

1. Sustainability Commission Agenda

Documents:

[SUSTAINABILITY_AGENDA_2018-01-08.PDF](#)

2. Sustainability Commission Meeting Packet

Documents:

[MEETING_PACKET_2018-01-08.PDF](#)

**CITY OF YPSILANTI
SUSTAINABILITY COMMISSION MEETING
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS – ONE SOUTH HURON ST
MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 2018
7:00 P.M.**

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Keith Michalowski	P	A	Thomas Kovacs	P	A
Emily Drennen	P	A	Nancy Heine	P	A
Natalie Sampson	P	A	Thomas McKee	P	A
Brett Zeuner	P	A	Julia Bayha	P	A

III. AGENDA APPROVAL

IV. PRESENTATIONS

V. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Approval of minutes of November 7 and December 5, 2017
- B. Approval of 2018 Sustainability Commission regular meeting schedule

VII. RESOLUTIONS/MOTIONS/DISCUSSIONS

- A. Community benefits staff response discussion - Solar Energy
- B. Community benefits surveys proposal (McKee)
- C. 220 N. Park Developers Agreement discussion

VIII. LIAISON REPORTS

- A. Sustainability Plan subcommittee (Kovacs)
- B. MGC Challenge subcommittee (McKee)
- C. Outreach subcommittee (Michalowski)
- D. STAR update (Drennen)
- E. NOAA climate resilience program update (Sampson)

IX. COMMUNICATIONS

- A. Citizen Committee on Housing Affordability & Accessibility discussion
- B. Report on recycling program (Heine)
- C. Report on Peninsular Dam (Zeuner)
- D. Discussion on new commission members
- E. Report on bike share program (McClary)
- F. Report on Sun Shot Challenge grant (Drennen)

X. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

XI. PROPOSED BUSINESS

XII. NEXT MEETING DATE

Monday, February 12th, 2018

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

**CITY OF YPSILANTI
SUSTAINABILITY COMMISSION MEETING
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS – ONE SOUTH HURON ST
MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 2018
7:00 P.M.**

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Keith Michalowski	P	A	Thomas Kovacs	P	A
Emily Drennen	P	A	Nancy Heine	P	A
Natalie Sampson	P	A	Thomas McKee	P	A
Brett Zeuner	P	A	Julia Bayha	P	A

III. AGENDA APPROVAL

IV. PRESENTATIONS

V. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Approval of minutes of November 7 and December 5, 2017
- B. Approval of 2018 Sustainability Commission regular meeting schedule

VII. RESOLUTIONS/MOTIONS/DISCUSSIONS

- A. Community benefits staff response discussion - Solar Energy
- B. Community benefits surveys proposal (McKee)
- C. 220 N. Park Developers Agreement discussion

VIII. LIAISON REPORTS

- A. Sustainability Plan subcommittee (Kovacs)
- B. MGC Challenge subcommittee (McKee)
- C. Outreach subcommittee (Michalowski)
- D. STAR update (Drennen)
- E. NOAA climate resilience program update (Sampson)

IX. COMMUNICATIONS

- A. Citizen Committee on Housing Affordability & Accessibility discussion
- B. Report on recycling program (Heine)
- C. Report on Peninsular Dam (Zeuner)
- D. Discussion on new commission members
- E. Report on bike share program (McClary)
- F. Report on Sun Shot Challenge grant (Drennen)

X. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

XI. PROPOSED BUSINESS

XII. NEXT MEETING DATE

Monday, February 12th, 2018

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting Minutes

City of Ypsilanti
Sustainability Commission
Regular Meeting
SPARK East - 215 W Michigan
Ypsilanti, MI 48197
Monday, November 6, 2017, 7:00 P.M.

I. **CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m.

II. **ROLL CALL:**

Commissioner Emily Drennen	Present
Commissioner Nancy Heine	Present
Commissioner Natalie Sampson	Absent
Commissioner Thomas McKee	Absent
Commissioner Leah Vanlandingham	Absent
Commissioner Brett Zeuner	Present
Commissioner Julia Bayha	Present
Commissioner Keith Michalowski	Absent
Commissioner Thomas Kovacs	Present
City Manager McClary McClary	Present
City Council Member Beth Bashert	Present
Commission Secretary Seth Torkelson-Regan	Present

III. **AGENDA APPROVAL and APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS TWO MEETING MINUTES:**
Approved. Offered by Commissioner Drennen; seconded by Commissioner Bayha.
Voice vote

IV. **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION/COMMISSION RESPONSE:** None

V. **PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS:** None

VI. **ACTIVE BUSINESS**

A. Sustainability Plan subcommittee update

Kovacs: Stated that the subcommittee met on the third Monday in Oct. Eight people present, including Drennen. Laid out outline of sustainability plan. Started with intro, talking about methodology and process. Talked extensively about methodology, particularly the measurables of how we evaluate sustainability. Talked about STAR rating system, something municipalities

have available to them. There is a process that goes into measuring and documenting sustainability, which costs \$1500. We will look into STAR rating system. Biggest concern is cost.

McClary: Added that the STAR is a leading program for measuring community sustainability. The framework would be valuable to this commission by consolidating everything into one framework. Was impressed by a presentation on the program in San Antonio. The process involves the community becoming certified in different sustainability areas. It could be invaluable for this commission and will help take lots of the guess work out of this work.

Kovacs. Stated that he agrees, but concern is the cost.

McClary: Stated that if commission decides they want it, he will recommend it be purchased to City Council.

Bayha: Asked if the city could afford the STAR program.

McClary: Responded that \$1500 is not too large of an expense to get the SC started in this work.

Bayha: Asked if there would be some benefit to the technical document.

Kovacs: Responded that the document would come with the program. Additionally, he has worked with a program called STARS (at EMU) that is identical in purpose, but not content. It makes much of the work of the SC much easier because it is all laid out, leaving only the assessments to be done. Check out American Association for Higher Education. A similar program for municipalities is starcommunities.org. Stated he would share the higher ed program to the commission.

Drennen: Added that in her day job at Ann Arbor they do the STAR program. It took a year to complete. She contacted them to ask how smaller municipalities could adapt to it. I talked to Michalowski about giving a presentation about the program here. If anyone would like to work on this presentation with her, that be great.

Zeuner: Responded that he would work with Drennen on it, and they could do so at the Sustainability Plan sub-committee.

Bashert: Stated that if the SC wants to request money from council for the STAR program, she suggests the subcommittee do a presentation at a SC meeting with recommendations, followed by a request to city council for it to be considered and voted on at the next council meeting.

Zeuner: Added that the subcommittee can send out the presentation before the SC meeting so they can be aware of it before seeing the presentation for the first time.

Kovacs: Stated that the next subcommittee meeting date is Monday Nov 20, 6:30pm, Ypsi downtown library.

- B. MGC Challenge subcommittee update: No updates
- C. Outreach subcommittee updates: No updates
- D. Volunteer opportunities for the Commission update: No updates
- E. City of Ypsilanti recycling planning update and discussion

Heine: Stated that the presenter is booked for next meeting. Added no follow up in terms of recycling for Ypsi. Contact person for this topic is Stan Kirton of Public Works, skirton@cityofypsilanti.com

Bayha: Stated that she heard from Commissioner Michalowski that there would be a tour of the Ann Arbor Recycling Center, but never heard from anyone else. Also, heard from Michalowski that Ypsi City will need new recycling drop off location.

Bashert: Responded that Economic Development is working on that.

Bayha: Asked if anyone knows if the empty Ford Plant parking lot would be an option.

McClary: Responded that it is owned by another company and that working with them is a struggle, and they have other interests in that property for economic projects. Doesn't believe they would consider allowing city to use part of property. They have people interested in leasing parts of facilities. Stan and Beth are looking at all possibilities, which are limited. The Ann Arbor and Chelsea facilities are setting up tours for their materials handling facilities. If anyone's interested in touring, he can get them info.

F. Peninsular Dam update and discussion

Bashert: Stated that a group has come together including the city of Ypsi, residents of up river who have joined Friends of Pen Park, and two of the nearby townships to draft a scope of work. Now it has gone from \$40,000 estimate to \$68,000, and now has gone up to \$100,000. At next council meeting there will be discussion of how to find money for the project

McClarey: Added that there was talk about splitting costs 50/50 between Ypsilanti and other members of group.

Bashert: Stated that Friends of Pen Park include many people with houses on river. The money is for the study of the effects of removing the dam, including bridge, impacts on the sediment and water upriver, and estimated costs of the dam removal.

McClary: Add that for this study the data will present general cost estimates.

Kovacs: Asked if by soil, this refers to sediment behind the dam. Asked if there is a study regarding how sediment will change downriver.

McClary: Responded that the study will include types of sediments, speed of water flow, and how sediments would be carried downriver after the dam removal.

Bashert: Added that the dam is not removed in one piece so that the flow of the river does not change. That is why there will be minimal disruption downriver. Biggest disruption will be around the dam.

Zeuner: Asked if Huron Watershed Council is conducting the test.

Bashert: Responded that they are helping and an engineering firm is primarily doing the study.

Zeuner: Stated that UM pays School of Natural Resources and the Environment students to participate with projects. If students are interested in dams, they could help with no cost to city or firm. This could help with cost of study.

Bashert: Responded that because of time of year, this will most likely have to wait to spring, and takes a bit of time to do study. Suggested students hook up with Huron River Watershed Council.

Bayha: Asked about the participation of committee with this project.

Bashert: Responded she is not sure what the role of this commission is yet. However, for the role of sub-committees, this project is important. Bashert: The vision for the dam project includes the rehab at Pen Park, including taking out invasives and developing the historic building. To see

Bayha: Asked that Bashert and others involved in the project remember that the commission could lead volunteer work around sustainability, and could be at Pen Park as a presence.

Kovacs: Stated dams are a sustainability issue, and removing dams is different story than putting dams in. The study is an important step for this issue.

Zeuner: Added that he doesn't think the city can proceed without the study.

Bashert: Added that it is an issue of liability, and the study will help us understand that.

McClary: Stated that according to the DEQ, funding can be used for removal and restoration of dam.

Bayha: Asked what the point of the dam is if it is not used.

McClary: Responded that an expert on hydroelectric power has been in touch with companies that would be interested in reestablishing hydroelectric power at that facility. It comes down to a price point with state public servant.

Kovacs: Asked if the study also is looking at rehabilitation of the dam.

McClary: This study looks at the feasibility of removal, and subsequent impact on adjacent property lines and environmental and economic costs of removal. Study looks at alternatives to the 2014 study. The study will help Council determine which option looks more attractive. We don't know which option will be best, but this study is one step in that process.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Interest in attending the Housing and Affordability Joint Meeting with the Planning and Human Relations Commissions, scheduled for Monday Nov. 13th at 7pm

Zeuner: Stated that the purpose of the meeting is to discuss the formation of Citizen Advisory Committee that Planning Commission wants to facilitate. Having all three commissions there will help contribute to that conversation.

Bashert: Encouraged the Sustainability Commission to participate in the joint meeting because the actions that result from it will influence the Master Plan.

- B. Discussion on appropriate usage of council/staff advisor resources by Commission, proper procedure for getting a subject onto the council agenda, and ways to improve the proposal process

Kovacs: Stated he was surprised with how proposals that the Commission had made to the City Council were then presented during the following City Council meeting. Asked what the best procedure may be for the Commission to make recommendations and proposals for Council.

Zeuner: Stated that he thought the request for the city to extend the deadline would be considered a resolution at the City Council meeting, but it was nowhere on the agenda, and he thought the ideas for sustainable development would be considered as a recommendation to discuss, but not a formal resolution.

Bashert: Responding to Zeuner, the reason the first request (deadline extension) was not on the agenda was because it was in contradiction to the contract signed by the city. Stated that when a commissioner wants to extend a resolution to Council or perform a similar action, they should have language drafted before coming to the commission meeting at which they present their proposal, rather than drafting language during meeting. Resolution language should appear roughly as follows: "Whereas the City of Ypsilanti... Therefore, now be it resolved that etc. action take place..." Lastly, stated that during the trip to China, the staff and mayor Pro Tem learned that a crucial member of the IV development team needed to be recruited. Additionally,

there will be two series of working open meetings about the International Village, and so the timeline to have these meetings requires the City Council to negotiation of the International Village deadline.

Kovacs: Asked what is the more acceptable way for the Commission to refute some action or agenda item by Council, such as the contract deadline extension, in this case.

McClary: Responded that the best way is to have the Commission Chair send a letter to McClary's office stating the proposal of the Commission. This will get the item on the Council's agenda, except in situations where he (McClary) does not feel it's appropriate to be on the agenda. His office will need a proposal for city council in appropriate language at least one week before the Council meeting.

Kovacs: Responded to McClary that this issue (regarding the deadline) was not a resolution, but a recommendation.

McClary: Responded to Kovacs that everything is either a resolution or ordinance.

Bashert: Added that softer language on the Commission's recommendation would have more likely made it on to the City Council's agenda, such as *We propose that Council considers or discusses...*

McClary: Added that the Council is bound by the terms of the purchase agreement, so the City Council cannot take action that is contrast to what they agreed to follow.

Kovacs: Stated, again, his confusion about why the Commission's recommendation was not put on the Council's agenda.

Zeuner: Responded to Kovacs that he thinks the Commission recommending a resolution to Council does not guarantee it will be on Council's agenda.

McClary: Responded to Kovacs that if a resolution is sent to his office, it will be on the Council's agenda. The thing is, his recommendation to the Council in this case would have been to deny the Commission's request because Council was and is not yet at the point in this process to make a decision to delay. As the Council moves through this process, it becomes more and more clear that it will need to request an extension. He is not sure that at the time of the proposed deadline extension by the Commission, the Council was at that point of knowing whether or not a deadline extension was appropriate. The City has a process it has to go through according to the purchase agreement. Again, however, if a formal request is sent to his office to put a resolution on Council's agenda, he will put it on the agenda, with his recommendation.

Bashert: Added that the Commission would need two Council sponsors to get a proposal or recommendation on the Council's agenda. Commissioners can approach Council members and ask them to sponsor. Then the Council can vote on the proposal. If, in the future, you are critical of something done by Council, you can send a statement to the Council not requiring any action, but simply stating the Commission's disagreement with the Council.

Kovacs: Asked how can the Commission use the city staff to craft resolutions more properly.

McClary: Responded that it is important to work through the Commission chair. Added that he and his office can communicate with the chair to change or clarify any language of motions if needed. He will also communicate if he feels a recommendation is not appropriate for the Council's agenda. It is important though that a formal request is submitted (as a letter) to his office for McClary to help the Commission. If he had received a formal letter to his office, he would have most likely put the Commission's request for a deadline extension on the agenda, but would have added that he does not recommend the City Council adhere to the request because of the contradictions to the purchase agreement. Part of the issue was an oversight on his part because he did not contact the Commission Chair, who did not then contact the Commissioners, about that specific motion. If he had, though, the result would have likely been the same, except the Commissioners would have been less surprised by the outcome.

