

1
2
3 **APPROVED**
4

5
6
7 **CITY OF ANN ARBOR – PARKS ADVISORY COMMISSION**
8 **MEETING MINUTES - TUESDAY, MAY 16, 2006**

9
10
11 **A - CALL TO ORDER**

12 Meeting was called to order at 4:13 p.m. by J. Satarino (Chair)

13
14
15 **B - ROLL CALL**

16 Commissioners Present: Satarino, Berla, Macomber, Offen, Riseng and Cohen (6)

17 Commissioners Absent: Reneaud, Berauer and Nystuen (3)

18 Ex-Officio Members Present: Woods and Johnson (arrived @ 4:35 pm.) (2)

19 Ex-Officio Members Absent: Aeschbach (1)

20
21 Staff Present: Borneman, Smith, Naud and Acquaviva

22
23
24 **SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS**

25
26 **Intro 1 - Welcome to PAC's newest member, Gwen Nystuen (POSTPONED)**

27
28 **PUBLIC COMMENTARY OF AGENDA ITEMS (3 Minutes per Speaker)**

- 29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
1. Karen Sidney, 100 Longman Lane, Ann Arbor, MI – Spoke about the millage proposals (C-1) – Complimented PAC on the public commentary that has been encouraged, but doesn't like the choices given for the millage. Feels there were three options: 1. Renew existing and cut services; 2. Increase millage 2.6 Mil above the 4 Mil currently being raised for the same services and 3. No millage at all. Feels Parks should not cut services if these are approved, as they will have more to spend. Believes the millages are another 'City Hall' tax in a 'Green' wrapper.
 2. Glen Thompson, 100 Longman Lane, Ann Arbor, MI - Spoke about the Greenbelt and Parks Millages (C-1) – Is not in agreement with how Parks spends its millage dollars and feels the latest millage proposals are an attempt to extort greater taxes by withholding the items the citizens want – things like trees, flowers and a greenway.

42 Chair mentions that the money that was spent on Sculpture Park is coming from the Downtown Development Authority with the exception of \$50,000.00 spent regarding park restoration funds.

43
44
45 **A - APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

46
47 **A-1a** March 21, 2006 Regular Session - Corrections – Accepted as Presented

48 **A-1b** April 18, 2006 Regular Session – Corrections – Lines 70, 184 and 218

49
50 Moved by Riseng, Seconded by Macomber that the minutes of March 21st and April 18th, 2006 be
51 accepted with the amended changes.

52
53 **VOTE – Unanimous – PASSED**

54
55 **B – UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

56
57 **B-1a thru B-1d Natural Area Preservation -**

58
59 Bluffs, Bandemer, Dolph Parks and Stapp Site (Adjacent to Future Library Site)

61 Dave Borneman of NAP reported on the above listed sites (information packets originally submitted to PAC in
62 March of 2006). He spoke about the priority rankings of over 1200 acres natural areas within the city. It is about
63 prioritizing in which areas first - for invasive control, environmental quality, how restorable each site is, etc. In
64 addition, NAP does butterfly, bird, plant, salamander and frog and toad surveys to assess whether a site should be
65 a potential acquisition and invasive species such as garlic mustard can cause major problems in the plant
66 community.

67
68 PAC thanked Mr. Borneman for the important work that he and all of NAP and its volunteers and park stewards
69 contribute to preserving our natural areas.

70
71 **B-2** Memorial/Gift Task Force – Additional Appointments

72
73 At the April meeting, a task force was formed to recommend updating and putting into place a policy and
74 procedure for memorial gifts in Ann Arbor's parks. Chair Satarino invited the public to be a part of the process and
75 join the sub-committee to work on this issue. Jeff Dehring will be spearheading the committee. Current members
76 are Tim Berla, Katherine Rising and Janet Cohen.

77
78 In addition to that sub-committee, Christen Smith spoke about establishing a Task Force from PAC that will
79 establish a procedure to monitor, comment, participate and evaluate projects within the park system prior to their
80 end stage, and to solidify a step-by-step process that will allow that.

