CITY COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA
OCTOBER 8, 2018
7:30 PM

**Agenda Documents to Retain**

This list is being provided as a reminder. Items will drop off the list when the Commission has completed consideration of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAVE FROM</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SAVE FOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 17, 2018</td>
<td>4L. Resolution setting a public hearing for October 8, 2018 to consider recommended amendments to Chapter 126, Zoning, of the City Code to remove all references to Church or Churches and replace the terms with religious institution(s) and provide a definition for same.</td>
<td>October 8, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8, 2018</td>
<td>Resolution setting a public hearing for October 29, 2018 -- BSD Assessment</td>
<td>October 29, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8, 2018</td>
<td>Resolution setting a public hearing for October 29, 2018 -- Lot split at 120 Hawthorne</td>
<td>October 29, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
   Andrew M. Harris, Mayor

II. ROLL CALL
    J. Cherilynn Mynsberge, City Clerk

III. PROCLAMATIONS, CONGRATULATORY RESOLUTIONS, AWARDS, APPOINTMENTS, RESIGNATIONS AND CONFIRMATIONS, ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS, INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.

   Introduction of Guests:
   • Shelley Goodman Taub, County Commissioner, 12th District.
   • Mike McCready, State Representative, 40th District

   Announcements:
   • Commissioner Sherman's Birthday
   • Tonight marked the official grand opening of Fire Station #2. The Public is invited to tour the new station located on Chesterfield at open public tours on October 11th, 5:30-8:00 pm, and on October 20th, 10:00am-1:00pm.
   • Tomorrow, October 9th, is the deadline to register to vote to be eligible to vote in the November general election. If you are not already registered to vote at your current address go to Michigan.gov/Vote to register online, or contact the City Clerk's office at 248-530-1880.
   • The Birmingham Fire Department's Annual Open House is Saturday, October 13th, from 1-4 p.m. at the Adams Fire Station. Attendees can operate a fire hose, learn about fire safety, and view an EMS and vehicle extrication display, along with HAZMAT apparatus and equipment. Enter a raffle and enjoy fire house chili at this family-friendly event. For more information, contact the Birmingham Fire Department at 248.530.1900.
   • The Baldwin Public Library is hosting “A Novel Wine Tasting”, a fundraiser to support the upcoming Youth Room Expansion and Renovation. The event takes place on Friday, October 19th, 6:00-9:00 pm. Purchase tickets at www.baldwinlib.org/booksandbites.

   Appointments:
   A. Interviews for the Board of Zoning Appeals
      1. Erik Morganroth
      2. John N. Miller
   B. Appointments to the Board of Zoning Appeals
      1. To appoint ______________ to the Board of Zoning Appeals as a regular member to serve a three-year term to expire October 10, 2021.
2. To appoint _____________ to the Board of Zoning Appeals as a regular member to serve a three-year term to expire October 10, 2021.

C. Administration of Oath of Office to Appointees

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

All items listed on the consent agenda are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion and approved by a roll call vote. There will be no separate discussion of the items unless a commissioner or citizen so requests, in which event the item will be removed from the general order of business and considered under the last item of new business.

A. Resolution approving the City Commission special meeting minutes of September 17, 2018.

B. Resolution approving the City Commission regular meeting minutes of September 17, 2018.

C. Resolution approving the warrant list, including Automated Clearing House payments, dated September 19, 2018 in the amount of $29,692,487.78.

D. Resolution approving the warrant list, including Automated Clearing House payments, dated September 26, 2018 in the amount of $2,757,529.68.

E. Resolution approving the warrant list, including Automated Clearing House payments, dated October 3, 2018 in the amount of $400,349.29.

F. Resolution accepting the resignation of Jeffery Jones from the Board of Zoning Appeals, thanking him for his service, and directing the City Clerk to begin the process of filling the vacancy.

G. Resolution accepting the resignation of John Rusche as Alternate Member of Parks and Recreation Board, thanking him for his service, and directing the City Clerk to begin the process of filling the vacancy.

H. Resolution accepting the resignation of Lauren Tolles from the Design Review Board, thanking her for her service, and directing the City Clerk to begin the process of filling the vacancy.

I. Resolution accepting the resignation of Adam Charles from the Design Review Board and from the Historic District Commission, thanking him for his service, and directing the City Clerk to begin the process of filling the vacancy.


K. Resolution setting a public hearing for October 29, 2018 to consider the proposed Lot rearrangement of 120 Hawthorne, Parcel #1935230015 and 125 Aspen, Parcel #1935230001.

L. Resolution authorizing an expenditure of $25,000 from the Parking Enterprise Fund #585-538.001-901.0300 in support of the BSD holiday television campaign.

M. Resolution approving the purchase of (2) workstations, (2) secure storage cabinets and (16) lateral files in the amount of $16,744.42 from Kentwood Office Furniture, Inc.; further authorizing this budgeted expenditure from account number 101-301-000-972.0000; further authorizing and directing the mayor and city clerk to sign the agreement on behalf of the city.
N. Resolution approving $19,760 in Municipal Credits and $7,217 in Community Credits from fiscal year 2019 and $1,901 in Community Credits from fiscal year 2018 to Next in support of their specialized transportation program; to approve $21,932 in Community Credits from fiscal year 2019 to purchase and install a bus shelter (location to be determined); and further directing the Mayor to sign the Municipal Credit and Community Credit contract for fiscal year 2019 and the amendment to the fiscal year 2018 contract on behalf of the City.

O. Resolution authorizing the City Manager to cast a vote, on the City’s behalf, for the two incumbent members of the Michigan Municipal League Liability and Property Pool Board of Directors for three year terms, beginning January 1, 2019.

P. Resolution awarding parts 2 and 3 of Contract 9-18(S) to Doetsch Industrial Services of Warren, MI, in the amount of $691,485.02, to be charged to account number 590-536.001-981.0100. Further, approving the appropriation and budget amendment as outlined.

Q. Resolution authorizing the purchase of the Tennant Sweeper in the amount of $37,843.00. Funds are available in account #585-538.001-971.0100.

R. Resolution approving the purchase of one (1) new 2018 GMC Sierra 2500 HD from Todd Wenzel Buick GMC through the Oakland County cooperative purchasing contract #5222 in the amount of $36,838.00 from account #641-441.006.971.0100.

S. Resolution authorizing an increase in the authorized amount for the 2018 Sidewalk Trip Elimination Program, Contract #6-18(SW), to Precision Concrete Cutting, Inc., in the amount of $34,174, to be charged to the Sidewalk Fund, account number 101-444.001-981.0100.

T. Resolution accepting the recommendation of the Advisory Parking Committee to authorize an additional 75 parking permits for Lot 12 located at the southeast corner of Woodward and Maple Road.

U. Resolution approving the appointment of election inspectors, absentee voter counting board inspectors, receiving board inspectors and other election officials as recommended by the City Clerk for the November 6, 2018 General Election pursuant to MCL 168.674(1) and granting the City Clerk authority to make emergency appointments of qualified candidates should circumstances warrant to maintain adequate staffing in the various precincts, counting boards and receiving boards.

V. Resolution scheduling a meeting of the Election Commission on Monday, October 29, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. for the purpose of conducting the Public Accuracy Test for the November 6, 2018 General Election.

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Resolution approving an ordinance amendment to Chapter 126, Zoning, Article 9, Section 9.02, Definitions, to amend the definition of bistro to establish a maximum of 65 seats indoors, and 65 seats outdoors for bistros located within the Downtown Overlay District and to establish a maximum of 85 seats indoors and 85 seats outdoors for bistros located within the Triangle and Rail Districts as recommended by the Planning Board on August 8, 2018.

OR

Resolution approving an ordinance amendment to Chapter 126, Zoning, Article 9, Section 9.02, Definitions, to amend the definition of bistro to establish a maximum of
___ seats indoors, and ___ seats outdoors for bistros located within the Downtown Overlay District and to establish a maximum of ___ seats indoors and ___ seats outdoors for bistros located within the Triangle and Rail Districts.

B. Consideration to award contract to provide professional services to prepare an update to the City’s comprehensive master plan.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Public Hearing to approve the twenty-eight recommended amendments to Chapter 126, Zoning, of the City Code to remove all references to Church or Churches and replace the terms with religious institution(s) and provide a definition for same.

1. Resolution approving the twenty-eight recommended amendments to Chapter 126, Zoning of the Birmingham City Code.

B. Resolution authorizing the purchase of a 2019 Life Line Typ-1 ambulance on a Ford F-450 chassis for the cost of $237,241.00 and a 2019 Danko mini-pumper mounted on a Ford F-550 chassis for a cost of $338,431.00; further authorizing this budgeted expenditure from account number 663-338.000-971.0100; further authorizing and directing the mayor to sign the respective agreements on behalf of the City.

C. Resolution directing the MKSK/F&V design team to proceed to final plans for the Maple Rd. project from Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave., as outlined.

D. Resolution accepting the Downtown Parking Strategies and Recommendations report, as presented by the Nelson Nygaard Consultants and further directing the APC to evaluate and prioritize implementation of the recommended strategies in future meetings.

VII. REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS

IX. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

X. REPORTS

A. Commissioner Reports

1. Notice of Intention to interview for three positions on the Birmingham Shopping District Board on November 19, 2018.

2. Notice of Intention to appoint one member to the Cablecasting Board on November 19, 2018.

3. Notice of Intention to appoint one regular member to the Board of Zoning Appeals on November 19, 2018.

4. Notice of Intention to appoint one alternate member to the Parks and Recreation Board on November 19, 2018.


6. Notice of Intention to appoint one member to the Historic District Commission on November 19, 2018.

B. Commissioner Comments

C. Advisory Boards, Committees, Commissions’ Reports and Agendas
D. Legislation  

E. City Staff  
1. Parking Utilization Report, submitted by Assistant City Manager Gunter.  
2. Oakland County Board of Commissioners Ad Hoc Committee on Election Infrastructure Report, submitted by City Clerk Mynsberge.  
3. CN Railroad, submitted by Director of Public Services Wood.  

XI. ADJOURN
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO APPOINT TO
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

At the regular meeting of Monday, October 8, 2018 the Birmingham City Commission intends to appoint two (2) regular members to the Board of Zoning Appeals to serve three-year terms to expire October 10, 2021.

Interested parties may recommend others or themselves for these positions by submitting a form available from the City Clerk’s office. Applications must be submitted to the city clerk’s office on or before noon on Wednesday, October 3, 2018. Applications will appear in the public agenda at which time the commission will discuss recommendations, and may make nominations and vote on appointments.

Duties of Board
The Board of Zoning Appeals acts on questions arising from the administration of the zoning ordinance, including the interpretation of the zoning map. The board hears and decides appeals from and reviews any order, requirement, decision or determination made by the building official.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th>Criteria/Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erik Morganroth</td>
<td>Applicants shall be property owners of record and registered voters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631 Ann St.</td>
<td>Resident and registered voter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John N. Miller</td>
<td>Resident and registered voter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544 Brookside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: All members of boards and commissions are subject to the provisions of City of Birmingham City Code Chapter 2, Article IX, Ethics and the filing of the Affidavit and Disclosure Statement.

SUGGESTED ACTION:

To appoint _____________ to the Board of Zoning Appeals as a regular member to serve a three-year term to expire October 10, 2021.

To appoint _____________ to the Board of Zoning Appeals as a regular member to serve a three-year term to expire October 10, 2021.
The Board of Zoning Appeals acts on questions arising from the administration of the zoning ordinance, including the interpretation of the zoning map. The board hears and decides appeals from and reviews any order, requirement, decision or determination made by the building official.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Home Address</th>
<th>Home Business E-Mail</th>
<th>Appointed</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canvasser</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>369 Kimberly</td>
<td>(248) 231-9972</td>
<td>7/9/2018</td>
<td>10/10/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jcanvasser@clarkhill.com">jcanvasser@clarkhill.com</a></td>
<td>Regular member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>2051 Villa</td>
<td>(248) 4967363</td>
<td>2/27/2012</td>
<td>10/10/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:khartassociates@aol.com">khartassociates@aol.com</a></td>
<td>(served as an alternate 2/27/12 - 10/13/14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judd</td>
<td>A. Randolph</td>
<td>1592 Redding</td>
<td>(248)396-5788</td>
<td>11/13/1995</td>
<td>10/10/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(248) 396-5788</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:arjudd@comcast.net">arjudd@comcast.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dicklilley@icloud.com">dicklilley@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillie</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>496 S. Glenhurst</td>
<td>(248) 642-6881</td>
<td>1/9/1984</td>
<td>10/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:lilliecc@sbcglobal.net">lilliecc@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>544 Brookside</td>
<td>(248) 703-9384</td>
<td>1/23/2012</td>
<td>10/10/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:feymiller@comcast.net">feymiller@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>(Served as alternate 01/11/10-01/23/12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Home Address</td>
<td>Home Business</td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morganroth</td>
<td>Erik</td>
<td>631 Ann</td>
<td>(248) 762-9822</td>
<td><a href="mailto:emorganroth@comcast.net">emorganroth@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>10/12/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodriguez</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>333 Pilgrim</td>
<td>248-631-7933</td>
<td><a href="mailto:francis@korolaw.com">francis@korolaw.com</a></td>
<td>1/22/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CITY BOARD/COMMISSION ATTENDANCE RECORD

**Board/Commission:** Board of Zoning Appeals  
**Year:** 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Name</th>
<th>1/12</th>
<th>2/9</th>
<th>3/8</th>
<th>4/12</th>
<th>5/10</th>
<th>6/14</th>
<th>7/12</th>
<th>8/9</th>
<th>9/13</th>
<th>10/13</th>
<th>11/8</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>Total Mtgs. Att.</th>
<th>Total Absent</th>
<th>Percent Attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Hart</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery Jones</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph Judd</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Lillie</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lyon</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Miller</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Morganroth</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Grove</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Canvasser</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members in attendance: 7 7 7 7 7 6 7 7 7 7 7 7

**KEY:**
- **A** = Absent
- **P** = Present
- **NM** = No Meeting

Department Head Signature
# CITY BOARD/COMMISSION ATTENDANCE RECORD

**Board/Commission:** Board of Zoning Appeals  
**Year:** 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Name</th>
<th>1/10</th>
<th>2/14</th>
<th>3/14</th>
<th>4/18</th>
<th>5/9</th>
<th>6/13</th>
<th>7/11</th>
<th>8/8</th>
<th>9/12</th>
<th>10/17</th>
<th>11/14</th>
<th>12/5</th>
<th>Total Mtgs.</th>
<th>Total Absent</th>
<th>Percent Attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Hart</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery Jones</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph Judd</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Lillie</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lyon</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Miller</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Morganroth</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALTERNATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Name</th>
<th>1/10</th>
<th>2/14</th>
<th>3/14</th>
<th>4/18</th>
<th>5/9</th>
<th>6/13</th>
<th>7/11</th>
<th>8/8</th>
<th>9/12</th>
<th>10/17</th>
<th>11/14</th>
<th>12/5</th>
<th>Total Mtgs.</th>
<th>Total Absent</th>
<th>Percent Attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Canvasser</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Grove</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Baiardi</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members in attendance: 7 7 7 7 7 8 7 7 7 7 7 0

**KEY:**  
A = Absent  
P = Present  
NM = No Meeting  
NA = Not Appointed at this time

Department Head Signature
## CITY BOARD/ COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE RECORD

**Name of Board:** BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
**Year:** 2018  
**Members Required for Quorum:** 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER NAME</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEPT</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>SPEC MTG</th>
<th>SPEC MTG</th>
<th>Total Mtgs.</th>
<th>Total Absent</th>
<th>Percent Attended Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGULAR MEMBERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilie, Charles</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judd, Randy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon, Peter</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Jefferey</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, John</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart, Kevin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morganroth, Erik</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canvasser, Jason</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALTERNATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canvasser, Jason</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis N. Rodriguez</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilley, Richard</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present or Available</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- **A** = Member absent
- **P** = Member present or available
- **CP** = Member available, but meeting canceled for lack of quorum
- **CA** = Member not available and meeting was canceled for lack of quorum
- **NA** = Member not appointed at that time
- **NM** = No meeting scheduled that month
- **CM** = Meeting canceled for lack of business items

Department Head Signature
# CITY BOARD/COMMISSION ATTENDANCE RECORD

**Board/Commission:** Board of Zoning Appeals  
**Year:** 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Name</th>
<th>1/13</th>
<th>2/10</th>
<th>3/10</th>
<th>4/14</th>
<th>5/12</th>
<th>6/9</th>
<th>7/14</th>
<th>8/11</th>
<th>9/8</th>
<th>10/13</th>
<th>11/11</th>
<th>12/8</th>
<th>Total Mtgs.</th>
<th>Total Absent</th>
<th>Percent Attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Hart</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery Jones</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hughes</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph Judd</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Lillie</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lyon</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Miller</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Morganroth</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALTERNATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Name</th>
<th>1/13</th>
<th>2/10</th>
<th>3/10</th>
<th>4/14</th>
<th>5/12</th>
<th>6/9</th>
<th>7/14</th>
<th>8/11</th>
<th>9/8</th>
<th>10/13</th>
<th>11/11</th>
<th>12/8</th>
<th>Total Mtgs.</th>
<th>Total Absent</th>
<th>Percent Attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Grove</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Loughrin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members in attendance: 7 7 6 7 6 7 7 0 7 7 6 7

**KEY:**  
A = Absent  
P = Present  
NM = No Meeting

[Department Head Signature]
APPLICATION FOR CITY BOARD OR COMMITTEE

Thank you for your interest in serving on a Board or Committee. The purpose of this form is to provide the City Commission with basic information about applicants considered for appointment. NOTE: Completed applications are included in the City Commission agenda packets. The information included on this form is open to the public. All Board and Committee members are subject to the provisions of the Ethics Ordinance (Chapter 2, Article IX of the City Code).

