

APPROVED**CITY OF ANN ARBOR - PARKS ADVISORY COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES - TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2005****A - CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by John Satarino (Chair)

B - ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Berla, Macomber, Cohen (Arrived @ 4:15 p.m.), Satarino, Berauer, Rodgers and Offen (7)

Commissioners Absent: Reneaud, Rising (2)

Ex-Officio Members Present: Johnson & Woods (2)

Ex-Officio Members Absent: Aeschbach (1)

Staff Present: Miller, Henderson, Bergren, Bemish, Dehring, Kuras and Acquaviva

C - SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

C-1 – Emerald Ash Borer Presentation - Karla Henderson and Mike Bergren

Various questions were asked by the Commission which included: Funding sources for removal of diseased trees, replanting, manpower, EAB Millage on November 2005 Ballot, borrowing funds from the insurance fund and contracting final tree removal.

C-2 – Waterscapes – Storm Water Management as Art and Amenity – Joan Martin

Presentation shows what damage is happening with stormwater runoff.

C-3 – Waterscapes as Public Art – Margaret Hunter

Questions from the Commission included: How to begin coordination of storm water gardens, which sites, other examples that the Commission might look at, possibly involving the University of Michigan, involving private developers in new building projects, AATA bus stops as info spots and funding for public art.

D - PUBLIC COMMENTARY OF AGENDA ITEMS

1. Glen Thompson, 100 Longman Lane, Ann Arbor, MI 48103 - Spoke in opposition regarding the new proposed City Market Master Plan.
2. Karen Sidney, 100 Longman Lane, Ann Arbor, MI 48103 – Presented financial documents regarding the Farmer's Market in connection with the Parks Department.
3. Christine Hildebrand, 2115 Devonshire, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 – Thinks the new proposed Market Master Plan is "shameful."
4. Robert Dascola – One of the Members of "Friends of West Park" – Wants to help West Park with additional gardens and future planning. – Email is: Bdascola@umich.edu

55 **E - APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

56
57 **"Moved by Berauer, Seconded by Berla** that the minutes of the August 16, 2005 Regular Session be
58 accepted with changes – lines 381 and 383."
59

60 On a Voice Vote – **Motion Passed** -Unanimous

61
62 **F - UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

63
64 **F-1 Discussion on PAC By-Laws**

65
66 Satarino – Suggests this issue be tabled until it can be studied more.

67
68 J. Miller – Will check with the City Attorney's Office on status of all Commission By-Laws. Their office is
69 currently reviewing those from each of the City Boards and Commissions.

70
71 Berauer – I'd agree with tabling, Article 6, Section 7 (Order of Meeting), that we add "Report from any other
72 Committee or Sub-Committee." The next section speaks to term limitations. Do we have term limitations?

73
74 J. Miller – Not that I'm aware of. If you did, it would be in your by-laws. The Attorneys office is looking into
75 that matter as well.

76
77 Offen – I'd like a better idea of the Community Services Area and what the C.S. Administrator does. We're
78 obligated to change our by-laws to adapt to the reorganization and title changes. Can we generalize this
79 without amending the by-laws each time?

80
81 J. Miller – I have some recommendations on changes too, but the way particular positions are referenced is
82 actually consistent with the changes that have happened. I don't believe we'll have to make those structural
83 changes any time again soon.

84
85 Rodgers – Article 4, Section 2, speaks to 'Members to be appointed to the Commission' - Is the Assistant
86 Superintendent for Community Services the Ann Arbor Public Schools or their designee? (J. Miller) – Yes,
87 that's an incorrect title, it's actually the Director of Community Services. Would it be a good idea to have a
88 University representative for planning to be represented here?

89
90 J. Miller – Questions the need for still having a liaison with the Schools still since Sara Aeschbach has not
91 been attending regular PAC meetings. We need to encourage her to be here and if she doesn't want to be
92 in that role, to provide some rationale back to this body (PAC).

93
94 Berla – From my position as the RAC representative, there isn't always a lot of information. Maybe we need
95 those contact people involved, but not every meeting. We could remove them from the By-Laws and have
96 them submit communications.

97
98 Cohen – Better agenda planning where we could invite others to meetings of interest and have a list of
99 people whose functions overlap with ours in someway so that we can invite them for input.

100
101 Berla – Would be nice to have a commitment from someone at the County and U of M.

102
103 Rodgers – Article 5, Section 5 dealing with the Vice-Chair, so that Vice-Chair could be replaced if
104 necessary. Same Article, Section 6, we should remove those representatives like Public Schools, Leslie
105 Science Center, etc. and instead have them invited for meetings which have something involving them.
106 Section 7 is also redundant.