81
82 Chair Satarino asked PAC if anyone felt that PAC had previously felt uninformed on any projects that could have
83 been presented in an up-to-date process so that the Commission could aid in steering the projects through fruition.
84 Most feel that PAC needs an established procedure for this so that the Commission can make better
85 recommendations to City Council on all issues. John Satarino and Samuel Offen have volunteered to be a part of
86 this task force. Berla suggested that the task force establish a "what can PAC do" paragraph in its solution which
87 would aid PAC in what it can productively do to help (i.e, pass a resolution, ask Council for intervention, etc.)

88
89
90 **C – NEW BUSINESS**

91
92 **C-1** Millage Update

93
94 Satarino stated that PAC had its first public hearing on Thursday, May 11th, and despite the efforts made, the
95 attendance by the public was poor. Many people felt they needed to read all of the information before making a
96 decision. Some of the things we heard didn't have a bearing on the millage – anticipating future events whether
97 any park funding would be available to those projects, and there were others who spoke about not being sure that
98 the money wouldn't be shifted to other projects. Satarino firmly believes that there is no slush in the Parks
99 Department budget at all.

100
101 These are serious concerns from the public and are part of the process. These are park supporters and we need
102 to address their concerns. We (PAC) are receiving much more information than we ever have (quarterly financial
103 reports) and we were told we could be an advisory board to capital improvements in the future. We were also told
104 we will be getting printouts of both millages on expenditures and assets. Satarino and Macomber mentioned two
105 upcoming meetings at Cobblestone Farm – May 17th and 23rd at 7:00 p.m. – he urged all to attend and shape the
106 parks system for the coming years.

107
108 **C-2** Project Updates

109
110 **Swift Run Park – Status of City-County Partnership -**

111
112 Christen Smith recapped prior meetings with the County regarding the possibility of the Swift Run Dog Park. There
113 were some concerns about costs for development and maintenance back in March of this year. Both entities have
114 revisited those issues, and we're both very anxious to move forward. We will be looking at that as an 'off-leash'
115 area with fencing around the perimeter and minimal improvements to get by in order to get this up and running for
116 the summer season.

117
118 We're also looking at developing another 'off-leash' area at one or more of our existing park areas in order to
119 provide additional space and to move as quickly as we can.

120 Bridget Macomber and some city staff and community groups have walked a couple of the sites, and we're
121 working with the neighbors to be sure we're a 'good fit' with their neighborhood. Macomber thanked staff for an
122 extraordinary effort working toward this.

123
124 Cohen questions whether this will help to bring unauthorized 'off-leash' users in other parks out of those other
125 areas? It is evident that an increase in Park Rangers is not feasible, but simple things like posting signs and
126 having mechanisms for people to report problems in real time and so on is necessary. Smith replied that they
127 hope that offering the off-leash areas that are currently at our parks that are heavily used will get those individuals
128 over to the appropriate parks that we're inviting them to use. Cohen states that it will take more than hoping, as
129 there is now an established 'culture' of belief that this is acceptable to run dogs without leashes, and a fair amount
130 of education will be required to change that.

131
132 Offen asks if Smith is at liberty to say which other parks are possible locations for off-leash areas. Smith states
133 that she doesn't want to mention these until they have worked with the neighborhoods concerned to see if they are
134 going to be receptive. Offen believes that parks should let the community as a whole know about these instead of
135 just the immediate neighborhoods, as there are many of the public that use these parks - more than just local
136 residents. He also stated that he has a neighbor that has dogs, and she expressed concerned that parks should
137 be checking for inoculations etc., because as a dog owner, she wants to be sure that her dogs don't encounter
138 dogs that have illnesses, etc.

139
140 Macomber stated that they have not yet formulated park rules, but this will be discussed and codified as most dog
141 parks require that a dog have a city license or a county license plus a rabies tag. Generally, you have to present
142 your vaccination records to obtain a license. Smith stated that they will rely on the community groups to help
143 police this issue. Offen is concerned (like Cohen is) that these things be monitored to prevent legal action.