Information on various Boards and Committees and a list of current openings can be found on the City website at www.bhamgov.org/boardopportunities.

(Please print clearly)

Board/Committee of Interest ___BZA___

Specific Category/Vacancy on Board MY TERM IS COMPLETE FOR GENERAL MEMBER

Name ___ERIK MORGANROTH___

Residential Address ___631 ANN ST.___

Residential City, Zip ___BIRMINGHAM, MI___

Business Address ___SAME___

Business City, Zip ______

Phone ___248.762.9822___

Email ___EMORGANROTH@COMCAST.NET___

Length of Residence ___48 YEARS___

Occupation ___REAL ESTATE/BUILDER___

Reason for Interest: Explain how your background and skills will enhance the board to which you have applied. I HAVE ALREADY SERVED ONE TERM AS A BZA MEMBER. MY EXPERIENCE IN REAL ESTATE, CONSTRUCTION, ARCHITECTURE & ALL ASPECTS OF DEVELOPMENT HELP TO MAKE REASONABLE DECISIONS TO SUPPORT OUR BULWARK ORDINANCES.

List your related employment experience:

MORGANROTH REAL ESTATE, GRANBY CUSTOM HOMES

List your related community activities:

CURRENT OF FORMER BOARD MEMBER OF KAMANOS CANCER PARTNERS, CHILDREN HOSPITAL FOUNDATION, DETROIT INSTITUTE OF ARTS FJC, SHERIFF BOUCHARD ADVISORY BOARD

List your related educational experience:

GRAND RAPIDS HIGH SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN B.S., LICENSED REALTOR, MICHIGAN

To the best of your knowledge, do you or a member of your immediate family have any direct financial or business relationships with any supplier, service provider or contractor of the City of Birmingham from which you or they derive direct compensation or financial benefit? If yes, please explain: ___NO___

Do you currently have a relative serving on the board/committee to which you have applied? ___NO___

Are you an elector (registered voter) in the City of Birmingham? ___YES___

Signature of Applicant ___

Date ___9/12/18___

Return the completed and signed application form to: City of Birmingham, City Clerk’s Office, 151 Martin, Birmingham, MI 48009 or by email to Lpierce@bhamgov.org or by fax to 248.530.1080.
APPLICATION FOR CITY BOARD OR COMMITTEE

Thank you for your interest in serving on a Board or Committee. The purpose of this form is to provide the City Commission with basic information about applicants considered for appointment. NOTE: Completed applications are included in the City Commission agenda packets. The information included on this form is open to the public. All Board and Committee members are subject to the provisions of the Ethics Ordinance (Chapter 2, Article IX of the City Code).

Information on various Boards and Committees and a list of current openings can be found on the City website at www.bhamgov.org/boardopportunities.

(Please print clearly)

Board/Committee of Interest: BOARD & ZONING APPEALS
Specific Category/Vacancy on Board: BOARD MEMBER

Name: JOHN N MILLER
Phone: 248.703.9384

Residential Address: EAST BROOKSIDE
Email: jmillerstudios@gmail.com

Residential City, Zip: BIRMINGHAM 48009
Length of Residence: 20 YRS

Business Address: 1191 W. SQUARE PKWY
Occupation: ARCHITECT

Business City, Zip: BLOOMFIELD HILLS 48032

Reason for Interest: Explain how your background and skills will enhance the board to which you have applied

SEE ATTACHED

List your related employment experience

SEE ATTACHED

List your related community activities

SEE ATTACHED

List your related educational experience

SEE ATTACHED

To the best of your knowledge, do you or a member of your immediate family have any direct financial or business relationships with any supplier, service provider or contractor of the City of Birmingham from which you or they derive direct compensation or financial benefit? If yes, please explain: NO

Do you currently have a relative serving on the board/committee to which you have applied? NO

Are you an elector (registered voter) in the City of Birmingham? YES

Signature of Applicant: John N. Miller
Date: 9.13.2018

Return the completed and signed application form to: City of Birmingham, City Clerk’s Office, 151 Martin, Birmingham, MI 48009 or by email to Lpierce@bhamgov.org or by fax to 248.530.1080.
Reason for interest:

I have been a member of the Board of Zoning Appeals since 2010. And now, I would like to apply this past service, along with my extensive professional experience, to the on-going efforts of the board.

I believe that over the past 8 years I have been able to provide important insight into some of the complex issues that we have deliberated over. I also feel that I have developed a strong working relationship with my distinguished colleagues on the board.

I appreciate that this board is very important to the growth and interests of the city, and I find my work on the board to be very interesting and personally fulfilling. I also believe in the importance of civic engagement and giving back to my home community.

For these reasons, I am asking for your consideration in an appointment to another term of service on the BZA.

Thank you,

John N. Miller AIA
John N. Miller, AIA
Principal

John has over 40 years of architectural design experience. His expertise includes architectural design and programming, along with campus planning. He has been a leader on many of our complex college and university renovation projects.

John's professional experience includes the following projects:

Perkins Local Schools, OH
New Perkins Academy
District Master Plan
2010 Bond Issue Program

Olentangy School District, OH
New Middle School

Utica Community Schools, MI
Eisenhower High School Addition/Remodeling - Performing Arts Building
Ford High School Addition/Remodeling - Performing Arts Building
Utica High School Addition/Remodeling - Auxiliary Gym Addition
Stevenson High School Addition/Remodeling - Auxiliary Gym Addition
Ford High School Addition/Remodeling - Auxiliary Gym Addition
Utica High School Addition/Remodeling - Shop, Cafeteria & Two Classrooms

Birmingham Public Schools, MI
Performing Arts Addition/Renovation

Spring Arbor College, MI
Village Student Housing Complex
Village Housing Complex Phases II

Troy School District, MI
2013 Bond Issue Program
District Facilities Study
Elementary Schools Secured Entries (12 Schools)
Boulan Park Middle School Addition/Remodeling
Larson Middle Schools Addition/Remodeling
Troy High School Performing Arts & Classroom Addition

Warren Consolidated Schools, MI
Sterling Heights HS Performing Arts Center

Clawson School District, MI
High School Remodeling - Performing Arts Auditorium and Competition Gymnasium
Middle School Remodeling

Notre Dame Preparatory School and Marist Academy, Pontiac, MI
Campus Master Plan
Academic/Science Wing Addition

Monroe County Community College, MI
Performing Arts and Education Building
University of Detroit Mercy, MI
Student Fitness Center
Site Development & Tennis Complex
New McNichols Entry
College of Health Professions Expansion
Chemistry Building Renovation
Commerce & Finance Building Renovation

Michigan State University, East Lansing
Bott Building for Nursing Education & Research Addition/Renovation
School of Hospitality Business Learning Labs Renovation

Oakland Community College, Southfield, MI
Health Sciences Addition/Renovations
Campus Master Planning
Student Commons Renovation
Welcome Center/Resource Center Addition

Oakland University, MI
Performing Arts Complex Feasibility Study
Oakland Center Master Plan
Oakland Center Addition/Renovation
Recreation and Athletic Center
School of Business Administration Addition Study

Lake Superior State University, MI
Proposed Student Housing Complex

Rochester College, MI
New Academic Building
New Arts & Sciences Building
New Student Dormitory
Black Box Theatre
Administrative Offices
Master Plan

Oakland Community College, Royal Oak, MI
Campus Master Planning
New Building Entrances/Vestibules
Exterior Facade Replacement Study
Student Commons Renovation
Counseling & Resource Center Renovation
Learning Resource Center Renovation
Computer Classroom Addition
North and South Parking Structure Renovations

Baker College of Owosso, MI
New Auto/Diesel Institute
Master Plan
Assessment for New Student Housing

Goodwill Industries, MI
Office/Classroom Renovation
Dining Room & Cafeteria

Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti
Rackham Hall Physician's Assistant Program
Rackham Hall Phase II - College of Health & Human Sciences Programs
Warner Hall Assessment Study
Student Housing Building and Community Complex Study
Student Dormitory Building Study - Phases I & II

Concordia University, MI
Student Union Expansion
Recreation Center Addition/Renovation

University of Michigan Hospitals, Ann Arbor
Maternal and Child Health Center
A. Alfred Taubman Health Care Center
Visitors' Parking Structure

Rossford School District, OH
New 6-12 Junior High & High School Program & Planning

St. Clair Community College, Port Huron, MI
Health Sciences Building Master Plan
EJ Theisen Building Renovation - School of Nursing

Novi Community School District, MI
High School Athletics Addition
Deerfield Elementary School Addition/Remodeling
Parkview Elementary School Addition
Novi Meadows Upper Elementary School Remodeling

Martin Public Schools, MI
Performing Arts & Competition Gymnasium Addition

Oakland Schools, Waterford Township, MI
Special Education Campus Renovation Plan

Walsh College, MI
Troy Campus Master Plan
I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Harris called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

ROLL CALL: Present, Mayor Harris
          Mayor Pro Tem Bordman
          Commissioner Boutros
          Commissioner DeWeese
          Commissioner Hoff
          Commissioner Sherman

Absent, Commissioner Nickita

Administration: City Manager Valentine, City Attorney Currier, City Clerk Mynsberge
Rebecca Camargo, Joseph Fazio, and Jeffrey Haynes - Beier Howlett Attorneys
and Counselors

III. CLOSED SESSION

09-251-18 CLOSED SESSION

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Sherman, seconded by Commissioner Hoff:
To meet in closed session pursuant to Section 8(h) of the Open Meetings Act, MCL 15.261 -
15.275.
(A roll call vote is required and the vote must be approved by a 2/3 majority of the
commission. The commission will adjourn to closed session after all other business
has been addressed in open session and reconvene to open session, after the closed
session, for purposes of taking formal action resulting from the closed session and
for purposes of adjourning the meeting.)

ROLL CALL: Yeas, Mayor Harris
          Mayor Pro Tem Bordman
          Commissioner Boutros
          Commissioner DeWeese
          Commissioner Hoff
          Commissioner Sherman

Nays, none

Absent, Commissioner Nickita
City Manager Valentine said no action was expected to be taken upon reconvening into open session.

IV. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no members of the public wishing to speak.

The Mayor adjourned the meeting to closed session at 7:03 p.m.

V. ADJOURN

Mayor Harris reconvened the meeting into open session and adjourned the special meeting at 7:30 p.m.

_____________________________
J. Cherilynn Mynsberge, City Clerk
I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Andrew M. Harris, Mayor

II. ROLL CALL

ROLL CALL: Present, Mayor Harris
Mayor Pro Tem Bordman
Commissioner Boutros
Commissioner DeWeese
Commissioner Hoff
Commissioner Sherman

Absent, Commissioner Nickita

Administration: City Manager Valentine, City Attorney Currier, Senior Planner Baka, Assistant City Engineer Bridges, Communications Director Byrnes, Police Chief Clemence, Fire Chief Connaughton, Planning Director Ecker, Assistant City Engineer Fletcher, City Clerk Mynsberge, City Engineer O’Meara, BSD Director Tighe, DPS Director Wood

III. PROCLAMATIONS, CONGRATULATORY RESOLUTIONS, AWARDS, APPOINTMENTS, RESIGNATIONS AND CONFIRMATIONS, ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS, INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.

09-252-18 ANNOUNCEMENTS

- City Engineer O’Meara introduced Assistant City Engineer Austin Fletcher and Assistant City Manager Teresa Bridges.
- Police Chief Clemence introduced Bella, who is now a Certified Therapy Dog.
- The second annual Read in the Park is being held in Beverly Park on Saturday, September 22nd from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. In the event of rain, this event will take place at Baldwin Public Library.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

All items listed on the consent agenda are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion and approved by a roll call vote. There will be no separate discussion of the items unless a commissioner or citizen so requests, in which event the item will be removed from the general order of business and considered under the last item of new business.

09-253-18 APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

The following items were removed from the Consent Agenda:

- Mayor Pro Tem Bordman: Item F, Special Event Request - Santa House; and, Item M, 345 Hawthorne Landscape Plan Proposal
- Commissioner Hoff: Item A, City Commission Meeting Minutes of September 6, 2018; and,
Item J, 2018 Fee Schedule Change to add Applicant Review for Liquor License Applicants Removing an Existing Party to the City Clerk’s Office Section

- Commissioner DeWeese: Abstained from voting on Item A, citing his absence from the September 6, 2018 Commission Meeting.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Deweese, seconded by Commissioner Boutros:
To approve the Consent Agenda with Items A, F, J, and M removed.

**ROLL CALL:**
- Present, Mayor Harris
- Mayor Pro Tem Bordman
- Commissioner Boutros
- Commissioner DeWeese
- Commissioner Hoff
- Commissioner Sherman

- Absent, Commissioner Nickita

**B.** Resolution approving the warrant list, including Automated Clearing House payments, dated September 5, 2018 in the amount of $228,748.31.

**C.** Resolution approving the warrant list, including Automated Clearing House payments, dated September 12, 2018 in the amount of $755,829.44.

**D.** Resolution approving a request submitted by Ascension of Christ Lutheran Church requesting permission to place a Nativity scene in Shain Park from November 23, 2018 to December 31, 2018, contingent upon compliance with all permit and insurance requirements and payment of all fees, and, further, pursuant to any minor modifications that may be deemed necessary by administrative staff at the time of the event.

**E.** Resolution approving a request from the Birmingham Shopping District to hold the Winter Markt, in Shain Park and surrounding streets from November 27 - December 2, 2018 and to allow the use of temporary liquor licenses in Shain Park for this event, contingent upon compliance with all permit and insurance requirements and payment of all fees, and, further, pursuant to any minor modifications that may be deemed necessary by administrative staff at the time of the event.

