

1 **APPROVED**

2
3 **CITY OF ANN ARBOR – PARKS ADVISORY COMMISSION**
4 **MEETING MINUTES - TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2005**
5

6
7 **A - CALL TO ORDER**
8

9 Meeting was called to order at 4:20 p.m. by J. Satarino (Chair)

10
11 **B - ROLL CALL**
12

13 Commissioners Present: Berla, Berauer, Cohen, Macomber, Riseng, Rodgers Reneaud, Offen and
14 Satarino (9)

15
16 Commissioners Absent: (0)

17
18 Ex-Officio Members Present: Johnson

19
20 Ex-Officio Members Absent: Aeschbach and Woods (2)

21
22 Staff Present: Miller, Kuras, Dehring and Acquaviva
23

24 **C - SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS**
25

26 None.

27
28 **D - PUBLIC COMMENTARY OF AGENDA ITEMS**
29

30 None.

31
32 **E - APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
33

34 **“Moved Riseng, Seconded Renault by that the minutes of the October 2005 Regular Session be**
35 **approved with changes.”**
36

37 Changes: Line 29 - Ethel Potts commentary – Berauer requests more detail – reference to city policy and
38 Huron river and stormwater runoff that she wanted in the PROS Plan and the City’s Policy regarding plant
39 growth.

40
41 Line 31 - Karen Sidney commentary – Berauer requests more detail – States that speaker spoke about the
42 financing for the EAB issue.

43
44 Line 284 – Change language that states ‘very busy’ – Riseng wants to change the language to ‘more
45 productive.’

46
47 *Vote – **Passed** - Unanimous*
48

49 **G – NEW BUSINESS**
50

51 **(Questions and General Statements):**
52

53 Rising – Was asked by people on the Environmental Commission as to what the City’s policy is on
54 Community Gardens in neighborhood parks – possible future subject?
55

56 Satarino – There is a proposal by city staff to shift \$500,000 from our repair and rehabilitation millage to the
57 transfer to remove trees in city parks that have been affected by the Emerald Ash Borer. This will go before
58 City Council next Monday, so we should at least have a chance to gather more information and discuss it.
59

60 Offen – States he hasn't heard anything about this at all
61

62 J. Miller – Last weeks election saw the defeat of the Emerald Ash Borer millage, and after last City Council
63 meeting there was a meeting of the Budget and Finance Committee (a Council Sub-Committee). Staff and
64 Administration proposed a number of options for Council to consider and give us guidance on in terms of
65 alternative funding sources to consider for us to be able to still remove these trees. One of those alternatives
66 included using \$500,000.00 of the fund balance that's in the Park Repair and Restoration Millage. It is one of
67 a number of options being considered.
68

69 One question that did arise is, "if that \$500,000.00 is used, what won't get done and/or replaced? Park
70 Maintenance staff had anticipated using that dollar amount to put in upgraded rubberized surface in
71 neighborhood parks and playgrounds. It's a very expensive process to do, but when you do that instead of
72 putting wood chips down every year – the life of the rubberized surface and the cost comparison to replacing
73 the wood chips every year, it's more beneficial to do it. That is the work that would not get done.
74

75 Macomber – How did they arrive at \$500,000.00?
76

77 J. Miller – Currently there is \$680,000.00 in that fund that is not budgeted to be used (unallocated funds). It
78 was one of the scenarios presented to the Sub-Committee and I don't know how they arrived at that figure.
79

80 Offen – What limitations are set in the millage regarding how the dollar amounts are used (City Parks only).
81

82 J. Miller – One of the limitations is that that money has to be used on City Park Trees. (Not in the public
83 right-of-way).
84

85 Berauer – Is the intent for removal and restoration or removal only? (Removal only). How many trees?
86 (Unknown).
87

88 J. Miller – Possibly not doing stump removal. This is only one piece of the funding that staff is looking at.
89 Goal is still to remove all the trees.
90

91 Berauer – Would this be the only funding that would go toward Parks tree removal? (No – Just that this
92 particular funding source is restricted to Parks. The goal is still to remove all the 10,000 dead trees, but we
93 can begin with the trees in Parks as part of the solution).
94

95 Cohen – Is there an inventory of how many in parks are dead and must be removed? (We do have that
96 information, but not with me today. Staff is looking at the full cost of the tree removal. What do they want to
97 recommend to council, regardless of fiscal year).
98

99 Berauer – What other sources under discussion? Any trees in the Central Business that the DDA could
100 cover?
101

102 J. Miller – General fund, risk fund (without repayment), deferral of issuance of maintenance facility bonds, no
103 stump removal, limiting the Dean fund replanting, limiting trimming other trees, hiring freeze. Unknown as to
104 the amount in the Business District.
105

106 Rodgers – How much money is saved without removing stumps? (Don't have that information in front of me).
107

108 Cohen – Pay to do it later anyway, is it equal later? (Miller – Pretty much).
109

110 Chair asks for input from the Commission as to support of this? Going to Council on Monday, so, no time to
111 do that. We'll have to let City Council deal with this since we don't have time for PAC input.
112

113 J. Miller – I think that it is good for the Council members on PAC to hear your comments so that they can
114 pass those issues on to City Council.