Kovacs: Stated that he now understands how to make sure the Commission's opinions and recommendations are heard by Council.

McClary: Added that he is more than happy to work with the Chair to make the Commission's goals a reality.

Zeuner: Asked if it would be helpful to put draft resolution language on Commission meeting agendas so that the the language can be revised during Commission meetings. Asked when he needs resolution language for the Commission's packet.

Bashert: Responded that a week before would be appropriate, so Keith can get it in the packet.

C. Recommendations for a partnership between EMU and the city of Ypsilanti for a bike share program

Kovacs: [Presented a powerpoint presentation on a potential bike share program in Ypsilanti. See meeting packet for November 6, 2017 meeting.]

Kovacs: [When presentation was over] Stated that one of the problems with bike share problem is there is no requirement for helmets.

Drennen: Responded that people tend to use helmets when using bike share bikes.

Bayha: Added that if you encode it that riders have to wear helmets, we will see a significant drop in participation. The city could bring in some type of waiver/agreement that riders have to sign regarding liability. This would work more easily with the university, but maybe not with the city.

McClary: Responded that this depends on how the contract is set up. He assumes that the developers could build into the app a hold harmless agreement that users would be required to click in order to use.

Zeuner: Added that the company assumes the liability. There is no way that all these cities with these bike share programs have made liability agreements.

McClary: Stated that as long as the use of services complies with the city's ordinances, this should be okay. The city attorney would have to review it, but it's like any other service provided for the community. The city could work with the university. He would love to see a service like this in the community.

Bayha: Stated that many commuters would like this, and many people might like to use a bike who cannot own a bike.

Bashert: Stated it would be valuable to have the university and the city at the table in order to ensure a volume of bikes that the company will want.

McClary: Asks if there is a representative who could give a presentation.

Kovacs: Added that one of the issues is where people put the bikes. Not all companies recommend how to do this.

Zeuner: Asked if the Commission could table this till next meeting and bring comparisons between the companies.

Heine: Added that this is just brainstorming about the idea, not a formal recommendation.

Kovacs: Stated EMU wants the company to demo the bikes for the Commission. Tomorrow at 11:30, Spin Bike will demo their bikes, and at 12:30 LimeBike will demo the bikes. Outside Boone Hall, off of Cross St. Reps of the bike share program will be there.

Zeuner: Requested Kovacs to ask the reps at the bike demo if there are any means for residents without smart phone access to use the bike share.

Bayha: Requested Kovacs to ask the reps how open they (their companies) are to allowing off campus residents to use the bike share program as well.

Bashert: Requested Kovacs to give the two companies' contact information to City Manager McClary.

D. Community Benefits Ordinance recommendations to council update and discussion on how to proceed

Bashert: Stated this topic is in relation to the agenda item that went in the form of a resolution to City Council. It is being reviewed by Mr. Barr, the City Council's lawyers, and will come back to City Council and this Commission for feedback.

Zeuner: Stated some citizens trying to mobilize the CBO are now trying to communicate with Dushane for feedback on how to move forward. From outside perspective, there may be no need to hire someone because the city is curious about a CBO. Dushane is helping us understand what Detroit has done with their CBO. For clarification, a CBO would set different criteria to be met by developers in the city.

Bashert: Stated that so much of what we can do at the city level is regulated by federal/state/county ordinances. The only areas the Commission and City Council can have impact are when it is a piece of property owned by the city that is under development [Zeuner: or when there are tax incentives offered to the developer]. CBOs are cutting edge. CBAs (Community Benefits Agreement with individual developments) are more common and have a history of successes and failures. Now the city is looking at what is possible and what is practical. Detroit has a CBO, but Detroit is not necessarily a valid comparison to Ypsilanti. The list that was sent to Mr. Bar will come back with lots of feedback from him. This will help the learning curve of the Commission because the Commission can know its limitations and know how to work with those limitations. Once the feedback is received from Mr. Barr, she suggests that the Commission take two or three pieces of Mr. Barr's feedback, discuss it at a meeting, then share feedback with City Council in the form of resolutions related to the CBO. This can continue as long as the Commission wishes.

Kovacs: Stated that his original proposals for development requirements in the city were not to be limited to a CBO, CBA or International Village.

Zeuner: Responded to Kovacs that a CBO is an enforcement mechanism for those demands.

Kovacs: Responded to Zeuner that a CBO is not the only mechanism.

McClary: Agreed with Kovacs that he did not see his list of proposals as related to a CBO.

Bashert: Interjected that she apologizes about that.

Kovacs: Stated he would like his list of proposals to be separate from the CBO discussion.

McClary: Responded that many of Kovacs' points on his list do relate to a CBO.

Kovacs: Responded that he agrees and that has clarified his confusion about this topic. Added that the other point he wanted to make was that a CBO and CBA only apply to city owned properties.

McClary: Stated that from an admin standpoint, his office is working on Kovacs' list of recommendations not as a CBO recommendation, but as a recommendation for all development, whether through zoning or through other means.

Kovacs: Responded yes, that is how he meant it.

McClary: Stated that is the way his office will give recommendations back, with this framework in mind. He anticipates that the list comes back to the Commission for further discussion and clarification. Added that his office is working on a CBO.

Bashert: Stated that this conversation is directly related to discussion item A, the Sustainability Plan Subcommittee.

Kovacs: Yes, that is where this topic came from. The reason the CBO idea came from there is that they believed there would be a long time before the city had a plan, so the subcommittee wanted something to start with, especially since the Commission knew there would be a lot of development coming to Ypsilanti.

Bashert: Asked if the Commission will have feedback from city staff in time to have the meeting next Monday.

McClary: Responded yes.

Kovacs: Added that he would like to argue the lawyer's points regarding the list of proposals.

McClary: Responded that he has to have the lawyer's feedback before it can be argued. Added that feedback will be coming on the 14th.

VIII. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION/COMMISSION RESPONSE

Pete Murdock: Stated that regarding the Peninsular Dam, it was obtained in the 1980's and the intention was always to reestablish it as a hydroelectric power generator. However, the city could never make the numbers work well enough. Since the city has gone through this process of deciding what to do, he has asked another city councilmember to research new laws and technology might make hydroelectric power more feasible. The dam has a thirteen foot head, and could generate 1.3 million kilowatts annually. It's not the Hoover Dam, but it could generate some power.

McClary: Responded by thanking Council Member Murdock for his work on this project.

IX. PROPOSED BUSINESS (FOR NEXT MEETING)

A. Discussion of renters' rights when viewing homes and apartments.

Zeuner: Shared that he has learned about cities that entitle buyers and renters to see prior 12 months energy bills for any home or apartment they are considering renting. He would like to propose bringing a resolution or updates on a proposal to city council that mandates all rentals provide upon request energy bills to potential renters. He has talked with Rachel Eubanks (public service manager in Lansing) and DTE reps about this.

McClary: Asked how can landlords access that info.

Zeuner: Responded that landlords still have the properties and can get access to their properties' energy bills.

Drennen: Added that Ann Arbor has a similar law on the books. The landlord data portal issues are complex. The city of Ann Arbor has been trying to get DTE to participate in landlord portal issues, but DTE has no interest in participating in state or national conversations on this topic.

Zeuner: Responded to Drennen that the next step is to get the public service commission to force DTE to do so.

Drennen: Suggested to Zeuner that he talk to her coworker.

Zeuner: Responded that this would be good. Added that this is why he has talked with the public service commission because they control DTE.

McClary: Asked Zeuner if the public service commission has already established rules requiring utilities to share information, or if this is something that he wants to work on.

Zeuner: Responded that he wants to work on this topic.

Bayha: Asked if this exists in other places.

Zeuner: Responded to Bayha that yes, it does.

Bashart: Responded to Zeuner that she thinks Drennen was saying these laws are not effective.

Zeuner: Responded to Bashart that yes this is true, but then it takes more advocacy and work by the city to hold renters accountable. Additionally, renters need to know that such laws and rights exist for them. Making the law is the first step, and then it takes education, advocacy and outreach.

McClary: Asked if the Commission could receive a copy of Ann Arbor's ordinance on this topic. He did not know and is still not sure how municipalities could control public utilities.

B. Resignation of a Commissioner

Kovacs: Stated there is a Commissioner that is resigning.

McClary: Added that she needs to submit a letter of resignation to the City Clerk.

Kovacs: Stated he can let her know that she needs to do that.

C. Open Commission seat for youth

Bashert: Reminded that Commission that it has an open seat for youth. Added that there is no one retired on this Commission, which is a valuable asset.

X. NEXT MEETING DATE: Monday, December 4, 2017

XI. ADJOURNMENT: 9:41 p.m. Offered by Commissioner Zeuner; seconded by Commissioner Heine

Meeting Minutes

City of Ypsilanti
Sustainability Commission
Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers
1 S Huron St.
Ypsilanti, MI 48197
Monday, December 4, 2017, 7:00 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER: 7:03pm

II. ROLL CALL:

Sustainability Commission:

Commissioner Emily Drennen	Present
Commissioner Nancy Heine	Present
Commissioner Natalie Sampson	Present
Commissioner Thomas McKee	Present
Commissioner Brett Zeuner	Present
Commissioner Julia Bayha	Absent
Commissioner Keith Michalowski	Present
Commissioner Thomas Kovacs	Present

Staff:

Council Member Beth Bashert	Present
City Manager Darwin McClary	Present
Commission Secretary Seth Torkelson-Regan	Present

III. CONSENT OF AGENDA

A. Approval of Agenda

Drennen (second Zeuner) moved to approve the agenda. Unanimous approval. Motion carries.

B. Approval of Minutes

Zeuner (second McKee) moved to postpone approval of minutes for the November meeting until January meeting, after amendments have been made. Unanimous approval. Motion carries.

IV. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION/COMMISSION RESPONSE:

Erica Mooney, Ypsilanti: Thanked commission for their work. Advocated for the SC to be cohesive with the work of other commissions. Voiced support for citizen committee on affordability and accessibility and updates to Master Plan. Stated she will continue to support a sustainability action plan. Stated the CBO process is confusing regarding public participation and understanding. Wants the ideal recommendations for the sustainability action plan from the SC shared sooner than later.

Amber Fellows, Ypsilanti: Stated her support of the resolution passed to City Council (discussed in the previous meeting). Stated that she would like the City Manager's statement regarding why the resolution was not recommended to Council to be placed into the previous meeting's minutes.

V. PROCLAMATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

A. Recycling presentation - April Baranek, Washtenaw County Energy Coordinator, Office of Infrastructure Management

[Below are the main points of the presentation. The full PowerPoint can be found on pages 14-29 of the Sustainability Commission agenda packet from the December 12th meeting, posted on the Sustainability Commission's page of the Ypsilanti city website.]

- Purpose of the presentation was to discuss the recycling program implemented by Washtenaw County
- Washtenaw CO has approximately 1200 employees, generating roughly 4800 pounds of trash each day.
- Benefits of recycling include: energy and resource saving, reduction of consumption and pollution, and job creation.
- Suggestions for how to implement smarter recycling programs: 1) waste audit; 2) purchasing policy that is environmentally friendly; 3) change the waste culture in the building; 4) communicate "why"; 5) work with your vendor; 6) standardize collection receptacles, centralize bin location, and eliminate desk-side bins
- Identify "single stream" recycling from bins that take other non-single stream recyclables
- Look for ways to reduce trash, including: avoid disposable items; purchase products with minimal packaging; and donate or sell used or unwanted items
- Recycle Ann Arbor is located at 2950 East Ellsworth, Ann Arbor. There are other recycling drop off locations in western Ann Arbor

Heine: Asked if county subscribes to consumer rate, instead of DTE rate, for natural gas.

Baranek: Responded that Michigan is one of few states that has a choice natural gas program. You have to buy gas through a choice provider if you want to get on a transportation program, such as a contiguous campus, like hers. Because of this, her department pays a cheaper rate. However, such programs are not regulated by the Michigan Public Service Program, meaning they can change the rates more frequently and drastically. If you get into a program like that,

you definitely want to lock in gas rates. Her department has saved over \$8600 in cash through this program.

Zeuner: Asked what is the closest recycling drop off to Ypsilanti.

Baranek: Responded Recycle Ann Arbor off of Ellsworth.

Zeuner: Asked why most of the recycling centers are on the west side of Ann Arbor.

Baranek: Responded that she is not sure why they are all located west of Ann Arbor. She manages the 415 W Michigan, which has recycle pick up.

Zeuner: Stated that another commissioner frequently advocates for recycling programs for multi-unit apartment buildings. He is curious about opportunities for residents in such buildings.

Michalowski: Added that Ypsilanti does have a recycling drop off near the park.

Baranek: Responded to Zeuner that the first step is auditing how much material is coming in so that one can understand what type of human effort is needed to move all the material.

Michalowski: Asked Baranek to provide contact information about her current recycling provider.

Baranek: Responded that their current recycling provider is Waste Management. Stated there are four or five different recycling services in the area, including Viola, Republic Services, Advanced Waste, and Waste Management.

Heine: Stated Ypsilanti uses Waste Management.

Baranek: Advised separating and labeling bins very clearly so that waste is not contaminated and recycling material is not lost.

VI. ACTIVE BUSINESS

A. Sustainability plan subcommittee update

Kovacs: Stated that the committee met on November 20 and discussed the STAR rating system and what it will bring to the commission at a later time. The next subcommittee meeting is on Monday, December 18 at the downtown Ypsilanti library.

B. MGC plan subcommittee update

McKee: Stated the committee is in a holding pattern. They are waiting for the 2018 application challenge to go live. The commission is waiting to see if the metrics stay the same as the 2017 metrics. McKee has begun to organize the divisions of labor to track the measurements for the

challenge. The spreadsheet is divided into three major categories of energy, resource management and transportation. The committee has spoken with some members of the community regarding research. No next meeting is planned.

Michalowski: Asked if someone could reach out to the MGC to ask for when the 2018 metrics will be released.

McKee: Responded that he will do that.

C. Outreach subcommittee update

Michalowski: Has begun streaming events and meetings through Facebook live. Hopes to expand streaming beyond meetings to include business showcasing and activities in the town. He is considering reaching out to a group of people he has collected who want to create a more concerted plan for outreach efforts. Anyone interested in helping should let him know.

D. Peninsular Dam update (Council Member Bashert)

McClary: Stated he has worked with the Huron River Watershed Council and the Friends of Pen Park regarding the scope of the project, to make sure neighboring property owners are comfortable. Believes all have come to agreement regarding the scope of the study, and this will be discussed at the City Council meeting on December 5. The Friends of Pen Park has committed to contributing to the cost of the study. Princeton Hydro will be performing the study work, under contract with HRWC. He anticipates the study will be completed in the spring. Once completed, the study will be reviewed by City Council, who will also review the 2014 dam restoration study. The Council will determine which option is best for the community--dam restoration or dam removal. The city does need to come up with a plan as soon as possible for the DEQ. A report was supposed to be made last February, but the city is moving forward.