**G.** Resolution approving the federal funds in the amount of $21,781.00 for the 2018 Emergency Management Performance Grant period of 10/1/2017 to 9/30/2018. Further, to direct the Mayor to sign the agreement on behalf of the City.

**H.** Resolution authorizing the Mayor of the City of Birmingham to sign the Emergency Management Performance Grant Work Agreement on behalf of the City.

**I.** Resolution approving the purchase of one (1) new Toro Debris Blower from Spartan Distributors, through State of Michigan extendable purchasing contract #2017025 for a total expenditure of $7,436.04. Funds for this purchase are available in the Equipment Fund account # 641-441.006-971.0100.

**K.** Resolution approving the 2018-19 agreement with RS Contracting, Inc. for painting yellow centerline and white long line pavement markings in the amount of $8,356.00 for the 2018-19 fiscal year; further authorizing and directing the mayor and city clerk to sign the agreement on behalf of the city; further to authorize this budgeted expenditure from account number 202-303-001-937.0200.
L. Resolution setting a public hearing for October 8, 2018 to consider recommended amendments to Chapter 126, Zoning, of the City Code to remove all references to Church or Churches and replace the terms with religious institution(s) and provide a definition for same.

09-254-18 APPROVAL OF THE CITY COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2018 (ITEM A)
Commission Hoff noted that motion #09-247-18 on page four should be amended to include ‘lease agreement between Birmingham Public Schools and the City of Birmingham for the two tennis courts adjacent to Quarton School’

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Hoff, seconded by Commissioner Boutros:
To approve the City Commission meeting minutes of September 6, 2018 as amended.

VOTE: Yeas, 6
Nays, 0
Absent, 1

09-255-18 SPECIAL EVENT REQUEST - SANTA HOUSE (ITEM F)
BSD Director Tighe stated that admission to Santa House is indeed free, and the BSD will make sure the signage explicitly states that. If someone should desire to make a voluntary donation, then the recommended donation is $5 to the Lion’s Club.

MOTION: Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Bordman, seconded by Commissioner DeWeese:
To approve the request from the Birmingham Shopping District to place the Santa House and related activities as described in the Special Event application in Shain Park between the week of November 24th, 2018 through the week of January 5, 2019 including free parking at the on street meters on November 24, 2018, contingent upon compliance with all permit and insurance requirements and payment of all fees, and, further, pursuant to any minor modifications that may be deemed necessary by administrative staff at the time of the event.

VOTE: Yeas, 6
Nays, 0
Absent, 1

09-256-18 FEE SCHEDULE CHANGE TO CITY CLERK’S SECTION TO ADD APPLICANT REVIEW FOR LIQUOR LICENSE APPLICANTS REMOVING AN EXISTING PARTY (ITEM J)
Chief of Police Clemence explained that the $350 fee would only apply in cases where an existing party to the liquor license is being removed without any additional applicants or operational changes.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Hoff, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Bordman:
To amend the 2018 City of Birmingham Fee Schedule, City Clerk’s Office section, to include an “Administrative Applicant Review” fee of $350.00 in cases where an existing party to the liquor license is being removed without any additional applicants or operational changes.

VOTE: Yeas, 6
Nays, 0
Absent, 1
09-257-18  345 HAWTHORNE LANDSCAPE PLAN PROPOSAL (ITEM M)
Commissioner Boutros disclosed that 345 Hawthorne is next to his home. He continued that he is in support of this resolution, and has no economic interest in 345 Hawthorne.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman said:
- Canadian Hemlocks are beautiful trees.
- She is concerned about the selection of Canadian Hemlock because they are prone to infestation by the woolly adelgid.
- Woolly adelgids are currently in five or six counties in west Michigan and are moving east.
- She would like to know the plan for monitoring the trees.
- If one of the thirteen planned hawthornes is infested, it will spread to the twelve other hemlocks and any hemlocks in Birmingham.

DPS Director Wood said:
- DPS does not generally monitor the trees unless they are directly on a trail. Since these are newly planted trees, there may be an exception.
- Patrick Funke from Michael J. Dul & Associates could speak more to the particular issues with Canadian Hemlock.
- Mr. Cupisz would be irrigating the hemlocks as part of his landscaping.

Mr. Funke stated:
- Mr. Cupisz would also be willing to do a spray program to protect both his property and the hemlock against woolly adelgid and other infestations.
- Synthetic turf is being proposed for a part of Mr. Cupisz’s backyard because it is impossible to get a lawn mower into that area. While the Engineering Department counts the synthetic turf as impervious, Michael J. Dul & Associates only uses pervious turf.

MOTION:  Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Bordman, seconded by Commissioner DeWeese:
To approve the landscape plan next to 345 Hawthorne, on park property which is part of the City trail system in Linden Park, including the removal of invasive buckthorn, dead trees, and planting of thirteen new Canadian Hemlock trees. All costs to be borne by the applicant, Mr. Anthony Cupisz. Further, to authorize the Department of Public Services to issue a Tree and Shrub Permit in accordance with the Tree Preservation Ordinance for such work on public property.

VOTE:  Yeas, 6
Nays, 0
Absent, 1

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
09-258-18  UPDATES TO PROCEDURES, CONDITIONS AND REGULATIONS FOR GREENWOOD CEMETERY
City Manager Valentine recommended withdrawing this item for the time being pending a full legal review. Subsequently the item would come back before the Commission.

Commission Hoff asked for the number of plots under payment plans and the total dollar amount of payments made on those lots to date.
City Clerk Mynsberge replied:
- She could have that information for when this item returns to the Commission.
- Thirty plots are currently under payment plan.

Mayor Harris:
- Asked how the purchaser is made aware of the policy;
- Stated he would like to see language about pre-payment and how those payments would be allocated to plots;
- Stated the accelerated payment or pre-payment options are inconsistent with a proportionate distribution if there are multiple plots, which should be clarified;
- Stated purchasers should not forfeit all previous payments if one payment is missed, as there should be a cure period; and,
- Stated the allocation of funds to the perpetual care account should be clarified.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman said paragraph two has unnecessary repetition which should be revised.

The Commission took no action.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

09-259-18 REQUEST TO ELIMINATE THE HISTORIC DESIGNATION OF 361 E. MAPLE

Senior Planner Baka:
- Reviewed the materials in the agenda packet regarding this item, including his September 7, 2018 memo to City Manager Valentine.
- Clarified that a historic designation does not preclude changes to a building.
- Confirmed that the facade of a building is generally considered the most important part to preserve.
- Confirmed that no historically designated buildings in the historic district have been de-listed.
- Explained that the district establishes the purview of the Historic District Study Commission (HDSC), which means any changes to a building within the district must go before the HDSC. Only the landmark buildings, however, are subject to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. These requirements are part of City ordinances.
- Said there is no restriction on height for historically designated buildings. Drastic changes would be more challenging, but there are ways to modify buildings while remaining sensitive to their historic nature.
- The only home that has been de-listed was 505 Townsend, because there were so many previous undocumented changes that the home was no longer considered historic. To Senior Planner Baka’s knowledge there have also been no other requests to de-list beyond 505 Townsend and 361 E. Maple.

John Gabor, attorney representing property owner Victor Simon, explained:
- Mr. Simon requested the de-listing of 361 E. Maple to allow development of the building consistent with the City’s 2016 Plan and the overlay district ordinance.
- It is not mandatory for the Commission to follow the recommendation of the HDSC to deny, as the Commission is free to consider other factors including plans, ordinances, patterns of development, and comments from other Board and Commissions.
A report included in the agenda packet, as submitted by historic architect William L. Finnicum at the owner’s request, found there is no historic significance to 361 E. Maple and supported de-listing the property. Mr. Gabor reported that in Mr. Finnicum’s forty year career this is only the second time that Mr. Finnicum has supported de-listing a building.

361 E. Maple was of minimal historic significance when it was designated. It would not be designated as a landmark today because of the changing character of E. Maple.

361 E. Maple has lost that small shop context that enabled the building to be designated as a landmark.

361 E. Maple is a twenty-foot wide building with minimal architectural features. The original inventory form filled out at the time of designation showed very weak rationale for the designation. Question #18 on the inventory, which specifically asked about architectural significance, specified no significance. Question #19 on the inventory, asking about historical significance, also specifies no significance. It was a good example of buildings from the time, but bears no significance in and of itself. 361 E. Maple was somewhat arbitrarily chosen, as other buildings nearby have identical characteristics.

Changes to the structures adjacent to the landmark buildings matter as much for changing or maintaining the character of the district as changes to the landmark buildings themselves.

Due to surrounding development, the designation of 361 E. Maple has been rendered irrelevant, whereas other landmark buildings remain significant in their context.

Robin Boyle and Daniel Share of the Planning Board supported the de-listing of 361 E. Maple, and Michael Willoughby, Thomas Trapnell, Doug Burley and Adam Charles of the Historic District Commission supported the de-listing as well.

While this will be a precedent-setting decision, the rationale for de-listing 361 E. Maple does not apply to other landmarks, so this will not cause a landslide of other de-listing applications.

Mr. Simon renovated 159 Pierce Street, which was also historically designated.

Property owner Victor Simon stated:

- 361 E. Maple was purchased in 2016.
- He was aware of the property’s historic designation when he purchased it.
- An architect already determined that the facade could not be maintained while achieving the development goals.

Blair Gould, attorney for the Kaftans who own the building immediately to the east of 361 E. Maple, laid out a number of reasons the Kaftans object to the proposed de-listing of 361 E. Maple including:

- Mr. Simon should have been aware of the designation at the time of purchase.
- The historic designation for these landmark properties were maintained after the 2016 Plan.
- The fact that this building is a one-story landmark building makes 361 E. Maple more significant, not less.
- The building has been zoned B-4 since 1984.
- The Kaftans have offered to acquire the property from Mr. Simon for the price that he paid in order to maintain the historic designation.

Melvin Kaftan said:

- The HDC heard the request to de-list 361 E. Maple twice and denied it.
● 261 E. Maple through 323 E. Maple are marked historic. An owner of some of those buildings said he was interested in de-listing his building as well if Mr. Simon’s de-listing goes through.
● If 361 E. Maple is de-listed and is built bigger, it will require significantly more parking.

Gerri Kaftan said:
● She and her husband chose 369 E. Maple Road because the street is charming. They built their home with brick and lime in order to maintain the character of the street.
● 361 E. Maple just needs a bit of tender loving care.
● Like the man in the movie Up, Mr. Simon is trying to muscle all the charm out of Birmingham.

A member of the audience noted that 361 E. Maple is the smallest of the landmark buildings at twenty feet in width.

Patricia Lang stated three times that in the Bay Area historic buildings are not allowed to be demolished unless they are entirely beyond repair. She continued:
● That building owners in the Bay Area are not able to build a structure that would change the light neighbors receive unless all the neighbors sign off on it.
● She does not want to see Birmingham lose its character.
● She implored the Commission to maintain the historic designation for 361 E. Maple.

Mr. Gabor noted that 369 E. Maple was built to four stories, adhering more to the 2016 Plan and the overlay district than the previous character of the street.

Mr. Gould stated that there are alternatives to fully demolishing 361 E. Maple and clarified Mr. Kaftan’s claim that another owner expressed his desire to de-list. The owner, rather, stated that he supported the de-listing of 361 E. Maple, describing the building as ugly.

Mayor Harris called a brief recess at 8:59 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 9:02 p.m.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman noted:
● Birmingham’s historic buildings are important to many Birmingham residents.
● 361 E. Maple fulfills the definition of a landmark because it is “an example of its type”.
● It was built in 1927, and maintaining the building is a way to see the past.

MOTION: Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Bordman, seconded by Commissioner Hoff:
To deny the request by the property owner to eliminate the historic designation on 361 E. Maple as recommended by the Historic District Study Committee.

Commissioner Sherman said a skilled architect could maintain the facade of 361 E. Maple without needing to de-list the property.

Commissioner Hoff noted that since the building is one of the last of its kind, she will be supporting the motion.

Mayor Harris stated:
● The first question for de-listing a building is whether the building has lost its historic significance.
• He is concerned that if this building is de-listed buildings around it will also be de-listed and the historical significance will be eliminated.

Commissioner DeWeese said the best approach will be to maintain the designation and preserve the building’s best features.

VOTE: Yeas, 6  Nays, 0  Absent, 1

09-260-18 PUBLIC HEARING – BISTRO ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 126, ZONING OF THE BIRMINGHAM CITY CODE

Mayor Harris opened the public hearing at 9:09 p.m.

Planning Director Ecker reviewed her September 7, 2018 memo to City Manager Valentine and explained:
• Bar seating is included in the maximum number of indoor seats.
• Any bistros with enclosures to allow year-round outdoor dining are grandfathered in.
• A special land use permit (SLUP) would allow the Commission to address the possibility of high-top tables without seats should the situation arise.
• Class C restaurants generally have at least 125 seats.

Mayor Pro Tem shared concern about the possibility of competition between bistros and Class C restaurants since these ordinance changes allow bistros with up to 170 seats. She continued that bistros were originally intended to be intimate.

Mayor Harris closed the Public Hearing at 9:22 p.m.

Planning Director Ecker clarified:
• Class C restaurants have no restrictions on their seating numbers beyond what is determined by their SLUP.
• Outdoor rooftop dining for bistros is permitted as long as surrounding properties are not impacted in a negative manner.

Commissioner Hoff echoed Mayor Pro Tem Bordman’s concerns regarding the number of potential seats being proposed for bistros.

Commissioner DeWeese said he was also concerned with the numbers, and with the possibility of encouraging nightclub-like atmospheres with these changes.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman stated:
• Having bistros in the Rail District and the Triangle District is a fabulous idea.
• She appreciates all the work the Planning Board has done with these amendments.
• Encouraging bistros too aggressively stands to undermine Class C restaurants.
• This item should go back to the Planning Board specifically to discuss the number of allowed seats in a bistro.
• The Planning Board could also consider incentives. For instance perhaps if a bistro provides some measure of parking, they could increase their number of seats by a percent.
• Going over 65 seats defeats the whole idea of a bistro.
MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Sherman, seconded by Commissioner DeWeese:
To approve the following ordinance amendments to Chapter 126, Zoning of the Birmingham City Code:
1. Section 3.04, Specific Standards, Building Use, to amend the regulations of the bistro Special Land Use Permit;
2. Section 5.06, O1 – Office District, Specific Standards, Building Use, to amend the regulations of the bistro Special Land Use Permit;
3. Section 5.07, O2 – Office District, Specific Standards, Building Use, to amend the regulations of the bistro Special Land Use Permit;
4. Section 5.08, P – Parking District, Specific Standards, Building Use, to amend the regulations of the bistro Special Land Use Permit;
5. Section 5.10, B2 – General Business District, B2B – General Business District, B2C – General Business District, Specific Standards, Building Use, to amend the regulations of the bistro Special Land Use Permit;
6. Section 5.11, B3 – Office-Residential District, Specific Standards, Building Use, to amend the regulations of the bistro Special Land Use Permit;
7. Section 5.12, B4 – Business-Residential District, Specific Standards, Building Use, to amend the regulations of the bistro Special Land Use Permit;
8. Section 5.13, MX – Mixed Use District, Specific Standards, Building Use, to amend the regulations of the bistro Special Land Use Permit; and

VOTE: Yeas, 6
Nays, 0
Absent, 1

Commissioner Sherman stated:
- The definition of “Bistro” in Section 9.02, Definitions is concerning because it treats bistros as larger than Class C restaurants for nine months out of the year.
- He was on the Commission when bistro licenses were developed and making them larger than Class C restaurants was never the intention.
- Very few sites would justify a 65-seat outdoor capacity.
- The following changes could be made to the proposed ordinance:
  - Bistro: When located in the Downtown Overlay District, a restaurant with a full service kitchen with interior seating for no more than 65 people and seating for outdoor dining of no more than 65 people. When located in the Triangle District or Rail District, a restaurant with a full service kitchen with interior seating for no more than 85 people and seating for outdoor dining of no more than 85 people.
- Then the Planning Board should consider a smaller number for outdoor dining.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman replied that 85 indoor seats is still too large for a bistro. She suggested keeping bistros at 65 indoor seats in all areas, and sending it back to the Planning Board for the outdoor numbers.