115
116 Offen – Hearing at City Council for this? (Miller) No, not specifically on this issue – there is public comment.
117

118 Offen – Concerned, need action, if this is something that the citizens know was going to be dedicated to
119 parks and is being shifted to something else, they should be able to speak out about it and about how they
120 prefer to have their money spent.

121
122 Rodgers – Concurs with Offen. I'd like to express my unhappiness in that we don't have any input in this.
123

124
125 **PROS PLAN DISCUSSION**
126

127 **Chair Reads Resolution**
128

129
130 RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE 2006-2011
131 PARKS AND RECREATION OPEN SPACE PLAN
132

133
134 Whereas, The Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan (PROS) expires in December,
135 2005;

136
137 Whereas, the PROS Plan is the guiding document for all future planning for the Ann Arbor
138 Park System;

139
140 Whereas, The Michigan Department of Natural Resources requires that the PROS Plan be
141 updated every 5 years and that the City must provide an updated plan to be eligible to
142 apply for grants;

143
144 Whereas, A City-wide telephone sample survey, interviews, focus groups, public
145 workshops and public hearings as well as other input processes were completed as part of
146 preparing the 2006-2011 Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan;

147
148 Whereas, Public review of the draft plan has been completed including all surrounding
149 municipalities, townships, Washtenaw County, and public utilities as required to
150 incorporate the PROS Plan as part of the City of Ann Arbor's Master Plan; and

151
152 Whereas, A comprehensive list of facility improvements, recreation needs and park
153 improvements was developed to provide the basis for millage renewals and capital
154 improvements as a result of the public input;

155
156 RESOLVED, That the Park Advisory Commission approves the 2006-2011 PROS Plan
157 and recommends that the Planning Commission and City Council approve the Plan.
158

159
160 Park Advisory Commission
161 November 15, 2005
162

163 **Moved by Cohen, Seconded by Berla, that PAC discuss the PROS plan.**

164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220

DISCUSSION

SECTION A

Satarino – Introduction? Anyone object to including the intro that was submitted on the May 2005 draft? (None). Please add. Anything else to be addressed in Section “A” that is basically a history of the City and Parks system?

Berauer – **(A-5)** -- Numbers of acres of parkland is same noted in previous PROS plan. Error? (Kuras/Miller – We have that info, will verify).

MOTION by Berauer, Seconded by Rodgers to add the two maps which were in the former plan - There were previously 3 maps – on hydrology and topography and the general watershed (watershed was included, the other two are not) areas added. The other two maps should be included. **(A-14)** Kuras – they were in the last plan because required by the DEQ, but we didn’t feel they were necessary. (On a Voice Vote – Motion Passes - 7 Yeas, 2 Nays – Berla and Satarino)

Rodgers – Pg. 87 = Last paragraph under historical population growth only goes to 1990 – needs to be more up to date. (Amy will update)

SECTION “B”

Changes - **NONE.**

SECTION “C”

Rodgers – **C-2** - Paragraph under Natural Resource Preservation? Identical to the old PROS plan – repair and restoration millage paragraph 1 – whole paragraph is identical - too old. Needs updating. (Kuras – will update).

Satarino – **C-2, #1** Motion to make some deletions and additions in the first paragraph

#1. Natural Resource Preservation and newly acquired parkland ---- Should be **sixty percent** and **not fifty percent** from the information I received from NAP of the current parks and recreation system, is comprised of natural areas, then delete - **“do not receive routine maintenance”** – replace with “change 582 acres of wooded area to 855 acres --- The sentence would read “This includes 20 miles of Huron River frontage, 855 acres of forest, 275 acres of other natural areas, such as wetlands, prairies or shrublands. All from “A total” would stay – everything up unto *“The staff of natural area preservation.....* Then 3 lines down, strike **“Which is entirely supported by these millage funds, manages and protects these resources”** and insert **“Have conducted ecological assessments of these sites, and ranked them based on their level of ecological integrity and restorability.”** **“They use these rankings to prioritize their ecological stewardship activities, such as invasive species control, trail maintenance, native seedlings and wildlife enhancement.”** Then resume with “In addition” on to the end of the paragraph.

Rising – “No routine maintenance, but otherwise, it sounds more like what we look at for acquisitions.

Berauer – I understand NAP does rate them – shortened version Catherine that offered?

Offen – why the disparity in the numbers (acreage) – Why does Borneman have one set and Amy another?

Kuras – Will check into these numbers.

Riseng – Wooded areas are a better term than “Forests” - Forests mean something ‘ecologically’ and many of these areas aren’t forests. More accurate to leave as it is.

221
222 Satarino – Include some language to show the rationale on how we chose these, would be fine with me. It
223 just reinforces the idea that we need to manage natural areas like we manage any other. That would
224 discourage any purchases of new natural areas if it seems that we can't take care of them. The point is, we
225 take care of whatever it is at the level of care it needs; and that may not be traditional 'care'

226
227 Kuras – In the area that they talk about what used to be forested, but are now 'natural areas'?

228
229 Berauer – (Friendly Amendment) NAP protects and manages these resources [“At levels deemed appropriate](#)
230 [according to NAP Criteria”](#) **(Agreed – this is the only change to the above paragraph, other than the**
231 **wooded acreage numbers).**

232
233 Satarino – [Add pie charts that show revenue for parks system?](#) (as in old PROS Plan). There isn't nearly as
234 much financial info as in the previous version. That would help. ([IN FUNDING SECTION](#) – Revenue and
235 Expenditures).