Kovacs: Asked how the SC may participate in this process.

McClary: Responded that he will share the deliverables from the study along the way with the SC. The working group will consist of a representative from Friends of Pen Park, the executive director of the HRWC, McClary, and one representative each from Ypsilanti and Superior Townships.

Kovacs: Asked how the SC should request such deliverables.

McClary: Responded that no request is needed.

Zeuner: Asked if there is anything the SC can do if Council approves the beginning of the study tomorrow.

McClary: Responded that some of the fieldwork will not be completed till the spring. Encouraged commissioners to read the packet describing the scope of work in the study, which are available on the city website. There is also a project schedule in that packet.

Zeuner: Stated that he would rather discuss in the January meeting the schedule for the study.

Bashert: Reminded the commission that the study will be weather dependent.

Zeuner: Added that he would like to read over the study outline before making any motions or having any discussions on it.

Michalowski: Stated he will add a discussion on this item for next meeting.

Zeuner moved (second Kovacs) to add a discussion to the next meeting agenda regarding the dam study. Unanimous approval. Motion carries.

E. Bike share update (Commissioner Kovacs)

Kovacs: Stated at the bike demo that LimeBike's bicycles were a bit small. The university has made no decisions beyond the demoing. He has had no conversations with the city. EMU is proceeding with the bike share program.

Bashert: Asked McClary if the city is a part of this conversation.

McClary: Responded that he understood EMU to be spearheading this project and he is not aware if his staff has talked with EMU about anything beyond the demo. He does not know if the assumption is that the Sustainability Commission will be leading the city's participation in the project because his understanding is that the city will not be a contracting partner.

Bashert: Stated that she thinks it is relevant to the Commission that it works to make the bike share program city wide, and not simply by EMU.

Zeuner: Suggested making a subcommittee to work on the bike share program.

Bashert: Asked if it is the goal of the commission to pursue a city-wide bike share program.

Michalowski: Asked the commission if there is a motion to pursue such a program.

Zeuner: Stated he would motion if one of the bike share programs does not require a smartphone to participate.

Zeuner (second Drennen) moved to have the Sustainability Commission engage in further discussion with EMU regarding the bike share program and to push make it a city-wide program.

McKee: Asked if any research has been done to show whether the city has the geographic density to support such a program. Stated he is hesitant because of this.

Kovacs: Responded that he has been confused as to how the city would be part of the bike share process alongside EMU. It is not clear to him whether any such thing needs to be done by the city. Suspects the staff needs to be more involved than the Commission. Responding to McKee, stated the bikeshare program is free, so there is little to no risk or cost to the city. The company has incentive to put bikes where people will use them. The only thing is liability, but he believes the company bears all liability.

Zeuner: Added that the city could do an Memorandum of Understanding with EMU to show support for the program. It would be more symbolic support for the program.

Michalowski: Stated his understanding is that bikes can be taken anywhere riders want. His suggestion is that if the city be involved, there should be bike locations around the city so that city-wide participation is encouraged. Asked Darwin how the Commission can get the city participating in this bike share.

McClary: Responded that it depends on what the Commission wants. The city needs to make sure its ordinances support and do not go against the program. He would prefer the city not get involved with an MOU. The city's role would also be monitoring the program, making sure there are no issues with where bikes are left, how they're managed properly, etc. It all depends on the nature of the program.

Bashert: To Kovacs, stated it is not fair nor ethical to ask him to represent the SC when it discussion with EMU on this topic. Stated that, from her understanding, the perception at EMU is that the city has no interest in it. This topic may be more relevant to the Non-motorized Transportation Commission.

Michalowski: Added that the Non-motorized Transportation Commission is meeting soon to discuss their goals for this next year.

Zeuner: Stated that if the Non-motorized Commission takes this up, the Sustainability Commission can still work on this as support.

Bashert: Stated that either EMU will decide all of this, or the Commission needs to have a seat at the deciding table.

McClary: Asked who started the discussions with EMU about the bike share program.

Kovacs: Responded that EMU was interested in a dock program, but they could not afford one. Kovacs proposed a dockless program, which then led to he and former Commissioner Vanlandingham researching other options. All EMU is considering are dockless bike share programs. He has a seat at the table during these discussions at EMU.

McClary: Stated his surprise that EMU feels the city has no interest in the program.

Kovacs: Added that he is also surprised by that statement. He is not sure how the EMU organizing person is interfacing with the city. He is not sure what the city's role is in this process.

Zeuner: Suggested the Commission follow up with EMU people who went to the bike share demo, as well as with other city commissions and staff who are working on this topic.

Michalowski: Stated it appears the city has left the responsibility to EMU to make the decisions on the bike share program.

Sampson: Asked Kovacs if anyone from the Commission could participate in the conversations with EMU.

Kovacs: Responded that he would invite anyone to the table.

Bashert: Shared an example of why the city should be involved: Student A goes downtown for two hours of classes. Another person takes the bike home, but it was the only bike there, so Student A is now stranded. If there is no city participation, the program will be less effective because the company will have less understanding of the potential usage.

Kovacs: Stated that the bike share companies are for-profit companies, so they have incentive in making bikes as available as they are demanded. Stated his intention in working on this program with EMU has been to include the city to connect the university and city more effectively.

Zeuner: Asked if the Commission should postpone this discussion until after Commissioners have participated in more discussion with the university.

Michalowski: Responded that the Commission can discuss the topic more after the January meeting with the EMU representatives.

[Repeating the previous motion]: **Zeuner (second Drennen) moved to have the Sustainability Commission engage in further discussion with EMU regarding the bike share program with the goal of making it a city-wide program. Unanimous approval. Motion carries.**

F. Special Joint Meeting with Planning Commission and Human Relations
Commission update

Zeuner: Stated he felt the meeting was a good starting point. His takeaways were: 1) the master plan needs to be updated and there is consensus across commissions for the need to address affordability and accessibility. The idea of citizen action committee was well received by most of the three commissions.

Kovacs: Stated the discussion was positive and well received.

Zeuner: Stated that he thinks joint meetings will be valuable in the future.

Michalowski: Stated his takeaways are 1) the citizen committee will focus on affordable and accessible housing in the master plan; 2) only the Planning Commission can update the Master Plan; 3) local concerns in quality standards in housing (mold, radon, heat ducts); and 4) and the PC expects to have a charter developed for the next PC meeting. It would be good for SC members to attend the meeting in order to follow up with this charter.

Heine: Asked what is the correlation between the SC, HRC and PC.

Michalowski: Responded that the joint meeting was established by the PC to discuss affordability and accessibility in housing, and they were informed that the SC and HRC would be interested.

Sampson: Asked if there is a timeline for the Master Plan update.

Michalowski: Responded that they have to review it next year (2018), so they plan to do a focused update in 2018 in regards to affordability and accessibility, and then do a broader review the following year (2019).

McClary: Reminded the Commission that an important part of its definition of sustainability is social equity, and this is the connection to the HRC. Other issues including economic equity and environmental justice are areas in which the Commission needs to work closely with the PC to create congruent language for the Master Plan.

Kovacs: Stated that he thinks this is why transportation is an essential component of sustainability.

McKee: Stated he was also troubled by how accessibility and affordability were discussed at the joint meeting, but he believes that it is necessary for this Commission to make sure other forms of accessibility are considered in the citizen committee's work.

G. New member / youth member update

Michalowski: Stated that the Commission needs a new member. Asked wh

Bashert: Stated the mayor nominates and the Council approves commissioners.

Zeuner: Asked if previous applications are being considered for the position.

Bashert: Responded yes. She has also received applications from a youth member.

Michalowski: The Commission has two spots available, and other commission have openings as well.

Sampson: Asked if there is the online application process and any other promotional materials.

Michalowski: Responded yes.

Kovacs: Asked if the quorum for the Commission is four now that one commissioner has left.

McClary: Responded that it is five--a majority.

H. YCS Recommendations of sustainable development update

Michalowski: Stated he hoped to deal with one or two of the feedback bullet points this meeting.

Kovacs: Stated that from reviewing the feedback only briefly, he understands more clearly that he has a lot to learn about the process of creating a sustainable development plan. Stated that he thinks the recommendations should be discussed later after having more time to view them.

Bashert: Stated that the Commission should not feel about about the feedback on their recommendations. Suggested the Commission dig deeply into the feedback, because much of it is positive and helpful.

Sampson: Stated that she affirms the need for digging deeply into the feedback. Added that the climate action plan needs to come up in the Commission's meetings more.

Zeuner: Reminded that Commission that the context in which the recommendations were given was the potential development of International Village, and so the recommendations were a bit rushed.

Zeuner (second Kovacs) moved to discuss this business at the January 8th meeting.

Michalowski: Suggested choosing a few pieces of the feedback to discuss in the January meeting.

Bashert: Suggested the chair choose the parts to place on the agenda for January.

[Repeating earlier motion]: **Zeuner (second Kovacs) moved to discuss this business at the January 8th meeting. Unanimous. Motion approved.**

Heine: Stated she has a meeting with Beth Ernadt to discuss recycling.

Sampson: Asked if someone could contact Julia Bayha about recycling updates.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Sustainability Commission schedule for 2018

Michalowski: Stated that he proposed the Commission change its meeting dates to the second Mondays of each month.

Heine: Suggested it would be better to do 7-9pm.

Heine (second McKee) moved to change commission meetings to second Monday of each month in 2018 and to officially extend meeting times to 7-9 pm. Unanimous approval. Motion approved.

B. STAR presentation and resolution discussion (Drennen)

[Below are the main points of the presentation. The full PowerPoint can be found on the Sustainability Commission agenda packet from the December 12th meeting, posted on the Sustainability Commission's page of the Ypsilanti city website.]

- STAR Communities is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization that works to evaluate, improve, and certify sustainable communities. It is the nation's leading comprehensive framework and certification program for measuring local sustainability. STAR was built by and for local governments.
- Ann Arbor went through the STAR Communities rating process and received a 4 star rating.
- The framework of the Rating System includes: 7 *sustainability goal areas* supported by 44 objectives
- The sustainability plan subcommittee would like to take these goal areas and objectives and make them into a Sustainability Framework. The hope is that it would get adopted into the Master Plan during the update next year.
- Main path to working with STAR is to pursue certification, which the committee does NOT recommend for Ypsilanti because of cost and the cumbersome process involved.
- Another option is to report on 21 leading indicators, which the subcommittee recommends Ypsilanti and this Commission begin with.

- Completing the leading indicators for a few years could be a good prerequisite before pursuing full certification.
- Reporting the leading indicators and eventually pursuing certification would fulfill the Commission's mandate for a sustainability plan.
- There is an included Technical Guide to the rating system.
- Full access to the STAR system costs \$1000 annually, and this includes access to the technical guide I just talked about, the Leading Indicators project, valuable methodology and technical guidance manuals, resources for communicating sustainability progress, and tools to support data collection and reporting. It would also entitle us to technical assistance and training from STAR staff.
- The sustainability plan subcommittee recommends the city purchase the full access package.
- The subcommittee drafted a resolution to be considered by City Council.

Drennen (second Kovacs) moved to approve the following resolution to City Council:

“Whereas City Council charged the Sustainability Commission with the task of developing a Sustainability Plan for the City of Ypsilanti; and whereas the STAR Community Rating System is the nation’s leading comprehensive framework and certification program for measuring local sustainability; and whereas the Sustainability Commission and city staff can use the STAR Community Rating System to measure and report on Leading Indicators and perhaps eventually pursue STAR certification which would meet the Commission’s mandate for developing a Sustainability Plan; therefore be it resolved, that the Sustainability Commission urges the Ypsilanti City Council to allocate \$1,000 annually to pay for a full subscription to the STAR Communities Rating System.”

Kovacs: Stated that he thinks using a STAR program will be important for avoiding getting set back by the Commission's lack of knowledge of state laws.

McKee: Stated his concern is that there will be a trade off for the efficiency of the STAR system in that the system loses the local knowledge and specifics of Ypsilanti.

Drennen: Responded to McKee that the STAR system requires specificity and local knowledge in different ways and that it is built into the rating framework.

Zeuner: Added to Drennen's statement that an example of a specific of specificity might be that the SC is working with the DEQ around the developments at Bell Kramer.

McKee: Asked Drennen how the logical knowledge is incorporated into the framework.

Drennen: Responded that the framework piece is not entirely known yet, but the idea come up with so far is that the seven categories of the STAR system would make up the Sustainability Plan framework as well.

Kovacs: Added that the Commission has six months to create the framework, so the Commission can add local specificity in that time to the framework.

Zeuner: Stated he thinks there will be opportunities for collaboration between the STAR system and the MGC Challenge program.

Michalowski: Asked if the technical assistance will review information submitted to them and give recommendations.

Drennen: Responded that she is not sure if that happens for the leading indicators track. The leading indicators are designed so that small communities like Ypsilanti can still engage with the rating system without paying too much.

Michalowski: Asked if Drennen thinks engaging in the system is more valuable and worthwhile compared to simply using the free materials.

Drennen: Responded that the subcommittee thinks doing the full access package will help the Commission gain experience in how to evaluate and quantify its sustainability metrics.

Michalowski: Asked Bashert and McClary if the language of the draft resolution is appropriate.

McClary and Bashert: Responded that it is appropriate.

Sampson: Suggested to the Commission to think of a strategy of how working the STAR program could be updated regularly in order to spread the workload between current and future Commissioners and staff.

Zeuner: Responded to Sampson that this topic was discussed by the sustainability plan subcommittee.

Sampson: Asked if other commissions would buy into this, and might possibly track one or more leading indicators.

Zeuner: Responded that he thinks HRC could track indicators relating to civil and human rights. He thinks this could be a cross-commission tool.

Kovacs: Stated the subcommittee suggested engaging external networks to aid in this process, similar to the citizens' committee. This could include networks of groups and individual citizens.

McClary: Stated that it is important to remember that the staff is very limited. The city staff is very stressed and stretched compared to a decade ago. However, he stated that the city can offer resources and connections with other consultants as assistance to the Commission.

Bashert: Added that staff may help, but it will be on a case by case basis.

McClary: Stated that the Commission is proceeding with this process in the right way. As the Commission understands the future work in the process, his staff will be able to assist or allocate resources to aid in that process.

Kovacs: Asked if the Commission could begin the program at the time of their choosing if the Council approved the \$1000 cost of a annual subscription.

McClary: Responded that the Commission will have until June 30th to decide yes or no to obtain the annual subscription, otherwise that \$1000 lapses on June 30th. In that case, the money could be approved for the following budget. Council will continue supporting the annual subscription as long as they and the Commission believes it continues to be beneficial and important.

[Repeating original motion]: **Drennen (second Kovacs) moved to approve the previously stated resolution to City Council. Unanimous approval. Motion approved**

Drennen: Asked McClary if Council would need anything from the Commission to help them understand the proposed resolution.

