesel tank -- a semi tractor-trailer jackknifed and the diesel tanks ruptured and spills diesel into river.

And they had a boom across the river in an attempts to absorb some of the diesel.

They noted this is the third crash since June of 2019, where they caused a spill into the river.

One of these crashes resulted in a fatality and all three occurred during a rain event.

So especially on Facebook, the fire department is making a plea for m dot to take action.

We know that staff is working on this and trying to get MDOT to improve this area for sometime.

We have been up running into some issues with this.

This is just a request to elevate that and bring all of council's voice to this issue and it doesn't prescribe any particular solutions but also that we do this as a priority area to improve.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks, Mr. Mayor.

First off, I would like to be added as a cosponsor.

I would have like to have been on the making of this as someone would lived within a half mile of this stretch for 20 -- I don't know, for a while.

For 26 years, something like that.

So 29 years.

We know it's a problem and there was one today.

There was today but it didn't go into the river.

It was a little bit before the downward slope.

I think it's perfectly appropriate to formalize our request.

For a couple of years we have been working and trying to get MDOT to act and there's a reconfiguration of the barton interchange in the works and we know that the MDOT has purchased 75 barton drive as an example and we have been working to see how that can best serve the whole community.

That reconfiguration has been published and both of them are better than what exists now.

I think that the final whereas clause, they have to say if they do study it, they may increase the speed limit but obviously that would be ridiculous in that stretch, it would be impossible to imagine that.

I guess I just wanted to -- obviously, I support this notion.

I wanted to speak to the third from final resolve clause where it says should MDOT decide closing the intersection is a preferred option.

I will make the assumption that by that intersection you mean the barton interchange, because that's the only -- I assume that's the only intersection in play here or is that also the main street -- north main street on to 23 is considered part of that intersection, interchange, and I was wondering if there should be more clarity.

I can't I mag ever that stretch of the 14 would be closed.

Are we talking about main and 14 or barton and 14 or all that there?

It's a question for the authorizes.

>> City Admin. Crawford: I can jump in if you like.

It's barton.

Chief Kennedy helped to draft this, but it's barton that we are referring to.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Can I move to amend that to add barton before intersection and call it the barton interchange.

Because that's what MDOT calls it.

Should MDOT decide closing the barton interchange.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is that friendly to the body?

>> Councilmember Hayner: I think that's good for our neighborhood too because then they will know what they are talking about because that's obviously been a topic of conversations for many decades in our area.

You know, it will let our constituents know that we're considering their -- and hearing their pleas.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

I thought it was the main street connector to the m-14 that would be subject to so being closed which I thought would be extremely detrimental.

I have a question regarding the Lee traffic crashes and the investigations that ensued, whether what the drivers of those semi trucks were cited for in those accidents do.

We have a police report or -- I don't know if chief Kennedy -- do you have any information on the citations that were issued no those drivers?

>> There's a little bit of a boundary issue.

The bridge itself is in Ann Arbor township and so MSP typically does the reports.

The -- that's literally the dividing line between the city and the company.

So once it hits the water, it our problem but the bridge itself is in the township.

So I don't have that information.

I could follow up on that.

But that would be a request through MSP, which is not as easy a lift as Ann Arbor police department.

So I would be interested in knowing the cited reasons for those crashes.

I know we can speculate and assuming driving too fast for conditions but it would be good to have that information asker as part of that decision, not that not having it right now would prevent me from supporting this.

I do have an issue with that resolve clause that was just amended.

The word "happy."

Just -- it isn't -- I think it's like "interesting" or "nice."

But if it's not just in the future, using something more qualitative than the word happy, the city would assist -- would assist, or participate or would help to facilitate in that

manner, but I'm not sure the word "happy" fully describes my sentiment in supporting this.

Thank you.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Could I suggest "is willing."

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: That would be great.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I want to mention that former Councilmember Ackerman actually set up a process whereby we met with senator Irwin and representative Yousef Rabhi and then representatives from MDOT and it was very effective at prioritizing issues and city administrator Tom Crawford was there and he would try to narrow decide what we want to work on.

We might want to have another meeting and have that process, as well as a couple of other issues and find out what the status is of that interchange project -- I'm sorry, the ramp that has been talked about, unless staff has an update on that.

I think that by having those meetings occasionally, it improves our communications with MDOT and they don't have multiple people calling them asking them questions if we can have such a meeting.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Councilmember, we have already started have those meetings and one of the comments we received was it would be beneficial for the Ann Arbor city council to pass a resolution encouraging the supported action and that was the genesis of this resolution.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Oh, great!

>> City Admin. Crawford: So we have reached out.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Good.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: I just want to say, I should have started my comments by saying thank you very much to staff for creating this and pretty much developing this resolution and advocating for improvements in this area.

And also give the opportunity to chief Ken city council, did he has anything to say, and the frustration of trying to repeatedly respond to --

>> No, I just appreciate Councilmember Briggs and other councilmembers.

I'm just tired of diesel going into the river.

One of these times we will move out and boom in the river is treating the symptoms and not curing the disease.

We would like to get some permanence.

We care about the river and usually there is a life lost.

We have already checked those boxes tragically and MDOT is a big bureaucracy and slow to change but this has gone on for a little too long and we just don't want that bad thing to happen, and we're all regretful that we don't take more action.

So thank you.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: I remiss and Councilmember Briggs reminds me of my manners and I wanted to stay publicly what a thrill it was to see this appear in my inbox

a few weeks after I had sent, I think, an email to staff saying, ahhh!
And there it was.

And that was the nicest thing in my inbox in a long time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I don't know if this is true, a crash occurred four days ago that included any fluid into the river.

So it seems to be very frequent.

>> For clarification, the crash last Thursday, there was a diesel link.

Thankfully they were able to dike it before this got into the river but it was pure luck that it didn't hit the river.

The same spot, but just a little south.

We got very fortunate.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thanks to my colleagues for bringing this forward age staff for preparing this resolution and chef Kennedy for his service and continued vigilance on improving safety.

I would like to be added as a cosponsor to this resolution.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

Approved.

DC-4, Resolution Levying Certain Delinquent Municipal Solid Waste, Board Up, Clean Up, Vacant Property Inspection Fees, Housing Inspection Fees, and Fire Inspection Fees as Special Assessments and Ordering Collection Thereof.

Moved by Councilmember Nelson and seconded by Disch.

Discussion of DC-4.

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

DC-5, Resolution to Approve Amendments to the Council Rules.

Moved by grand and seconded by Eyer.

Discussion, please of DC-5.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Mayor, there were some questions in advance of this.

Mr. Postema is here to comment.

>> City Atty. Postema: Yes, I will raise the general issue about getting these type of questions the day of a councilmember and I will raise that for process so I can give you the best advice and I will focus on that because one of the questions has to do with concerns over ACLU letter and first amendment issues that we spent a tremendous amount of time at council's direction preparing a memo, not only an advice memo but also a public memo and those take any sort of constitutional analysis, take a lot of time and they are not really amenable to be doing it -- I can't do it justice without writing manage that is helpful to the council.

So I would encourage certainly new things come up and we have this rule, it's really not amenable to constitutional question like this and I would recommend -- I can do my best advice for the council if I get it much, much earlier.

And so that's just a process issue.

For me to give you the best advice possible.

Now with that, I can provide some analysis there is a question about conduct unbecoming a councilmember and whether it's what prompted concerns from the ACLU.

Well, I don't know what prompted concerns from the ACLU.

I have read their letter in the past and I addressed many of those things in the memos that I had.

I think there was a question about first amendment and sort of first amendment retaliation and issues about what a council could do and whether a council had its own first amendment right to either discipline or to reprimand or to counsel, all of those things were addressed and the reason that I spend a long time writing an amendment to the council, because you wanted it and wanted it to be public.

Now the specific ACLU letter addressed one item that I wrote on, and whether there was an interference with the discipline concerning elected duties.

And in that letter, they cited a Supreme Court case and then a case out of the fifth circuit that I identified in the memo, but there was a whole other body of law that I felt compelled to discuss with you and what their concern was, I believe, was a chill on speech with some other rules.

Again as I pointed out in the memo, the chill on speech, it didn't -- the rule at that time did not any -- it didn't prohibit speech.

It was an after action that was taken by the councilmember.

I can't really answer the question better than that.

I will say whether there was an overbreadth doctrine.