107
108 Satarino – Also talked about annual reports from these people.
109

110 J. Miller – Article 3, second paragraph – Mentions recommendations to Community Services Area
 111 Administrator, City Administrator and Council, in particular recommendations should be Community Services
 112 Administrator as well as Public Services Administrator. Park Operations and Maintenance and Forestry are
 113 a part of Public Services, so this body should be making recommendations there also.

114
 115 Article 4, Section 2 – Two Members of Council and Community Services Administrator serving on this body -
 116 (This should be Parks and Recreation Manager). Article 6, Section 7 – Order of meeting. – The Agenda –
 117 need to add a report from the Parks and Recreation Field person. Article 8, Section 4, Parks and
 118 Recreation person more appropriate here? Those are my recommendations.

119
 120 Offen – It would help me to know what the responsibilities of the Parks and Recreation Manager are as
 121 opposed to the Community Services Administrator.

122
 123 J. Miller – I will get in touch with you (Offen) and provide an orientation. I'll bring a revised document next
 124 meeting based on our comments today. I will also check with the Attorney's office on by-laws for all Boards
 125 and Commissions. (Article will be laid on the table in October, voted on in November.)

126
 127 **F-2 Discussion of Renewal of Millages**

128
 129 Satarino – Spoke about the millages that will be on the next ballot.

130
 131 J. Miller – Due to the budget process and having to rethink our funding strategies and decrease our budget
 132 and going to a 2 year budget plan, looking at more long term answers (such as the Park Millages) for the
 133 City as a whole. These are still conversation with City Council and other strategies for them to consider for
 134 long term funding. What are our needs long term? Amy Kuras and staff are looking at those two millages
 135 and what our long-term needs are.

136
 137 Satarino – (Recaps Regionalization proposal for Parks, other alternatives that PAC has discussed.) Will
 138 these be included with the Council Committee?

139
 140 J. Miller – We have already mentioned these to Council, and there is the Metro-Alliance, which is a
 141 conglomeration of elected officials throughout the Cities and Townships, and one of those topics is
 142 Regionalization.

143
 144 Berauer – Is it true that a Regional Parks System cannot conform to the boundaries of the school district
 145 because they bisect some of the jurisdictions?

146
 147 J. Miller – The conversations are not that far along yet to determine what the boundaries are.

148
 149 Rodgers – Concerned that PAC has not had a chance to discuss what the millage proposals are going to
 150 be, nor time to discuss them thoroughly.

151
 152 J. Miller – I agree, and this Commission does need to review that.

153
 154 Johnson – I think that PAC needs a rundown on what the millages pay for now, and what will suffer if the
 155 millages fail. What is the General Fund contribution to the Parks department? Is that at risk? That needs to
 156 be put forth for the conversation.

157
 158 Woods – Agrees with Council Member Johnson. The Administrator and C. S. Administrator are thinking
 159 farther ahead about these issues, even more than City Council, which is what they're paid to do, but that
 160 doesn't mean that PAC will be excluded.

161
 162 Offen – Do we have a timetable for this?

163
 164 J. Miller – I fully expect that Council will expect recommendations from this body, but I don't have a timetable
 165 yet.

166
 167 Berauer – Did PAC have a Sub-Committee in the past just to deal with this? (Satarino) Yes.
 168 We might think about doing that again and who might want to serve on it.

169
 170 **F-3 Emerald Ash Borer Millage**

171
 172 Satarino – The EAB is a severe problem, and one that wasn't budgeted for. I think this is important to have
 173 the money available for the removal of these trees.

174
 175 Rodgers – This millage language doesn't specify that this is only for removal of the trees. There is also
 176 "municipal service charges" – can this be more specific.

177
 178 **Moved by Berla, Seconded by S. Offen** "To accept the EAB Millage Language."

179
 180 *(Discussion)*

181
 182 Woods – My understanding that this language has already been accepted by the Governors office for a
 183 ballot proposal. There isn't really anything that can be done about this at this point, but that you want to let
 184 City Council know that you are supportive on this. We had dialogue on City Council about the Municipal
 185 Service Charges and wanted to know what was actually going to be covered by the millage. Basically,
 186 you're deciding to let City Council know if you're in support of it.

187
 188 Johnson – It helps to say that PAC is in favor of it (if you're in favor of it). Your voice matters.

189
 190 Offen – I'd appreciate having been asked before Council voted on this.

191
 192 Berla – Our role is still important, we can tell the voters what we think. I'm in favor of this. I understand there
 193 are some issues about Municipal Service Charges, but from my perspective, the rise in those charges are a
 194 result of the way the general financing of the City government has been going; namely, we've had increases
 195 in cost and fewer staff doing the same jobs, and a certain amount of functions that were handled in the
 196 General Fund are now reflected in the budget of every single department. I don't see it as an important
 197 problem.

198
 199 J. Miller – This goes back to getting some guidance from Council on "how much can the public bear" and
 200 "where do we get the funding for these things?"