McClary: Suggested the subcommittee give a short presentation at the Council.

Kovacs: Stated that he would like to present at the beginning of the Council's meeting and not at the end.

McClary: Responded that the subcommittee could be placed at the beginning of the Council meeting agenda.

Drennen: Asked if 3-5 minutes is appropriate for the presentation.

McClary: Responded yes.

C. Sun Shot Challenge grant (Council Member Bashert)

Bashert: Stated that Dave has identified fifty of the best rooftop. Suggested that the SC do the following: 1) request a list of the fifty locations 2) distribute the locations among the Commission 3) anyone with knowledge of the owners of the fifty locations contact the owners directly and encourage them to support Dave's goal. Regardless of whether the city gets the Solar Sun Shot

Challenge grant, the city is nationally recognized. Dave is aware of what it takes to get Ypsilanti to win the grant.

Michalowski: Asked Drennen to contact Dave and ask him to share information with the Commission.

Zeuner: Asked Bashert for the deadline for the Sun Shot Challenge grant.

Bashert: Responded she is not sure at the moment. Added that there are two goals: 1) The grant, and 2) the fifty solar roofs.

Zeuner: Asked if the Sun Shot Challenge Grant subsidizes the fifty solar roofs, or vice versa.

Bashert: Responded she is not sure, but that is a good question for Dave.

Sampson: Stated a page in the agenda packet describes the Sun Shot Challenge Grant.

Kovacs: Stated he was part of the grant. It was a DOE grant that would offer a pot of money to a few groups who would compete for the bigger pot, a million dollars. Ypsilanti is still able to compete for the million dollar prize, but we do not get the sixty thousand dollar prize to help us reach the million dollar prize. Suggested that the Commission hire an intern from EMU to work on this project.

Bashert: Stated that utilizing personal connections to contact people who own the fifty roofs being targeted is more effective than hiring a stranger or intern to do so.

D. Bell-Kramer update (Manager McClary)

McClary: Stated that he does not know the details of the history of the Bell Kramer neighborhood. The PC petitioned the rezoning of the Bell-Kramer neighborhood two years ago. The City had rezoned the area to PRD because the City was concerned about the potential for contamination of the area from adjacent land that was a former industrial zone. The residents in Bell-Kramer were upset--many have lived there a long time or are children of original residents in the neighborhood. The rezoning could cause problems for residents being able to make new mortgages, being able to sell properties, and new purchase being able to get mortgages on their properties, as well as some of the properties being developed for residential use. The city is determining what environment impacts may have occurred through multiple tests, including soil, gas, and air quality testing. There were eight initial test locations in June. The DEQ suggested the city do tests quarterly over a year period. The first round of testing did not indicate any concentrations of target parameters of DEQ screening levels. The second round of testing was done in November, and two more will follow in the next six months. The PC has looked at making further changes to zoning of the neighborhood, because the city is sensitive to the emotional connections citizens in the neighborhood have to the area.

Zeuner: Stated that in the 2011 Needs Assessment for the South Side Neighborhood, the mayor at the time and others stated that they would rezone Bell Kramer if a development was proposed. DTE was the one who sounded the alarm about gas underground because they said it would be a development liability. There were plans in 2011 in the Needs Assessment for redevelopment. He feels it should have been kept residential while it was being figured out. He would be happy to share the 2011 Needs Assessment with commissioners.

Bashert: Responded that no development project has been planned for that area.

Zeuner: Responded to Bashert that from his perspective the neighborhood should be kept residential. He is glad to hear the PC is moving back to residential.

McClary: Stated that the city needs to do a better job at engaging residents in decision making process, making sure they understand the history behind communities, and the emotional connections people have to their neighborhoods.

VIII. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION/COMMISSION RESPONSE - none

IX. PROPOSED BUSINESS

Zeuner: Stated that the recycling meeting is on December 11, so there should be follow up on that meeting. Should also be a follow up on the PC meeting, and on the topics of the bike share program, dam, and sustainability plan.

X. NEXT MEETING DATE: January 8, 2018

XI. ADJOURNMENT: 9:46pm

Kovacs (second Zeuner) moved to adjourn the meeting. Unanimous approval. Motion carries.



City of Ypsilanti
SUSTAINABILITY COMMISSION
One South Huron Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

2018 Calendar of Meetings

The regular meetings of the City of Ypsilanti **Sustainability Commission** for 2018 will generally be held on the **second Monday** of each month, at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers (first floor) at One South Huron Street, Ypsilanti, Michigan. Dates for 2018 **Commission** meetings are as follows:

January 8	July 9
February 12	August 13
March 12	September 10
April 9	October 8
May 14	November 12
June 11	December 10

The regular meetings of the City of Ypsilanti **Sustainability Commission Plan Sub-Committee** for 2018 will generally be held on the **third Monday** of each month, at 6:30 p.m. in the Ypsilanti District Library Downtown Branch at 229 W Michigan Ave, Ypsilanti, Michigan. Dates for 2018 **Sustainability Plan Sub-Committee** Work Sessions are as follows:

January 15	July 16
February 19	August 20
March 19	September 17
April 16	October 15
May 21	November 19
June 18	December 17

The City of Ypsilanti encourages persons with disabilities to participate and will provide necessary reasonable auxiliary aids and services, such as signers for the hearing impaired, Limited English Proficiency (LEP) services, and audios of printed materials being considered at the meeting. Individuals requiring auxiliary aids or services should provide two (2) days' notice to the City, and contact the City by writing or calling the following:

City Clerk's Office
One South Huron Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197-5420
(734) 483-1100

All persons are welcome to attend. For further information on the Sustainability Commission, contact the City Manager's Office at the above address, or 734-483-1810, or <http://cityofypsilanti.com/642/Sustainability-Commission>.

it is potentially a cart-before-the-horse approach; the City would be relying upon the future actions of a third party (the USGBC) to permit a development to go forward. Neither the developer nor the City could compel the USGBC to grant a certain ranking, and such standards change. Although green building certification is a useful public relations tool for the developer, involving a third party in the approval of built projects is challenging; a better path would simply be to review the requirements for certification and, where desired and possible, adopt such standards in the zoning code.

It is also notable that the City may not make modifications to the State Building Code- that is, they may not require as a matter of course that a building have certain elements above and beyond those required in the State Building Code, such as green building elements. Thus, requiring that a building must incorporate certain elements may be legally fraught. It may, however, choose to - it may only enact those requirements as part of a contract, such as when granting an incentive.

- Recommendation
At this point in time, staff recommends that Council incorporate the original recommendation of the CAP into the Community Benefits Ordinance discussion and that Council recommend to the Sustainability Commission that they work to identify specific incentive-based zoning recommendations as part of the upcoming Sustainability Plan.

SOLAR ENERGY:

- Background
There are three types of solar energy in the context of development projects: passive solar construction, which aims to capture the heat from the sun to minimize use of HVAC and is most popular for single-family home construction and greenhouses; solar water heating, which uses a thermal collector to heat water and can be used in residential, commercial, or industrial applications; and photovoltaic energy production ("solar panels").
- Climate Action Plan
"Monitor financing opportunities for solar installation and publicize via Solar Ypsi. The City should monitor grant opportunities for solar hybrid systems on high water-usage public buildings, such as the Rutherford Pool and Fire Department, and remain alert for low-cost ways to support private installations; a PACE [Property Assessed Clean Energy] program would be one such option. A target of 20 kW of new installed capacity within the city annually would build on recent momentum." (p18)
- Discussion
Zoning permits construction of "passive solar buildings" – essentially defined in the code as hoopouses or greenhouses – as primary uses in the Parks, PMD, or as an accessory use/structure in R1, MD, CN-SF, CN-Mid, CN, HC, NC, GC, and HHS. Solar water heating is permitted in all districts, provided the thermal collectors are attached to a building. Photovoltaic production is permitted as an accessory use in all districts when attached to a building; solar farms are permitted in Parks and in PMD. Photovoltaic panels are also permitted to be attached to pole lights, such as those found in parking lots, in all districts. These regulations were put in place following extensive feedback from the community during the 2013 Shape Ypsi master plan process and the 2014 zoning code update process. Building permits must be pulled prior to installation to ensure safe installation of both any electrical or plumbing components as well as supporting structural members; in the Historic District, such installations must also be reviewed to ensure compatibility with the historic fabric of the community.

The Ypsilanti Fire Department installed a 50kW photovoltaic array in 2017. The Rutherford Pool is currently operated by a 501(c)3 nonprofit, Friends of the Rutherford Pool, who will be exploring options to renovate the existing bath-house in the near future. The City has had PACE financing available through the Southeast Michigan Regional Energy Office since at least 2014, but to date no development has expressed interest. In 2013, the City adopted a resolution supporting a goal of 5MW in photovoltaic production locally by 2020, on average, this is 700kW per year, well in excess of the CAP goal.

The City is on track to meet and exceed the CAP goals regarding photovoltaic production and permits other types of solar energy capture in alignment with the goals of the CAP. The City does not publicize grant or financing opportunities, however, as it does not currently have the capacity to do so. Solar Ypsi remains the primary local resource to connect interested parties with funding opportunities.

- **Recommendation**
Staff recommends that the Council recommend to the Sustainability Commission that they work to define specific goals regarding alternative energy production locally as part of the Sustainability Plan.

WASTE STREAM REDUCTION AND/OR DIVERSION, INCLUDING RECYCLING;

- **Background**
We assume, for the purposes of this memo, that the Sustainability Commission is referencing only solid waste, not wastewater, although the CAP addresses both. Waste stream reduction can be accomplished through the production of less waste, while waste stream diversion refers generally to recycling and composting, opposed to landfilling. Reduction is generally programmatic, not something that can be predicted or regulated as part of the development or redevelopment of a site, and can be difficult to monitor over time, requiring an ongoing system of incentives and disincentives. Diversion can be enabled through provision of programs, and encouraged through an ongoing system of incentives and disincentives. Zoning does not specify how to handle solid waste, but does specify how outdoor waste receptacles, such as dumpsters, trash bins, or recycling containers, must be stored and screened.
- **Climate Action Plan**
 - **Work with neighborhood associations and Eastern Michigan University to hold a recycling competition, based either on improvements over past performance or on town vs. gown recycling rates.** The challenge for Ypsilanti residents should be to collaborate with or out-compete neighbors, but also on an individual level, to achieve the national average rate of recycling: 34.1%. The City should consider using a neighborhood competition as a pilot—perhaps working only with a few neighborhoods to begin with or seeking to later expand to include local businesses, as well. (p32)
 - **Partner with EMU, local schools, and the DDA to create an artistic trash bin design contest, incorporating local sponsorships and educational efforts.** Test the program first on EMU's campus while exploring options to expand downtown recycling, then move outwards into city itself. Additional savings could be generated by investing in an outdoor recycling service in the city's parks and downtown areas. (p33)
 - **Partner with Growing Hope and local businesses that are high generators of food waste to implement a pilot program for a municipal kitchen compost system using the drop-off site method.** Solid waste, alternative energy or similarly targeted grants should be explored to fund installation of a biodigester at any selected pilot site. (p35)
- **Discussion**

Thomas McKee to me

12/6/17

Hi Keith,

I have a thought about something the Sustainability Commission could do to help City Council with the CBO proposal. I'm not sure what their timeline is, but if they learned anything from IV, I hope they are planning to get community input. Anyways, here is a rough sketch of my idea, and if you're interested, I'd be willing to present it (further fleshed out) at the January meeting.

Objective: Better understand the community's priorities for a CBO

Method: Survey. I would design a survey based on CBOs from other cities around the country. The survey would ask respondents to rank in importance a range of objectives and then weight their importance. I would pull the objectives from other CBOs. They would be presented something like this:

Objective	Unit	Low	High	Rank
Create Local Jobs	% Local Hires	25%	100%	
Incentivize Green Building Practices	% meeting LEED	25%	50%	
Incentivize Affordable Housing	% Units Affordable	0%	20%	
Increase Accessibility to Food	Avg Distance to Grocery Store	3	1	
Increase Accessibility to Health(care/outcomes)	Accessible recreation activities nearby	0	4	
Decrease development disincentive	Added cost to developer per unit	\$5,000	\$1,000	
Increase Tax Base	Added Taxable value per unit (after incentives)	\$0	Market Rate	

They would be asked to rank each objective, 1-7, based on their preference of moving from the worse value to the better value. For example, one respondent might rank an increase in buildings meeting LEED standards from 25% to 50% the most important, moving from 25% local hires to 100% local hires the next most important, and so on. Another respondent might think it is far more important to reduce the cost to the developer from \$5000 per unit to \$1000 per unit, so he or she would rank that first. They might think that affordable housing is the next most important, but is only, say, 20% as important as decreasing the development disincentive, so they would weight decreasing development disincentive as 100, and incentivize affordable housing as 20. Does that make sense? Alternatively, the questions could be posed pairwise, like: "Would you rather if a CBO increased the percentage of local hires from 25% to 100%, or the percentage of affordable units from 0% to 20%?" The survey would ask about every pairing. From that series of questions, I could glean the same information as I could from the rank/weight survey, but it might be more easily understood.

After running the survey, I would be able to generate universal weights to each of the objectives, which would then correlate back to model CBOs. Council would then have information about what is actually most important to residents in a potential CBO, and they would have model language from precedents to inform writing Ypsilanti's CBO.

This is part of how I envision the Sustainability Commission being most valuable to the city - decision support. Each part of the city administration is subject to their own biases and group dynamics that can lead to substandard decisions, and deploying the Sustainability Commission in a decision support role with the stated goal of improving sustainability could lead to better decisions.

A project like this would require some time to develop, but I don't anticipate needing city staff in order to complete it. Volunteers to administer the survey would be helpful though - I picture the survey being offered in many venues - online, at the farmers' market, etc.

Anyways, just a thought.

Best,

Tom

...



INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

To: City Manager, Mayor, Council, and City Attorney

From: Beth Ernat, Director of Community and Economic Development

Date: December 14, 2017

Subject: Work Session for development agreement – 220 N. Park

The purchase agreement for the property at 220 N. Park was approved at the November 28th meeting and executed on December 7th. The purchase agreement created 90 days for City Council and the purchasers, Norfolk Homes, to agree to a development agreement. The 90 days expires on March 1st. Based on Council meeting schedule the agreement would have to be approved by February 20, 2018.

As a community benefits ordinance/agreement policy has not yet been adopted by Council, staff recommended a temporary process to move forward with creating a development agreement. The first step in the process is to have a Council work session to discuss the goals and objectives of for a development agreement.

A development agreement is a voluntary contract between a local jurisdiction and person who owns or controls property within the jurisdiction detailing the obligations of both parties and specifying the standards and conditions that will govern development of the property. The terms of the agreement should be terms not otherwise required through existing regulations. The terms of the agreement need to be enforceable and specified within the agreement.

Representatives from Norfolk have indicated that they will provide a proposed agreement that they have used for similar past developments as a starting point. The agreement will be provided to Council for review and discussion as soon as it is received. The goal of the work session is to provide direction to City staff and legal staff to negotiate terms to be brought back to Council in the form of a proposed agreement.