Again, I'm happy to provide an in-depth analysis of this, we obviously looked at that with respect to this conduct that unbecoming of a councilmember, and the reason why I recommended that or discussed that, there's always a section between having specific ethical rules and having what is called a catch all and this is actually quite common catch all, so that -- because every type of behavior cannot be covered in a rule and every court from the supreme down has recognized that and what the ACLU wrote about as to overbreadth or vagueness, they cited two or three cases and best way for me to approach that.

What they talked about was the criminal context.

And again when you look at overbreadth or vagueness, it applies with more or less scrutiny depending on the context.

Criminal laws are subject to higher level scrutiny, but certainly other types of conduct are not, and certainly, Rules and particularly catch-all rules have been upheld, you know, against void for vagueness or overbreadth cases.

There's certainly cases on that.

And the reason whether it's an improvement or not, it's helpful to have some sort of catch-all, I believe in the current for example -- in the reprimand rules.

The language was very limited in the extent of ethics rules, administrative rules and violation of state law and when additional problems come up, you are stymied in some way, because you have to then enact a rule, put it in the ethics rule, and then obviously the conduct is already passed.

And that's really the tension that you have, that is describing specific rules that you

believe should guide your behavior, and you all should spend some time and talk those things, what rules you want to be governed by, but as far as a catch-all, I do I have a specific assessment and the answer is yes, and that is that that type of thing has been upheld with respect to overbreadth or vagueness.

That's best way I can answer it.

And I will cite the cases in the ACLU order.

They were in the criminal law context and not in this context, but nevertheless, we're certainly aware of how the catch-alls are there.

We don't have to have a catch-call.

If you don't want specific rules.

You have gone without them for a long time.

I told you before that when the ethics rules were drafted, it was always contemplated that behavioral rules or conduct would come back in in some capacity and, again, you will have to ask the sponsor as to the specific rules but there shh some wisdom again to have a catch-all, because I will tell you, there have been behaviors in the past that have been very problematic and they are to the covered by rules and who would know that you would have to have a rule.

It doesn't make sense that they would behavior that way, and yet they did.

That's my overall guidance.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Thank you.

Yes, I just -- I want to start by correcting a misperception that the new rules under response to the ACLU letter.

They are not.

Not at all.

You know, we received the guidance from our city attorney, both prior to creating the previous rule, you know that we are now taking out for reasons I will get into in a minute, and we received the public guidance from our city attorney, the public memo that made very clear that there was not an issue with that rule.

The reason we're taking it out is because -- well, there are two things.

First, it was in the wrong place.

In -- within the rules because it addressed councilmember conduct outside of meetings but it was located in the section of councilmember conduct within meetings.

Then in addition we received additional guidance from our city attorney in that public memo, looking at -- as Mr. Postema just outlined, having more of -- going more broad with it.

That we didn't need to be so specific and in fact, it would be more useful to be more broad and create a set of aspirational goals for councilmember conduct and how we treat each other and how we treat members of the public.

And so that is how we came to the list of aspirational behavioral goals that we have right now before us.

So those were taken from various other governing bodies.

I haven't done -- nobody has done a formal study, but based on a lot of looking around and a lot of research, we are outliers, in my view in, terms of not having anything that addresses councilmember conduct in this way.

So I think this is a positive thing for us and I'm glad that it came out of the admin committee with full support from all five members and I hope we can pass it tonight.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

These rule changes speak more to Rule 10 and 12.

Those are more substantial.

They are substantial, meaningful rule changes that will help us to better govern.

I brought the idea at admin committee and our city attorney as it relates to 5b and the review of the draft agenda as it pertains to adding items to the agenda.

I felt that late additions to the agenda were extremely problematic, troubling and most often unnecessary.

And so the proposed rule changes would require three cosponsors to be a part of a resolution that is added to the agenda after 5:00 on Thursday.

That's still after our questions are due at noon on Wednesday, but not as late as it currently is.

So it would require either three cosponsors if it's added after 5:00 on Thursday or the majority of the body when the agenda is approved they onset of our council meeting.

So six members of council would have to vote in the affirmative for it to be included on our agenda.

The proposed addition would lie in a purgatory state for the members to view and others to view so that it's not completely out of public sight and public view.

It would be a viewable document, but not necessarily a part of our approved agenda until action was taken by council.

And that right, there I think is a very substantial improvement to our current process.

I think it would help us come to our meetings more informed, less surprised and not questioning the motives of why things were added at 5:00.

I would like to focus our time and attention on the rule changes.

As to the other part, unfortunately, we're fixing one mistake with another one.

The vagueness of the second part that pertains to Rule 10 and Rule 12 seems to be something that we are looking for a problem.

This catch-all is unnecessary.

We saw this poddy take action two weeks ago and strip another councilmember of his assignments in one meeting and we were told that we didn't even need to follow any of the steps outlined in Rule 12 to do it.

So I feel our responsibility lies with the voters.

If our actions are so abhorrent and terrible, we should be voted out.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I think the changes to 5b are entirely appropriate and if I'm reading it properly, when we speak to the three cosponsors, that the councilmembers would need to cosponsor.

So there's three names on an item that were put on.

That means you have to reach out to your colleagues and get things done in a collaborative way and I think that's appropriate.

I assume that makes no changes to our ability to you know, staff for a staff presentation, if the answers couldn't have gotten back to us.

I find that completely appropriate.

As far as the second part, the ethics Rule 12, the changes to 12, I mean, they read broadly, like a consolidation of power to the administrative committee.

It's narrowing the authority of the body to that of the administration committee, which is sort of dangerous, I think.

And also sort of taking from the notion of the body, self-governing to get it down, it's sending it down to the admin committee instead.

At least it should say fall under the statute and now it says fall under the scope of council administrative committee.

You are that authority away from the body and giving it to the admin committee.

I don't think this is appropriate.

And the council reprimand, as you pointed out Councilmember Ramlawi, there seems to be no need for due process to be followed.

We saw that two weeks ago, and to add this other conduct that's unbecoming a councilmember in these cases, I mean it's -- it's almost border line ex post facto law, which is the hall mark of tyranny.

It's an unusual situation, and from my perspective it almost looks like recognition that this body acted without authority two weeks ago and stripped me of committees.

Well, we would have done that if this rule would have been in here.

That's what it reads like that way to me and I'm sure it reads that way to a lot of other people in the community.

I support the changes higher up but not the changes to Rule 12, I will not support this generally.

As I didn't support the previous rule changes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Thank you.

I just want to -- I want to give credit to council member Ramlawi and whoever else was supportive of Rule 5, because in is the kind of meaningful rule that's very much focused on the work that we do as policymakers and making sure that we are arriving at decisions in a thoughtful way and come to the table and be focused on the serious business of council.

It brings me back to when we had rules committee before it was disbanded.

The most meaningful change we made in 2019 was shifting a timeline so that councilmembers would actually have access to responses to questions of the agenda.

It was like you used to get the answers three hours before the meeting.

And so rule five feels to me what the rules committee used to be when it existed focused on how we can be more intentional on the decisions that we make for the benefit of the community.

The others, I'm -- I guess I don't understand the -- well, I guess I do.

But we're creating lots of opportunities for the majority to target individual members and that seems like a very strange focus, for -- for this level of government where we are supposed to be that much more closely connected to the problems and the situations that the community is experiencing.

So it feels like a very strange distraction.

I would like to make a motion to consider these four separate rule changes individually

not as a group.

There are changes to Rule 5, Rule 10, and Rule 12 and 14 and I would like to break them up.

>> Mayor Taylor: That makes sense to me.

Councilmember Grand?

>> Councilmember Grand: Sure.

I mean it doesn't -- I support all of these.

It doesn't matter to me if we break them up.

Fine.

I was asked a question this evening about what I would -- how I would want us to change.

I think the last three speaking terms just spoke really clearly to why I supported DC-1 going back to the admin committee.

I was really glad that Councilmember Ramlawi brought forward the changes about late additions.

I didn't cast any aspersions as to his intent or, you know, or much like the other changes this evening, our lawyers thought that this was sound and I thought it was a great idea, and I always supported good ideas, no matter where they come from.

I think we heard from our city attorney that these rules are pretty straightforward and standard.

And so every -- I mean if you want to ask me what a problem is.

Every time there seems to be a disagreement about policy, there's a need to -- and I don't want to go down this rabbit hole, but sometimes it might just be okay to just listen, and not respond because we don't need to hear everyone talk every single time.