Planning Director Ecker said the Planning Board is strongly against putting any limit at all on outdoor seating. The proposed limit of 85 was to address the Commission’s previous concerns. If the Commission desires to go in a specific direction, the Planning Board has given their input.

Commissioner Sherman asked for a list of current bistros and their indoor/outdoor seating numbers.
Mayor Pro Tem Bordman said she would also like Class C restaurants included on that list.

Commissioner Boutros recalled a Class C restaurant owner in the Triangle District speaking in support of the proposed SLUP for a large bistro in the Triangle District when the issue came before the Commission. Because of this he suggested the Commission should choose the number of seats they are comfortable with.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman said she would like to see other numbers before the Commission makes a decision.

Commissioner Sherman commented that the Commission’s job is not to protect the legacy license holders, but to serve the best interest of the community as a whole.

Commissioner DeWeese suggested the Planning Board could recommend incentives for bistros in the Rail and Triangle Districts.

Planning Director Ecker said:
- She would bring back the information regarding seating.
- If no changes are made to 9.02 this evening, bistros will remain limited to 65 seats for now.

City Manager Valentine clarified:
- This year’s application deadline for bistro applications is October 1, 2018.
- The proposed ordinance changes will be in effect when the applications come in, with the exception of the maximum capacity on outdoor dining.
- Applicants will be advised as to the changes in the bistro ordinances when they submit their applications.

Commissioner Sherman said it would not be an issue because the bistro applications are concept plans, not approvals, which means the Commission will have a bit more time.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Sherman, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Bordman:
To continue the public hearing until October 8, 2018.

**VOTE:**
- Yeas, 6
- Nays, 0
- Absent, 1

**09-261-18 REQUEST TO AMEND THE BROWNFIELD PLAN FOR 34965 WOODWARD TO INCLUDE 215 PEABODY**
Planning Director Ecker presented her September 10, 2018 memo to City Manager Valentine.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner DeWeese, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Bordman
To approve the developer’s request to amend the Brownfield Plan for 34965 Woodward to include the property known as 215 Peabody as recommended by the Brownfield Redevelopment Authority on September 5, 2018.

**VOTE:**
- Yeas, 6
- Nays, 0
Planning Director Ecker reviewed the provided information regarding this item, including her September 10, 2018 memo to City Manager Valentine. She continued by introducing Senen Antonio, DPZ Partner, Matt Lambert, DPZ Partner, Mr. McKenna and Bob Gibbs, urban planner with specialization in retail from Gibbs Planning.

Commissioner Sherman expressed concern that the DPZ proposal is broader than the Commission asked for in the RFP, as the RFP focused on the neighborhoods and integrating them into Birmingham’s existent sub-plans.

Mr. Lambert said Commissioner Sherman’s concerns came across loud and clear and that DPZ had already received similar feedback from City staff. In DPZ’s reply to the feedback, they focused on:

- Their neighborhood planning experience;
- How neighborhoods internalize the character of their plans; and
- The interaction between downtown, the neighborhoods and their interaction with each other since this is a comprehensive Master Plan.

Mr. Gibbs explained a retail study would determine the interest in retail within the neighborhoods in order to create more walkable areas.

Commissioner Sherman shared concern regarding Mr. Gibbs’ inclusion on the team because he previously represented Birmingham building owners advocating for offices on the first floor before the Commission. He added:

- Other residents had raised this concern as well.
- If there is to be a retail study, the focus must remain on whether retail in walking distance of the neighborhood is appropriate, as opposed to any attempt to redefine retail.

Mr. Gibbs clarified:

- That he did not previously appear before the Commission as a representative.
- He gave his opinion before the Commission regarding the possibility of offices on the first floor in Birmingham.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman said:

- DPZ’s plan does not reflect an understanding of what the Commission outlined very clearly in the RFP. The comprehensive community engagement plan should have been a focal point in DPZ’s plan, because engaging Birmingham residents is such a high priority.
- Birmingham is not a large City trying to develop its downtown at this point. The Commission is looking to invest in Birmingham neighborhoods, an issue better addressed by MKSK in their proposal.

Commissioner DeWeese echoed concerns over community engagement, noting that a large part of the process is not just creating the plan but generating excitement about the plan. He continued that the focus needs to be on integrating all the areas of the City, not just developing the downtown.
Mr. Lambert explained:

- The $30,000 budget for the comprehensive community engagement plan is solely for publicity.
- About $70,000 of the ‘Plan Preparation’ fees would be spent on further community engagement, because community engagement is considered integral to the planning process by DPZ.
- Community engagement is such a high business priority for DPZ that they are rebranding to emphasize it. Community engagement was budgeted under plan preparation because the plans are made through an ongoing dialogue with the community.
- Neighborhood planning has evolved especially in regards to what a neighborhood unit is, how the structure functions, and the relationships between different types of neighborhoods. DPZ has spent a significant amount of time working with neighborhood planning but did not adequately represent their experience in their response to the RFP.
- The Jacobs Firm is a global firm headquartered in Atlanta, and DPZ is headquartered in Florida.

Commissioner Hoff said:

- Companies nearer to Birmingham tend to have a better sense of what Birmingham is looking for with these projects.
- The biographies included in DPZ’s proposal focused heavily on urban revitalization, new urbanism, and downtowns, which is not what Birmingham is looking for in this process.

Mr. Lambert stated:

- DPZ partner Andres Duany, who was part of the Downtown Birmingham 2016 plan team, will lead and be heavily involved in the Charrette process and the preparation of the plan.
- Mr. Lambert is the project manager on this project and his mother, grandparents and great-grandparents lived in Birmingham, which gives him familiarity with the City. While he was not raised in Birmingham, he spent recreational time during his teen years in Birmingham.
- DPZ has worked with municipalities of all sizes, including ones with neighborhood structures similar to Birmingham’s.

Commissioner Boutros said he was reassured that DPZ will do sufficient community engagement, but wants to hear more about how they are not focusing excessively on the retail environment of Birmingham.

Senen Antonio, Partner at DPZ, explained that Mr. Duany will be meeting one-on-one with representatives from each Birmingham neighborhood during the Charrette in order to discuss issues within the neighborhoods and to devise solutions.

Mr. Lambert said that DPZ presented much more of their experience with neighborhoods, planning and engagement during their interview with the Ad Hoc Master Plan Selection Committee. He stressed DPZ:

- Will be taking direction from the Commission and from the residents.
- Fully understands the focus on Birmingham’s residential neighborhoods.
- Also understands the holistic nature of the comprehensive master plan.
Mr. Antonio stated that DPZ’s work in Miami and Omaha focused primarily on the seams between the commercial corridors and the residential areas, which parallels what the Commission is looking for on behalf of Birmingham.

Commissioner DeWeese read aloud a question from Commissioner Nickita: “How will the consultant work to unify the residential and commercial areas of the City?”

Mr. Lambert replied that DPZ has extensive experience in the area, the openness to listen to the Commission and the residents, and to not bring preconceived notions to bear.

Mr. Antonio said DPZ projects usually have a kick-off, then meetings with the client teams, due diligence and technical studies, followed by the Charrette, further meetings with the client team and local decision makers for comment and further input, final revisions and a final plan submission. During this whole time there is also a simultaneous community engagement process.

Mr. Lambert explained that on the first day of the Charrette, Mr. Duany will present background on the project, information DPZ has learned to-date, and summary of some of the elements of prior plans and observations of existing conditions.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman stated that she was still disturbed that DPZ did not understand what Birmingham was looking for from the RFP for the project. She said their response to the RFP demonstrated a lack of understanding of the community.

Mr. Gibbs asserted that DPZ understands neighborhoods better than any other consultant because DPZ reinvented the prewar neighborhood. He continued that:

- Part of the DPZ process will be designing specific plans for each neighborhood as part of the citywide plan.
- Mckenna is Michigan’s largest planning firm with extensive experience across Michigan.
- He has lived in several Birmingham neighborhoods, and his office has been across the street from City Hall in Birmingham for thirty years. His children attended Birmingham schools, and he has served on Birmingham boards.
- DPZ’s intention is to fully understand Birmingham’s neighborhoods.
- He is currently in the process of writing a book on Birmingham’s neighborhoods because they are superlative.
- DPZ has built hundreds of neighborhoods across the country and are very astute when it comes to implementing the residents’ vision.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Boutros, seconded by Commissioner Sherman:
To approve the contract with DPZ Partners, LLC, as recommended by the Ad Hoc Master Plan Selection Committee, in the amount of $298,000.00 payable from account # 101-721-000-811.000, to provide professional services to prepare an update to the City’s comprehensive master plan, and to direct the Mayor to execute same.

Commissioner Hoff said she would like to hear a presentation from MKSK as well.

City Manager Valentine stated MKSK was invited to this meeting but was not able to attend due to a conflict.
Commissioner DeWeese agreed with Commissioner Hoff since DPZ and MKSK were nearly identical based on scores.

Mayor Harris said he sees no reason to ignore the Ad Hoc Master Plan Selection Committee’s (MPSC) near-unanimous recommendation of DPZ. He thinks they would be a great partner in this long-term project and stated he was inclined to support the motion.

Commissioner Sherman pointed out that the Commission appointed the MPSC to vet the proposals, hear the proposals, and make a recommendation to the Commission. He continued that:

- If MKSK presents to the Commission, then the Commission will be doing the exact same work the MPSC has already completed.
- DPZ solely answered questions this evening, and made no presentation to the Commission. Therefore, if MKSK presents, DPZ will need to present as well, rendering all the work of the MPSC entirely redundant.

Mayor Harris agreed with Commission Sherman.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman emphasized:

- The MPSC makes a recommendation, but not the final decision, as that responsibility rests with the Commission.
- If the Commission agreed with every recommendation, the Commission would merely be a rubber stamp.
- There was a 1.69% difference between DPZ’s score and MKSK’s score.

Mayor Harris objected to the characterization of accepting the MPSC’s recommendation as rubber stamping since the Commission received reams of documents, the minutes of all presentations, and detailed answers from the applicants. He concluded that the Commission had done due diligence on the matter.

VOTE: Yeas, 3 (Harris, Sherman, Boutros)  
Nays, 3 (Hoff, Bordman, DeWeese)  
Absent, 1

Commissioner Sherman said the next step must be to have both teams return and present to the Commission.

Commissioner Hoff said she would just like the opportunity to ask questions of MKSK.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman agreed with Commissioner Hoff.

Commissioner DeWeese said:

- It was a problem that the Commission did not hear from a representative of the MPSC this evening to explain why they recommended strongly in favor of DPZ.
- Being able to speak to both sides allows for education and for better decisions.
- Since the Commission did not have access to the presentations given to the MPSC by MKSK and DPZ, the Commission is only going on the originally submitted materials.

Planning Director Ecker stated that she was given the cellphone number of Chris Herman, the President of MKSK, in case the Commission had questions.
Chris Longe, vice-chair of the MPSC, explained:

- The score sheet the Commission is seeing was from prior to the MPSC’s interviews with MKSK and DPZ.
- During the interview process it became clear that there was a compelling difference between DPZ and MKSK.
- The interview process likely even swung some votes that were initially leaning towards MKSK.

There was consensus that MKSK should appear before the Commission to answer questions in a similar manner to this evening’s proceedings with DPZ.

Mayor Harris thanked DPZ and affiliated entities for coming to the meeting.

**09-263-18 PRIORITIZED LOCATIONS FOR BUS SHELTERS**

Planning Director Ecker reviewed the provided information on priority locations for bus shelters.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Sherman, seconded by Commissioner Boutros:

To approving the recommendation from the Multi-Modal Transportation Board that the attached list (appended to these minutes as Attachment A) of priority locations for bus shelters be used as a guide when new bus shelters are considered for installation.

AND

To direct City staff to work with SMART to install three SMART enhanced FAST style shelters at SMART FAST bus stops on Woodward Ave. northbound at 14 Mile Rd. and northbound and southbound at Maple Rd.

AND

To relocate the existing standard Birmingham shelter on northbound Woodward Ave. at 14 Mile Rd. to westbound 14 Mile Rd. at Woodward Ave. in order to facilitate the installation of a SMART enhanced FAST style shelter at the existing bus stop.

AND

To approve a bus shelter at westbound E. Maple Rd. and Coolidge as the next bus shelter to be installed.

VOTE: Yeas, 6

Nays, 0

Absent, 1

**09-264-18 MDEQ LEAD AND COPPER RULES CONCURRENCE**

Commissioner Sherman:

- Asked City Engineer O'Meara to confirm that this motion is to concur with the recommendation that the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality change their methodology for imposing rules.
- Specified that this motion is not in support of lead or copper in the water system.

City Engineer O'Meara confirmed for Commissioner Sherman, saying that the goal of this is to give MDEQ a chance to reconsider their process.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner DeWeese, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Bordman:

To authorize the Mayor to sign the Concurrence Form regarding the Request for Declaratory Ruling filed by the Great Lakes Water Authority, the Detroit Water & Sewer Dept., and the
Oakland Co. Water Resources Commissioner pertaining to the new Lead & Copper Rules as issued by the Michigan Dept. of Environmental Quality dated June 14, 2018.

City Manager Valentine explained this item was passed to municipalities throughout Michigan, and that while some are passing resolutions, City Manager Valentine and City Attorney Currier agreed this was a more appropriate avenue for Birmingham.

VOTE: Yeas, 6  
Nays, 0  
Absent, 1

09-265-18  HEARING ON APPEAL OF FOIA REQUEST
City Attorney Currier reviewed the provided information on the matter.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Sherman, seconded by Commissioner DeWeese:  
To grant the appeal to provide the information from FOIA request #18-0425 to Mr. Arthur Siegal, Jaffe, Raitt, Heuer & Weiss, PC.

Mayor Harris stated the City is not waiving any objections to discovery if this matter is requested during litigation.

Commissioner Sherman said this is not a good way to perform an end-run around discovery, but since there is nothing here, he is moving it forward.

Commissioner Hoff asked for City Attorney Jeff Haynes’ opinion.

City Attorney Haynes said:
- It would not be arbitrary and capricious for the Commission to deny the FOIA request appeal because the FOIA was brought by an attorney working for a law firm representing a client with whom the City is in litigation.
- The material that is being requested could be requested through discovery. The difference between a FOIA request and discovery is a matter of time and cost.
- Granting the FOIA appeal request expedites the process.

Commissioner Sherman noted that, except in rare cases, a FOIA is paid for by the requesting party, which means Mr. Siegal and his client will be paying for the expedited receipt of this information.

City Manager Valentine explained the FOIA request is for documents related to the Brownfield reimbursement for the 2400 E. Lincoln property.

City Attorney Haynes added that the FOIA request is also for the documents retained by the City for the joint consultant between 2400 E. Lincoln and the City, which are voluminous.

City Attorney Currier explained that his letter dated September 12, 2018 to Mr. Siegal was an attempt to narrow the scope of the FOIA request, which Mr. Siegal accommodated.