Terms otherwise governed:

1. Planning Commission review and approval
2. Engineering standards and approval
3. Historic District compatibility and approval
4. State Building Code review and plan approval

Terms specified in Request for Qualifications:

1. Create new, for-sale residential options in a combination of single-family detached, duplex, and townhome formats
2. Include at least 10% of units as accessible and barrier-free
3. Offer site layout and building design that respects and complements the adjacent

Historic East Side Neighborhood

4. Include east to west public access via a bike/walk path across the southern edge of the property and a street or alley through the property, aligned with existing Locust Street to the east
5. Offer residences ready for occupancy within two years of property sale
6. Not require a payment in lieu of taxes (PILOT) or other long-term tax abatement

Current Zoning

The site at 220 N. Park is zoned Core Neighborhood Mid. This form-based designation is described in part as a walkable urban plan supported through a network of interconnected, tree-line streets, a diversity of housing choices and a mix of appropriate commercial and residential uses in a compact form. These areas also support public transit due to their compact nature. Housing types range from mansions to cottages, with multiple-family and single-family uses.

Terms for consideration

- The developer retains the land until it is sold to the ultimate purchaser
- Streets shall be maintained in a clean and accessible condition (evenings and weekends)
- Mitigation and fencing during construction
- Construction commencement date
- Percentage of construction to be completed by date
- Guarantee of delivery – Minimum and maximum units/building types
- Local contractor preference
- Infrastructure improvements to streets or access
- Dedication of new right-of-way
- Green infrastructure requirements

The attached sustainability goals memo describes how recommendations from the sustainability commission are already in use and built into ordinances.

As stated, the purpose of the work session is to have Council provide input and guidance to staff moving forward with crafting an agreement. Additional information will be provided as necessary.



Memo

To: Darwin McClary, City Manager
From: Bonnie Wessler, City Planner
Date: November 1, 2017
Subject: Sustainability Commission Recommendations

Background

In early September, the Sustainability Commission adopted a resolution directing the City Council and Planning Commission, when applicable, ensure certain standards are met for all development plans, until such time as a Sustainability Plan is drafted. In early October, staff received direction to review the recommendations and provide further information on each.

Discussion

LEED RATING OF AT LEAST SILVER;

- **Background**
LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) is a green building rating system developed by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), a 501(c)3 nonprofit. New construction, rehabilitation, neighborhoods, homes, and campuses are all eligible to apply for certification; projects must then be recertified every five years and provide continuing energy and water usage data. Project rating levels are Certified, Silver, Gold, and Platinum; how many points a project earns dictate its ranking. USGBC charges for certification are based on square footage, and start at \$9,920 for a new construction commercial single-building project with less than 250,000 square feet and no appeals. LEED is the most recognizable green building ranking system available, but alternatives exist, such as Green Globes, the Living Building Challenge, Energy Star, and Build It Green.
- **Climate Action Plan**
The 2012 Climate Action Plan (CAP) recommended the City adopt a Green Globes certification requirement for any development project receiving \$10,000 or more in municipal incentives or tax abatements in a single year. This was estimated to reduce emissions by an equivalent of approximately 272 metric tons of carbon dioxide, presuming that 10,000 square feet annually were developed or redeveloped under this standard. This standard was chosen with an eye to the redevelopment projects of a scale and type we typically see in the City- budget-conscious, entrepreneurial, and generally consisting of less than 250,000 square feet.
- **Discussion**
Generally, where a city has incorporated certifications in their zoning code, they have been experiencing significant development pressure and done so by incentivizing, not requiring, certification. (Such incentives are discussed later in this memo.) This can be challenging, as

it is potentially a cart-before-the-horse approach; the City would be relying upon the future actions of a third party (the USGBC) to permit a development to go forward. Neither the developer nor the City could compel the USGBC to grant a certain ranking, and such standards change. Although green building certification is a useful public relations tool for the developer, involving a third party in the approval of built projects is challenging; a better path would simply be to review the requirements for certification and, where desired and possible, adopt such standards in the zoning code.

It is also notable that the City may not make modifications to the State Building Code- that is, they may not require as a matter of course that a building have certain elements above and beyond those required in the State Building Code, such as green building elements. Thus, requiring that a building must incorporate certain elements may be legally fraught. It may, however, choose to - it may only enact those requirements as part of a contract, such as when granting an incentive.

- Recommendation
At this point in time, staff recommends that Council incorporate the original recommendation of the CAP into the Community Benefits Ordinance discussion and that Council recommend to the Sustainability Commission that they work to identify specific incentive-based zoning recommendations as part of the upcoming Sustainability Plan.

SOLAR ENERGY:

- Background
There are three types of solar energy in the context of development projects: passive solar construction, which aims to capture the heat from the sun to minimize use of HVAC and is most popular for single-family home construction and greenhouses; solar water heating, which uses a thermal collector to heat water and can be used in residential, commercial, or industrial applications; and photovoltaic energy production ("solar panels").
- Climate Action Plan
"Monitor financing opportunities for solar installation and publicize via Solar Ypsi. The City should monitor grant opportunities for solar hybrid systems on high water-usage public buildings, such as the Rutherford Pool and Fire Department, and remain alert for low-cost ways to support private installations; a PACE [Property Assessed Clean Energy] program would be one such option. A target of 20 kW of new installed capacity within the city annually would build on recent momentum." (p18)
- Discussion
Zoning permits construction of "passive solar buildings" – essentially defined in the code as hoopouses or greenhouses – as primary uses in the Parks, PMD, or as an accessory use/structure in R1, MD, CN-SF, CN-Mid, CN, HC, NC, GC, and HHS. Solar water heating is permitted in all districts, provided the thermal collectors are attached to a building. Photovoltaic production is permitted as an accessory use in all districts when attached to a building; solar farms are permitted in Parks and in PMD. Photovoltaic panels are also permitted to be attached to pole lights, such as those found in parking lots, in all districts. These regulations were put in place following extensive feedback from the community during the 2013 Shape Ypsi master plan process and the 2014 zoning code update process. Building permits must be pulled prior to installation to ensure safe installation of both any electrical or plumbing components as well as supporting structural members; in the Historic District, such installations must also be reviewed to ensure compatibility with the historic fabric of the community.

The Ypsilanti Fire Department installed a 50kW photovoltaic array in 2017. The Rutherford Pool is currently operated by a 501(c)3 nonprofit, Friends of the Rutherford Pool, who will be exploring options to renovate the existing bath-house in the near future. The City has had PACE financing available through the Southeast Michigan Regional Energy Office since at least 2014, but to date no development has expressed interest. In 2013, the City adopted a resolution supporting a goal of 5MW in photovoltaic production locally by 2020, on average, this is 700kW per year, well in excess of the CAP goal.

The City is on track to meet and exceed the CAP goals regarding photovoltaic production and permits other types of solar energy capture in alignment with the goals of the CAP. The City does not publicize grant or financing opportunities, however, as it does not currently have the capacity to do so. Solar Ypsi remains the primary local resource to connect interested parties with funding opportunities.

- **Recommendation**
Staff recommends that the Council recommend to the Sustainability Commission that they work to define specific goals regarding alternative energy production locally as part of the Sustainability Plan.

WASTE STREAM REDUCTION AND/OR DIVERSION, INCLUDING RECYCLING;

- **Background**
We assume, for the purposes of this memo, that the Sustainability Commission is referencing only solid waste, not wastewater, although the CAP addresses both. Waste stream reduction can be accomplished through the production of less waste, while waste stream diversion refers generally to recycling and composting, opposed to landfilling. Reduction is generally programmatic, not something that can be predicted or regulated as part of the development or redevelopment of a site, and can be difficult to monitor over time, requiring an ongoing system of incentives and disincentives. Diversion can be enabled through provision of programs, and encouraged through an ongoing system of incentives and disincentives. Zoning does not specify how to handle solid waste, but does specify how outdoor waste receptacles, such as dumpsters, trash bins, or recycling containers, must be stored and screened.
- **Climate Action Plan**
 - **Work with neighborhood associations and Eastern Michigan University to hold a recycling competition, based either on improvements over past performance or on town vs. gown recycling rates.** The challenge for Ypsilanti residents should be to collaborate with or out-compete neighbors, but also on an individual level, to achieve the national average rate of recycling: 34.1%. The City should consider using a neighborhood competition as a pilot—perhaps working only with a few neighborhoods to begin with or seeking to later expand to include local businesses, as well. (p32)
 - **Partner with EMU, local schools, and the DDA to create an artistic trash bin design contest, incorporating local sponsorships and educational efforts.** Test the program first on EMU's campus while exploring options to expand downtown recycling, then move outwards into city itself. Additional savings could be generated by investing in an outdoor recycling service in the city's parks and downtown areas. (p33)
 - **Partner with Growing Hope and local businesses that are high generators of food waste to implement a pilot program for a municipal kitchen compost system using the drop-off site method.** Solid waste, alternative energy or similarly targeted grants should be explored to fund installation of a biodigester at any selected pilot site. (p35)
- **Discussion**

Currently, commercial trash, recycling, and waste oil or compost pickup are done via private contract between the producers and the waste handlers.

For residential properties, the City provides weekly single-stream recycling pickup year-round, and weekly yard waste (non-food compost) pickup during spring, summer, and fall, primarily to single-family residences. The City contracts with Republic for weekly rubbish pickup, and allows Simple Recycling to do curbside pickup of specialty recyclables.

A dropoff station for specialty recyclables currently open three days a week in Depot Town. No incentives or disincentives are in place. Washtenaw County administers "Waste Knot," a program for local businesses to help them reduce or divert their waste. This program is purely voluntary and no cost.

- Recommendation

At this time, no progress has been made towards these goals of the CAP. Staff recommends that the Council recommend to the Sustainability Commission that they evaluate the barriers to completion for these goals and consider alternative goals as part of the Sustainability Plan. Note that City Council has governing authority over residential waste streams, and would have to enact new policy and updates through scavenger contracts.

LED LIGHTING IN ALL PUBLIC SPACES;

- Background

LED is a popular lighting type that draws relatively little power compared to other technologies. The City recently converted its streetlights to LED fixtures, as well as the lights in City buildings. It is unclear, however, what the Sustainability Commission intends by "public spaces," and if the intent includes lighting previously unlit areas.

- Climate Action Plan

- **Upgrade lighting in city buildings as soon as possible. Advertise the availability of low and no cost energy audit services to help building owners prioritize the energy work they would like to do in their buildings. Partner with relevant organizations to help market available services.** (p16)

- **Upgrade as many street lights as possible with the city's revolving loan fund, working with the DDA, EMU and Regional Energy Office to achieve the best price through bulk upgrades and to identify any grants or other funding opportunities.**

This should be undertaken as soon as possible, so that savings from initial upgrades can pay for additional lights in future years. The DDA and Public Services Department should also review existing light levels during this process—in some locations, additional energy and cost savings may be achieved through removal of unneeded fixtures. (p28)

- Discussion

The zoning code does not address the power consumption of outdoor lighting, however, it does regulate outdoor light placement, brightness, glare, and pollution. Outdoor lighting within the Historic District is reviewed for appropriateness. Indoor lighting is regulated under the State Building Code. Staff is not presently aware of communities that mandate LED light fixtures, either indoor or outdoor.

- Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Council recommend to the Sustainability Commission that they work to define the scope and intent of this item and evaluate the progress made by the City since the CAP adoption as part of the Sustainability Plan.

ENERGY STAR-RATED APPLIANCES;

- Background
It is unclear when, where, and how the Sustainability Commission is proposing these be required. Currently the City does not have a mechanism to require or incentivize certain types of appliances be used. Mechanical & plumbing-related installations are governed by State Building Code or, in specific circumstances, County Public Health. Staff is not currently aware of a mechanism by which Energy Star appliances could be required.
- Climate Action Plan
The CAP does not mention Energy Star appliances in its recommendations.
- Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Council recommend to the Sustainability Commission that they work to define the scope and intent of this item and evaluate the progress made by the City since the CAP adoption as part of the Sustainability Plan.

BIKE-FRIENDLY ROADS;

- Background
Bike-friendly roads mean different things to different people, and in different contexts. On some roads, bike friendliness includes painted and protected bike lanes; on others, no particular infrastructure improvements would be required. Generally, bike friendliness can include signage, striping, bike lanes, protected bike lanes, separated bike lanes, speed of vehicle traffic, traffic light timing, traffic light sensors, street lighting, volume of vehicle traffic, presence or absence of other bicyclists, and more. Bike-friendliness also depends a great deal on the assumed skill level of the bicyclist. The City has adopted a Complete Streets ordinance that applies to newly constructed streets or reconstructed streets; this ordinance mandates that bicyclists be considered as part of the design process.
- Climate Action Plan
 - **Continue development of bicycle and pedestrian network in coordination with Townships, WCRC, and Border to Border (B2B) trail development.** Considering existing, predominantly east/west commuting patterns, roads like Forest Avenue, East Cross and West Cross/Packard may hold the most benefit in terms of converting traffic from motor vehicle miles to bicycle miles. (p 38)
 - **Engage community partners in an effort to understand residents' travel needs and develop a marketing plan to meet those needs.** Provide bicycle maps, designated routes, and other wayfinding mechanisms to make the transition to bike commuting easy and convenient. Special attention should be paid to the connections between EMU's campus and Ypsilanti's downtown and Depot Town areas, encouraging students to explore the surrounding city. The existing Non-Motorized Advisory Committee should lead this effort within the city. (p 41)
 - **Partner with Eastern Michigan University to create a bike-sharing program and to expand the carsharing network both on-campus and downtown.** The programs can originate at the university, targeting students as the primary users with the source of information available online and at new student orientation. University faculty and employees, and downtown employees, should be targeted with information on bike- and car-sharing options as a support for car-free commutes; landlords and neighborhood

associations can provide residents with information on car-sharing as a cost-saving alternative to a second household car. (p 43)

- Discussion
In 2011, the City adopted the Complete Streets Ordinance, which requires any street undergoing a certain level of construction be reviewed by the Planning Commission and staff to ensure the road will be able to serve all modes, taking into such considerations as grades, legal obligations, street trees, and other issues. Due to a limited budget, few roads are reconstructed to that level, however, recent successes include West Cross from Washtenaw to Elbridge. The success of Complete Streets has also led to street rehabilitation projects that do not trigger the extensive review incorporating features such as curb bump-outs, which improve pedestrian visibility and help to prevent excessive speeds.
- Recommendation
As the Non-Motorized Committee (a subcommittee of the Planning Commission) is currently working on revising and updating the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, staff recommends that the Council recommend to the Sustainability Commission that they relay their input to that committee, and coordinate the recommendations of the Sustainability Plan with those of the Non-motorized Transportation Plan to ensure that they are complementary, not conflicting or duplicative.