144
145 Other suggestions by PAC were: Having posted hours, contact information to reach staff in case of problems and
146 possibly a trial period or a pilot program in order to assess any possible problems.

147
148 Enforcement of all park rules is important, and the funding for this is also addressed in the millages as
149 \$400,000.00 dedicated to exactly that. Council members should be notified of which parks are affected so that
150 they can address problems within their wards. Public Hearings should also be held prior to implementation.

151 152 153 **D – COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS**

154
155 Matt Naud of the Environmental Services Area was before PAC to discuss an issue that was spotlighted in
156 the Ann Arbor news regarding contamination due to 1-4 Dioxane at Dolph park.

157
158 Pall (Gelman Sciences) has been working for some years now trying to identify the sources of 1-4 Dioxane within
159 the community. It is moving in a number of directions from their site. There had been an extraction well at Dolph
160 Park that predated my involvement in this, which is over 5 years. This has been quietly working away and
161 bringing contamination deep underneath Dolph Park back to the site, then being treated and discharged to Honey
162 Creek.

163
164 There was a recent court order which the company was directed to keep the 1-4 Dioxane on its property, and not
165 migrating past Wagner, but there is a lot of effort to get what has already gone past Wagner treated and dealt with.
166 They needed to put in another well at Dolph Park as a way to monitor progress. The latest monitoring finds that
167 the contamination is now only 40 feet down, as opposed to 100 to 200 feet down.

168
169 We will notify neighbors of the testing of the sister lakes there which show a small amount of 1-4 Dioxane and we
170 will continue to monitor this. We will be posting the press release at the sister lakes and other prominent points
171 and will be monitoring the lakes as well.

172 173 174 **E – REPORT FROM INTERIM PARKS AND RECREATION MANAGER**

175
176 **E-1** City Council Items Update (Information in packet – A. Kuras not available)

177
178
179 **E-2** Park Project Update - (Information in packet - Jeff Dehring not available)

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
221
222
223
224
225
226

F – REPORT FROM MANAGER OF FIELD OPERATIONS

None.

G – REPORT FROM RECREATION ADVISORY COMMISSION

Berla reports that there is still a problem between Rec & Ed and the attorneys’ trying to iron out the problem with the ball field issue. He suggests that a City Council member and a school board member should be on a committee together and iron things out. Smith states that they are working very closely with Rec and Ed to try to resolve the issue. Delivering the ‘service’ (use of the ball fields by Rec and Ed) is, however, happening.

Council Members Woods and Johnson said that if staff called on either of them to assist that they would participate, but possibly contacting the City Administrator to see what can be done might expedite things.

H – REPORTS FROM RELEVANT COMMISSIONS, COMMITTEES, BOARDS AND/OR TASK FORCES

None.

I – PUBLIC COMMENTARY – GENERAL (3 Minutes per Speaker)

None.

J – COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

Berla – Mentioned that all of Argo Pond is a ‘no wake zone,’ yet the rowers have a motor boat they use, and that there should be some “code” of how they should interact with other people on the river. In general, it isn’t solely their river and they can’t do anything they want... they’re sharing it. If we were renewing their contract, that would be something that would have to be agreed on.

I’m not saying we shouldn’t have rowers; we should have more continuity. Satarino said that they felt the same, and that the rowers now have 13 powerboats in their floatilla which seem to be on the lake all at the same time. It is my understanding that those are released in I’d suggest we talk about this at the next meeting.

Johnson – Don’t want to exaggerate on that, as I kayak there during the week, and believe that the rowing clubs are a valuable resource.

Riseng – I live the closest to them, and I row as well, and I believe that they work very hard to keep those things to a minimum

K - TRANSMITTALS

“Motion to Adjourn by Satarino, Seconded by Riseng.”

On a voice vote, - Motion Passes - Unanimous

Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Submitted by: Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Support Specialist V