236
237 **SECTION “D”**

238
239 **(Berauer) - D-1 Makes motion – Seconded by Rodgers, amended by Cohen**

240
241 Major guiding principal is missing – (Add Bullet) ***ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIPS** - “Provide
242 responsible stewardship of natural resources.

243
244 (J. Miller) Insert between “City's” and “Natural” “Parks” this will suffice. Cohen and Berla, give language
245 added to this (friendly amendment – “That impact the city's park system”)

246
247 Amended motion now reads [“*Environmental Stewardships – Provide responsible stewardship of natural](#)
248 [resources that impact the city's park system.”](#) (Accepted) On a Voice Vote – **PASSED as Amended** –
249 Unanimous.

250
251 **D-3 Motion by Rodgers , Seconded by Berauer – Under Goal 2, “Rationale”** – Second sentence –
252 Strike 3 words, so it reads [“Public service providers have a goal of providing a broad variety of recreation,](#)
253 [enrichment and leisure opportunities to all those in the community who desire these services.”](#) Rationale for
254 change? It is too broad the way it is. Sounds like we offer anything to anyone. On a Voice Vote - **PASSED** –
255 UNANIMOUS

256
257 **D-6 – H (Top of Page) Berauer goal 4.6 – Accidentally left over from the 1st plan? “Continue to improve the**
258 **recently developed maintenance plan” (KURAS – Don't have a maintenance plan for schools)**
259 **THEN - STRIKE SCHOOL - WITHDRAWN**

260
261 **Goal 5, objective C – Rodgers - Says “Replace dead or diseased ash trees.” (Ash is not included) Leave**
262 **as is --- WITHDRAWN**

263
264 **Berauer – Goal 6, D- 7 Under objectives - None of them talk about citizens proactively coming to PAC or**
265 **Parks. Wants to add in E.**

266
267 **E - “Insure avenues for citizen input in ongoing dialog with Pac and Parks staff, Including Feedback,**
268 **Public hearings, etc.” (No motion necessary) none made.**

269
270 **Under D-9 and D-10**

271
272 **GOAL 8-K (Berauer) Instead of recognize... “Work toward increasing” (NO MOTION NECESSARY)**

273
274 **GOAL 9 – Need another objective.**

275
276 **D-10 – This goal talks about enhancing Huron River and water quality, we need to add another paragraph –**
277 **Allen creek should be mentioned wherever relevant.**

278
279 MOTION TO ADD A Line“G” – (On Linda’s sheet that I didn’t get) – “Develop greenways along tributaries of
280 the Huron River where feasible to improve water quality” (Friendly Amendment by Riseng) add “And reduce
281 flooding”

282
283 (Cohen, asks Linda to remove Greenway, it means different things to different people).

284
285 (Kuras – Basically that’s an open ended statement – it’s ok. can leave it.).

286
287 **Motion by Berauer, Seconded by Offen** – On a Voice Vote – Passed – Unanimous

288
289
290 **SECTION “E”**

291
292 **E-7** – BERLA delete public hearing at RAC (Kuras – we did find that and crossed that out).

293
294 **E-4** (Satarino) – Just above “Trails and Greenway connections.” Fifth paragraph – mini workshops and
295 participant groups...Doesn’t make a point. What is the significance of that point? There weren’t any
296 respondents who said “Washtenaw County Rec. Center” - I thought we should strike the Mary Lou Murray
297 Recreation center.

298
299 STRIKE the “One Significant Issues” – Sentence within that.

300
301 Paragraph above that – (Berauer) – Her point #15 on her list.

302
303 **E-2 - FUNDING** Point 12 – “Millage” – First sentence. – Wants to change the “Millages remain (add) an
304 effective (Strike) the preferred funding source of the Ann Arbor parks and recreation system “ (As some
305 people think we don’t need the general fund, and we do!) (Language change above inclusive of friendly
306 amendment by Cohen to replace the word “preferred” with effective. – (All in agreement).

307
308 Berauer – ‘Respondents’ (That came out of the ‘focus groups’) (Second paragraph after 12) - - Identify the
309 Source of the Input (Name the Groups). It goes toward a consensus that we haven’t gotten to by the way it
310 currently reads. If we can substantiate who said the statements, we should.

311
312 Kuras – Not sure we have the data that will pinpoint that, not comfortable with that.

313 Riseng – I’m not comfortable voting for this is Amy is not comfortable with it.

314 Berauer – **(WITHDRAWN)**

315
316 **Top of E 3** - “finally, considering that (replace) many parks have corporate-sponsored programs...” – this is
317 misleading. I think it should say ‘some’

318
319 The phrase “There is an expressed desire” – this phrase is problematically vague. If we can’t say ‘who’ said
320 ‘what’ then say “some” or “a few” expressed this desire.

321
322 The previous version of this draft was changed, and I prefer the previous version – “However, many
323 expressed a concern to avoid... over-commercialization....” And that was changed to “over time, some
324 individuals have expressed a concern...”