201
 202 Woods – The citizens I've heard from are more concerned with removal right now. It might distress them to
 203 see some areas being replanted when their area has not yet had their dead trees removed.

204
 205 Berauer – Who is in charge of educational materials for the EAB issue? There should be some kind of
 206 warning in the literature letting the public know that a replanting is not included in that millage.

207
 208 Rodgers – I don't feel comfortable supporting this until there is an accounting of what the 4 plus Million
 209 dollars will be spent on.

210
 211 (More discussion by the Commission about the Municipal Service Charge and the
 212 conditions of the EAB contracts, removal costs and accounting for funding.)

213
 214 Offen – Suggests the meeting be tabled until October 18th (next PAC meeting). **Move to "Table the vote
 215 on the EAB millage language, Seconded by Rodgers."**

216
 217 Satarino – The vote on this is November 8th, and our next meeting isn't until two weeks before that, so it
 218 doesn't give much time to exploit our approval for the millage proposal.

219
 220 Woods – I'd like to speak to the motion on the floor. If the information regarding this is given to you (S.
 221 Offen) by Tom Crawford (A2 CFO), would this suffice so that a vote could be taken on this?

222 Satarino – Maybe we could have this information and vote on it when we meet at the next LAC meeting on
 223 the 3rd of October?.

224
 225 J. Miller – If you table this, you could call a special meeting, we would post it, you could vote on it there.
 226

227 M. Bergren – The Municipal Service Charge is \$16,000.00 at 3 percent interest total. We will have to borrow
 228 against our Insurance Risk Fund until the millage money starts next July.
 229

230 Satarino – (To Offen and Rodgers) Is this enough information?

231
 232 Offen – Yes, I withdraw the Motion to Table.
 233

234 Satarino – (Re-reads the original motion for approval of the EAB Millage Language.)
 235 On a Voice Vote – **Motion Passed** - Unanimously.
 236

237 **G - NEW BUSINESS**

238
 239 **G-1 Election of Chair and Vice-Chair**

240
 241 J. Satarino – We have two members absent. We could defer this until the next meeting due to the
 242 absences.
 243

244 **BREAK - Meeting recessed at 6:33 p.m.**
 245 **Reconvene at 6:40 p.m. – (Woods excused – has another meeting.)**
 246

247 *Commission agreed to move this issue to the October meeting.
 248

249 Cohen – Can we ask anyone who might be interested in serving as a PAC Officer to contact us so that we
 250 have a basis to go on for the next meeting?
 251

252 **H - COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS**

253
 254 **H-1 Discussion of PAC 12-Month Work Plan**

255
 256 Satarino – This is also a lengthy issue, and I suggest that we talk about this topic then as well. (Item
 257 postponed to the October 18th, 2005 PAC meeting).
 258

259 **I – REPORT FROM INTERIM PARKS AND RECREATION MANAGER**

260
 261 **I-1 Park Rehabilitation and Development Millage Project List Update – September 2005***

262
 263 **I-2 City Council Items Update***
 264

265 Satarino – *There aren't many updates on these two items, but if you have questions, feel free to ask them.
 266 We would like to have a PROS Plan update.
 267

268 A. Kuras – *PROS Plan* – We had a Steering Committee meeting. We have all of the public commentary
 269 from the County and PAC. (Thanks PAC for all the comments and hard work they've contributed.) Now
 270 have to evaluate all the comments and incorporate those into the Plan and then set up a timetable. We
 271 understand that PAC wants to devote discussion on approval of this plan from the Planning Commission at
 272 the next PAC meeting in October. I'll try to get those changes out to you prior to that meeting so a vote can
 273 be taken in October – Planning Commission would be November, and we'd like to get this through Council
 274 in December so that we have the Plan finished by the end of the year.
 275

276 The last tenant at Bandemere Park is out and our opinions as staff is that those buildings are not
 277 salvageable and the ability to bring them up to code and make them barrier free is virtually impossible,
 278 especially since there is no water or sewer on site. I've prepared a demolition bid for those structures.
 279 John (Satarino) expressed an interest in seeing those structures, so if PAC would like to tour them, I'll try to
 280 set that up.

281
 282 Offen – Which buildings are these?

283
 284 Kuras – The two middle huts and the brick building that is attached to them and the garage behind the
 285 rowing building.

286
 287 Berauer – Is this within walking distance of the Ice House?

288
 289 Satarino - That is the Ice House. They used these buildings to store ice that they cut from Argo Pond, so
 290 there was a concern about their Historic Value.

291
 292 Kuras – Many safety issues besides no water or sewer that we don't know how to resolve. I'll send an email
 293 to everyone to set up a tour time.