That -- that doesn't mean that it's trying to be a power grab.

Maybe it's just good policy.

Maybe it's just the way other communities do things or we learn from them or we are just following the advice of our attorneys.

It's not -- it's not a conspiracy theory or reason to grab power.

Sometimes we just disagree and we are all trying to do what -- I'm trying to believe that everyone here is doing what they think is best for our community but I will be honest, it's hard sometimes and if we want to start communicating better, maybe we can start by having policy agreements without talking about the intent of the sponsors because that's a new rule that I really liked and I'm working really hard to try to follow it because it's so easy to go the other way.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: Thank you, councilmember, I'm not sure which rule we are on right now so I will speak to all of them, if that's all right.

I do want to thank Councilmember Ramlawi and the administration committee to Rule 5. I think it will make our meetings a little easier as the folks have time to respond to things and get questions answered.

I have no interest in really relitigating the conversation that we had from two weeks ago, although to speak to council ethics Rule 12:00 I think while obviously this was being worked on before the vote of two weeks ago, I think actually many of the arguments that I heard from councilmembers around this table about wanting additional due process

and wanting a process for this to -- for this play out differently, the only action that we had to send a message to our LGBTQ residents is addressed by the changes in council Rule 12.

We would now have another avenue for the admin committee to afford some additional steps for councilmembers to respond and to go through a process when that is necessary.

That doesn't mean that the actions as clearly laid out by our attorney of two weeks ago were not allowed or somehow in violation of our rules or ability.

It's the only power had two weeks ago and this would allow more flexibility for council in instances like that.

And to council -- and to ethics, this goes to the ongoing conversations of how we better work with one another and listen to one another, and engage with one another.

This is to a great step of codifying some of that and making sure that we are actually pointing to a list of things that we demonstrate will actually have effect that we have all now, I think, in the previous -- in the previous debate said that we support the intent behind.

This is something meaningful that we can do to but these in our rules and say, yes, we do want to change behavior.

This is a step towards us demonstrating that we want to be part of the solution.

So thanks to the admin committee for all of their work on this.

I will be supporting all the rule changes as well.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember -- [Garbled audio]

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I will save my comments to the portion of the vote that I will speak to but nothing right now.

Thanks.

Postema and then Councilmember Hayner.

And then let's stop the queue and start -- start dealing with these various rules separately.

Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: I just have a question of clarification.

All of these were approved by the admin committee before coming to the table.

So this has opinion worked out and voted on and supported beforehand, right?

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes, these were passed out of the admin committee with the approval of all five members.

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Postema.

>> City Atty. Postema: I wanted to say, when it says coming from the attorney, I did suggest that historically, Rules were going to come in that would be additional behavioral things but as to the specific rules, these are not necessarily ones that -- that I have drafted and I only say that because these in the end are your rules and I do think that, you know, you are talking about a catch all that is that some people have said is too broad and then you have more specific rules but those are all specific things you should talk about.

The one way you were talking about behavioral issues and the best way to address those, I think is actually by going through the rules and see if those are norms you want

to have for your body.

Those specific ones, I'm not telling you, you should have any specific rules but certainly, it's appropriate to have them.

And -- and that's my only point, because I didn't draft those rules.

I'm not walking away from those rules.

I'm saying you should look at those as a whole, and, you know, they are quite different -- there are different rules for different types of behavior.

So thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: All right, let's roll with --

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Can I clear up something.

I'm sorry, mayor.

I would like to speak in response to a question from our colleague, Councilmember Song.

>> Mayor Taylor: Sure.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: When I vote in the admin committee to recommend or send things to this body to vote on as a whole, it's not to say I approve all of those changes.

It is to give this body the consideration to make those changes.

So I would just like to make it clear, that, yes, we voted on moving this forward to the body for consideration, but that does not mean that all five members under support of every single change.

We do support this body looking at all of these and making that decision for themselves.

>> Mayor Taylor: All right.

>> Councilmember Eyer: I'm sorry, this is an important point.

Councilmember -- you know, prior to bringing these proposed conduct rules to the admin committee, I ran them by Councilmember Ramlawi.

On March 18th, I received a message back say thank you, all seems amenable.

Appreciate the suggestions.

>> Mayor Taylor: All right, that's --

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: That was for Rule 13.

>> Councilmember Eyer: That was work with other councilmembers to establish effective policies and it was all of the conduct --

>> Mayor Taylor: All right.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Issues we are talking about right now.

So I just -- I want to make sure that we are not, again, rewriting history.

>> Mayor Taylor: All right, let's move on to focusing on the code right now.

We are on Rule 5 right now.

Let me suggest it's late.

We have a lot of stuff to go over and it's -- things have already been said.

Let's move on.

Any further discussion of Rule 5.

All in favor of rule 5, please say aye.

[Chorus of ayes]

Opposed?

Rule 5 is adopted.

All in of the change to Rule 10.

Is there any discussion of Rule 10.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I feel vindicated by having this removed.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner?

So.

>> Councilmember Hayner: So 10 is struck out in our copy of the rules moving forward. We are not going to renumber them and move -- like 11 doesn't exist either now.

I'm concerned about the lack of numbering.

>> City Atty. Postema: I understand your concern.

It's one section of Rule 10.

>> Councilmember Hayner: You only put in what is being struck.

>> City Atty. Postema: Yes.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I thought you left it all out, all of a sudden.

>> City Atty. Postema: No.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Okay.

>> Mayor Taylor: Discussion?

All in favor?

I'm sorry, Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: I'm sorry, I can't let that go without a response, because this is why I don't believe you want to change your behavior.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Was that addressed to me?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I think you are measuring --

>> Mayor Taylor: It was an I statement.

>> Councilmember Hayner: To whom was it addressed.

>> Mayor Taylor: It was addressed to who it was addressed.

I think Councilmember Ramlawi.

Further discussion of Rule 10.

All in favor?

Opposed?

Rule 10 is approved.

Change to council administration -- pardon me, council administrator, Rule one.

Any discussion?

Councilmember Hayner?

>> Councilmember Hayner: We had a meeting where we talked about formal notification from city staff.

Under this administrative rule, when if we have a concern about the department or staff misconduct, is there a consideration that in it be sent to you in writing, Mr. Crawford or is a phone call sufficient?

>> City Admin. Crawford: I'm happy to take it however you would like it.

If I need it in writing, I will certainly let you know.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Okay.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

>> Councilmember Nelson: I would like a roll call vote, please.

>> Mayor Taylor: All in favor, with respect to administrative rule number one, roll call

vote, starting with Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: Decision of Rule 12.

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I thought we were open Rule 12.

We had routed on Rule 10.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Administrative rule one is the roll call vote you asked for.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Oh, oh, I'm sorry.

I need to change my vote.

I apologize.

Councilmember Song, you recall my -- many times that I told you not to be embarrassed.

I'm not in the lightest bit embarrassed.

I apologize it's late.

>> Mayor Taylor: Owl -- all in favor, considering the prior vote to be void with the complete acquiescence of council.

Councilmember Hayner, you did move your hand.

Do you have an objection to this?

>> Councilmember Hayner: No, but I have another question for the -- since the no vote was cast, I had to read it three times.

Would this be construed as requiring a councilmember to bring concerns to the city administrator.

>> City Admin. Crawford: It is your judgment on the level of concern you have.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I wouldn't be in violation of a council administrative rule if I refused to bring a staff misconduct report to you?

>> City Admin. Crawford: The point here is when you have issues with staff that you don't need to deal with them directly between yourself and the staff or the public.

It needs to just come to me.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yeah, I wouldn't take it somewhere else.

I don't want to set up something, where someone says, you knew about that, and you didn't say anything about it?

And I say, oh, not yet.

And all of a sudden you are in administration.

>> Mayor Taylor: All in favor of administrative Rule 12 -- Rule 12 I messed that up.

In all in favor of administrative Rule 1, administrative responsibility, the rule with respect to bringing concerns to staff.

If you are in favor of that rule change, please say aye.

[Chorus of ayes]

All opposed?

Administrative Rule 1 is approved.

Rule 12, discussion?

Council woman Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I voted for this in the administrative committee.

I'm concerned about conduct that is unbelieving of a councilmember that I believe is too broad and I probably break that rule every day.

So I don't think I can vote for it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I also supported bringing this to the body for consideration.