ACCESS TO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS;

- Background
Staff assumes that this means that stops and routes be placed conveniently to areas of denser housing development. The Ride (AAATA) serves the Ypsilanti area with public transportation, and is a separate entity from the City.
- Climate Action Plan
The CAP speaks of public transportation, access to it, and ways to improve access, but quite a bit more broadly. See pages 39-42 for more information.
- Discussion
As part of any housing development or redevelopment process that involves a site plan or special use application, staff works to ensure that the developers and AAATA communicate, and that the needs of each and the future residents are addressed.
- Recommendation
Staff believes that current practice satisfies this goal to the best of the City's legal ability and recommends that the current practice be continued.

BIO-SWALES OR RAIN GARDENS UPSTREAM OF STORM WATER DRAINS AND WETLANDS;

- Background
Staff assumes the intent of the recommendation is to provide for detention of stormwater and removal of sediment as well as some pollutants from stormwater, thus improving area water quality.
- Climate Action Plan
The CAP does not address stormwater.
- Discussion

The City has adopted the Design Standards of the Washtenaw County Water Resources Commissioner, which are available here: http://www.ewashtenaw.org/government/drain_commissioner/dc_webPermits_DesignStandards/dc_Rules/frontpage. The City is responsible for review of stormwater management designs under the WCWRC rules. These standards provide for stormwater detention, and require stormwater be handled according to best management practices, which may include rain gardens, vegetated swales, detention ponds, or engineered storage solutions, based on the needs of the applicant and the unique properties of the site. Not all sites or projects will be able to accommodate a surface solution, such as a raingarden or swale; some will require engineered solutions.

- Recommendation
Staff believes that the City's current practice meets and exceeds the desires of the Sustainability Commission, and recommends a continuation of current practice.

PROPERTY TAX RELIEF AND RENT PROTECTION FOR LOW INCOME AND RETIREMENT-AGE RESIDENTS;

Please see the previous memorandum from the City Attorney regarding property tax relief and rent controls.

•

AND INCENTIVES IN ZONING (EXPEDITED REVIEW, DENSITY BONUS, TAX REDUCTION, ETC.) FOR COMMUNITY BENEFITS (E.G., OPEN SPACE CONSERVATION, AFFORDABLE HOUSING, SUSTAINABLE [sic] DEVELOPMENT BEYOND THESE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS).

- Background
Staff assumes the intent of the recommendation is to provide for public benefit on particularly large, impactful, or complex projects.
- Discussion and recommendations on individual elements
The City cannot further expedite review of projects. Currently City review is constrained only by the timing of legally required meetings and the applicant's ability to submit complete plans and turn around revisions requested by Planning Commission or staff. This review time is considered one of the shorter review times in the state, per conversations with Michigan Department of Economic Development staff, discussed as part of the Redevelopment Ready Community certification process.
Staff does not recommend a change to current practice.

Provision of a "density bonus" is commonly used in larger cities. In Ypsilanti, zoning standards already permit, either by right or with a special use permit, the densest residential and commercial development the community expressed a desire for during the 2013 master plan development and 2014 zoning code development. To engineer a "density bonus" we would either be lowering densities below what the community has already established, or pushing the maximum higher than what the community has expressed a desire for.

Staff does not recommend a change to current practice.

Provision of a "tax reduction" is only available as part of incentive packages that the City already offers, such as PILOT, brownfield, OPRA, NEZ, etc.

Staff recommends that this be part of the Community Benefits Ordinance discussion.

- Discussion on overall concept

The City does already have a tool similar to that proposed for certain types of projects. Planned Unit Development (PUD) projects generally are used in larger or more complex projects, and allow for certain exceptions from the zoning code to secure a public benefit. These PUDs are reviewed by Planning Commission and ultimately approved by Council. More information is in Chapter 122, Article VII, Division 1 (sections 122-700 through 709), available at cityofypsilanti.com/zoning.

Note that the City is considered a Redevelopment Ready Community by the MEDC. This voluntary designation generally indicates that the City's development and redevelopment processes are clear, quick, and consistent; the designation also enables the City to apply for certain MEDC funding. To maintain that status and eligibility for funding, clarity, speed, and consistency must all be taken into account if or when zoning incentives are designed.

Conclusion

The recommendations of the Sustainability Commission are generally aligned with the intent and purpose of the Master Plan (Shape Ypsi), the Climate Action Plan, the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, and other plans adopted by the City. However, the specific recommendations as presented conflict with the specific recommendations of these plans, lack public input, and do not reflect an understanding of the existing development processes and regulations. Staff recommends that the Sustainability Commission seek out more information about the existing development processes and controls within the City, and about best practices regarding plan creation, including public comment, and work with staff to develop future recommendations.

Ashley Fox to me

Dec 7

I appreciate you thinking of me.

I will pass on the information, and I hope we can get you someone good.

Thank you!

Ashley

...

On Thu, Dec 7, 2017 at 3:40 PM, Keith <kmichalowski@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello there,

I'm the chair of the Sustainability Commission of the City of Ypsilanti. I was given your contact information by Willow Krupin-Carter. We are currently seeking two youth members (ages 16-17) who live within the city limits to join our Commission as Youth Members appointed by the mayor for a one year term. While Youth Members currently do not vote, they are allowed the opportunity to participate in the discussion outside of the time allotted to general audience participation. If you know of anyone who may be interested, please direct them to fill out the form found here (<https://cityofypsilanti.com/FormCenter/Boards-Commissions-6/Citizen-Advisory-Boards-and-Commissions--45>) and to send an email to myself so I may assist in moving the selection process along.

Thank you kindly for your time,

Keith Michalowski

--

--

Mr. Ashley Fox, M.Ed.

American Studies, Government, DP History, and Theory of Knowledge Teacher

Washtenaw International High School

[510 Emerick St.](#)

[Ypsilanti, Michigan 48198](#)

[734-994-8145](#)

afox@wihi.org

SPEAK UP! *We need your help to create a safe, respectful, and caring community for everyone.*

Report Bullying and Harassment [HERE](#).

Report Concerns about Mental Health [HERE](#).

Climate resilience from the youth up: A place-based strategy uniting high school students, educators, scientists, residents, community organizations, and municipalities in southeast Michigan

INTRODUCTION: As climate impacts ratchet up across the United States, the Great Lakes region has a tendency to fly under the national radar. While the Great Lakes do not experience hurricanes, rising sea levels, or large-scale wildfires, the local climate has become increasingly erratic in recent years. The region, however, is one of the most unprepared in the country to cope with these impacts.

A recent Grosvenor report (2014) on climate resilience among 50 global cities ranked Detroit last among 11 U.S. cities for adaptability and only better than three cities for overall resilience, which incorporates both climate vulnerability and adaptability factors.¹ Of U.S. cities with more than 100,000 residents, Detroit has the highest percentage of African American residents (80.7%, U.S. Census 2016). Still recovering from bankruptcy, the city also has a 39% poverty rate, which impacts over 56% of children (ibid). The socio-economic factors, coupled with other environmental justice concerns, such as a centrally located incinerator and an asthma rate of 15.5% among adults resulting in over 3,000 hospitalizations annually, make Detroit residents particularly vulnerable to climate impacts.

Localized climate information for the city, provided by NOAA Great Lakes Integrated Sciences and Assessments (GLISA), indicates that average temperatures will rise by 3-5°F through mid-century and that heavy precipitation events will likely continue to become more intense and more frequent. The number of days above 100°F is predicted to rise from a current rate of fewer than one per year to a stunning 23 days per year by 2100 in a high-emissions scenario.

This project will address the urgent need to increase resilience by working with high school students and teachers in Detroit and southeast Michigan to increase their awareness of climate change and develop projects that help their schools and neighborhoods become resilient to increased occurrence and intensity of heat waves, storm events, and flooding. High school students and teachers will partner with climate scientists to explore local climate impacts firsthand and to develop resilience strategies and projects that protect vulnerable households and neighborhoods and contribute to broader sustainability initiatives. The City of Detroit in particular seeks this involvement as it ramps up a new Office of Sustainability and seeks proposals to develop the city's first Sustainability Framework.

PROJECT OVERVIEW: This proposal is closely aligned with NOAA's vision of "Healthy ecosystems, communities, and economies that are resilient in the face of change," and directly relates to NOAA's mission in the areas of climate science and Great Lakes literacy. The project engage a robust network of existing high school "Green Teams", which have been supported and facilitated by EcoWorks since 2012.

The project team will work with Green Team club members and teachers and use NOAA assets, including GLISA localized climate data and Sea Grant outreach and education expertise, to: 1) Engage students in assessing and quantifying climate vulnerabilities of their schools, neighborhoods, and surrounding community; 2) Use a place-based education (PBE) model to involve local high schoolers in creating plans and completing projects that work toward achieving community resilience; 3) Empower high school students to teach residents about local climate impacts and increase understanding of resilience strategies to mitigate extreme weather events or other environmental hazards; and 4) Assist with completion of the Detroit Sustainability Action Agenda and Climate Resilience Plan.

The Place-Based Education model involves three processes: Student-driven inquiry, connection to place, and civic action. In PBE, students: 1) Pursue interdisciplinary questions they are curious about and problems that are meaningful to them; 2) Identify the strengths of their community and develop deep relationships with people and organizations in their neighborhood; 3) Learn how to take informed public

¹ Grosvenor. (2014). Resilient Cities: A Grosvenor Research Report. Retrieved from: www.grosvenor.com/getattachment/194bb2f9-d778-4701-a0ed-5cb451044ab1/ResilientCitiesResearchReport.pdf

action around a problem that they and partners have identified as important to the social and ecological health of their community.

METHODS: The project will consist of four components:

1) Place-based climate science and resilience education: Uniting professionals to develop engaging, hands-on experiences for students to explore local climate impacts. These experiences might include environmental justice tours, visits to science labs, field trips to stormwater or clean energy projects, and ecological / watershed monitoring. Partners for this component would include university professors and students, as well as staff from GLISA and Michigan Sea Grant. These partners would serve as content experts, project advisors, and career mentors; would introduce students to climate and STEM careers; and would help students interact with NOAA tools and datasets.

Outcomes: 200 students from 8 high schools in Detroit and 2 in Ypsilanti will participate annually on a weekly basis. An additional 1,000 students from Detroit and Ypsilanti schools will participate in limited engagement explorations and inquiries about climate resilience.

2) Place-based education support: Training and professional development for participating teachers and EcoWorks AmeriCorps Green School Coordinators. Training and support would be provided by the Southeast Michigan Stewardship Coalition (SEMIS).

Outcomes: Each year, four GSCs and six lead teachers will participate in four days of dedicated professional development with a focus on the pedagogy and practice of place-based education. They will also be invited to participate in the three-day summer institute and receive on-site, ad hoc coaching.

3) Neighborhood- and city-scale climate resilience projects: Adapting the Climate Resilience Toolkit and the Earth Force process of civic engagement for students. EcoWorks Detroit's AmeriCorps members will help form and support student teams to assess climate vulnerabilities on their school campuses and in their neighborhoods, select feasible projects (e.g., stormwater management, tree plantings, household response plans and education for heat waves), and implement the projects. Resilience foci could include security of energy, water, and food; reducing vulnerability to heat waves and flooding.

Outcomes: Over three years, students will design and implement 30 semester- to year-long projects that directly enhance climate resilience in their schools and surrounding neighborhoods. Projects will have measurable impacts on resilience indicators including indoor air temperatures, tree cover, energy and water conservation, renewable power and storage capacity, on-site stormwater management capacity.

4) Promoting climate resilience: Collecting data at both city- and neighborhood scales, students will contribute to formal sustainability and climate resilience planning and initiatives in the Cities of Detroit and Ypsilanti. Students offer an important voice for future generations and can educate residents about anticipated climate impacts and how they can respond. Students will present their projects at the SEMIS Community Forum, MI Place-Based Education Conference, block club meetings, and city meetings.

Outcomes: Student projects will directly inform and benefit at least 3,000 residents (100 per project) and be incorporated in resilience plans and procedures by the cities of Detroit and Ypsilanti.

RELEVANCE: Detroit, Michigan, and surrounding areas in southeast Michigan have experienced a greater occurrence of high temperature days, storm events, and flooding than they have in the past. National rankings put Detroit at the bottom of the list for resilience, and the city's inability to adapt to these changes has been apparent in several recent events:

- A two-hour rainstorm in August 2014 inundated the city's highways with up to 14" of water and effectively shut down transportation for two days.

- A surprising windstorm in March 2017, which left 1.2 million customers without power for upwards of one week in the midst of winter.
- In nearby Toledo, just 50 miles downstream from Detroit, a 2014 algal bloom made the city's water source from Lake Erie highly toxic and undrinkable for three days.

Factors² contributing to local vulnerability include: 1) Highly outdated and fragile infrastructure, particularly the city's electrical grid and water mains; 2) An excess of impervious surfaces, many of which are vacant lots; 3) A combined sewer system with regular combined sewer overflows (CSOs); 4) Inefficient housing stock that lacks sufficient cooling; 5) Lack of universal access to basic human needs including drinking water and power, as up to 1 in 6 residents (upwards of 100,000 since 2014) experienced water shutoffs for delinquent accounts; 6) A large population of senior citizens, young children, and individuals with a disability; and 7) A poor public transit system, leaving many residents without access to critical needs like cooling centers or groceries in the event of emergency.

COMMUNITY CONTEXT: Until May 2017, Detroit was the largest U.S. city without a sustainability office or director. Detroit's Office of Sustainability has brought on three staff and issued an RFP to create a Sustainability Action Agenda for the City, which requires extensive community engagement and the creation of a Sustainability Ambassadors program. EcoWorks has advised on the creation of the office and hiring and maintains close connection with the director and other city leaders. The city is also requesting a University of Michigan School for Environment and Sustainability (SEAS) masters project to develop the structure for a Climate Resilience Plan. Similarly, Detroit Public Schools have an Office of Sustainability and see close alignment with its objectives and the proposed NOAA deliverables of this grant. Finally, EcoWorks is leading an initiative called Eco-D, which supports neighborhood-led efforts to leverage green development to meet basic needs, enhance quality of life, and advance climate resilience. In short, municipal and community leaders are actively seeking to explore and adopt climate resilience strategies and students could be instrumental in researching and designing the course of those steps.

STRUCTURE: Michigan Sea Grant (MISG) will lead the project employing its extensive library of climate and Great Lakes education materials and experience in outreach. Two Michigan Sea Grant Extension educators are located in southeast Michigan and will be actively involved in the project. MISG director will serve as principal investigator, communications program leader as project manager.

EcoWorks will dedicate four AmeriCorps Green School Coordinators (GSCs) serving in full-time capacity on this project and 50% of the program manager's time; participating GSCs will have strong backgrounds in education and youth leadership development. Two pairs of GSCs will each partner with five existing high school green teams (ten schools per year), which include 12-25 students each. Green teams must have a lead teacher committed to the project. EcoWorks has formal partnerships with the Detroit Public Schools Community District, and all participation in the project is voluntary and supported by the top administrators in the district and the school board.