Mr. Siegal said:
- In this case it works to the City’s advantage to provide the information.
He did not wish to put the City to undue expense or effort, so he would come in and look at the files to specify the individual documents he wants.

The current litigation is exceptionally narrowly focused and he does not believe any of the documents requested are pertinent to said litigation. While it involves some of the same parties and the same property, it has no bearing on the issues currently before the court in the pending litigation.

This request has to do with clarifying the grounds on which the Brownfield Redevelopment Authority terminated an agreement.

VOTE:  Yeas,  6
Nays,  0
Absent,  1

VII. REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

The items removed were discussed earlier in the meeting.

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS

None

IX. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None

X. REPORTS

08-266-18 ACCEPTANCE OF THE 2017 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE GREENWOOD CEMETERY ADVISORY BOARD
Commissioner Hoff recommended this and the GCAB payment plan policy be considered at the next Commission meeting due to the late hour.

XI. ADJOURN

Mayor Harris adjourned the meeting at 11:22 p.m.

_____________________________
J. Cherilynn Mynsberge, City Clerk
## Priority Locations for Enhanced Transit Stops – 08-05-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Stop ID</th>
<th>Routes</th>
<th>Bus Stop</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>2017 Ridership</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22059</td>
<td>460,780</td>
<td>E. Maple &amp; Coolidge Westbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11300</td>
<td>450,460,780</td>
<td>W. Maple &amp; Old Woodward Eastbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>W. Maple &amp; Old Woodward Westbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>450,460</td>
<td>S Old Woodward &amp; Daines Northbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12082</td>
<td>445,450,460</td>
<td>Woodward &amp; Bennaville Southbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10676</td>
<td>450,460</td>
<td>Bowers &amp; S. Old Woodward Northbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12099</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>W. Maple Rd &amp; Pleasant Eastbound</td>
<td>ARC 7/15/16</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10691</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>W Maple Rd &amp; Woodward Westbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23830</td>
<td>461,462</td>
<td>Woodward &amp; Maple Southbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Too soon for ridership figures</td>
<td>FAST stop (SMART offering to pay for shelter of different design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23829</td>
<td>461,462</td>
<td>Woodward &amp; Maple Northbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Too soon for ridership figures</td>
<td>FAST stop (may relocate)- Near shelter on Maple (SMART offering to pay for shelter of different design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>22375</td>
<td>415,420</td>
<td>14 Mile Rd &amp; Woodward Westbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Number</td>
<td>Early Release</td>
<td>Vendor #</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261046</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 TECH SIGNS</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261047</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>460 WEST MAPLE LLC</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261048</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000855</td>
<td>48TH DISTRICT COURT</td>
<td>343,079.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261049</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006965</td>
<td>7UP DETROIT</td>
<td>375.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261050</td>
<td></td>
<td>008872</td>
<td>ACE DOOR COMPANY</td>
<td>278.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261053</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALLEN INDUSTRIES</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261054</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALLIED SIGNS INC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261055</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALLIED SIGNS, INC.</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261056</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMERICAN POOL SERVICE INC</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261057</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMERICAN STANDARD ROOFING</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261058</td>
<td></td>
<td>008246</td>
<td>ANCHOR BAY POWDER COAT, LLC</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261059</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>ANDREW AND JAIME PEYKOFF REVOC TRST</td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261060</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>ANTHONY B GOUGH</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261061</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>ANTHONY KOLO</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261062</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>ANTO GLASS BLOCK INC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261063</td>
<td></td>
<td>002727</td>
<td>ARTISTIC CUSTOM CABINETS</td>
<td>2,485.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261064</td>
<td></td>
<td>007479</td>
<td>ASB DISTRIBUTORS</td>
<td>112.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261065</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>1,243.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261066</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>176.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261067</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>225.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261068</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>128.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261069</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>238.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261070</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>65.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261071</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>ATA NATIONAL TITLE GROUP LLC</td>
<td>118.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261072</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>ATEX BUILDERS LLC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261073</td>
<td></td>
<td>005590</td>
<td>AXON ENTERPRISE, INC.</td>
<td>936.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261074</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>B-DRY SYSTEM OF MICHIGAN INC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261075</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>B7 INVESTMENTS LLC</td>
<td>6,900.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261076</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>BACKYARD CREATIONS BY MIKE ASSEMANY</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261081</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>BARRIENTOS CONTRACTING</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261082</td>
<td></td>
<td>003012</td>
<td>BATTERIES PLUS</td>
<td>71.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261083</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>BCM HOME IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261084</td>
<td></td>
<td>002597</td>
<td>BELSON OUTDOORS INC</td>
<td>701.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261085</td>
<td></td>
<td>008503</td>
<td>BIRDIE IMAGING SUPPLIES, INC</td>
<td>1,684.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261086</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>BIRMINGHAM BLOOMFIELD CHAMBER</td>
<td>60.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261087</td>
<td></td>
<td>006683</td>
<td>BIRMINGHAM LAWN MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>20,124.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261088</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>BLACKCOMB EQUITY LLC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261090</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>BLOOMINGDALE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY I</td>
<td>659.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261091</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>003282</td>
<td>LISA MARIE BRADLEY</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261092</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006953</td>
<td>JACQUELYN BRITO</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261093</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>BRUTTELL ROOFING INC</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261094</td>
<td></td>
<td>008179</td>
<td>BUCCILLI GROUP, LLC</td>
<td>13,431.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Number</td>
<td>Early Release</td>
<td>Vendor #</td>
<td>Vendor Name</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261095</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>BUILDING DETAIL INC</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261096</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>BVT PROPERTIES LLC</td>
<td>786.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261097</td>
<td>003907</td>
<td></td>
<td>CADILLAC ASPHALT, LLC</td>
<td>2,491.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261099</td>
<td>007732</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAPITAL TIRE, INC.</td>
<td>904.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261100</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>CASWELL MODERNIZATION CO INC</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261101</td>
<td>005238</td>
<td></td>
<td>CBTS</td>
<td>5,270.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261103</td>
<td>* 004444</td>
<td></td>
<td>CDW GOVERNMENT INC</td>
<td>121.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261104</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEDAR WORKS INC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261105</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHRIS COMSTOCK</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261106</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHRISTINE DALTON</td>
<td>700.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261107</td>
<td>000605</td>
<td></td>
<td>CINTAS CORPORATION</td>
<td>119.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261108</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>CMC PLBG HTG &amp; COOLING</td>
<td>403.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261109</td>
<td>002668</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTRACTORS CLOTHING CO</td>
<td>1,425.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261110</td>
<td>* 008582</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORE &amp; MAIN LP</td>
<td>745.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261111</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>DAS CONTRACTING LLC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261112</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>DAVID J CARTER</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261113</td>
<td>000177</td>
<td></td>
<td>DELWOOD SUPPLY</td>
<td>179.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261115</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>DESIGNER HOMES INC</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261116</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>DETROIT BUILD INC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261117</td>
<td>005446</td>
<td></td>
<td>ETHNIC ARTWORK</td>
<td>327.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261118</td>
<td>000190</td>
<td></td>
<td>DOWNRIVER REFRIGERATION</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261119</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>EASY EXIT EGRESS WINDOWS LLC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261120</td>
<td>000493</td>
<td></td>
<td>ED RINKE CHEVROLET BUICK GMC</td>
<td>7,492.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261121</td>
<td>000198</td>
<td></td>
<td>H.D. EDWARDS</td>
<td>31.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261122</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>EDWIN ANTHONY HOMES</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261123</td>
<td>* 007538</td>
<td></td>
<td>EGANIX, INC.</td>
<td>720.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261124</td>
<td>000196</td>
<td></td>
<td>EJ USA, INC.</td>
<td>1,596.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261126</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>ELKINS, JOHN C</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261127</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>EMERGENCY EGRESS LLC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261129</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>EVER-DRY OF SOUTHEASTERN MI</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261130</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>FIVE STAR PROPERTY</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261131</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>FOLLIS, HILLARY</td>
<td>218.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261132</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>FOREST ELM LLC</td>
<td>230.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261134</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>FOUNDATION SYSTEMS OF MICHIGAN INC</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261135</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>GASIOROWSKI, ERIC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261137</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>GIANFRANCO PALAZZOLE</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261138</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>GILLETTE BROTHERS POOL &amp; SPA</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261139</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>GLOBAL SIGNS &amp; AWNINGS</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261140</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>GLOSSMANN, TOBIAS</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261141</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>GOECKEL CONSTRUCTION LLC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261142</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>GOERTZ, NORBERT W</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261143</td>
<td>001771</td>
<td></td>
<td>GOLF ASSOC. OF MICHIGAN</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261144</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>GONZALEZ, DAVID</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Number</td>
<td>Early Release</td>
<td>Vendor #</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261145</td>
<td></td>
<td>004604</td>
<td>GORDON FOOD</td>
<td>1,438.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261146</td>
<td></td>
<td>007099</td>
<td>GRANICUS, INC.</td>
<td>1,823.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261147</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>000249</td>
<td>GREAT OAKS LANDSCAPE</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261149</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>001447</td>
<td>GUARDIAN ALARM</td>
<td>235.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261150</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>006346</td>
<td>GUTTER SYSTEMS OF MICHIGAN</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261152</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>261146</td>
<td>HALT FIRE INC</td>
<td>31.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261153</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>HANS M STUHLDREER CONSTRUCTION INC</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261154</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>HANSONS ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP LLC</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261155</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>HARRELL'S LLC</td>
<td>276.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261156</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>HARTFORD ROOFING &amp; WARRANTY CO LLC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261157</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>HEWSON HOMES LLC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261158</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>HM HOMES LLC</td>
<td>1,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261159</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>HOME DEPOT USA INC</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261160</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>007375</td>
<td>HOMEFIELD TURF AND ATHLETIC INC.</td>
<td>3,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261161</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>HUNTER ROBERTS HOMES</td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261162</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>000948</td>
<td>HYDROCORP</td>
<td>1,315.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261163</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>IDEAL BUILDERS AND REMODELING INC</td>
<td>2,400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261164</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>IGOR K CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261165</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERCITY NEON</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261166</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERSTATE TITLE</td>
<td>48.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261167</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>IOACHIMCIUC, GABRIEL</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261168</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>IREVIVE PROPERTY SERVICES LLC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261169</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>002407</td>
<td>J &amp; B MEDICAL SUPPLY</td>
<td>575.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261170</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>007870</td>
<td>J.C. EHRLICH CO. INC.</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261171</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>000344</td>
<td>J.T. EXPRESS, LTD.</td>
<td>3,823.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261172</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN GRAHAM</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261173</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>JOSEPH KENNEDY</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261174</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>007827</td>
<td>JUDY EPSTEIN</td>
<td>870.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261176</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>007511</td>
<td>HAILEY R KASPER</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261177</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>KEARNS BROTHERS INC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261178</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>000352</td>
<td>ADAM KNOWLES</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261179</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>004085</td>
<td>KONE INC</td>
<td>1,953.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261180</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>KOPACZ, DAVID</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261181</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>KROLL CONSTRUCTION CO</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261183</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>KT CONSTRUCTION GROUP LLC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261184</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>L &amp; P CUSTOM BUILDERS LLC</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261186</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>LEGACY TITLE AGENCY</td>
<td>51.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261187</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>LESLIE OR GREG COYLE</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261188</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>LEVINE &amp; SONS INC</td>
<td>1,063.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261189</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>006817</td>
<td>LEXISNEXIS RISK DATA MANAGEMENT INC</td>
<td>372.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261191</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>008804</td>
<td>LIEBERMAN, GIES &amp; COHEN, PLLC</td>
<td>3,301.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261192</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>LMB PROPERTIES LLC</td>
<td>7,300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Number</td>
<td>Early Release</td>
<td>Vendor #</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261193</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>001577</td>
<td>KATE LONG</td>
<td>368.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261194</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>001171</td>
<td>JIM LOTRIDGE</td>
<td>113.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261196</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>M &amp; M IRISH ENTERPRISES INC</td>
<td>111.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261197</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAC'S CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261198</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAINSTREET RESTORATIONS &amp; REMODELIN</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261199</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAJIC WINDOW COMPANY</td>
<td>1,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261200</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAJID PEZHMAN</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261201</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MATTHEW GORDON FAUST</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261202</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MCCS LLC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261203</td>
<td>000888</td>
<td></td>
<td>MCKENNA ASSOCIATES INC</td>
<td>51,732.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261204</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MERRILLWOOD COLLECTION</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261205</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>004738</td>
<td>MGFOA</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261206</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MICHIGAN ASPHALT PAVING</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261207</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MICHIGAN BEST DECK BUILDERS</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261209</td>
<td>007394</td>
<td></td>
<td>MICHIGAN URBAN SEARCH &amp; RESCUE</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261210</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007051</td>
<td>STATE OF MICHIGAN</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261213</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MILLCREEK CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT C</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261214</td>
<td>001950</td>
<td></td>
<td>MILLER CANFIELD PADDock AND</td>
<td>13,147.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261215</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MOSHER DOLAN INC</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261217</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>NC CEMENT</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261218</td>
<td>001194</td>
<td></td>
<td>NELSON BROTHERS SEWER</td>
<td>675.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261219</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>NGUYEN, MINH</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261220</td>
<td>005431</td>
<td></td>
<td>NILFISK, INC.</td>
<td>155.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261221</td>
<td>001864</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOWAK &amp; FRAUS ENGINEERS</td>
<td>26,657.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261222</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>O'DWYER BUILDING COMPANY</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261223</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000477</td>
<td>OAKLAND COUNTY</td>
<td>1,164.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261224</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>OASIS CUSTOM POOLS AND SPAS INC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261226</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000481</td>
<td>OFFICE DEPOT INC</td>
<td>47.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261227</td>
<td>008669</td>
<td></td>
<td>OHM ADVISORS</td>
<td>98,554.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261228</td>
<td>002767</td>
<td></td>
<td>OSCAR W. LARSON CO.</td>
<td>2,157.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261230</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>PARENT, JOHN THOMAS</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261231</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>PARK PLACE GROUP LLC</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261232</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>PELLA WINDOWS &amp; DOORS, INC.</td>
<td>2,200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261234</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>001753</td>
<td>PEPSI COLA</td>
<td>391.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261236</td>
<td>002518</td>
<td></td>
<td>PITNEY BOWES INC</td>
<td>195.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261237</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>POOL BUSTERS</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261238</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000801</td>
<td>POSTMASTER</td>
<td>1,955.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261239</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>POWER HOME REMODELING GROUP</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261240</td>
<td>001062</td>
<td></td>
<td>QUALITY COACH COLLISION LLC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261241</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008875</td>
<td>JESSICA RAK</td>
<td>139.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261242</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>RAM RESIDENTIAL SPECIALISTS</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261244</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>RENEWAL BY ANDERSEN</td>
<td>4,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261245</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000286</td>
<td>RESIDEX LLC</td>
<td>2,939.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Number</td>
<td>Early Release</td>
<td>Vendor #</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261246</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>ROBERT IRONS</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261247</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>ROBINSON, STEVEN L</td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261249</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>S A S SERVICES INC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261250</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>SCOTT FLECK</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261251</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>SEMBOIA, INC.</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261252</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>SHERWIN WILLIAMS COMPANY</td>
<td>51.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261253</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>SHORT, MAXINE ANN</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261255</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>SHW PROPERTIES</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261256</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>SIGNS &amp; MORE</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261257</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>SMOLYANOVL HOME IMPROVMENT</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261258</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>SOUTHEASTERN EQUIPMENT CO. INC</td>
<td>382.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261261</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>SPARTAN DISTRIBUTORS INC</td>
<td>983.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261262</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>STAY DRY BASEMENT WATERPROOFING INC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261263</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>STEEL EQUIPMENT CO.</td>
<td>850.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261264</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>STERLING DEVELOPMENT CORP</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261265</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>STONE, SCOTT M</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261267</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>SUN AND FUN POOLS</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261268</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>SUPERIOR LAWN &amp; LANDSCAPE</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261269</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>TECHHOME BUILDING CO LLC</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261270</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008748</td>
<td>TECHSEVEN COMPANY</td>
<td>2,272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261271</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>TEMPLETON BUILDING COMPANY</td>
<td>376.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261272</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>THD AT HOME SERVICES INC</td>
<td>1,700.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261274</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>TOMATOES APIZZA III LLC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261275</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>TOMINA, ANNETTA</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261277</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>TUCKER, LOGAN M</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261278</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>TURNER SANITATION, INC</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261279</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>TURNOUT RENTAL</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261281</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>UNITED HOME SERVICES</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261282</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>VALLEY CITY LINEN</td>
<td>74.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261283</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>VANDORN, JEFFREY</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261284</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>VARLESE, RICHARD T</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261285</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000158</td>
<td>VERIZON WIRELESS</td>
<td>120.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261286</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000158</td>
<td>VERIZON WIRELESS</td>
<td>719.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261287</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000158</td>
<td>VERIZON WIRELESS</td>
<td>251.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261288</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000158</td>
<td>VERIZON WIRELESS</td>
<td>151.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261289</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000158</td>
<td>VERIZON WIRELESS</td>
<td>194.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261290</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000158</td>
<td>VERIZON WIRELESS</td>
<td>438.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261291</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>WALLSIDE INC</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261292</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>WEATHERSEAL HOME IMPROVEMENT CO INC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261293</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>WHITELAW CUSTOM HOMES INC.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261294</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>WILMOT, JEFFREY</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261295</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>WINDOW PRO HOLDINGS LLC</td>
<td>2,300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261296</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>005794</td>
<td>WINDSTREAM</td>
<td>704.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City of Birmingham
### Warrant List Dated 09/19/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check Number</th>
<th>Early Release</th>
<th>Vendor #</th>
<th>Vendor #</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261297</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>003890</td>
<td>LAUREN WOOD</td>
<td>525.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261298</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>005360</td>
<td>WORRY FREE INC</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261300</td>
<td></td>
<td>008391</td>
<td>XEROX CORPORATION</td>
<td>900.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261301</td>
<td></td>
<td>007401</td>
<td>XEROX FINANCIAL SERVICES</td>
<td>368.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL PAPER CHECK** $744,334.57