After further consideration, and speaking with constituents and others on this matter, I do feel that this is too broad, too vague, and not that the intention is to consolidate power.

It could be used in a ways to abuse in ways that we don't intend.

I don't know what this means.

I shouldn't be voting for something when I don't know what it means.

If I'm not doing council business, and I'm somewhere, and I say something offhand, does that now -- you know, cause me to be reprimanded as a councilmember, even though it occurred in a different sphere of my life, whether in my business or personal life?

I'm not sure what this necessarily means.

And I'm not sure what many of us though what it means and our city attorney's office has stated that this is -- was what was asked from councilmembers to address problems they are trying to solve.

And the problem was with rule 10.

So it is in response to striking out the problematic rule that was under Rule 10, and this is to supplement what was just removed.

And it's too broad and it needs to be more prescriptive.

To take away political representation from people is a serious act.

And I think we should take long, hard -- think about it long and hard before we act on it, because stripping representation from people is a very powerful thing and we are talking about voter suppression, we are talking inclusivity and a lot of things as a progressive community.

This might be a regressive form of democracy.

And I can't support it and I think we should strike the words that are highlighted in red "or other conduct unbecoming of a councilmember."

>> Mayor Taylor: If I suggest -- you are certainly within your right to --

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I will withdraw that and simply vote no.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: So I'm struggling with this a little bit and it came as a recommendation of the administration committee.

I hoped that we were dealing with a solution that was -- maybe providing a little bit more of a catch-all addressing some of the concerns around Rule 10.

We need to hold ourselves to a higher level of conduct.

Future councils do as well.

There's an expectation from the community that we hold ourselves to a higher level of a high level of conduct.

I'm fine with this going back to admin committee that everybody agrees on and provides some clarity, but I think that just striking that language doesn't -- it doesn't seem very useful.

We're trying to achieve something here.

And we can work harder to get there so there's a common ground but I mean we need to identify what we can all agree upon, you know, and to -- Mr. Postema's points earlier, we are not necessarily going to be able to line a list of 50 pages long of what is unbecoming of a councilmember.

At some point, this is going to have to be somewhat broad.

There's -- so I'm happy to address this language.

>> City Atty. Postema: Councilmember Briggs, I can suggest that, again, I'm willing to provide additional written guidance on all of these that certainly is about the vagueness and the overbreadth.

I have touched on that, but also, you are right.

If there's additional things that you -- ultimately these are your rules and if there are things that you want in, I have to pride of authorship.

These make sense.

They were litigated.

If there's something that you want them to specifically address, I'm happy to look at that and perhaps with more guidance that might be a useful discussion, what -- what is conduct unbecoming of a councilmember.

Why do you want to be able to councilman or reprimand somebody.

This is not stripping anybody of anything.

So that's what we need to look at.

I'm happy to provide some more guidance.

I usually like more time and I'm happy to answer the questions.

Don't get me wrong on that, but in a constitutional, setting, you know I like to provide you the full analysis.

I'm quite willing to spend more time on it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: I'm not sure that there has ever been a better example of the dysfunction on this body than the discussion we are having right now.

I as the author of this proposed language, sought the input, first from Councilmember Griswold and then from Councilmember Ramlawi and received the green light, go.

Looks great.

Amenable.

Love it.

Then we took it to the admin committee, and nobody raised an issue with any of these -- any of this language.

And then we bring it to the council table and suddenly, because there's this desire, I guess to have a partisan divide -- or I don't know, what it is.

I shouldn't even try to speculate.

But now suddenly, there are issues.

And Councilmember Briggs, I love you for wanting to think that we can come to consensus, but how can we possibly take it back to the admin committee after what I just described and try to start all over again?

I move the previous question.

Let's vote on this and be done with it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Postema --

>> Councilmember Eyer: I'm calling the question.

We had 30 minutes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Not on this specific matter.

>> City Atty. Postema: Well, I think -- I think everybody needs to call the question and I don't have Robert's -- I don't have it in front of me, but everybody needs to have spoken at least once and I would need to check that.

>> Mayor Taylor: The opportunity to speak once.

On this particular question, Radina, Hayner, grand, Councilmember Ramlawi, you have spoken on this issue.

Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: Because I haven't spoken to this particular rule, I guess I don't know if we are procedurally -- if these are all separate agenda items now or not.

-- so I'm also a little shocked by this simply because of the conversations that I have had with staff as well, and my understanding of what we have as a body, is also to have speech rights and that's largely what this rule is.

I'm a little confused by the suggestion that something in ethics rules 12 would strip someone of representation and it's about counseling and reprimand and I think the reason this is broad because it's the ability of the body to speak with a voice as to whether or not there is conduct that the body views is unbecoming the council.

And we would then have a discussion about this.

We would vote yes or no and we as a body would be granted that speech right in response to whatever conduct was in question.

There's nothing in this rule about stripping folks of anything.

It is reprimand.

It is a public statement by this body, and so I guess I'm just confused because my understanding from the conversations and, you know -- my understanding from speaking with members of admin is this process has been played out with staff involvement as well.

And -- and I also don't understand what would come out as a different outcome because this has been a long process.

And so I'm ready to vote on this as well.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thank you, Mr. mayor.

I think Councilmember Ramlawi's concerns and I will speculate that when he spoke to removing people's representation, of course he was talking about the case of two weeks ago, when this body didn't follow any procedure, didn't follow in due process and denied the first ward residents their representation on boards and commissions.

And it was acted completely outside of these rules.

And you know, there was no ethics violation.

There was no law broken.

And yet this body sought fit to act.

So you would think that I would support this because it brings it back into council Rule 12, because it provides for due process and a descriptive remedy, or reprimand, but I don't because unbecoming conduct is in the eye of the beholder.

Because in my -- making my rounds these last two weeks, I have had many, many, people say to me, how shocked they were that not the language I used outside of this body, but people on this body, wrote it and sent it out and so when people opened up their council newsletter, they were confronted with this horrible language.

And so it's entirely possible that someone would say, what's the difference between him saying it in this area and you saying it in that area?

And so I find it unbecoming conduct in the eye of the beholder and that's why I'm not going to support.

This I'm not afraid to talk about what happened two weeks ago.

There's nothing that this group can do to embarrass me any further.

So let's get real about what we're talking about here.

We're talking about rules to regulate all of our behaviors both inside and outside of this chamber, virtual though it may be.

And if you are willing to do that and take that authority, that shows how highly you think of your judgment, but I don't trust our judgment as a body.

I will not support this.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: I don't wonder why we have trust issues.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I would like to call a point of order.

>> Councilmember Grand: Just point of context, this is supposed to be rare, and all it is -- it is not about what happened two weeks ago.

I would like to really not make it about that because we have been working on this for months.

And so what it is and what maybe the situation last month showed is that there are times when because our rules were so specific that there was clearly an issue of concern in the community or on council and our rules are -- our administrative rules did not meet it.

It is not intent that this is -- these are not the discussions I want to have at the council table.

I want us to be doing, not doing this.

I want us to be actually enacting polity.

That -- policy that's important to our community but there have been times and

Mr. Postema, you know, was very diplomatic, but there have been times as

someone would have been doing this for quite sometime, that there were questions that were highly questionable by councilmembers.

And it didn't fit our rules.

So this in the fair, hopefully, occasion gives us the space to have a discussion about whether or not those actions are appropriate.

That's all.

This is not some radical deviation from what a lot of other bodies do, but it just gives us the space that if for some accountability.

That's it.

Super simple.

>> Mayor Taylor: The question on this matter has been called, and rather than putting I have Ramlawi and Griswold wanting to speak.

I have them both as having spoken to this rule.

Am I correct in that, councilmembers?

I will take that as a yes.

Councilmember Griswold, can you speak to this rule already.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I have spoken but I wanted to address a comment that was attributed to me, if I may.

And that is the language is the same as it was two years ago -- I mean, two weeks ago, but my feelings as an elected official will never be the same due to how I feel -- not what happened but how I feel.

I won't say anything else, because that -- that's all I will say.

I feel terrible.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: So procedurally you are going around --

>> Mayor Taylor: The question has been called on this issue.

Everybody who -- if you -- if you have already spoken that you are not -- that you don't speak again on this matter.

People would have not spoken have the opportunity to speak.

I will take the opportunity to say that we take a lot of time of how we abuse each other and then try to say that we won't and it just goes back and forth and back and forth.

So I would rather that we just go to vote and try to get through the rest of the agenda.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Does anyone else wish to speak on Rule 12?