325
326 J. Miller – I’ll read through this, tell me what you think: “Finally, considering that (add) ‘some’ parks have
327 corporate sponsored programs, a desire has been expressed to expand these relationships and generate
328 additional revenue through advertising through recreation facilities.” (...and keep the rest the same). Just
329 take (Strike) “over time” and (replace with) “some individuals say that they expressed a concern to avoid
330 privatization.” (Berauer) – Agreed.

331
332 **E-3** – Berauer – (Strike) ‘given the opportunity to elaborate....’ Replace with ‘some workshop attendees.’

333
334 **E-4** – We’ve already dealt with that.

335
336 **E-8** – Riseng – (Add) The new flood mitigation plan will be based on the new FEMA maps.
337

338 **SECTION “F”**
339

340 Berauer – **F-3** ---- Discussion between Amy, Linda, Sam, Satarino regarding the phrasing “Open Space” and
341 its use. Satarino suggests it be dropped. **(WITHDRAWN)**
342

343 Berauer - **F-4 - (Point 2 at the bottom)** — The process for Land Acquisition – The language should reflect
344 what we do... not include such things as ‘if a parcel is to be acquired, staff researches it and notifies PAC; I
345 think that that suggests that not all are brought before PAC. Historically, staff has notified PAC whether they
346 think it’s worthwhile or not, and if they don’t, they give their recommendation and generally we agree.
347 **(Delete sentence)** “When it is clear...” and substitute with “When an owner, neighbors, or others interested in
348 a particular site propose that a site be acquired, staff researches the parcel and notifies PAC; if there is
349 potential for **(Strike) a potential** for public benefit to the acquisition, PAC and staff will discuss next steps for
350 further research to determine if the efforts to acquire should proceed.” (Staff regularly does this – this just
351 confirms it).
352

353 Satarino - Yes, I have something similar. “Staff will notify the Park Advisory Commission in a timely manner
354 of all offers of land for acquisition, easements, contributions or dedications.”
355

356 **Moved by Berauer, Seconded by Riseng, “To approve the motion to change the previous language.”**
357

358 On a Voice Vote – **Motion Passed** – Unanimous
359

360 Berauer - **F-5** – Acquisition Guiding Principals – We need to refer to the evaluation forms. I’d like them to be
361 in the appendix (the eval forms) Intro could be “Please see the appendix for copies of these rating forms.”
362

363 Berla and Miller – Object to that because it constrains changes to the forms.
364

365 Riseng – Flow Chart – Did we ever agree with that? (NO) That would have been a nice thing to include
366 here, but if it’s not ready, it’s not ready.
367

368 Berauer – Do we need a motion for that? (NO)..

369 Kuras – I will just refer to the ‘forms’
370

371 Berauer - **F-8** – The rewrite of the section on “Assessing Environmental Quality of Natural Areas” is good, but
372 all about wildlife (vs. Flora), surveys left out and discussion about how natural corridors are important for
373 wildlife. Wants to add the “Fauna” portion back in – **AGREED**
374

375 Rodgers – **F-11** – “Previous PROS Plans have referred to specific parcels in the various planning areas
376 described in this document. All mention that specific parcels have been removed from the current PROS
377 Plan in the interest of reducing speculation and possible inflation of acquisition costs. The City of Ann Arbor
378 does, however, maintain a confidential inventory of various parcels and ratings of their possible importance
379 with respect to their suitability for acquisition; therefore, the lack of citation of a specific parcel within this
380 PROS Plan does not suggest either an interest or a lack of interest of the City in pursuing the acquisition of a
381 particular parcel.” **NO MOTION MADE – AGREED (this was originally submitted as a “G” category
382 item, but decided to transfer to the “F” category.)**

383 Berauer – **F-15** – (Mid-paragraph ‘b’) -“The remaining portions should be requested by dedication, and a
384 cash contribution in lieu **(Strike) there** of should be requested. - **AGREED**
385

386 **SECTION “G”**
387

388 Satarino – **G-1** “...also, parks staff and PAC, enabled by Chapter 42 of the City Code which covers open
389 space and parkland preservation in the process of review of several acquisitions outside the City Planning
390 areas.” (I thought we should mention that, as it’s not mentioned anywhere else, as we’re focusing on ‘within-
391 city,’ when in actuality, we’re looking at some areas outside the city.