### ACH TRANSACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check Number</th>
<th>Vendor #</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* 008847</td>
<td>ABS- AUTOMATED BENEFIT SVCS, INC</td>
<td>10,857.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008840</td>
<td>BIRMINGHAM PUBLIC SCHOOLS-TAXES</td>
<td>10,972,739.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008843</td>
<td>OAKLAND COUNTY TREASURER- TAX PYMNT</td>
<td>17,879,815.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002284</td>
<td>ABEL ELECTRONICS INC</td>
<td>4,190.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008555</td>
<td>ABELL PEST CONTROL INC</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007345</td>
<td>BEVERLY HILLS ACE</td>
<td>42.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007624</td>
<td>BIRMINGHAM OIL CHANGE CENTER, LLC</td>
<td>114.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 000157</td>
<td>BOB ADAMS TOWING INC</td>
<td>1,471.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 006380</td>
<td>C &amp; S ICE RESURFACING SERVICES, INC</td>
<td>423.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007359</td>
<td>DETROIT CHEMICAL &amp; PAPER SUPPLY</td>
<td>36.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 001077</td>
<td>DUNCAN PARKING TECH INC</td>
<td>6,177.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006181</td>
<td>FIRST CHOICE COFFEE SERV</td>
<td>98.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001023</td>
<td>GABRIEL, ROEDER, SMITH &amp; CO.</td>
<td>3,100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003870</td>
<td>GREAT LAKES TURF, LLC</td>
<td>570.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001672</td>
<td>HAYES PRECISION INC</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000331</td>
<td>HUBBELL ROTH &amp; CLARK INC</td>
<td>45,176.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000261</td>
<td>J.H. HART URBAN FORESTRY</td>
<td>15,690.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003458</td>
<td>JOE'S AUTO PARTS, INC.</td>
<td>506.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005876</td>
<td>KROFF MECHANICAL SERVICE COMPANY</td>
<td>3,164.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 005550</td>
<td>LEE &amp; ASSOCIATES CO., INC.</td>
<td>709.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006359</td>
<td>NYE UNIFORM COMPANY</td>
<td>113.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001255</td>
<td>TEKNICOLORS INC</td>
<td>99.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000278</td>
<td>TROY AUTO GLASS CO INC</td>
<td>427.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002088</td>
<td>WM. CROOK FIRE PROTECTION CO.</td>
<td>2,557.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL ACH TRANSACTION** $28,948,153.21
All bills, invoices and other evidences of claim have been audited and approved for payment.

Mark Gerber
Finance Director/ Treasurer

*-Indicates checks released in advance and prior to commission approval in order to avoid penalty or to meet contractual agreement/obligation.
### City of Birmingham
#### Warrant List Dated 09/26/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check Number</th>
<th>Early Release</th>
<th>Vendor #</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261304</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000855</td>
<td>48TH DISTRICT COURT</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261305</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006965</td>
<td>7UP DETROIT</td>
<td>127.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261306</td>
<td></td>
<td>004877</td>
<td>AASLH</td>
<td>118.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261307</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008649</td>
<td>ROBERT ABRAHAM JR.</td>
<td>169.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261308</td>
<td></td>
<td>000394</td>
<td>AERO FILTER INC</td>
<td>1,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261309</td>
<td></td>
<td>003708</td>
<td>AIRGAS USA, LLC</td>
<td>210.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261310</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>ALISON UZIEBLO</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261311</td>
<td></td>
<td>007112</td>
<td>AMERICAN PAINTING LLC</td>
<td>894.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261312</td>
<td></td>
<td>000167</td>
<td>ANDERSON ECKSTEIN WESTRICK INC</td>
<td>1,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261313</td>
<td></td>
<td>000285</td>
<td>APPLIED IND. TECHNOLOGIES</td>
<td>1,271.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261314</td>
<td></td>
<td>000500</td>
<td>ARTECH PRINTING INC</td>
<td>518.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261315</td>
<td></td>
<td>007479</td>
<td>ASB DISTRIBUTORS</td>
<td>30.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261316</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>59.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261317</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>80.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261318</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>146.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261320</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>BHAVIN PATEL</td>
<td>4,027.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261321</td>
<td></td>
<td>002231</td>
<td>BILLINGS LAWN EQUIPMENT INC.</td>
<td>87.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261322</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008885</td>
<td>CITY OF BIRMINGHAM #233</td>
<td>5,115.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261323</td>
<td></td>
<td>006683</td>
<td>BIRMINGHAM LAWN MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>501.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261324</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000546</td>
<td>KAREN D. BOTA</td>
<td>1,730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261325</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006953</td>
<td>JACQUELYN BRITO</td>
<td>91.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261326</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>BUCCELLATO ENTERPRISES</td>
<td>836.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261327</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006177</td>
<td>BULLSEYE TELECOM INC</td>
<td>113.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261329</td>
<td></td>
<td>000443</td>
<td>CCH INCORPORATED</td>
<td>947.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261330</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>CHARLES J LEMAIRE</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261331</td>
<td></td>
<td>000603</td>
<td>CHEMCO PRODUCTS INC</td>
<td>420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261332</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>CHRISTINE DALTON</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261333</td>
<td></td>
<td>000605</td>
<td>CINTAS CORPORATION</td>
<td>178.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261334</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008006</td>
<td>CLEAR RATE COMMUNICATIONS, INC</td>
<td>1,382.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261335</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000627</td>
<td>CONSUMERS ENERGY</td>
<td>3,458.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261336</td>
<td></td>
<td>008512</td>
<td>COOL THREADS EMBROIDERY</td>
<td>633.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261337</td>
<td></td>
<td>008772</td>
<td>CRANBROOK PAVEMENT</td>
<td>5,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261338</td>
<td></td>
<td>008005</td>
<td>DE LAGE LANDEN FINANCIAL SVCS INC</td>
<td>173.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261339</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000177</td>
<td>DELWOOD SUPPLY</td>
<td>1,929.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261340</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006999</td>
<td>CHRISTOPHER DEMAN</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261342</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007980</td>
<td>CURTIS DAVID Dicho</td>
<td>333.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261343</td>
<td></td>
<td>008641</td>
<td>DINGES FIRE COMPANY</td>
<td>2,220.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261344</td>
<td></td>
<td>007506</td>
<td>DST INDUSTRIES INC.</td>
<td>1,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261345</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000179</td>
<td>DTE ENERGY</td>
<td>18,781.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261346</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000180</td>
<td>DTE ENERGY</td>
<td>11,311.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261347</td>
<td></td>
<td>007505</td>
<td>EAGLE LANDSCAPING &amp; SUPPLY</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261348</td>
<td></td>
<td>000196</td>
<td>EJ USA, INC.</td>
<td>1,780.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Number</td>
<td>Early Release</td>
<td>Vendor #</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261349</td>
<td></td>
<td>004671</td>
<td>ELDER FORD</td>
<td>91.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261350</td>
<td></td>
<td>007684</td>
<td>ELITE TRAUMA CLEAN-UP INC.</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261351</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>004367</td>
<td>ENSEICOM, INC.</td>
<td>25,779.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261352</td>
<td></td>
<td>000213</td>
<td>FIRE DEFENSE EQUIP CO INC</td>
<td>381.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261353</td>
<td></td>
<td>000223</td>
<td>GASOW VETERINARY</td>
<td>69.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261354</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>GJURASHAJ, ZEF</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261355</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008190</td>
<td>GLASCO CORPORATION</td>
<td>2,788.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261356</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>GLOBAL PAYMENTS</td>
<td>5,935.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261357</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>004604</td>
<td>GORDON FOOD</td>
<td>1,323.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261358</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>004878</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT FINANCE OFFICERS</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261359</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>004983</td>
<td>GREAT AMERICAN BUSINESS PRODUCTS</td>
<td>434.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261360</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>GREGORY WEDDELL</td>
<td>1,368.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261362</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>HEMPHILL BUILDERS</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261363</td>
<td></td>
<td>001846</td>
<td>HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE AND</td>
<td>7,929.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261364</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>HM HOMES LLC</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261366</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>HORIZON BANK</td>
<td>3,308.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261367</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008849</td>
<td>RAMAIZ IMRAN</td>
<td>47.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261368</td>
<td></td>
<td>002407</td>
<td>J &amp; B MEDICAL SUPPLY</td>
<td>601.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261369</td>
<td></td>
<td>000155</td>
<td>JOHNSON CONTROLS SECURITY SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>291.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261370</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007837</td>
<td>LARYSsa R KAPITANEC</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261371</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>KL POOLS LLC</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261372</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007828</td>
<td>DEBORAH KLEIN</td>
<td>356.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261373</td>
<td></td>
<td>004085</td>
<td>KONE INC</td>
<td>271.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261374</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>005327</td>
<td>L3 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.</td>
<td>290.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261375</td>
<td></td>
<td>008188</td>
<td>LEARN TO SKATE USA</td>
<td>726.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261376</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008158</td>
<td>LOGICALIS INC</td>
<td>9,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261377</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000312</td>
<td>LUCKENBACH-ZIEGELMAN ARCHITECT</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261378</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>MADISON SEATING</td>
<td>1,974.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261379</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>005104</td>
<td>MARIO CHIESA</td>
<td>561.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261380</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>MARTINO ENTERPRISES INC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261381</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>MATTHEW W ROSS CONST LLC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261382</td>
<td></td>
<td>000369</td>
<td>MCMi</td>
<td>1,708.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261383</td>
<td></td>
<td>008689</td>
<td>MERIDIAN CONTRACTING GROUP LLC</td>
<td>26,816.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261384</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>METROPOLITAN CONCRETE CORP</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261385</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>004738</td>
<td>MGFA</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261387</td>
<td></td>
<td>007163</td>
<td>MOBILE HEALTH RESOURCES</td>
<td>1,179.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261388</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008160</td>
<td>MPARKS</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261389</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>MR COOPER/LETERA</td>
<td>8,674.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261390</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007856</td>
<td>NEXT</td>
<td>623.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261391</td>
<td></td>
<td>001864</td>
<td>NOWAK &amp; FRAUS ENGINEERS</td>
<td>9,698.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261392</td>
<td></td>
<td>002792</td>
<td>PAUL O'MEARA</td>
<td>273.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261393</td>
<td></td>
<td>000477</td>
<td>OAKLAND COUNTY</td>
<td>174,025.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261393</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000477</td>
<td>OAKLAND COUNTY</td>
<td>242,067.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Number</td>
<td>Early Release</td>
<td>Vendor #</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261394</td>
<td></td>
<td>008214</td>
<td>OAKLAND COUNTY WATER DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>5,588.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261395</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>003461</td>
<td>OBSERVER &amp; ECCENTRIC</td>
<td>586.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261396</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>004370</td>
<td>OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH CENTERS</td>
<td>117.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261397</td>
<td></td>
<td>002767</td>
<td>OSCAR W. LARSON CO.</td>
<td>932.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261398</td>
<td></td>
<td>006625</td>
<td>PACIFIC TELEMANAGEMENT SERVICES</td>
<td>78.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261399</td>
<td></td>
<td>008881</td>
<td>PAINTING &amp; WALLPAPERING, INC.</td>
<td>2,634.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261400</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>PELLA WINDOWS &amp; DOORS, INC.</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261401</td>
<td></td>
<td>001277</td>
<td>PHYSIO-CONTROL CORP.</td>
<td>704.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261402</td>
<td></td>
<td>000486</td>
<td>PLANTE &amp; MORAN PLLC</td>
<td>41,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261403</td>
<td></td>
<td>008858</td>
<td>PODS ENTERPRISES, LLC</td>
<td>69.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261404</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>PRIME</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261405</td>
<td></td>
<td>002405</td>
<td>R.D. WHITE CO., INC.</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261406</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>RENEWAL BY ANDERSEN</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261407</td>
<td></td>
<td>002566</td>
<td>REYNOLDS WATER</td>
<td>187.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261408</td>
<td></td>
<td>000218</td>
<td>ROYAL OAK P.D.Q. LLC</td>
<td>146.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261409</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>SEJAL PARIKH &amp;</td>
<td>632.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261410</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>SHERMAN, SHAUN</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261411</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007907</td>
<td>SP+ CORPORATION</td>
<td>4,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261412</td>
<td></td>
<td>000260</td>
<td>SPARTAN DISTRIBUTORS INC</td>
<td>76.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261413</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008507</td>
<td>SUPERFLEET MASTERCARD PROGRAM</td>
<td>528.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261414</td>
<td></td>
<td>006749</td>
<td>SUPERIOR SCAPE, INC</td>
<td>4,064.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261415</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>SUSAN MALINOWSKI &amp;</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261416</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>004355</td>
<td>SYMETRA LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>34,683.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261417</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>003173</td>
<td>TIFFANY FLORIST</td>
<td>61.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261418</td>
<td></td>
<td>000275</td>
<td>TIRE WHOLESALERS CO INC</td>
<td>620.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261419</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>001696</td>
<td>TRANSACT TECHNOLOGIES INC</td>
<td>268.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261420</td>
<td></td>
<td>004887</td>
<td>TRUCK &amp; TRAILER SPECIALTIES INC</td>
<td>97.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261421</td>
<td></td>
<td>008632</td>
<td>TURNOUT RENTAL</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261422</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>UNIVERSAL FIDELITY, LP</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261423</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>001410</td>
<td>JOE VALENTINE</td>
<td>160.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261424</td>
<td></td>
<td>007226</td>
<td>VALLEY CITY LINEN</td>
<td>177.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261425</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000158</td>
<td>VERIZON WIRELESS</td>
<td>125.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261426</td>
<td></td>
<td>000298</td>
<td>VESCO OIL CORPORATION</td>
<td>83.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261427</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>WALLSIDE INC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261428</td>
<td></td>
<td>000299</td>
<td>WEINGARTZ SUPPLY</td>
<td>240.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261429</td>
<td></td>
<td>007362</td>
<td>WINTERGREEN CORPORATION</td>
<td>23,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261430</td>
<td></td>
<td>005360</td>
<td>WORRY FREE INC</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261431</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008391</td>
<td>XEROX CORPORATION</td>
<td>415.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL PAPER CHECK** $731,952.10