GSCs and lead teachers will receive formal training in place-based education from the Southeast Michigan Stewardship Coalition (SEMIS). SEMIS will provide teachers with a holistic support system that includes nine full days of professional development, site-based curriculum coaching, and funding for community partnerships. The program's yearly sequence ends with an annual Community Forum in which K-12 students from across the Coalition lead workshops and presentations for each other and the broader community. EcoWorks also regularly convenes three high school symposia, a climate summit, parent workshops, and a summer presentation symposium — all opportunities for students to present and

² American Forests. (2006). Urban Ecosystem Analysis SE Michigan and City of Detroit: Calculating the Value of Nature. Retrieved from: www.michigan.gov/documents/SE_MI_UrbanEcosystemAnalysisReport_160216_7.pdf

disseminate their resilience research and projects. Over the course of the year, Green Teams will meet weekly and follow the Steps to Resilience outlined in the U.S. Climate Resilience Toolkit:

1) Explore hazards: Students will partner with researchers from GLISA, Michigan Sea Grant, and University of Michigan School for Environment and Sustainability to learn about the principles of climate science, observed local impacts, and local vulnerabilities. Students will have opportunities for field-based inquiry, such “vessel-based learning” with Michigan Sea Grant’s Great Lakes Environmental Program. Using place-based tools from SEMIS and the EarthForce Community Action and Problem-Solving Process, students will conduct community environmental assessments and gather first-hand accounts of climate impacts residents have experienced. Students will also seek input from municipal leadership at the Cities of Detroit and Ypsilanti, who are project partners, about their climate impact concerns. Finally, students will be connected to Detroit’s rich network of researchers, both university- and community-based, through the Detroit Climate Action Collaborative, Community Research Collective (which authored Mapping the Water Crisis in Detroit), and studies from SEAS including Housing, Health, and Heatwaves (NSF, forthcoming) and research from the Urban Energy Justice Lab.

2) Assess Vulnerability and Risks: Based on their initial inquiry and feedback from residents and municipal leaders, students will develop analyses of local vulnerability. At this stage, students will translate these analyses into relevant, accessible language that is appropriate for both residents, community organizations, and city partners.

3) Investigate Options: Students will continue to work with their teachers and academic partners to research community-based solutions from around the nation, particularly the Great Lakes. They will analyze solutions based on impact, cost, accessibility, desirability and appropriateness for the local community, and feasibility, including municipal adoption.

4) Prioritize and Plan: Students will present their assessments and possible solutions at the SEMIS Community Forum and at several community meetings. Residents and city officials will be engaged in a design charrette process to select and hone final projects. Preference will be given for projects that are replicable or can be formally adopted by municipalities in their sustainability plans and frameworks.

5) Take Action: A select group of high school students will be enrolled in the EcoWorks summer program, which provides an AmeriCorps scholarship of \$1,200 and a stipend of about \$1,000. The program operates 35 hours per week for seven weeks. Teams of 10 students and three to four adult leaders will be responsible for adopting projects designed. EcoWorks leverages other grants and funds that allow teams to apply for mini grants ranging from \$750 to \$5,000 per project. In the past, teams have completed projects such as rainwater irrigation systems, home weatherizations, and neighborhood composting systems; which have contributed to climate resilience. At least three projects each summer will be implemented, resulting in a total of nine projects over the three-year grant period.

CONCLUSION: The team of project partners possess the technical expertise, educational track record, familiarity with NOAA assets, connections with school and community partners, and municipal relationships to deliver robust educational and climate resilience outcomes. We believe this team brings an optimal combination of scientific tools and knowledge, place-based education pedagogy, and top-level partnerships with city officials that will result in adoption and implementation of the student-created resilience plans.

COMMITTEE CHARTER:

Citizen Committee on Housing Affordability & Accessibility

December 14, 2017

Background

In October 2013, the Planning Commission of the City of Ypsilanti adopted a new Master Plan (also referred to as the “Shape Ypsi” Master Plan), a hybrid land use/policy plan intended to guide development, redevelopment and preservation in the City over a 20-year horizon. It provides the framework on which the City’s Zoning Ordinance is based and also contains guidance for other areas of civic governance, such as capital improvements, non-motorized transportation and development of publicly-owned land.

Two of the guiding values set forth in the Master Plan are “*Diversity is our strength*” and “*Anyone, no matter what age or income, can find a place to call home in Ypsilanti.*”

In the four-plus years since the 2013 Master Plan was adopted, issues of housing affordability and accessibility have surfaced repeatedly during Planning Commission proceedings (which include reviews of site plans and special use applications). Rents are rising, in some cases so sharply that renters have been priced out of the City. Barriers to physical accessibility, common among Ypsilanti’s older homes, continue to limit housing options for people with a disability. These realities conflict with the Master Plan guiding values cited above.

By statute, the Planning Commission is required to review the Master Plan at least once every five years and to make updates as deemed necessary.

I. Purpose

The Citizen Committee will review and update the City of Ypsilanti’s 2013 Master Plan with a focus on preserving and enhancing housing affordability and accessibility in keeping with the guiding values of the Master Plan. The Committee will develop and issue recommendations for specific land use and policy changes for consideration by the Planning Commission and (upon invitation) City Council.

II. Committee Type

Per Planning Commission bylaws, “*the Commission, Chair or City Planner may establish and appoint citizen committees with the consent of the Commission. The purpose of the citizen committee is to be able to use individuals who are knowledgeable or expert in a particular issue before the Commission or to better represent various interest groups.*”

The Citizen committee is a “special” committee of the Planning Commission (as opposed to a standing committee). It is formed to serve for a limited time and will be dissolved once the tasks and responsibilities assigned to it are complete.

III. Membership

The committee will be comprised of:

Up to four (4) members of the Planning Commission
One member of the Human Relations Commission
One member of the Sustainability Commission
One member of the Ypsilanti Housing Commission board
One representative of EMU
One representative of Defend Affordable Ypsi
One representative of Ann Arbor Center for Independent Living
One representative of Avalon Housing
One representative of civic affairs organization at the county or state level
One Ypsilanti owner-occupant
One Ypsilanti business owner (and employer)
One lessor of rental properties in Ypsilanti
Up to two members of the community at large

All members will be residents of the City. A guiding principle in recruiting and selecting individuals to serve on the committee will be the degree to which the members, as a whole, represent the diversity of the Ypsilanti community, both demographically (in terms of income, race and age group) and with respect to affordability and accessibility-related interests.

Organizations represented on the committee may elect to rotate their representative as appropriate to accommodate the thematic focus of work sessions. Participation is voluntary, and any organization may opt out of committee participation at any time.

All members shall have equal voice and standing with respect to the proceedings and recommendations of the Committee.

The Planning Department of the City of Ypsilanti will provide a staff advisor to the Committee.

IV. Chairperson

The Chair of the Planning Commission shall serve as the Chairperson of the Citizen Committee and will designate another committee member to chair work sessions in her absence.

V. Activities, Duties & Responsibilities

- Drawing on the most up-to-date quantitative and qualitative data and resources available, assess the current situation with respect to housing affordability and accessibility in Ypsilanti and Washtenaw County
- Analyze underlying barriers to affordability and accessibility at the municipal, county, state and national levels
- Study existing affordability and accessibility strategies and models (local and non-local)
- Identify additional strategies and models for increasing affordability and accessibility
- Rate strategies based on their probable impact, feasibility and acceptability in Ypsilanti
- Develop written land use and policy recommendations for adoption and implementation
- Present recommendations to Planning Commission and (upon invitation) City Council

VI. Committee Procedures

Frequency of meetings: The committee will hold its initial work session in January 2018 and will meet on a regular basis (not more than twice-monthly and not less than monthly) to fulfill its duties as described above.

Venue(s): Work sessions of the Citizen Committee will be publicly noticed and held at rotating, accessible venues to facilitate community engagement in the review and updating of the Master Plan.

Thematic focus groups: As appropriate, the Citizen Committee will invite additional input from community residents through focus groups, special presentations, and public comment sessions.

Completion of work and presentation of recommendations: The committee's work will be completed **no later than October 2018**, five years from the date of the adoption of the Master Plan. Upon finalizing its recommendations, the committee will make a formal presentation to the Planning Commission and, upon invitation from City Council, to Council members.

VII. Authorship Information

This charter was drafted by Heidi Jugenitz, Chairperson of the Planning Commission of the City of Ypsilanti, with input from members of the Planning, Sustainability and Human Relations Commissions, City Council, and the community at large.

XI. RESOLUTIONS/MOTIONS/DISCUSSIONS –

1. ~~Resolution No. 2017-282, approving Scope of Work and Fee Estimate for the Huron River Watershed Restorative Services (Peninsular Dam). (Removed)~~
2. Resolution No. 2017-283, approving extension of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Washtenaw Community College for Educational and Community Training Programs at Parkridge Center.

RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF YPSILANTI that:

The First Extension of the Memorandum of Understanding between Washtenaw Community College and the City of Ypsilanti Regarding Parkridge Center be approved and the Mayor and City Clerk are authorized to sign for and on behalf of the city, subject to the approval of the city attorney.

OFFERED BY: Council Member Richardson

SECONDED BY: Council Member Bashert

Council Member Richardson stated as a member of the Parkridge Community Center Advisory Board she would like to mention the members of the Washtenaw Community Center of Parkridge were not notified this item was on the agenda. Over the last year several improvements were made due to the participation of WCC, both academic and recreation. The programming includes activities for children and adults. The city needs to continue the memorandum and maintain the building for this community.

Council Member Bashert supports the resolution, and asked if funds have been received by Mr. Barfield. Mr. McClary responded in the affirmative.

On a roll call, the vote to amend Resolution No. 2017-283 was as follows:

Mayor Pro-Tem Brown	Yes	Council Member Robb	Yes
Council Member Murdock	Yes	Mayor Edmonds	Absent
Council Member Richardson	Yes	Council Member Vogt	Yes
Council Member Bashert	Yes		

VOTE:

YES: 6 NO: 0 ABSENT: 1 (Edmonds) VOTE: Carried

3. Resolution No. 2017-284, approving appointments to Boards and Commissions.

RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF YPSILANTI:

THAT, the following individuals be appointed to the City of Ypsilanti Boards and Commissions as indicated below:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>BOARD</u>	<u>TERM EXPIRATION</u>
Sam Stroud (Youth) 210 Oak St. Ypsilanti, MI 48198	Sustainability Commission	12/5/2018

Devika Chourhuri 2116 Roosevelt Ypsilanti, MI 48197	Human Relations Commission	12/5/2020
Anne Brown 2125 Collegewood Ypsilanti, MI 48197	Huron Watershed Council	12/5/2019
Patricia Berry 616 Collegewood Ypsilanti, MI 48197	Ethics Commission	12/5/2022
Andy Fanta 1221 Westmoorland Ypsilanti, MI 48197	Tax Review Board	12/31/2019
Roberta Andrews 7 N. Normal Ypsilanti, MI 48197	Tax Review Board	12/31/2019
Ron Rupert 421 N Huron Ypsilanti, MI 48197	Historic District Commission	1/31/2021
Erika Lindsay 317 Prospect Ypsilanti, MI 48197	Historic District Commission	1/31/2021
Ariel Moore 1 Oakwood Ypsilanti, MI 48197	Housing Commission	12/31/2022

OFFERED BY: Council Member Vogt
SECONDED BY: Council Member Bashert

Council Member Murdock asked when appointments are made can the Mayor provide information on who they are replacing and what the vacancy is.

Council Member Murdock moved, seconded by Council Member Robb to split the question to vote separately on the appointment of Patricia Berry to the Ethics Commission.

On a roll call, the vote to split the question Resolution No. 2017-284 was as follows:

Mayor Pro-Tem Brown	Yes	Council Member Robb	Yes
Council Member Murdock	Yes	Mayor Edmonds	Absent
Council Member Richardson	Yes	Council Member Vogt	Yes
Council Member Bashert	Yes		

VOTE:

YES: 6 NO: 0 ABSENT: 1 (Edmonds) VOTE: Carried

On a roll call, the vote to approve Resolution No. 2017-284 as amended was as follows:

Mayor Pro-Tem Brown	Yes	Council Member Robb	Yes
Council Member Murdock	Yes	Mayor Edmonds	Absent
Council Member Richardson	Yes	Council Member Vogt	Yes
Council Member Bashert	Yes		

VOTE:

YES: 6 NO: 0 ABSENT: 1 (Edmonds) VOTE: Carried

Council Member Murdock stated the Ethics Board has been a concern of controversy and he would like a better idea of who he is appointing to that board. Especially since there might be possible ethics charges filed by that committee.

Council Member Bashert asked if ethics violations are charge to a Council Member would that go through the Ethics Board. City Attorney Barr responded it could but would depend on the circumstance. Council Member Murdock stated a person could file a complaint through the Ethics Board. Ms. Bashert stated the Mayor nominates and Council approves, this is a question of if Council wants an Ethics Board or not. She knows Patricia Berry and she is fair, pragmatic, direct, and intelligent individual. She would trust were to serve the position well. Council Member Robb asked if this could be postponed until the next meeting so the application could be provided.

Council Member Vogt moved, seconded by Council Member Richardson to table the appointment of Patricia Berry until the December 19, 2017 meeting.

On a roll call, the vote to table the appointment of Patricia Berry until December 19th was as follows:

Mayor Pro-Tem Brown	Yes	Council Member Robb	Yes
Council Member Murdock	Yes	Mayor Edmonds	Absent
Council Member Richardson	Yes	Council Member Vogt	Yes
Council Member Bashert	Yes		

VOTE:

YES: 6 NO: 0 ABSENT: 1 (Edmonds) VOTE: Carried

4. Resolution No. 2017-285, approving non-resident appointment to LDFA.

RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF YPSILANTI:

THAT, the following individuals be appointed to the City of Ypsilanti Boards and Commissions as indicated below:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>BOARD</u>	<u>TERM EXPIRATION</u>
Phil Tepley (non-resident) 752 E. Grand Blvd Ypsilanti, MI 48198	LDFA	6/30/2021

OFFERED BY: Council Member Vogt
SECONDED BY: Council Member Bashert

Council Member Richardson stated some time ago Council approved a resolution to only have city residents serve on boards and commissions. She asked if that resolution was rescinded. Council Member Murdock replied it takes a supermajority to approve a non-resident, which is why this approval was separated. Ms. Richardson asked why a non-

resident is being appointed when the city has qualified residents. Council Member Robb responded Mr. Tepley works for the Michigan Small Business and has been on the board for some time. He has a wealth of knowledge and that is the reason he has been nominated for appointment. He is sure a resident could do the job, but Mr. Tepley is an asset to the city and LDFA.