392
393 J. Miller - I'd like to expand on that a little, because of the way Chapter 42 is written, it's the Greenbelt
394 Commission that has the authority to give this body the authority to look at properties outside the city
395 boundaries, but within the greenbelt district. If you're comfortable with that, I can work with Amy on the
396 language to explain that this is within the purview of the Greenbelt Commission.
397
398 Offen – Question on G-1 – It lists the various plans and identifies the Northeast Area Plan (NAP) as being a
399 'draft,' 2004? Has that been adopted by City Council?
400
401 J. Miller – It should actually be 'Draft, 2005.' **(Correct this in PAC Draft).**
402
403 Offen – The previous sentence states that a number of city plans currently in effect..... and those include...
404 So, is it in effect? Or is it not in effect.
405
406 J. Miller – A. Kuras – Add a sentence that says that [that plan is under review for adoption](#), or something to
407 that effect. **(Correct this in PAC Draft)**
408
409 Rising – **G-5 thru 8 – (Made changes in the body of the text, but included all text in the areas within**
410 **the changes to demonstrate that some paragraphs had been moved ahead of or behind other**
411 **paragraphs because there are different types of parks and different uses, but it limits the types of**
412 **parks that might be in the downtown area, so added language that considered that).**
413
414 **(This paragraph cut from the Downtown District Needs evaluation – Moved as stated above and all**
415 **listed as 'additions' in blue.)**
416
417 **CENTRAL AREA NEEDS EVALUATION**
418
419 **Central Area Needs Evaluation outside of the Downtown Business District**
420
421 ["The Central Area contains 24 City-owned parks ranging in size from a tenth of an acre to 57 acres. The](#)
422 [total of 124.09 acres represents 6 percent of the entire City park acreage. Although the City is the major](#)
423 [provider of parkland in the Central Area, the Ann Arbor Public Schools and the University of Michigan also](#)
424 [contribute to the supply of public open space. The athletic fields and playgrounds of the three elementary](#)
425 [schools and one high school located in the Central Area also serve as parkland. The 139.17 acres of](#)
426 [combined city and school open space represents about 4 percent of the land area in the Central Area. The](#)
427 [university Diag and three athletic fields also provide recreation spaces for residents.](#)
428
429 [The proximity of large parks on the perimeter of the downtown, such as West Park and the University of](#)
430 [Michigan Diag helps meet the needs of central area residents. These parks are within walking distance of](#)
431 [the downtown core, and provide the type of neighborhood park space desired by families and other park](#)
432 [users.](#)
433
434 [Plans to develop a greenway along the alignment of the Allen Creek have been in City master plans for](#)
435 [decades. One of the 1988 downtown plan objectives is to "foster the development of a system of linked](#)
436 [open spaces on the floor of the Allen Creek valley to create an amenity which encourages residential](#)
437 [investment and provides an improved transition between the downtown core and west side neighborhoods."](#)
438 [This effort has recently become energized with citizen groups focusing on moving a plan forward and a](#)
439 [Council-appointed Greenway Task Force, made up of City residents, residents who serve on City boards,](#)
440 [and City Council to work with City staff to develop a recommendation to City Council for the development of](#)
441 [the new Greenway that will compliment and connect to the existing Huron River Greenway.](#)
442
443 [The Greenway Task Force will develop a preliminary recommendation to be delivered to the Downtown](#)
444 [Development Strategies Steering Committee no later than November 1, 2005, and a final recommendation to](#)
445 [be delivered to the Planning Commission, The Parks Advisory Commission and City Council no later than](#)
446 [October 1, 2006. To assist the Task Force in making its recommendations, it shall conduct a series of public](#)
447 [workshops, and consult with independent design, parks, and watershed professionals, in addition to its work](#)
448 [with City Parks and Planning Staff and Commissions.](#)

449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504

Central Business District Needs Evaluation

The Central Area includes the Central Business District, which is considered separately from the Central Planning Area due to the unique characteristics of the urban center. The density is much greater, including primarily commercial but also some residential, keeping the City vibrant and successful. Recreation activity in the downtown often occurs in an urban context, where residents and visitors recreate at museums, restaurants, theaters, urban plazas and music venues. The University of Michigan Central Campus with its great number of students and retail shops catering to their needs and interests, increases the diversity of people and types of entertainment. Current public park space in the downtown business area includes two plazas, an historical House and the Farmer' Market as well as the Dean Promenade on Main Street and other sidewalk amenities. These spaces provide different uses than the neighborhood parks, catering to business community, students, out-of-town visitors, those seeking entertainment and shoppers. The downtown is not judged by traditional park standards, such as the amount of grass or availability of playground equipment and thus, the calculation for open space in the downtown core does not follow the same formula as the rest of the Central Area, but responds to the surrounding environment. However, no specific downtown standards have been established, which should be revisited by PAC and staff to evaluate deficiencies and establish guidelines, especially in light of addition of extensive residential to the downtown business district currently being studied by the Calthorpe Group.

Downtown parks include Sculpture Plaza, Liberty Plaza, the Kempf House and the Farmers' Market. Programming and cooperation between the private businesses and the public sector are crucial to the success of these spaces. Encouraging the location of compatible businesses such as outdoor café's adjacent to these parks will foster greater use and visibility.

The University of Michigan central campus provides a significant contribution to downtown open space with its plazas, fountains, sculptures and large open spaces. Community High School also contributes open space with its playground and yard spaces.

The downtown business district contains areas with wide sidewalks that provide activity centers where street furnishings and commercial venues such as restaurants occupy space. Successful examples include the Dean Promenade on Main Street and recent improvements to Liberty and Washington Streets. Space along the sidewalks adjacent to private buildings, although not a major amount of space, is vital in maintaining a sense of openness and variety in downtown as long as they are pedestrian friendly spaces with amenities such as plantings and benches. Improvements could be made to make spaces such as those adjacent to the One North Main building on Main and Huron streets, the TCF Bank and building on Liberty and Division streets and Sloan Plaza on Huron Street more pedestrian friendly.

A healthy downtown has a balance of retail, office, residential and public space. Within Ann Arbor's Downtown Business District, there is a strong base of retail and office space and a burgeoning residential market.