>> Mayor Taylor: For my part, I will vote in favor of it.

I think the question of breadth and definition is one which, you know, it is proper to engage.

Such that deals with the reasonable person stand, the definition is -- the law does not require a definition of both terms at some point it really is up to the body and future bodies to come one that definition.

Further discussion.

Roll call vote on council ethic rules 12, starting with Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Radina: Sorry for procedural purposes, I believe that we have to actually vote on the call to question.

>> City Atty. Postema: Yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: My apologies.
>> My God!
>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.
Call to question.
>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.
>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.
>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.
>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.
>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.
>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.
>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.
>> Councilmember Hayner: No.
>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.
>> Councilmember Griswold: No.
>> Councilmember Song: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.
>> Mayor Taylor: Is there anyone who has not spoken with respect to Rule 12.
Roll call vote, starting with Councilmember Grand.
>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.
>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.
>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.
>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.
>> Councilmember Nelson: No.
>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.
>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.
>> Councilmember Hayner: No.
>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.
>> Councilmember Griswold: No.
>> Councilmember Song: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.
>> Mayor Taylor: Rule 13.

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks, Mr. Mayor, I find these rules to be strangely vague and unenforceable, and specifically, councilmember "should."

So these are shoulds.

Why do we create an ethics rule.

Is it a rule or a suggestion?

And so I think it -- I think it's inappropriate to have these as ethics rules.

I mean, you are -- we're encouraging free expression of opinion on policy issues.

Well, you wouldn't know that.

We're working with other councilmembers to establish effective policies.

Maybe.

He know, three is on.

I will say anything to someone's face that I will say anywhere.

They don't seem like ethics rules to me.

They seem like suggestions that have been kind of put together to come up with something and, I mean -- you know, we're picking and chooses some of the tenants of ICMA ethics and why not all of them?

It doesn't seem necessary to me.

So I'm not going to support this.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: We do talk about ourselves a lot more than we have before.

When Councilmember Eyer, I said, I endorse them.

I support the suggestions.

I did not -- she did not offer, at least to my knowledge, the prior rules that we adopted.

With the language of unbecoming.

That came from the city attorney, not Councilmember Eyer, as far as I recall.

I could be wrong.

She is right in this, so yes, there's nothing objectionable here.

This would be great.

But like my colleague just said, encourage the free expression on policy issues, boy, I don't feel encouraged at all, in fact, I feel rushed, pressured, cut off, and put down.

I don't feel this is an inclusive body at all.

It is very opposite of that.

On my provider term, my prior council, a lot of differences but I never felt the way I feel after one of these meetings, I can tell you that.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion.

Roll call vote starting with Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: DC-6, Resolution for the City of Ann Arbor to Hold a Community Conversation about the Palestinian People and Palestinian-Americans.

Moved by Councilmember Griswold, seconded by Councilmember Hayner.

Discussion, please of DC-6.

Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: First, I want to apologize for any insensitive behavior or language that I may have used.

My intent in writing this was sort of to connect a chronology of what happened I believe that as a councilmember, if I am to be involved in or sponsor such a community

conversation, it's important for me to bring it to council first.

I expect council to vote it down.

I will then independently work on a forum.

I want to thank everyone who has reached -- who has reached out to me so far.

It's been a very, very productive conversation with very few exceptions.

So I am willing to move to table this at some point after there's been a discussion or I don't think I can withdraw it.

So I'm more than willing to table it, and -- and move forward working with the community outside of council.

I guess as long as it's not considered behavior, it's not considered conduct unbecoming a councilmember.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: I appreciate those sentiments.

I -- I -- I read this resolution and I took issue with its connection with last month's anti-Asian hate resolution.

I mean, it's unfortunate, because it perpetuates the forever foreign, by connecting it with foreign affairs.

Last month's anti-Asian hate resolution, the community here in Ann Arbor and nationally, and that means here in the U.S.

So I called Palestinian American residents including the Arab American national museum, as well as the Congresswoman Tlaib to see if they support this rationale of connecting anti-Asian hate with a conversation around Palestinian-Israeli relations and they said no, there's no connection and no request for the city to convene one.

I also checked with local Arab leaders including -- whether they also anticipated a need for Palestinian-Israeli relations.

And why the Arab Muslim communities, you know, that the anti-Asian hate resolution is tied to a community that encompasses ethnicities and backgrounds but connected by political.

It was not demanding democracy in Vietnam.

And again the Arab and Muslim community here, the members I spoke with also stated there's no connection and to request for the city to convene a conversation.

The most poignant response I received is we are entering the last ten days of Ramadan.

One resident said this resolution will hurt my Jewish American friends who I love as family.

My daughter's fourth grade Palestinian-American teacher also shared how she celebrates and educates the community on Arab and Palestinian American history and identities from pride, pain, trauma, and that demonstrates how conversations are already occurring with children, my own child and community at large.

So seeing as the community outreach on this resolution seems limited and as one resident stated in her letter to council, that it talks about for the Palestinian American community but not with the community. I -- I concur and move to table this resolution for further community input on whether the city is the proper convener for a community conversation on Palestinian and Palestinian Americans.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a second?

Councilmember Grand.

Motions to table do not permit conversation.

So roll call vote starting with Councilmember Grand?

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Postema, do we have a closed session today?

>> City Atty. Postema: No, we do not.

We have the clerk's report of communications, petitions and referrals.

May I have a motion to approve the clerk's report, moved by Disch and seconded by Radina.

Discussion of the clerk's report.

All in favor?

Opposed?

The clerk's report is approved.

Do we have communications from our city attorney?

>> City Atty. Postema: No, mayor.

>> Mayor Taylor: We have now come to public comment general time.

Public comment general time is an opportunity for members of the public to speak to council and the community about municipal interest.

You need not sign up in advance.

To speak at public comment general time, enter the number on your screen, 877-853-5247.

Having done so, please enter meeting I.D., 94212732148.

94212732148.

Once you are connected, please enter star nine.

Star nine.

To indicate that you wish to speak.

The clerk will identify you by the last three digits when it is your turn to speak.

When it is your time to speak, you will have three minutes.

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

Is there anyone who would like to speak at public comment.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Clerk caller with the phone number ending in 205.

>> This is Joe Spalding.

Yeah, um, I needed to -- I wanted to talk about some of the bills that are going through the state house, because some of them pertain to Ann Arbor and the STR conversation.

Some of them are super important statewide for democracy and I will try to get to those. But I've got to say that the only word that I can describe the gaslighting on him not taking responsibility for this issue which he doubled down on here, is it's bullshit. And I'm sorry.

I'm sorry I swore on this council meeting, but the reality is it was unexplainable for anyone in 2020 to say that word in that way.

There are two serious issues there that are not getting addressed.

There's nobody.

There's nobody that can give you license to say that was okay.

Holding you accountable by showing a clip of the image of the stuff you posted is your fault, Jeff.

That is your fault.

So I just wanted to clear that up for everybody else, because it's super important that we defend our gay and lesbian and bisexual and trans people across Michigan, because -- because they suffer higher rates of suicide.

They have been bullied their entire lives because we tolerated a system of bullies like Jeff Hayner in a position of power.

And we're just done doing that.

So that's what this accountability is absolutely about.

I'm so proud of the councilmembers of Ann Arbor would voted to hold Jeff Hayner accountable, and his -- the ward one residents, they are not getting deprived of their voice.

Their voice is getting amplified because being associated with something so toxic like that comment and the rest of your behavior, Jeff, is depriving them of agency.

You are supposed to be their voice and you are denigrating your responsible and you are denigrating your ward.

So that being said, real fast, rapid fire, at the state, you should look into one of the bills in the house that's in committee.

They are trying to ban local ordinances for regulating STRs completely.

I don't really care that much about that conversation, but I'm sure some folks in Ann Arbor do.

The other things are and the Michigananders against voter suppression on Facebook, we are fighting back the voter suppression bills.

They will regulate the ballot boxes.

And make them so they condition be used between -- or after 5 p.m. the day before the election which is exactly when the highest rate of utilization is in the city of Detroit.

So just keep an eye on the state house stuff there's voter suppression stuff and trying to regulate STRs.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 556, do you have a comment?

>> Hello, this is Ralph McKee, can you hear okay?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> I would like to start with -- well, let's talk about the dysfunction of council.