On a roll call, the vote to amend Resolution No. 2017-285 was as follows:

Mayor Pro-Tem Brown	Yes	Council Member Robb	Yes
Council Member Murdock	Yes	Mayor Edmonds	Absent
Council Member Richardson	Yes	Council Member Vogt	Yes
Council Member Bashert	Yes		

VOTE:

YES: 6 NO: 0 ABSENT: 1 (Edmonds) VOTE: Carried

5. Resolution No. 2017-286, opposing repeal of Michigan's Prevailing Wage Law.

WHEREAS, Michigan's Prevailing Wage Law has been in existence since 1965, and

WHEREAS, the City of Ypsilanti has enacted a prevailing wage ordinance, and

WHEREAS, an initiative petition has been filed to repeal the prevailing wage law, and

WHEREAS, Paying a prevailing wage attracts skilled, safe and productive workers who ensure projects are done on time and on budget, saving costs for taxpayers; and

WHEREAS, Prevailing wage laws ensure our tax dollars are used to create jobs for local workers; and

WHEREAS, Michigan's Prevailing wage provides a critical foundation for construction trades apprenticeship programs; and

WHEREAS, there is little evidence that prevailing wage increases costs; and

WHEREAS, prevailing wage policies mean that the state will have a more skilled and educated workforce skilled and educated workforce, as well as safer local construction jobs for Michigan men and women.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the City of Ypsilanti opposes the repeal of Michigan's prevailing wage law.

AND FURTHER RESOLVED that in the event that the initiative petition is certified that the legislature place the issue on the 2018 November ballot to let the people decide,

AND FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be sent to the entire membership of the Michigan House of Representatives and Senate as well Kirk Profit, the City's lobbyist.

OFFERED BY: Council Member Murdock

SECONDED BY: Council Member Richardson

Darwin McClary to me, Nan, Beth, Beth

Dec 7

Keith:

Below please find the response from EMU regarding the city's involvement with the bike share program. It appears that EMU is very pleased with the city's participation and interest so far and that we are actively involved. Please pass this along to the Sustainability Commission. Thanks so much!



Darwin D. P. McClary

City Manager

One South Huron Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197
[\(734\) 483-1810](tel:(734)483-1810) – office
[\(734\) 483-7260](tel:(734)483-7260) – fax
www.cityofypsilanti.com

From: Caroline Sanders [mailto:csanders@emich.edu]

Sent: Thursday, December 07, 2017 11:07 AM

To: Darwin McClary <dmccclary@cityofypsilanti.com>

Cc: Bonnie Wessler <bwessler@cityofypsilanti.com>; Beth Ernat <BErnat@cityofypsilanti.com>

Subject: Re: Bike Share Project

Mr. McClary, Beth and Bonnie have been fabulous to work with regarding this and another critical project. Third party, anonymous comments would not be something that I would feel comfortable responding to. Again, you are welcome to speak with me or Bonnie and I'm happy to add you to the next meeting invitation. Thank you.

Sent from my iPad

On Dec 7, 2017, at 10:26 AM, Darwin McClary <dmccclary@cityofypsilanti.com> wrote:

Caroline:

Thank you for your kind and very prompt response. I know that Bonnie has been engaged in this project, but I was concerned about the comment that was made at our Sustainability Commission meeting that EMU believes that the city is not interested in this project. Do you or anyone else connected with this project from EMU have that impression or feeling? I would hope that you have found the city supportive of your efforts. It is my understanding that this is an EMU project and that any involvement by the city would center around the city making sure that its ordinances and policies are supportive of the bike share program. If there is any other involvement needed from the city, please do not hesitate to reach out to me or Bonnie.

Thank you again for your quick response!

<image001.png>

Darwin D. P. McClary

City Manager

One South Huron Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197
[\(734\) 483-1810](tel:(734)483-1810) – office
[\(734\) 483-7260](tel:(734)483-7260) – fax
www.cityofypsilanti.com

From: Caroline Sanders [<mailto:csanders@emich.edu>]
Sent: Thursday, December 07, 2017 10:07 AM
To: Darwin McClary <dmcclary@cityofypsilanti.com>
Cc: Bonnie Wessler <bwessler@cityofypsilanti.com>; jalexande1@emich.edu; tkovacs@emich.edu
Subject: Fwd: Bike Share Project

Mr. McClary, Bonnie was present at the demonstration(s). Professor Kovacs was the EMU representative that invited the City of Ypsilanti to attend the demonstration. An additional meeting is planned with our community partners, hopefully within the next two weeks. Bonnie, as a city planner will be invited. Feel free to speak with Bonnie or me with additional questions. Thank you!

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Vicki Reaume <vreaume@emich.edu>
Date: December 7, 2017 at 9:54:40 AM EST
To: Darwin McClary <dmcclary@cityofypsilanti.com>, Decky Alexander <Decky.Alexander@emich.edu>, Caroline Sanders <csanders@emich.edu>
Subject: Re: Bike Share Project

Hello Darwin:

It is news to me regarding EMU not be interested . . . I have copied Decky Alexander and Caroline Sanders on this email. Decky runs our Engage EMU program and Caroline is handling Community Relations. They have worked on the bike share program and will reach back to you. I apologize for the confusion and appreciate you reaching out.

Vicki Reaume

On Thu, Dec 7, 2017 at 9:49 AM, Darwin McClary <dmcclary@cityofypsilanti.com> wrote:

Vicki:

I understand that EMU has been working on establishing a bike share program. During our Sustainability Commission meeting on Monday, a comment was made that EMU feels that the city is not interested in this project, but no one from the university has ever contacted me to discuss the project. I do know that the city was informed of the demonstration by the potential vendors that took place a few weeks ago, and we did have staff attend the demonstration. Could you provide me with the contact information for the person at EMU who is working on this project?

Thanks so much for your kind help!

<image001.png>

Darwin D. P. McClary

City Manager

One South Huron Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197
[\(734\) 483-1810](tel:(734)483-1810) – office
[\(734\) 483-7260](tel:(734)483-7260) – fax
www.cityofypsilanti.com

--

Vicki Reaume

Vice President and Secretary to the Board of Regents

Interim Vice President of Government Relations

Eastern Michigan University

207 Welch Hall

Ypsilanti, MI 48197

[734/487-2410](tel:7344872410)

GO GREEN!

Darwin McClary to me, Beth, Beth

Dec 7

Keith:

FYI below regarding my staff's response about the bike share program.

...



Darwin D. P. McClary

City Manager

One South Huron Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197
(734) 483-1810 – office
(734) 483-7260 – fax
www.cityofypsilanti.com

From: Bonnie Wessler
Sent: Thursday, December 07, 2017 2:18 PM
To: Darwin McClary <dmccclary@cityofypsilanti.com>
Cc: Beth Ernat <BErnat@cityofypsilanti.com>; Caroline Sanders <csanders@emich.edu>
Subject: RE: Bike Share Project

Caroline: thank you for your kind comments. :)

Darwin: I have not heard from the EMU bike share team members since the demonstration. I was under the impression that dockless bikeshare was a fully EMU-led project, and at the point that they needed our input or support, they'd reach out to us, and just confirmed with Caroline that's in fact the case. At no point have I indicated that the City would not be interested in a partnership- in fact, I've been pretty enthusiastic about it in the casual conversations I've had since the demo.

Thanks,
Bonnie

--

Bonnie Wessler
City Planner
Community Development Division, City of Ypsilanti
(734) 483.9646 (office)
bwessler@cityofypsilanti.com

Sign up to receive City news and public notices here: <http://cityofypsilanti.com/list.aspx>

--

...

From: Caroline Sanders [<mailto:csanders@emich.edu>]
Sent: Thursday, December 07, 2017 11:07 AM
To: Darwin McClary <dmccclary@cityofypsilanti.com>
Cc: Bonnie Wessler <bwessler@cityofypsilanti.com>; Beth Ernat <BErnat@cityofypsilanti.com>
Subject: Re: Bike Share Project

Mr. McClary, Beth and Bonnie have been fabulous to work with regarding this and another critical project. Third party, anonymous comments would not be something that I would feel comfortable responding to. Again, you are welcome to speak with me or Bonnie and I'm happy to add you to the next meeting invitation. Thank you.

Sent from my iPad



Seattle Test Will Lead to Regulating Dockless Bike-Share

BY JOSH COHEN | DECEMBER 21, 2017



LimeBike in Seattle (Photo by Joe Mabel)

Ridership numbers look good for private, dockless bike-share companies Spin, LimeBike and Ofo, after almost six months of operation in Seattle. As of the beginning of December, the three companies had served up **347,300 rides** totaling 1,052,061 miles. Pronto, the city's beleaguered, docked system, which shut down **in January**, had a total of 278,143 rides in its two and a half years of existence.

The Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) is running a yearlong pilot program to evaluate private bike-share use and the potential problems before creating the final regulations under which the companies will have to operate. Halfway through the pilot, SDOT isn't quite ready to declare dockless bike-share a success, but it's likely to continue permitting the companies after July 2018 when it ends. Some Seattle bike-share advocates are more skeptical of the early numbers and worry about whether the companies can really serve as a viable transportation tool.

“We’ve seen high mileage and high ridership numbers that compare very favorably to station-based systems around the country and what we had with Pronto,” says Joel Miller, SDOT bike-share program manager. “We’re not really prepared to say this is a success or isn’t a success until the end of the data collection period. In the next month or two, we will put together our full evaluation.”

The upside of high ridership numbers is tempered by some frustrations. The biggest problem is bike parking. Because the bikes use a rear wheel lock instead of locking to a rack or dock, users can and do park them anywhere. Bikes get left in the middle of the sidewalk, block ADA curb ramps, and block business and transit access. Because the bikes aren’t locked to anything, there’s also the issue of vandals [throwing them in lakes](#) and into the Puget Sound, and hanging them in trees and other creative and inconvenient places.

Miller says the majority of bikes are parked correctly, but with the three companies circulating close to 10,000 bikes, a small percentage of users can still pose real accessibility issues. Proper parking is going to be a factor in regulation. Miller says SDOT will require the companies to move improperly parked bikes within two hours of a problem being reported. If they fail to do so, SDOT will start reducing the number of bikes the company is permitted to put on the street.

“That doesn’t help someone in a wheelchair who has a bike in their way right there and then. But the two-hour rule incentivizes companies to deal with parking problems,” says Miller.

For Ryan Packer, a vocal bike-share advocate and senior editor at [The Urbanist](#), the biggest problem with the new companies is their lack of reliability, both in terms of bike availability and mechanical quality.

Whereas Pronto had established stations that were almost guaranteed to have bikes whenever you wanted them, the dockless bikes could be anywhere at a given time. “I’m fairly disappointed in [dockless bike-share] so far. It’s less of an option you can depend on,” Packer says. He acknowledges that the flip side of that, the ability to leave the bike next to your destination, wherever it happens to be, is a plus.

The reliability of the bikes themselves is a factor for Packer as well. “The bikes are definitely a lower quality. I have to do a full inspection of them before I get on the bike, which I didn’t have to do with Pronto. I’ve come across bikes without pedals, bikes without seats.”

One of SDOT’s proposed solutions to the parking problems might help address the reliability issue. SDOT is considering making corrals for the bike-share bikes. They would paint boxes on the edge of sidewalks out of the right-of-way and on streets protected by physical barriers in the last 20 to 30 feet of a block before an intersection where it’s illegal for cars to park.

“The important thing to me is it needs to be really visible on the app,” says Packer. “It needs to be integrated. If people see the benefit of being able to drop off and pick up bikes consistently, then that will be really helpful. Similarly, I hope SDOT makes some strides towards encouraging more grouping of bikes at transit stations.”

Packer says there are clues in the data available so far that indicate people have been using dockless bike-share more for recreational rides than commutes. For one, nearly 80 percent of the trips were made at off-peak hours. For two, the average dockless bike-share ride is longer than 20 minutes and 3 miles, both longer than Pronto's averages.

Miller says they'll have a clearer picture of who's using the bikes and why after their full data analysis in the coming months. But in general he says, "we like this as a mobility tool to serve all, not necessarily just for commuters."

If it does turn out that dockless bike-share is mostly being used for recreation rather than transportation, it's not necessarily a bad thing, says Packer. "It is great to have people biking and great if it helps people get more active. But we have serious transportation challenges, especially downtown. I think it also could have the potential to replace some transit, ride-hailing or single-occupancy vehicle trips. But it's all about reliability and people getting used to the system."

SDOT is aiming to have its data evaluation complete by the end of February and a regulatory framework established by the end of the spring.

BECOME A NEXT CITY MEMBER TODAY



Josh Cohen is a freelance writer in Seattle. His work has also appeared in The Guardian, The Nation, Pacific Standard and Vice.

 [FOLLOW JOSH](#)  [EMAIL JOSH](#)

TAGS: [SEATTLE](#), [BIKING](#), [BIKE-SHARE](#)

EU: Uber Is a Taxi Company, Not Just an App

BY [RACHEL DOVEY](#) | DECEMBER 20, 2017

**BRIEF**

LimeBike touts benefits of dockless bike-share in year-end report

By **Kristin Musulin** • Dec. 21, 2017

Dive Brief:

- Since its inaugural launch at University of North Carolina Greensboro in June, dockless bike-share company LimeBike has serviced more than 1 million rides with a 60% national retention rate, and has entered more than 30 markets including Seattle, Dallas, Washington, DC and South Bend, IN, according to its year-end report.
- LimeBike reports that its service costs \$5 to \$7 less than ride-sharing; has increased access to public transit; has saved 17,100 gallons of gas (enough to fill 700 full-size SUVs); and has cut 330,000 lbs of CO2.
- LimeBike aims to expand the "urban transportation revolution" by encouraging followers to "vote" for the next market to enter. Cities that reach 500 votes on their website will be considered.

Dive Insight:

Dockless bike-share hit the industry hot this year, as a number of dockless services infiltrated cities. In many markets, LimeBike and its competitors — Ofo, Spin, Mobike and electric bike service Jump — were adopted all at once, creating a battleground of competition for traditional, docked bike services. In Washington, DC, that competition was welcomed by CapitalBikeshare officials who believed the dockless services could increase overall acceptance and use of bike-share. However, that theory has not yet been proven conclusively.

And not all markets have had a favorable opinion of the dockless trend. The core feature of these bikes is a locking rear wheel that allows the bikes to be "parked" anywhere; however the reality of bikes being randomly abandoned in the middle of sidewalks or scattered around parks have left some city officials frustrated. In Seattle, bikes have even been thrown into lakes. That city is now considering painting parking corrals on sidewalks for the dockless bikes.

Despite concerns, it is likely that the dockless bike trend will continue to grow in both cities and on university campuses due to convenience and low cost — which should motivate ride-share services such as Uber and Lyft to stay creative and vigilant in the wake of growing bike-share opportunities. Some companies like Gotcha Group have tried to get ahead of the competition by building their own mobility services — Gotcha offers both ride- and bike-share to targeted collegiate partners — and it's likely similar companies will enter the market as the sharing service industry grows.

Recommended Reading:

 Markets Insider

LimeBike Releases Report On Economic, Health And Social Benefits Of Smart Bike Sharing 