As the downtown continues to evolve and more residential units are created in and around the Downtown Business District, the need for additional public gathering space increases, especially considering possible future plans to substantially increase residential density downtown. Public gathering space in the Central Business District can take many forms including urban plazas, pocket parks (also called vest parks) both green and paved, and town squares. These spaces are essential to creating and sustaining the vitality necessary for a healthy city. Public gathering space such as Sculpture Park, have been very successful and more plazas would be appropriate. Small pocket parks that contain an island of green space would provide access to some green space for the burgeoning downtown residents, especially those that cannot easily walk long distance (the elderly and disabled) or who do not have cars."

Moved by Riseng, Seconded by Berla – On a Voice Vote – PASSED – Unanimous

Moved by Riseng – Seconded by Berauer on adding a 'bullet' on G-11 on Downtown Issues (action items) – To continue along with that idea, the possibility of including some green space downtown – that we

505 could have some of these 'pocket parks' that have some green space in conjunction with increased
506 residential density. On a Voice Vote – **PASSED** - Unanimous
507
508 Riseng –**G-12** – Where it speaks to the 3 vacant parcels we've been discussing. I want to add a sentence at
509 the end that which references these parcels as a part of the Allen Creek Greenway. "The plans have been
510 for maintaining some portions of these parcels as public space, particular areas within the floodplain are
511 being considered as public green space." Just to give an idea that there is a consideration for some of these
512 parcels – not that it's determined or anything.
513
514 J. Miller – **Friendly Amendment** regarding Allen Creek Greenway – where you have "part of developing the
515 Allen Creek Greenway?" I would suggest changing that to... "While considering the development of the
516 Allen Creek Greenway...."
517
518 Rodgers – **Friendly Amendment** – Where it says, "maintaining *some* portion of these, I'd like to broaden it
519 to say *all* or *at least some* portion."
520
521 Berauer – **Friendly Amendment – Moved by Berauer, Seconded by Rodgers** - on a Voice Vote –
522 **PASSED** – Unanimously – I've re-written that too - Basically the same as Bill's statement – **G-12, second**
523 **bullet** – ALL to first sentence, "[all of which lie in the Allen Creek floodway and floodplain.](#)" (**STRIKE**) **second**
524 **sentence** and (SUBSTITUTE) with "[The Floodway portions of the North Main and West Washington parcels](#)
525 [have already been designated by City Council to be incorporated into the Allen Creek Greenway. The mayor](#)
526 [has appointed a Task Force to recommend the best uses of the floodplain portions of those two parcels, as](#)
527 [well as the best use of the First and William property, which lies completely in the floodway.](#)"
528
529 Berauer - **G-3** The very first page of the Central Planning Area, second paragraph – This was re-written
530 from the last version we had. I believe some of the comments from the Planning Commission were
531 substituted. I disagree with *some* of those comments, but not all of them. I explain precisely what I'd like to
532 see. It starts out in the middle of that paragraph – "This area contains the highest density of population and
533 the lowest per capita amount of Public Park and open space in the city..." (which is fine). The next sentence
534 was deleted, and I would like it reinserted. That sentence had read "This central area continues to have the
535 highest un-met need for parks, open space, recreation facilities and space for unstructured recreations." I
536 would like that put back in.
537
538 Kuras – I think that conflicts somewhat with saying that we need to develop a study to find out what our
539 needs are?
540
541 Berauer – Instead of this addition, delete that and put in "The CBD may have differing park and open space
542 needs than the rest of the Central Planning Area. I'm making a distinction, as I think it's very dangerous not
543 to differentiate between the two. (Quotes the rest....)
544
545 Kuras – I don't see the need to repeat that as we've mentioned that many times in the text, about the Task
546 Force (Berauer – We have?) Yes, it comes up again in the Planning Area section regarding the Allen Creek
547 Greenway.
548
549 Berauer – So, you're suggesting deleting the last sentence.
550
551 Kuras – Yes (Berauer) I'm ok with that.
552
553 Rodgers – The portion that says "[The Central Area contains the highest density of population and the lowest](#)
554 [per capita amounts of public park and open space in the City.](#)" (Berauer) - Then to where it says
555 "Substitute" and **delete the last sentence.**
556
557 Miller – Yes. I'm more comfortable with that statement – if you keep 'recreation facilities and space for
558 unstructured recreation?' I don't agree with that because Maybe "public" recreation space and facilities is
559 true... but it has 'private' opportunities..... (Berauer) – Agrees with Rodgers' statement.
560
561 **MOTION By Berauer, Seconded by Rodgers** – On a Voice Vote – **Passed** - Unanimous

562 Riseng - **G-30-33 Discussion – Under “Water Quality”** - Rewrote the water clarity issue in the first three
563 paragraph (constructing), next paragraph (stormwater treatment), third paragraph (Allen Creek). This way,
564 it's not disjointed.

565
566 “New construction in the community has accelerated soil erosion and resulted in increased amounts of
567 sedimentation and siltation in the river as well as turbid conditions after major rain events. [Studies of Huron](#)
568 [Rive water quality concluded that higher levels of pollutants are present after a major rain event. This](#)
569 [‘flushing’ effect could be minimized by treatment of the runoff before it enters into the river.](#) The
570 Environmental Commission and staff are working together to study what the best management practice
571 should be to deal with the issue of siltation and vegetation growth in the river and backwaters. Construction
572 and maintenance of storm water management facilities is required by the City’s development regulations to
573 insure that stormwater runoff is treated before entering the river and its tributaries. A storm water control
574 demonstration area was constructed at Olson Park that can be used as an educational tool for promoting
575 environmentally effective “best management practices.” The demonstration facility is based on new
576 technology and provides 3 major functions: sediment and erosion control, storm water management and
577 pollution management techniques.