294
 295 **I-3 Dog Park Update**

296
 297 I-3 Jeff Dehring gave an update on how agreements between the City and the County are developing.
 298 County has done some initial design, but no farther. (A copy of the 1998 Dog Park Report was
 299 passed out to PAC as was requested). The old plan doesn't have any effect on what we're doing
 300 now, but there is some good data in that report. We want to work on a mutual agreement with the
 301 County at this point so that we can put that in place before we go any further and invest more
 302 money, staff time and effort.

303
 304 Macomber – Report is dated 1998 – Outdated in raising concerns about Dog Parks. Since that time, many
 305 cities have new dog parks and are fairly 'trouble free.'

306
 307 Dehring - At the time the old plan was put together, it was an ongoing 'topic' and in its beginning stages.
 308 Our role will basically be to provide the land and some maintenance issues because it is on a City owned
 309 property and certain conditions must be met because it is located on the landfill site. Right now, the County
 310 will design, manage and operate, in addition to what we can work out with private clubs, etc.

311
 312 Berauer – How is liability handled?

313
 314 Dehring – That is another facet – involves the attorney's office in making certain that is all spelled out.

315
 316 J. Miller – We provide the site, County manages and operates, and from my perspective this shifts most
 317 responsibility toward the County. We need to agree on all the implications that this involves for both
 318 agencies before we go any further. I would hate for the public to anticipate this, then not be able to work out
 319 logistics with the County.

320
 321 **J - REPORT FROM RECREATION ADVISORY COMMISSION**

322
 323 Berla – Ongoing session about the Softball Issue – Rec and Ed and the City had worked out who did what
 324 (maintenance issues, etc), except the dispute over an invoice from a few years ago. It seemed
 325 unnecessary. Rec and Ed felt this was not something that was 'intended' to be paid because it was so
 326 outside of the way things were done when it was sent, but there was a feeling that 'we can't do business
 327 with you because you owe us money!' These two groups should be working toward solving problems, and
 328 they're spending time and money from both entities.

329
 330 J. Miller – It goes back to a meeting a year ago. George Pinera asked us to invoice the School District for
 331 both that and Mack pool. RAC was also meeting with the Board of Ed and came up with a proposal to pay,

332 based on that. We invoiced based on George Pineras request – RAC came up with a proposal to pay and
 333 the school refused to pay anything. From the City Attorney’s standpoint, I hope you can appreciate that.
 334 The fundamental issue is to clear up the past before we start a new contract. George Pineras was not
 335 aware that this was the stumbling block and said he would take care of that.

336
 337 Berla – Brown Park – Trash Pickup – and Parks in General – how often is trash pick up? We need trash
 338 recycling bins in the parks.

339
 340 J. Miller – I was a big proponent of recycling in Parks, but we found that it is labor intensive, because most
 341 people put trash in there, so someone has to go through it and separate it. It becomes a challenge in an
 342 open facility.

343
 344 Berla – Specific to Brown Park, can we discuss whether we can have staff go through the park and pick up
 345 trash?

346
 347 J. Miller – Ok.

348
 349 **K - REPORT FROM ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION**

350
 351 None. Rising Absent.

352
 353 **L - REPORT FROM GREENBELT ADVISORY COMMISSION**

354
 355 None – Johnson Excused. Left @ 6:33 p.m.

356
 357 **M – REPORT FROM GREENWAY TASKFORCE**

358
 359 Berauer – (Gave a rundown on the newly formed Taskforce members, meetings and times.) Members of
 360 this group include Jean Carlberg (Council), James D’Amour (Planning), myself from PAC, Sandi Smith
 361 (DDA), Peter Pollack (Landscape Architect), Peter Osler (Architect), Larissa Larsen (Landscape Architect
 362 and Professor at U of M), Barbara Murphy (President of the OWS Association) and Margaret Wong
 363 (Architect and Co-Chair of the Friends of the Ann Arbor Greenway). Jayne is the staff person working with
 364 us. We’ll be meeting every Wednesday at the Edison building from 7:00 until 9:00.

365
 366 J. Miller – Meetings will be televised. We are also going to be having the Greenway Taskforce on our
 367 website, so meeting times and agenda’s will be listed.

368
 369 **M - PUBLIC COMMENTARY - GENERAL**

370
 371 1. Christine Hildebrand, 2115 Devonshire, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 - Would like PAC to look at the staff
 372 that runs the City Parks System; Karla, Jeff and in terms of cost. Unhappy that the City is spending
 373 One Million dollars on the little ‘spit’ of land known as Farmer’s Market which serves it’s own
 374 purpose.

375
 376 **N - TRANSMITTALS**

377
 378 None.

379
 380 **"Motion to Adjourn by Berla, Seconded by Macomber."** On a Voice Vote – Motion Passes - Unanimous

381
 382 Meeting adjourned at 7:07 p.m.

383
 384 Submitted by: Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Service Specialist IV

385