And I would like to start by recognizing that at least in must view the dysfunction is the double standard that goes on here.

I heard Councilmember Briggs and I heard the caller, Mr. Spalding, who was just on talk about it's unacceptable to attack the press and I tend to agree with that.

But it's mayor taker called m -- Mayor Taylor called MLive in contempt.

Nobody has ever seen acknowledged that that has happened.

That's a clear violation of the formal rules and the conduct unbecoming a councilmember, I would think.

But that's okay, because he's in control of the votes.

Similarly, Ms. Grand or Dr. Grand, I should say, made -- said are we going to change our behavior?

Well, okay.

How about talking to your colleague Ms. Eyer, who has violated the council rule on denigrating or impugning motives most meetings.

She did it tonight.

She got called on I appoint of order and it got ignored.

So the dysfunction is the double standard.

That's clear.

Now, let's talk about the actual content or the substance of what Ms. Eyer said.

She said that it was the former council's fault for ignoring or not dealing with the fact that there was a cap.

Before you open your mouth, you should do some homework.

And what happened there was that -- that split between mixed use and residential came from staff.

The staff that you lionize regularly and I think they were acting in good faith.

They will thought incorrectly that the legal criteria is was it a commercial use or not.

That wasn't correct but that's where they started and that's where that came from, Councilmember Eyer, from staff!

Not from the former counsel members.

And if you are so concerned about that, you and Councilmember Disch too, maybe you could actually bring a motion or an amendment to deal with that, but, no, would you rather just slam somebody else.

There are a number of other things that were wrong with the analysis of the short-term rental issues, which I won't go into, but please, please, please if you are going to do legal analysis, just say you are relying on advice of council from the city attorney -- of counsel from the city attorney's office.

Don't try to play lawyer, please.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 404.

Please press star six and unmute yourself.

>> Hello?

Hello?

>> Mayor Taylor: Hello.

>> Hello, this is Mark Crory, I'm just calling in to -- for a couple of reasons.

Number one, I would like to thank Jeff Hayner and Kathy Griswold for their speech today regarding the Palestine vote and the placing of this matter on the city council agenda.

I think it's something that had to be brought and it needed to be brought over the last approximately, almost 20 years, we had these issues come before city council through public commentary, and I think, you know, it's so much a part of the Ann Arbor city culture.

We talk about the interfaith council of peace and justice and so many different groups, the quakers and various groups to address these in their own private forums, their own religious forums because it has a religious dimension, because the area is tied to -- to freedom of religions.

I think it's very important it needs to be brought out and discussed.

I think it's -- it's a situation where a lot of people addressed this.

I would applaud the statement I saw by Kathy Griswold and the support of Jeff Hayner.

I think a forum needs to be created.

I think it's something that needs to be addressed because it's tied with so many other related issue regarding anti-Muslim bias, regarding other types of biases that we see in the city of Ann Arbor and throughout the country.

I believe that it's an issue whose time has come and it needs to be addressed through a community forum.

I support this.

This particular placing of this issue on the agenda was covered several periodicals including ever Arab American news which appeared to support the issue and it's on passing Americans with regard to some other people said about Rashida Tlaib.

I spoke to some people and said they were happy to see this addressed as it has been today and I wish to thank the council people would have endorsed this forum, and support and hopefully support it in the future.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 534.

>> Hello.

This is Tom Stulberg, again calling from lower town.

We're talking about rules and things that are right and wrong and I think we forget that there's many shades of right and wrong.

As many as there are shades of blue.

Sky blue, ocean blue, royal blue, navy blue, how many different shades of wrong are there?

Illegal, immoral, unethical, inappropriate, make a mistake, you are wrong if you make a small mistake.

You know, what are the shades of right and wrong that we're able to put into a system of rules?

Was Mitch McConnell right or wrong when he denied merit Garland, President Obama's nominee for a Supreme Court, when he denied a hearing for a year, saying that he didn't want to hold a hearing the last year of a presidency, and then at the end of Trump's administration, he rushed through a nominee.

To me, that doesn't seem right, but did he have the votes?

To me, in my heart, I felt it was wrong.

Perhaps.

We're talking about certain rights and wrongs without looking at the perspective that there's a whole spectrum of that.

Let's talk about some serious wrongs.

As many times as Mayor Taylor or Councilmember Grand or anybody else, or any other social media mignons want to say, to paraphrase Councilmember Grand, lower town, no matter how many times you claim it, was wrong.

The city lost millions of dollars of affordable housing funds.

The exact site plan that was approved could have been approved as a P.U.D., the site was master planned for P.U.D. and zoned for P.U.D. and that exact site plan undeniably, irrefutably could have been approved as a P.U.D.

You did not do that.

That was nearly \$9 million of affordable housing funds.

That is the different between doing it that way and in the highly convoluted way that was done.

You had to bend over backwards to break the rules and bend the rules, and do something.

I know there's lots of comments on social media how and why, nobody can ever deny the simple fact that had you approached the exact same site plan as the PUD, we would have \$9 million, nearly that in our affordable housing right now, in our fund or 93 units built on site.

Did you not.

You missed that opportunity.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> However want to phrase it in the spectrum of wrong, it was wrong.

>> This is Blaine Coleman.

This is -- this is Blaine Coleman.

This is an extraordinary evening.

Extraordinary in quite a bad way.

You have Linh Song somehow pretending that the Palestinian community is against the Palestinian rights resolution?

Come on!

And you have the sight of Ali Ramlawi, the most powerful Palestinian politician to have ever lived in Ann Arbor, coming under unbearable pressures to the point that he actually has to speak against a Palestinian rights resolution.

And you have Kathy Griswold, Councilmember Griswold first trying to withdraw and then deciding to table her own Palestinian rights resolution.

I can tell you that she promised Ms. Savabieasfahani to put a bill against military aid before Israel.

And I need to from Councilmember Griswold if you will put that word and put that resolution, that three-ed resolution against military hid to Israel, in front of the council in two weeks.

Is Councilmember Griswold going to keep her word?

And I think she can nod her head yes or no right now.

I can get my answer right now.

Yes, are you going to keep your word, Councilmember Griswold.

I'm looking at you now.

Are you going to keep your word?

Are you, councilmember who keeps her word?

Okay.

I think -- I can't get an answer from Councilmember Griswold.

And I'm sorry to see what happens to her and Councilmember Ramlawi tonight.

Very sorry.

The pressures must have been unbearable.

I'm done.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number 941, did you have a comment?

>> I do have a comment.

Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Hello.

Today 28 families in a neighborhood of East Jerusalem were forcibly removed from their homes, beaten, and their homes seized by apartheid state of Israel.

Look at yourselves.

Look at who you are.

Look at the claims you have to humanity.

And then know that anybody who looks at you just laughs at you.

You are weak.

You are racist to the bone.

I am furious and angry and I am trying to control my rage because why you tiptoe around the most simple resolution to cut off guns to an apartheid state, people are dying!

People are being shot in the face.

Children are languishing in Israeli jails.

Look at yourselves and recognize that you are a shameful bunch.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, there are no other callers with their hands up.

Caller with the phone number 684, do you have a comment?

>> He why, hi.

This is Eric Sturgis from Ann Arbor, Michigan, calling.

A few things.

I wanted to respond from a caller from California, Holland, I'm not sure where.

I'm glad he's letting us know how first ward residents feel.

He did say something interesting the other day where he said that Israel was an apartheid state.

I thought that was pretty interesting coming out of Mr. Spalding's mouth.

But what I really wanted to talk about was the unbecoming of a councilmember and I

find it interesting that the councilmembers who brought up unbecoming of a

councilmember, didn't feel that drunk driving and not disclosing drunk driving was

unbecoming of a councilmember.

Councilmember Eyer assigned motives to Councilmember Ramlawi and Hayner.

I wish she was so upset about the sexual harassment that she was the vice president, owner, depending on her literature, and who knows.

Ideally, she said she was a small business owner and then she hasn't, you know, I don't really know what she was.

So I wish we would see her outrage for the women who are sexually harassed by her lovely boss, Mr. Bucholz.

I also find it interesting that we can sit and allow councilmembers to continue to attack and then when point of order is called, nothing is said.

They are silent.

There's no whether it's correct, whether it's not correct.

And that's a lack of leadership and I find the double standard just outrageous.

I think Councilmember Song said something great.

It came from both side.

She should look at her side and tell her side to stop.

To stop the double standard.

All your side out.