578
579 [Pretreatment of storm water would greatly aid efforts to improve water quality. Storm Water treatment could](#)
580 [include settling basins at or near the sewer mouth where land is available, or possibly an interceptor sewer](#)
581 [along the river, which would collect the discharge from each drain and bring the collected storm water to a](#)
582 [central location downstream of Gallup Park for treatment and discharge back to the river. Pretreatment of](#)
583 [stormwater could also occur in bioswales or other detention/retention facilities distributed throughout the](#)
584 [watershed. This would help reduce peak flows in urban streams as well.](#)

585
586 Major Pollution to the river comes from the Allen Creek drain. Most illegal connections have been
587 eliminated, however, many non-point source problems remain. Ongoing efforts of the Washtenaw County
588 Health Department and the Washtenaw County Drain Commissioner’s office to identify and correct illegal
589 discharges into the Allen Creek drain should be extended to the remaining storm drains in Ann Arbor.

590
591 **Motion by Riseng, Seconded by Berauer ---- On a Voice Vote – PASSED – Unanimous.**

592
593 **G-33 – The North Main Street and Argo Pond Area** – “Inclusion of bicycle/pedestrian access along the
594 North Main portion of the Huron River valley is also recommended for the following reasons: to provide
595 continuity with the bicycle/pedestrian trails already existing in the City; provide continuity with adjacent parks
596 (i.e., Bandemere, Argo, Kuebler-Langford, Barton, Bluffs; provide an alternative to [the traffic hazard](#)
597 [\(STRIKE\) the element of danger](#) associated with using North Main as a bicycle route;”

598
599 Satarino – **G-18** - Last bulleted item – “Linkages in the area should include the Barton to Bandemere [railroad](#)
600 underpass [\(STRIKE\) tunnel](#), the Gallup to Arboretum tunnel and linkage amongst the northern tier parks
601 from Sugarbush to Leslie Park.”

602
603 Satarino – **G22** - Questions about the figures - they seem to contradict the figures that were in the tables on
604 G-3. “Total acres represented” you have [62390](#) and on the table in G-3 it’s [45458](#).

605
606 Kuras – GIS people had redrawn each of the parks, so the boundaries changed and this needs to be
607 refigured.

608
609 Satarino - **G-23** – The last sentence where it begins “The West area shows a [\(STRIKE\) surplus \(INSERT\)](#)
610 [higher percentage](#) of park land when compared to the overall average.....‘surplus’ implies a lot of things you
611 don’t necessarily want it to. (Also, check the figures on this item compared to the same table in G-3, more
612 erroneous numbers).

613
614 **G-30** - Berauer – Ethyl Potts’ comments about the Huron Creek – Asks Amy to make Ethyl’s contribution
615 more concise. Second to the last paragraph Ms. Potts added “Major pollution comes from the Allen Creek
616 Drain as well as the highly polluted, uncontrolled storm water runoff from a large part of the urbanized area,
617 including the core downtown.” (This could be made more concise).

618

619 **SECTION "H"**

620
621 **H-4 to H-5** - Berauer – Proposes a short paragraph at the beginning (INTRO PARAGRAPH) that
622 encompasses all the greenways and trails along all the tributaries. Under "Greenway and Allen Creek" -
623 Since the Allen Creek is a big issue and is being actively worked on, it needs this introduction. I propose this
624 paragraph to introduce this section. My rationale is that we need a basic description of the Creek and the
625 support that it got in previous plans to show why it's so important, and that it's been supported in theory for a
626 long time.

627
628 "~~The main branch of the~~ main branch of Allen Creek runs along the railroad tracks in the transitional area
629 between the western edge of downtown and one of the oldest city neighborhoods" "The 1988 Downtown
630 Plan calls for the development of a highly visible "greenway" on the valley floor of Allen Creek to reinforce the
631 visibility of the valley, develop an improved transition between the downtown core and the neighborhoods to
632 the west, to establish a visual and recreational amenity, to create improved **entries** (Friendly amendment)
633 pedestrian & bicycle access to downtown, and to enhance downtown's unique identity as a place. Creation
634 of a greenway along Allen Creek fulfills the guiding principles for acquisitions as outlined in this PROS plan
635 and previous PROS plans and conforms to many of the acquisition evaluation criteria as outlined in Section
636 F." (Then continue with the text as it appears...)

637
638 Berla – Aren't there other parts that are called "Allen Creek" that are not that particular?

639
640 Kuras – Yes, there are branches

641
642 Berla – Like the part that goes through West park? So, that's a little bit misleading.

643
644 Riseng – Allen Creek is not the largest tributary to the Huron River, Mill creek is.