**ACH TRANSACTION**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>008847</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABS- AUTOMATED BENEFIT SVCS, INC</td>
<td>38,539.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>002284</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABEL ELECTRONICS INC</td>
<td>1,412.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>008847</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABS- AUTOMATED BENEFIT SVCS, INC</td>
<td>175,783.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Number</td>
<td>Early Release</td>
<td>Vendor #</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BEVERLY HILLS ACE</td>
<td>131.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIRMINGHAM OIL CHANGE CENTER, LLC</td>
<td>49.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIRMINGHAM PUBLIC SCHOOLS-TAXES</td>
<td>612,990.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CANFIELD EQUIPMENT SERVICE INC.</td>
<td>225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DELTA TEMP INC</td>
<td>500.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DORNbos SIGN &amp; SAFETY INC</td>
<td>32.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EZELL SUPPLY CORPORATION</td>
<td>355.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FIRE SYSTEMS OF MICHIGAN INC</td>
<td>101.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 007807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2 CONSULTING GROUP LLC</td>
<td>14,250.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HUBBELL ROTH &amp; CLARK INC</td>
<td>14,541.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 007465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN-HOUSE VALET INC</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.H. HART URBAN FORESTRY</td>
<td>18,370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JOE'S AUTO PARTS, INC.</td>
<td>1,726.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KROFF MECHANICAL SERVICE COMPANY</td>
<td>572.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 005550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LEE &amp; ASSOCIATES CO., INC.</td>
<td>672.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NYE UNIFORM COMPANY</td>
<td>836.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OAKLAND COUNTY TREASURER- TAX PYMNT</td>
<td>1,046,998.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PREMIER SAFETY</td>
<td>232.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 003554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RKA PETROLEUM</td>
<td>15,111.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROAD COMM FOR OAKLAND CO</td>
<td>11,700.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROSE PEST SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>286.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIGNS-N-DESIGNS INC</td>
<td>135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOCRRA</td>
<td>64,056.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WM. CROOK FIRE PROTECTION CO.</td>
<td>1,465.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  |               |           | SUBTOTAL ACH TRANSACTION                         | $2,025,577.58 |
|                  |               |           | GRAND TOTAL                                      | $2,757,529.68 |

All bills, invoices and other evidences of claim have been audited and approved for payment.

Mark Gerber
Finance Director/ Treasurer

*Indicates checks released in advance and prior to commission approval in order to avoid penalty or to meet contractual agreement/obligation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check Number</th>
<th>Early Release</th>
<th>Vendor #</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 WAY CEMENT</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261433</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000855</td>
<td>48TH DISTRICT COURT</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261434</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000855</td>
<td>48TH DISTRICT COURT</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261435</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000855</td>
<td>48TH DISTRICT COURT</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261436</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000855</td>
<td>48TH DISTRICT COURT</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261437</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000855</td>
<td>48TH DISTRICT COURT</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261438</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000855</td>
<td>48TH DISTRICT COURT</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261439</td>
<td></td>
<td>004627</td>
<td>A &amp; L SYSTEMS</td>
<td>196.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261440</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADIANNE DULIO</td>
<td>218.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261441</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>002670</td>
<td>MIKE ALBRECHT</td>
<td>94.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261442</td>
<td></td>
<td>007696</td>
<td>AMERICAN CLEANING COMPANY LLC</td>
<td>1,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261443</td>
<td></td>
<td>007479</td>
<td>ASB DISTRIBUTORS</td>
<td>46.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261444</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>186.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261445</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>480.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261446</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>156.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261447</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>131.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261448</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007216</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>95.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261449</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007425</td>
<td>ATA NATIONAL TITLE GROUP, LLC</td>
<td>325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261450</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008165</td>
<td>B5 INVESTMENTS, LLC</td>
<td>1,786.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261451</td>
<td></td>
<td>001122</td>
<td>BOB BARKER CO INC</td>
<td>814.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261452</td>
<td></td>
<td>003012</td>
<td>BATTERIES PLUS</td>
<td>68.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BAYS CONSTRUCTION COMPANY</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIRMINGHAM BUILDERS</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261455</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>001086</td>
<td>CITY OF BIRMINGHAM</td>
<td>899.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261456</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>001086</td>
<td>CITY OF BIRMINGHAM</td>
<td>316.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261457</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006953</td>
<td>JACQUELYN BRITO</td>
<td>65.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUILD A WAY LLC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C &amp; G CEMENT CEMENT CONTRACTORS INC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261460</td>
<td></td>
<td>003907</td>
<td>CADILLAC ASPHALT, LLC</td>
<td>2,781.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261461</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000444</td>
<td>CDW GOVERNMENT INC</td>
<td>350.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261462</td>
<td></td>
<td>007710</td>
<td>CINTAS CORP</td>
<td>324.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261463</td>
<td></td>
<td>000605</td>
<td>CINTAS CORPORATION</td>
<td>164.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261465</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007625</td>
<td>COMCAST</td>
<td>716.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261466</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007774</td>
<td>COMCAST BUSINESS</td>
<td>1,230.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261467</td>
<td></td>
<td>008512</td>
<td>COOL THREADS EMBROIDERY</td>
<td>773.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CRAGEN, LISE</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261469</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008772</td>
<td>CRANBROOK PAVEMENT</td>
<td>1,975.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D E EVANS CUSTOM CONSTRUCTION MGMT</td>
<td>1,559.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261471</td>
<td></td>
<td>003825</td>
<td>DEERE ELECTRIC INC</td>
<td>367.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261472</td>
<td></td>
<td>000177</td>
<td>DELWOOD SUPPLY</td>
<td>404.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261473</td>
<td></td>
<td>001143</td>
<td>ELLEN DEVIEW</td>
<td>423.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261474</td>
<td></td>
<td>008641</td>
<td>DINGES FIRE COMPANY</td>
<td>2,232.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Number</td>
<td>Early Release</td>
<td>Vendor #</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261475</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000179</td>
<td>DTE ENERGY</td>
<td>6,161.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261476</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>000936</td>
<td>FEDEX</td>
<td>548.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261480</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000213</td>
<td>FIRE DEFENSE EQUIP CO INC</td>
<td>94.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261481</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>003942</td>
<td>ENABLEPOINT</td>
<td>2,999.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261482</td>
<td></td>
<td>008868</td>
<td>JULIA FRYKMAN</td>
<td>116.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261483</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>001771</td>
<td>GOLF ASSOC. OF MICHIGAN</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261484</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>004604</td>
<td>GORDON FOOD</td>
<td>919.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261485</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>001531</td>
<td>GUNNERS METER &amp; PARTS INC</td>
<td>1,931.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261488</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>001956</td>
<td>HOME DEPOT CREDIT SERVICES</td>
<td>1,930.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261489</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>002407</td>
<td>J &amp; B MEDICAL SUPPLY</td>
<td>700.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261491</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>002576</td>
<td>JAX KAR WASH</td>
<td>529.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261492</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>005291</td>
<td>KAESER &amp; BLAIR INC</td>
<td>630.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261495</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008413</td>
<td>KARANA REAL ESTATE, LLC</td>
<td>8,429.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261496</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>004088</td>
<td>KEARNS BROTHERS INC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261497</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>006127</td>
<td>LANDSCAPE FORMS, INC</td>
<td>980.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261501</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>001194</td>
<td>NELSON BROTHERS SEWER</td>
<td>809.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261502</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>001660</td>
<td>MICHIGAN CAT</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261503</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008181</td>
<td>M-1 STUDIOS LLC</td>
<td>3,384.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261504</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008763</td>
<td>MARYKO HOSPITALITY, LLC</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261505</td>
<td></td>
<td>000369</td>
<td>MCMI</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261506</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>004739</td>
<td>MGFOA</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261507</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>001082</td>
<td>MICHIGAN BASEMENTS</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261508</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>001660</td>
<td>MICHIGAN CAT</td>
<td>809.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261510</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007659</td>
<td>MICHIGAN.COM #1008</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261511</td>
<td></td>
<td>000230</td>
<td>MIKE SAVOIE CHEVROLET INC</td>
<td>526.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261512</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>001194</td>
<td>MIKES CONTRACTING SERVICES LLC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261513</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>007755</td>
<td>NETWORK SERVICES COMPANY</td>
<td>1,204.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261518</td>
<td></td>
<td>002853</td>
<td>OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City of Birmingham
### Warrant List Dated 10/03/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check Number</th>
<th>Early Release</th>
<th>Vendor #</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261519</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>003461</td>
<td>OBSERVER &amp; ECCENTRIC</td>
<td>285.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261520</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000481</td>
<td>OFFICE DEPOT INC</td>
<td>5,959.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261522</td>
<td></td>
<td>002767</td>
<td>OSCAR W. LARSON CO.</td>
<td>805.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261523</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>PELLA WINDOWS &amp; DOORS, INC.</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261524</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>001753</td>
<td>PEPSI COLA</td>
<td>735.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261525</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>PETERSEN, CARL A</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261526</td>
<td></td>
<td>006959</td>
<td>PHOENIX COMMUNICATIONS &amp; CABLEING</td>
<td>9,517.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261527</td>
<td></td>
<td>002518</td>
<td>PITNEY BOWES INC</td>
<td>650.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261528</td>
<td></td>
<td>008858</td>
<td>PODS ENTERPRISES, LLC</td>
<td>169.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261529</td>
<td></td>
<td>001263</td>
<td>POSITIVE PROMOTIONS INC</td>
<td>464.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261530</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL RENOVATIONS SVS</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261531</td>
<td></td>
<td>001062</td>
<td>QUALITY COACH COLLISION LLC</td>
<td>273.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261532</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008342</td>
<td>RAIN MASTER CONTROL SYSTEMS</td>
<td>29.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261533</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROBIN VANNOstrand</td>
<td>98.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261534</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>RSS CONSTRUCTION LLC</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261535</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>RUSSELL C BROWN TRUST</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261536</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007897</td>
<td>JEFFREY SCAife</td>
<td>607.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261537</td>
<td></td>
<td>000260</td>
<td>SPARTAN DISTRIBUTORS INC</td>
<td>425.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261538</td>
<td></td>
<td>001104</td>
<td>STATE OF MICHIGAN</td>
<td>2,883.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261539</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>STERLING DEVELOPMENT CORP</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261540</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>THORNTON &amp; GROOMS INC</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261541</td>
<td></td>
<td>000275</td>
<td>TIRE WHOLESALERS CO INC</td>
<td>516.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261542</td>
<td></td>
<td>007226</td>
<td>VALLEY CITY LINEN</td>
<td>74.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261543</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000158</td>
<td>VERIZON WIRELESS</td>
<td>837.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261544</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000158</td>
<td>VERIZON WIRELESS</td>
<td>50.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261547</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>WALLSIDE INC</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261548</td>
<td></td>
<td>004497</td>
<td>WATERFORD REGIONAL FIRE DEPT</td>
<td>189.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261549</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>WEDDELL, GREGORY</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261550</td>
<td></td>
<td>000299</td>
<td>WEINGARTZ SUPPLY</td>
<td>50.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261551</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>WINDOW PRO HOLDINGS LLC</td>
<td>700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261552</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008344</td>
<td>WOODWARD BROWN ASSOCIATES, LLC</td>
<td>68,640.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL PAPER CHECK** $168,453.51

### ACH TRANSACTION

| * | 008847 | ABS- AUTOMATED BENEFIT SVCS, INC | 161,130.55 |
| * | 000517 | BEIER HOWLETT P.C. | 45,078.25 |
| 002284 | ABEL ELECTRONICS INC | 5,947.48 |
| 000518 | BELL EQUIPMENT COMPANY | 47.77 |
| 007345 | BEVERLY HILLS ACE | 116.87 |
| * | 006380 | C & S ICE RESURFACING SERVICES, INC | 470.76 |
| 006181 | FIRST CHOICE COFFEE SERV | 135.95 |
| 007314 | FLEIS AND VANDENBRINK ENG. INC | 7,394.71 |
| 001672 | HAYES PRECISION INC | 30.50 |
| * | 007465 | IN-HOUSE VALET INC | 1,500.00 |
# City of Birmingham

## Warrant List Dated 10/03/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check Number</th>
<th>Early Release</th>
<th>Vendor #</th>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>008851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INSIGHT INVESTMENT</td>
<td>4,021.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000261</td>
<td></td>
<td>008851</td>
<td>J.H. HART URBAN FORESTRY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JOE'S AUTO PARTS, INC.</td>
<td>370.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 005550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LEE &amp; ASSOCIATES CO., INC.</td>
<td>950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NYE UNIFORM COMPANY</td>
<td>1,680.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 003554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RKA PETROLEUM</td>
<td>949.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001065</td>
<td></td>
<td>003554</td>
<td>SUNSHINE MEDICAL SUPPLY, INC.</td>
<td>203.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TEKNICOLORS INC</td>
<td>433.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WOLVERINE POWER SYSTEMS</td>
<td>1,162.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL ACH TRANSACTION** $231,895.78

**GRAND TOTAL** $400,349.29

All bills, invoices and other evidences of claim have been audited and approved for payment.

Mark Gerber  
Finance Director/ Treasurer

*Indicates checks released in advance and prior to commission approval in order to avoid penalty or to meet contractual agreement/obligation.*
September 20, 2018

Mr. Bruce Johnson, Building Official
City of Birmingham
151 Martin Street
Birmingham, MI

Via Hand Delivery

RE: Board of Zoning Appeals

Dear Mr. Johnson:

My wife and I have sold our residence and closed on our former property. We own no other real property in the city and therefore I no longer qualify to sit on the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Accordingly, I herewith resign from the City of Birmingham’s Board of Zoning Appeals, effective immediately.

I have deeply appreciated both the opportunity and the actual time spent working with each member of the board and with each person on the staff of the city. I thank you for your dedication to the responsibilities of the positions, and your individual and collective understanding and patience with me. As a former property owner/resident, I truly thank each of you for your time, effort, knowledge, and commitment to the community. Birmingham is indeed fortunate to have each of you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jeffery R. Jones
1701 Winthrop Lane
Birmingham, MI 48009

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:
To accept the resignation of Jeffery Jones from the Board of Zoning Appeals, to thank him for his service, and to direct the City Clerk to begin the process of filling the vacancy.
Resignation as Alternate to the Birmingham Parks & Recreation Board
1 message

JPRusche@aol.com <jprusche@aol.com> To: Cherilynn Mynsberge <cmynsberge@bhamgov.org>  

Tue, Sep 25, 2018 at 10:26 AM

Hello Cherilynn,
I wish to resign from my position as an alternate to the Birmingham Parks & Recreation Board, so that I might assume the duties of a regular board member.