Call out Councilmember Grand who, you know, tonight said, oh, I will not go there, and then she was great most of the meeting.

I figured she took her medication or something, and then at the end of the meeting, she blew up.

She attacked Councilmember Hayner, and then she went after Councilmember Ramlawi.

It's so disappointing that there isn't be a difficult discussion over policy differences and that a councilmember, a minority councilmember feels threatened to speak and feels that hostile work environment that our city administrator felt because he followed the law.

And a councilmember criticized him for following the law.

Let's look at the double standard.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 936, do you have a comment?

>> Hello, this is Zachary storey and, yeah, I don't know who Hayner is hearing from exactly but I will let you know a little bit of what I'm hearing about the community's response to his behavior.

I spent 10 to 20 hours already going around to ward one businesses, mostly downtown and Kerrytown and, you know, I what you can in and start chatting up the employees and, you know, sometimes the owner is there or the managers and I say hey, do you know what's going on in Ann Arbor city council right now.

I think this is a good time to pay attention, and, you know what -- and then I just have the two Michigan daily news articles that were about your behavior and I just show it to them and let them decide for themselves and let me tell you, a lot of customers and I'm making conversation in the store.

Usually the looks are just like, really negative about what you did and what you said in your follow-up and double down.

And this is a continuing story.

It will keep going because the recall has been committed.

It's been -- it's in the county office.

They are going to vote on it and see if it was factual.

And I lot of constituents -- like the Michigan daily deciding to write two articles about it, they served the community, I guess, but they also know what the students, their largest readership group wants to hear about and wants to keep informed about.

So, you know, students make up nearly half the population in the town and they are paying attention to it, and, you know, I will be going back to businesses this week and asking if they want to come out with the public statement about this ongoing saga, and a chance to stand up for the LGBTQ community and show this is unacceptable and you should not be in office.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 736, do you have a comment?

>> Good morning!

This is Trische Duckworth, I came on to talk to you all about maybe aligning with the marijuana social equity plan for the state of Michigan.

You know, ensuring that African Americans have a hand or are ushered into this industry, and you all have that power.

I came on to talk to you about ensuring that black and brown people can -- who are impacted by marijuana would, you know, get free licenses and get money -- get money for their businesses, and grant money for their business.

I came to tell you to support Huronview as the only black-owned dispensary in Ann Arbor.

I came to say all of these things be but my gosh.

That meeting was painful!

The last meeting that I was at was equally painful to the point where I could not even come to the next one.

Like, I just don't understand there's no rule that you all vote on that will fix your behavior.

The only thing that you can do is fix your hearts.

Fix your hearts!

Because if you fix your heart, you will be mindful of how you treat each other.

And how you treat each other is -- it's a representation of how the community treats each other.

You all are leaders and all you do is bicker back and forth.

What if you have a youth watching this for a class?

How embarrassing would this be?

For adults to just argue back and forth all night!

About rule about how to act.

I can't even speak what I wanted to speak about and I know you will cut me off in a minute.

We could sit and wait for you all night but when the timer goes off, you want us to be

buy ethic.

Model good behavior.

You want us to have great behavior.

We are asking you all to model the same.

Get out of your head and get into your hearts.

You will waste that \$25,000 for someone to coming.

Good night -- good morning, I mean.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 340, do you have a comment?

>> Yes.

Greetings, city council.

Lewis Vasquez from the first ward.

Um, I'm going to speak to you as the parent of a son who is married to a transgendered male, and I have a granddaughter through them.

Who referred to both of them as papa.

And, you know, all of this recent happenings around Mr. Hayner's use of the slur, which he chose to put into print in a post, has really led us as a family to feel really unsafe in Ann Arbor and feel in many ways threatened and I wish this behavior would change with Mr. Hayner.

It's really uncalled for trying to excuse it and others covering it up, and -- I mean, just come on, Jeff!

Abide by the rules.

This is your fault.

Take ownership of it.

You started this firestorm and it's up to you all in city council to put a stop to it.

And so I support the actions that you took with regard to the rules.

And trying to, you know, bring back some decorum to this council and I can't wait for August of 2022, when we can make further changes to council.

That's all I like to say.

Thank you all.

Have a good night.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 828, do you have a comment?

>> My name is Kathy Stracken.

I'm very glad that the healthy streets initiative was not passed and I say that because in terms of needing space for children to be outside, I don't think being in the streets is where children should be playing, and Ann Arbor has over 160 parks.

And most parks are within walking distance of people's residence.

So I think there's ample opportunity for families and children especially to be outside without being in the streets.

The other reason I feel that living in ward one streets like sunset and summit was added and Chapin, those are all major connector streets, and I think that the people who live in those streets, that get to vote on it, of course they are going to vote for it because they don't want traffic on their street!

It's like, great not having the street on their street, but when it's a major connector from main street or trying to get if Miller to Huron.

And Chapin is not a street you can go fast on.

That's traffic calmed by the condition that the road is in.

But I guess the main reason I'm glad is I'm hoping that the money that is not being spent on this will go to the payment of this required thing -- I can't remember when you presented the budget, Mr. Crawford two weeks ago, there was some payment we're supposed to be paying and we are not putting as much as we should.

I think we need to fund that.

That needs to be a priority.

Household budget, you know, you have food on the table and a roof over your head and utilities and things that are extra sometimes don't get done and I think we need to stick to paying for the things that are very important and required and that is something that I think is very important.

So I'm hoping that we will use the money from the healthy streets to go towards that.

I think something else to consider with the main street reduction -- I mean if that Vahalla goes through with 524 apartments or bedrooms or whatever, there will be a lot more traffic going on main street and I think it will cause major backups because there's a lot of traffic on that street than there was last year.

And I just hope you will consider the budget and really look at things that are not necessary, especially this year with a \$2 million deficit.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, there are no other callers on the line, who had their hands up. Caller with the phone number ending in 677, do you have a comment?

>> Hi, this is Michelle Hughes, and I would like to say that homophobic hate speech is unacceptable.

It's just as unacceptable in ward one as it is in Oakland or Holland or anywhere.

LGBTQ people have been everywhere for all of history and beyond and it's unacceptable to be using language that targets us and makes us feel unsafe and makes us feel unwelcomed to approach our government.

And I think if Jeff Hayner has been -- has only talked to people who approved of his hate speech that probably says more about the people than he was talking to, than anything else.

I'm sure there's a lot of LGBT people who do not feel comfortable approaching him to say that he -- that they are not -- that they are not comfortable with his homophobic hate speech.

Many people have called in to talk about that and he's just ignoring that in his analysis.

No one I talked to disapproved of my hate speech.

So yeah, it's just unacceptable, and it needs to stop.

In terms of policy, the big tragedy was not approving the healthy streets.

And I hope that one of you who voted on the prevailing side will have a change of heart at the next meeting and bring healthy streets back for reconsideration.

It's -- it's not just a good program that will be -- that will be helpful to a bunch of people, but it was also a very popular program, so I'm sure you will be hearing a lot from -- from

us bicycle and pedestrian advocates in the coming days.

And I hope one of you will have a change of heart there and I hope that you will have a change of council for many reason as soon as possible.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: There are no other callers on the line with their hands up.

I believe most of them have already spoken.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there anyone else who would like to speak at public comment?

Seeing no one, public comment is closed.

Communication from council.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: This is probably our third our fourth meeting since we adopted the new council rules, it's 1:00 in the morning.

It does take time to listen and do the business of the people, and it does extend until the wee hours of the morning.

So I would just like to make a note that it was not because of the lack of the rules that we currently have.

Secondly, when we talk about reaching across and working with each other, I spent two hours on c1, on Sunday and Monday, reaching out to my colleagues.

Tonight, not one of them thanked me.

Not one of them.

Thanked me for calling them and giving them my input and my experience on c-1.

No recognition.

Zero.

That leads me to this double standard that's been being brought up by many members of the community.

It is obvious there's a double standard.

I filed a complaint against the mayor, for his comments that he made about MLive, about them being beneath contempt.

Guess where that went.

Nowhere.

Just when I asked for a point of order.

Guess where that goes.

Nowhere.

Don't worry.

I was born a Palestinian.

I'm used to being a second-class citizen.

I used to being a second-class councilmember now.

Ann Arbor is not inclusive.

It's very exclusive.

And very elitist.

And the actions of this council has taken is just reaffirming the beliefs of many, because I don't -- I'm not treated as an equal.