645
646 Kuras – Strike "Main branch of the" Allen Creek

647
648 Cohen – **Friendly amendment** – (**Strike**) **entries** and place "pedestrian and bicycle access" - **AGREED**

649
650 Berauer – H-5 under "Funding" – Add "Funding may be also available from the DDA for park related
651 improvements within the CBD, which may be applied to portions of the greenway in the downtown core."
652 DDA - ----- Doesn't understand the title, since it's under "Funding,"

653
654 J. Miller – I would change that to "The funding may come from the DDA..." Make it more generic – "Funding
655 may be available from the DDA for improvements within the central business district." Not sure what the
656 DDA's guidelines are on funding, and if we get specific and cite "parks," then if it doesn't match up, we have
657 problems.

658
659 Riseng – It does say elsewhere in the document that DDA supports and uses their funding for park related
660 improvements.

661
662 J. Miller – Ok.

663
664 Kuras – Are we scratching the environmental clean up?

665
666 Berauer – Yes, scratch all of that.

667
668 Kuras – So... "Funding MAY be available from the DDA for park related improvements to the city."

669
670 **SECTION "I"**

671
672 Satarino – **I-1** - Third paragraph – 13 permanent soccer fields and elsewhere you have included 13
673 permanent soccer fields and 11 temporary soccer fields. Keep it consistent?

674
675 Kuras – Playing fields are things that go through changes, so it's not always the same.

676 Riseng – Is there some way we can make that clearer without committing to specific numbers?
677
678 Satarino – It's always changing, so I don't think it needs to be changed.
679
680 Berla – It's only a snapshot, and there is a need for more fields, but I don't think it needs to be changed.
681
682 Riseng – **Withdraws suggestion.**

683
684 J. Miller – Correction within the third paragraph. Second to last sentence says “The Burns Park Senior
685 Center should be The Ann Arbor Senior Center.”
686

687 Satarino – **I-8** – I think there is more to this table.... Are we missing a page? I thought it was because there
688 were no park maintenance activities, but there are some in here.
689

690 Kuras – This is just purely an inventory. There is actually a second page to the Natural Features Inventory,
691 and I will include it with the final version.
692

693 Berauer – **I-13** – On the map it is [missing the Southeast Area](#)
694
695

696 **SECTION “J”**

697
698 Macomber – **J-14** – DOG PARKS – What is there implies that there is work being done to create a single
699 dog park, and I think it states the swift run site. I'd like to add a sentence. “[As the Swift run site dog park or](#)
700 [any single dog park is unlikely may not to meet the demand for this type of park use, opportunities to](#)
701 [establish additional dog parks will may be explored during the term of this plan.](#)
702

703 J. Miller – **Friendly Amendment** - Where it says “unlikely” can we change it to “may not” meet the
704 demands? **(AGREED)**
705

706 Cohen – **Friendly Amendment** - I would also change the ‘will be explored’ to ‘may be explored.’
707 **(AGREED)**
708

709 Satarino – **J-Schedule (Under “K” 3 and “K” 4)** – I have spoken to Dave (Borneman) about his figures and
710 if he was ok with the way that the spinning plan went for his natural areas. He suggested two changes which
711 I think (as I use these areas) are important are: Under “First Year Total” and under “Natural Areas” where it
712 says “Berkshire Creek/Boardwalk.” I moved that to the 4th year, and move the Cedar Bend Trail renovation
713 and stream bank stabilization in place of the Berkshire Creek/Boardwalk. I'd move Berkshire
714 Creek/Boardwalk to the 4th year.
715

716 J. Miller – There needs to be some heading at the beginning of this that refers to this as a ‘possible’
717 representation, as we're just in the beginning of having those discussions and I would hate to have this be
718 seen as a ‘funding recommendation.’
719

720 Kuras - There is a paragraph in there that addresses that. K-1, bottom last paragraph, says the
721 recommendations will be reviewed each year and ok'd by PAC.
722

723 J. Miller – Still concerned that K-3 through K-7, for those who are involved in the millages, this could be seen
724 as a millage proposal, and I would hate for us to be locked into these permanently. There is something in
725 K-3 through 7 that needs to be referenced and addressed later on.
726

727 Cohen - **Friendly amendment”** - [Leave as broad categories and not as specific years. Combine urban](#)
728 [categories as one classification, and list them all only once, and not by lump sum years.](#) **(AGREED)**
729

730 Riseng – Linda has a notation that this lists a [Map of Bikeways](#) (Amy said it was in there, now it's not!)
731 Needs to be included in the final drawing. **(AGREED)**
732

733 Vote on the Resolution and the Amendments

734
735 Macomber asks a question – Can they see it before it goes back to city council? – Discussion

736
737 J. Miller – Since you're going through these changes, when the Planning Commission gets a copy, PAC
738 should get a copy too to make sure that all these changes have been incorporated.

739
740 On a Voice Vote – **PASSED - UNANIMOUS.**

741
742 J. Miller – It next goes to Planning Commission, any changes from them will not be incorporated as they will
743 not be changed again in the Plan; I will, however, give copies of those recommendations from the Planning
744 Commission to City Council. It will then be up to Council as to whether they incorporate Planning
745 Commissions changes.

746
747 Satarino – **Motion to close the meeting, Berauer Seconded.** – On a Voice Vote – **PASSED - Unanimous**
748 - Meeting adjourned at 6:47 p.m.

749
750 **Submitted by:** Brenda Acquaviva
751 Administrative Support Specialist IV