I don't feel like an equal.

In fact, when I try to get the error of resolution, the proclamation that was giving last

meet, I had to repeatedly ask the mayor to put that on the agenda.

And only after repeated attempts was this then granted.

We are second-class citizens.

Don't fool anybody.

Guess what, Ann Arbor, many of us have not arrived.

I'm disgusted.

I'm disappointed and I'm disgusted and I won't be silenced.

I'm sorry.

I get treated as a second-class citizen.

>> Mayor Taylor: You are at your time.

Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: So I could not help thinking about the architects of our constitution during this public comment period.

And they made this wonderful distinction between a delegate and a representative.

And there was a suggestion during this public comment period that I have to admit really made me the bristle.

If we do not introduce made to order resolutions we are failing in our duties.

And I have to say that it gets it exactly backwards.

We are not delegates.

We are representatives and we are obligated to consider requests in light of the good of the community, talk about them with our colleagues, confer with staff over their feasibility and cost.

So for anyone to suggest that anyone on this council would doesn't do exactly what they ask for, when they ask for it, is not fulfilling their duty, just don't understand what we are about.

End of political science professor's remarks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I would like to start out by saying Councilmember Ramlawi, I have the utmost respect for the effort you put into this body.

I want you to know that you are not only my equal.

You are above equal.

I look up to you.

Your success as a business, as a American.

There's no question in your integrity as far as I'm concerned and I'm sorry you feel that way and I'm sorry if I have done anything to add to that.

You know, I have had people going around bad mouthing me and lying about me to ward one residents and businesses since before I was elected.

Some people like me, some people don't like.

Not everyone has to like me.

I do the best I can do when in I'm here and I pay attention to what is going on and Shepherd the things I know the most about and I try to learn and make good decisions on the things I know the least about.

And, you know, it's really something to hear people call in and pretend to know me and suggest I only talk to people -- you think I only talk to people who are happy with what I said.

That's not what I said.

Don't go off on Twitter lying about me.

I talk to all kinds of people about the words I used but the suggestion that I'm constantly reusing these words and creating a space of hate and fear in this community is preposterous.

I'm not a homophobe and I'm not a bigot and one of our callers had an interesting analogy and I wish I had gone around the block, but I was working two shifts this week, to see the event that they had on state street because it sounds like a good time.

And he said we should all take a walk in high-heeled shoes to see how they live.

I probably took a walk in high-heeled shoes before he was born because I have been up to here in the drag scene installation I was -- since -- I'm older than you might think.

Since I was 18 in 1980 something.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember.

And, so, you know, I reject the notion that I'm a homophobe.

Just get it out of your political system.

I absolutely am not.

Absolutely not.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

I will address a couple of things we heard in public comment.

One was a comment from Mr. Sturgis who suggested I was on my meds.

That's insulting to people who have significant health issues and while his statement was inaccurate about me because I am fortunate to not have to take them, I think that was -- that's the fact that he used that as an insult, is disconcerting to me and I'm sorry if that was hurtful of to anyone.

I didn't want to be in the middle of it.

There are things that I think people have just kind of -- you know, honestly coddled some councilmembers for way too long.

I sat in 2018, and specifically Councilmember Ramlawi come in and talk about the new council majority and how we better get in line.

And, you know, which we liked it or not.

And it's on video.

So, you know, you want to know why I didn't reach out -- it's because I think the behavior towards me has been gendered and bullying and also I was concerned about a conflict of interest because I thought that this resolution could potentially offer financial gain or not.

So I didn't reach out for those reasons.

Also, our meetings are long because certain councilmembers talk more than others.

It's not because of the rules.

You are right about that.

The rules were trying to help it.

But if we were to time who talks more, I'm sure I'm in the middle somewhere.

I will take responsibility for that.

But I'm nowhere near who is dragging out these meetings.

And so don't go blaming this group of people who talks a lot less than you do for trying

to come one some rules to contain it.

But if we have a consultant would looks at speaking time, I know how that will turn out. So that's -- I'm sorry to be doing this so late at night.

But I'm not scared of all of those men would call in and try to bully us.

>> Mayor Taylor: Council member.

>> Councilmember Grand: I'm not scared of anyone here.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I want to thank our legal staff, both internal lawyers and external, for all of the work they did preparing for the hearing this morning.

I see attorney Postema's light came on.

So good!

I'm just say thank you.

Thank you.

I'm still on a high regarding the hearing today.

I also want to thank Lily Gooding who was a student and wrote her first article about the Gelman plume and judge Connor actually questioned her.

I think she was very surprised to be asked a question so early in the morning for a u of m student.

Card meeting is tomorrow at 10 a.m.

If you need a link, send me an email.

I think it will be a real positive experience.

The last thing is the county now has a Twitter account, and I think it would be really great if the city could have one so that we don't have to rely on a2council to get our news out.

So anyway, something to think about.

Lastly, no, we won't be having a resolution in two weeks because that's our budget session, but I will continue working a Palestinian forum.

I realize it's a difficult conversation, but I am committed to continuing it.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: One of the things that was brought up this evening that maybe we -- it was around our meeting lengths and I do agree that while I don't want to suggest that we revisit rules any time soon, but perhaps we can keep an eye on them.

And look at the language around strive to end the meeting at 11:00.

I think I mentioned before to this body that my father used to be the reporter would covered Burlington news and political news and so the council meetings ended at 11:00 and they had to vote to continue.

I think we could have of moved things to a future agenda.

And we would not disrupt nick in the policy work.

So maybe in a few months or six months we can revisit this and see how it's working because I thank staff for staying awake until this time and listening to -- listening to the squabbling.

I hope that we can strive to treat each other a little more gently in the future.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: I will be really brief because Councilmember Briggs

mentioned a couple of things that I was going to expire many.
We had some long public hearings and obviously those are things we didn't have control over and things we shouldn't necessarily seek to be shutting down but I think there are other things -- the city of Ypsilanti has a similar process where past a certain point, council has to grant itself more time to continue the meeting.

I wanted to call attention to the fact that I think we had a really respectful discussion tonight interestingly on the resolution whether we needed some professional development and services to hold ourselves to a higher standard.

And then unfortunately very quickly after that we got into some more contentious things and the night was going on and it got more heated and more personal and I guess I would challenge myself and my colleagues to reflect back on that conversation that you had and the intentions that you had in that and conducting ourselves through all of our conversations.

You know, Councilmember Ramlawi, for my part, I'm sorry if you feel that I didn't appreciate our conversation.

We speak frequently.

I don't always thank people publicly.

I do talk to a lot of you about different issues we are working on.

I appreciate those conversations outside of the council meeting, even if I don't specifically call it out at this table.

But I -- I hope that we can all continue to try to think about the way we conducted ourselves during that debate that I thought might get contentious tonight, and carry that through to our other conversations as well.

I agree, it got really nasty tonight and I think unnecessarily a few times.

So thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further communications?

I will say briefly.

That I was reluctant to put the celebration of African American heritage month on the agenda and nothing could be farther from the truth.

The a representative of Arab American foundation reached out to me, at 7:26 p.m. requesting the proclamation.

I wrote back to her at 7:43 that night indicating how delighted I was to do that.

Councilmember Ramlawi wrote to me -- I should say too proclamations tend to come from community members.

That's generally how they are written.

And Councilmember Ramlawi wrote to me on the 31st indicating that he wished to have such a thing up and running.

I responded to him that very day, following up on your email, please see my communication regarding 2021 proclamation.

I was anticipating including it on March 19, prior to the 25th Zoom for the Arab American foundation, but if you would like it accelerated I can ask Christine to work with the residents to have it ready for the 5th assuming the resident is available.

That all said if this is out of key, please let me know and we'll find something that works for everyone.

That is from March 31st.

Sometimes it takes a while to get things on the agenda but it was on time and there had been communications with respect to it.

Councilmember Song?

>> Councilmember Song: I will go ahead and forward along a PowerPoint presentation that was presented to the school board on the Arab American -- Arab American heritage month.

Rema is the sister-in-law of the person who asked for the proclamation.

She encouraged me to share it with folks would are curious about Arab American history, culture and identity.

So if our children can learn this, hopefully we will too.

I will go ahead and forward that along tonight -- today, this morning.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further communication from council?

A motion adjourn, please.

May I have a motion to adjourn.

Moved by grand and seconded by eyer.

Discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

We are adjourned.