Best regards,

John P. Rusche
358 Henley
Birmingham, MI 48009
Mobile: 248-219-8114

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:
To accept the resignation of John Rusche as an alternate member of the Parks and Recreation Board, to thank him for his service, and to direct the City Clerk to begin the process of filling the vacancy.
Hi Cherilynn,

Thank you for reaching out.

I think it would be best for you to begin recruiting for my replacement. As much as I’ve enjoyed being on the DRB, I don’t think it would be fair for me to keep the seat when I don’t know how many meetings I will actually make. I think in a couple years when the kids are both older I’d like to rejoin, but for now I’ll take the hiatus and hope that you can find someone that can commit to more meetings than I can right now.

Please consider this my official resignation from the design review board.

Thank you,

Lauren Jennifer Tolles, ASID, Founder

MAISON Birmingham
1020 South Old Woodward Avenue
Birmingham | MI | 48009
office 248.203.6006 | mobile 248.310.5111
lauren@maisonbirmingham.com
www.maisonbirmingham.com

sent from my phone - please pardon any typos.

---

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:
To accept the resignation of Lauren Tolles from the Design Review Board, to thank her for her service, and to direct the City Clerk to begin the process of filling the vacancy.
Cherilynn Brown <cmynsberge@bhamgov.org>

Historic District Commission

Adam Charles <mradamcharles@gmail.com>  
To: Cherilynn Brown <cmynsberge@bhamgov.org>  
Mon, Oct 1, 2018 at 7:57 PM

Cherilynn,

Please consider this email my resignation from the historic review board and the design review board. It has been a great experience serving these past years, however, I am no longer able to fulfill this commitment.

Adam Charles

[Suggested Resolution]

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:
To accept the resignation of Adam Charles from the Design Review Board and from the Historic District Commission, to thank him for his service, and to direct the City Clerk to begin the process of filling the vacancy.
DATE: October 8, 2018
TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager
FROM: Ingrid Tighe, Executive Director, Birmingham Shopping District
SUBJECT: Request to set dates for BSD Special Assessment Hearings

INTRODUCTION:
- The three-year special assessment for the Birmingham Shopping District is in its final year and will require renewal for continuation of the district.

BACKGROUND:
- At the October 4, 2018 BSD Board meeting, the board passed a resolution requesting that the City Commission set dates for a Public Hearing of Necessity for October 29, 2018 and a Public Hearing of Confirmation of Assessment Rolls for November 12, 2018 for the Birmingham Shopping District. At the hearings, the City Commission will consider continuation of the Birmingham Shopping District Special Assessment for a four-year period.
- Historically, the BSD has requested an assessment rate for a three-year period. This year, however, the BSD is requesting that the rate increase and be set for a four-year period based on a thorough budget analysis performed by the BSD Executive Committee. The Executive Committee examined the BSD’s funding obligations and upcoming construction projects on Maple Road and South Old Woodward over the next four years.

LEGAL REVIEW:
- Legal counsel provided guidance to the BSD board during its evaluation of the assessment rate proposal.

FISCAL IMPACT:
- The BSD assessment is the BSD’s funding source.

SUMMARY
- The BSD is requesting that the City Commission set dates for a Public Hearing of Necessity for October 29, 2018 and a Public Hearing of Confirmation of Assessment Rolls for November 12, 2018 for the Birmingham Shopping District.

ATTACHMENTS:
- Suggested resolution to set public hearing dates
- Proposed rate grid
- BSD District Map
SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NOTICE OF A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE NECESSITY AND A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE CONFIRMATION TO PROVIDE FOR A BIRMINGHAM SHOPPING DISTRICT BY SPECIAL ASSESSMENT

WHEREAS, the Birmingham City Commission has heretofore established a Birmingham Shopping District Board pursuant to Public Act 120 of 1961 and Public Act No. 260 of 1984 as amended in 1992; and

WHEREAS, the Birmingham Shopping District Board has recommended the establishment of a special assessment district for the purposes set forth in the act, including, but not limited to the financing of improved promotion, maintenance, security and operation of the Birmingham Shopping District; and

WHEREAS the Birmingham Shopping District Board is requesting that a public hearing shall be held to determine the necessity of these public improvements and what cost shall be paid by the special assessment.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT SHALL BE RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

That a public hearing on the necessity to provide for a Birmingham Shopping District by special assessment shall be held on October 29, 2018 at 7:30 p.m. before the City Commission in the municipal building in the City of Birmingham.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in the event the Birmingham City Commission adopts a resolution declaring the necessity of making the public improvements that a further public hearing on the confirmation of the assessment roll shall be held on November 12, 2018 at 7:30 p.m. before the City Commission in the municipal building of the City of Birmingham; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Clerk shall be directed to provide public notice of such hearings as established in Title 1 Chapter 12 and 15a of the code of the City of Birmingham, and that the districts, lands and premises identified in Exhibit A upon which a special assessment may be levied, shall be given notice with respect to all hearings held in this matter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>District 1A</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Story</td>
<td>2nd Story</td>
<td>1st Story</td>
<td>2nd Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(49.4 cents/sq. ft)</td>
<td>(34.6 cents/sq. ft)</td>
<td>(24.7 cents/sq. ft)</td>
<td>(17.3 cents/sq. ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>$.494</td>
<td>$.346</td>
<td>$.247</td>
<td>$.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(49.4 cents/sq. ft)</td>
<td>(34.6 cents/sq. ft)</td>
<td>(24.7 cents/sq. ft)</td>
<td>(17.3 cents/sq. ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>$.494</td>
<td>$.346</td>
<td>$.247</td>
<td>$.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(49.4 cents/sq. ft)</td>
<td>(34.6 cents/sq. ft)</td>
<td>(24.7 cents/sq. ft)</td>
<td>(17.3 cents/sq. ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>$.494</td>
<td>$.346</td>
<td>$.247</td>
<td>$.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(49.4 cents/sq. ft)</td>
<td>(34.6 cents/sq. ft)</td>
<td>(24.7 cents/sq. ft)</td>
<td>(17.3 cents/sq. ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* BSD Rate will be held at the same rate for all four years. Subsequent increases to the max/property will be tied to the Detroit Consumer Price Index (MCL 125.985(4)).
The owner of the properties known as 120 Hawthorne and 125 Aspen is seeking a lot rearrangement to move the rear property line of 120 Hawthorne 22.15’ to the west. No new lots are proposed.

The Planning Division requests that the City Commission set a public hearing date of **October 29, 2018** to consider the proposed subdivision, pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 102-52 of the Subdivision Ordinance.

**SUGGESTED ACTION:**

To set a public hearing for October 29, 2018 to consider the proposed Lot rearrangement of 120 Hawthorne, Parcel #1935230015 and 125 Aspen, Parcel #1935230001.
Division of Platted Lots Application

1. Applicant
   Name: Claudia Sills
   Address: 120 Hawthorne St., Birmingham MI 48009
   Phone Number: 248-810-0688
   Fax Number: 
   Email Address: 

2. Applicant's Attorney/Contact Person
   Name: Richard D. Rattner
   Address: Williams, Williams, Rattner, and Plunkett, P.C.
            380 N. Old Woodward Ave., Ste. 300, Birmingham, MI 48009
   Phone Number: 248-642-0333
   Fax Number: 248-642-0856
   Email Address: rdr@wwrplaw.com

3. Project Information
   Address/Location of Property: 120 Hawthorne St., Birmingham, MI 48009
   and 125 Aspen Rd., Birmingham, MI 48009
   Sidwell #: Hawthorne: 1935230018; Aspen: 1935210001
   Current Zoning: Both properties are zoned R1 Single-Family Residential.

4. Attachments
   • Proof of ownership
   • Written statement of reasons for request
   • A letter of authority or power of attorney in the event the application is made by a person other than the property owner
   • Other: data having a direct bearing on the request
   • Sketches of proposed development (optional)
   • One digital copy of plans
   • Two (2) copies of a registered land survey showing:
     • all existing and proposed platted lot lines
     • legal descriptions of proposed lots
     • locations of existing/ surrounding structures and setbacks
     • footprints of proposed development

(I), (We), the undersigned, do hereby request to divide lots of record in the City of Birmingham, Oakland County, Michigan. (I), (We), do hereby swear that all of the statements, signatures, and descriptions appearing on and with this request are in all respects true and accurate to the best of (my), (our), knowledge.

Signature of Property Owner: [Signature]
Print Name: Claudia Sills
Date: 8/21/18

Signature of Applicant: [Signature]
Print Name: Claudia Sills
Date: 8/21/18

Fee: $200.00 per lot affected, minimum fee $400
Notice Signs - Rental Application
Community Development

1. Applicant
Name: Claudia Sills
Address: 120 Hawthorne St., Birmingham, MI 48009
Phone Number: 248-840-0588
Fax Number: 

Property Owner
Name: Claudia Sills
Address: 120 Hawthorne St., Birmingham MI 48009
Phone Number: 248-840-0588
Fax Number: 

2. Project Information
Address/Location of Property: 120 Hawthorne St., Birmingham MI 48009
Name of Development: 120 Hawthorne St.; 125 Aspen St.
Area in Acres: Hawthorne: 0.27 acres; Aspen: 0.29 acres
Name of Historic District site is in, if any: N/A
Current Use: Residential
Current Zoning: R1

3. Date of Board Review
Board of Building Trades Appeals:
City Commission: September 6, 2018
Historic District Commission:
Planning Board:

Board of Zoning Appeals:
Design Review Board:
Housing Board of Appeals:

The undersigned states the above information is true and correct, and understands that it is the responsibility of the applicant to post the Notice Sign(s) at least 15 days prior to the date on which the project will be reviewed by the appropriate board or commission, and to ensure that the Notice Sign(s) remains posted during the entire 15 day mandatory posting period. The undersigned further agrees to pay a rental fee and security deposit for the Notice Sign(s), and to remove all such signs on the day immediately following the date of the hearing at which the project was reviewed. The security deposit will be refunded when the Notice Sign(s) are returned undamaged to the Community Development Department. Failure to return the Notice Sign(s) and/or damage to the Notice Sign(s) will result in forfeiture of the security deposit.

Signature of Applicant: [Signature]
Date: 8/21/18

Office Use Only
Application #: ____________ Date Received: ____________ Fee: ____________

Date of Approval: ____________ Date of Denial: ____________ Reviewed by: ____________
QUIT CLAIM DEED

The Grantor(s): CLAUDIA SILLS, a single woman
Whose address is: 120 Hawthorne, Birmingham, MI 48009

Quit claims to: CLAUDIA SILLS, or her Successor, as Trustee of the CLAUDIA SILLS Revocable Living Trust dated November 16, 1998
Whose address is: 120 Hawthorne, Birmingham, MI 48009

the following described premises situated in the City of Birmingham, County of Oakland, State of Michigan:


for the sum of ONE ($1.00) DOLLAR - Exempt MCLA 207.505(a) and MCLA 207.526(a), subject to easements, building and use restrictions, and zoning ordinances, if any.

Dated this 25th day of January, 1999.

Signed in the presence of:

[Signatures]

Signed by:

CLAUDIA SILLS

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COUNTY OF OAKLAND

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 25th day of January, 1998, by CLAUDIA SILLS, to be her free act and deed.

JUDITH L. TORDINO
NOTARY PUBLIC, Wayne County, Mich
Acting in Oakland County My Commission Expires Nov 26, 2000

Drafted by:
BURTON E. ISAACS, Esq.
RUBENSTEIN SIEGEL & ISAACS Professional Corporation 2000 Town Center, Suite 2700 Southfield, Michigan 48075

Send subsequent tax bills to:
Tax Parcel # 14-35-230-015

Grantee
Recording Fee $ Transfer Tax $
WARRANTY DEED

The Grantor(s): Raymond F. Massa and Nancy E. Massa, Husband and Wife
whose address is 480 Thetford, Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304
Convey and Warrant to: Claudia Sills
whose address is 120 Hawthorne Street, Birmingham, MI 48009
the following described premises situated in the City of Birmingham, County of Oakland and State of Michigan, to-wit:

Lot 90, Birmingham Park Allotment Subdivision, as recorded in Liber 23, Page 25 of Plats, Oakland County Records.

Commonly known as: 125 Aspen Road, Birmingham, MI 48009
Tax parcel number(s): 19-35-230-001

For the sum of: Six Hundred Seventy Four Thousand One Hundred Fifty and 00/100 Dollars ($674,150.00)
Subject to: the existing building and use restrictions, easements, and zoning ordinances, if any.

Dated: May 12, 2017

Seller(s):

Raymond F. Massa

Nancy E. Massa
(Attached to and becoming a part of the Warranty Deed dated May 12, 2017, File Number 397603-55)

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COUNTY OF ________

Acknowledged by Raymond F. Massa and Nancy E. Massa, before me on the 12th day of May, 2017.

Drafted by: Raymond F. Massa, 480 Thetford, Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304
When recorded return to: Claudia Sills, 125 Aspen Road, Birmingham MI 48009
September 21, 2018

City of Birmingham
City Commission
151 Martin St.
Birmingham, MI 48009
Attn: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

RE: Application for Division of Platted Lots for 120 Hawthorne St., Birmingham, MI 48009 ("Hawthorne") and 125 Aspen Rd., Birmingham, MI 48009 ("Aspen") ("Application").

Dear Members of the City of Birmingham City Commission,

Please accept this letter in support of the above referenced Application of Ms. Claudia Sills ("Applicant").

The Applicant is the owner of both Hawthorne and Aspen, and uses Hawthorne as her primary residence. Both Hawthorne and Aspen are zoned R-1 single family residential and each is a single platted lot. Hawthorne’s lot area is 11,734 square feet and Aspen’s lot area is 12,770 square feet. There is a single-family home on each lot (See site plan attached as Exhibit A showing existing conditions).

Applicant proposes to move the rear lot line of Hawthorne 22.15 feet to the west to increase Hawthorne’s rear open space and to allow for renovation of the existing house (See site plan attached as Exhibit B showing proposed land division and architectural plans showing renovated residence). This modification will provide for a substantial improvement to Hawthorne and will have little to no impact on the Aspen lot or on the surrounding neighboring lots to the south (both lots are bordered by Maple Road to the north). The resulting lots, if this rear lot line adjustment is granted, will continue to meet all requirements of the Birmingham Zoning Ordinance and the existing structures on Hawthorne and Aspen also will comply with all Ordinances. This request will not cause any nonconformities.

In order to obtain approval of an application for division of platted lots, the Applicant must meet the requirements of §102-53 of the City of Birmingham Ordinances. Based on the above and the materials that have been submitted in conformance with the City’s lot split procedure, Applicant contends that the criteria at §102-53 of the Ordinance have been met, to wit:

1. 102-53(1) “All lots formed or changed by the division shall conform to the minimum requirements of chapter 126 of this Code for the zone
district in which the property is located.” The proposed lot change conforms to the R-1 Zoning District Development Standards. The minimum lot size in the R1 Zone is 9,000 square feet. If this request is granted, Hawthorne’s lot size will be increased to 13,547.5 square feet, and Aspen’s lot will be decreased to 10,956.4 square feet, well within the 9,000 square feet minimum for lots in R-1. Further, the proposed change comports with R-1 Standards for open space, lot coverage, set-backs, floor area, and building height, as well as the applicable additional development standards.

The Aspen house currently presents an existing non-conformity, as the house encroaches slightly on the side setbacks. This non-conformity has likely existed since the house was constructed in 1936. The proposed lot division will not alter or enlarge this existing non-conformity.

2. 102-53(2) “All residential lots formed or changed by the division shall have a lot width, as defined in chapter 126, of not less than the average lot width of all lots on the same street within 300 feet of the lots formed or changed and within the same zone district.” The proposed lot division will not alter the lot width of either Hawthorne or Aspen, which have existed for decades.

3. 102-53(3) “The division will not adversely affect the interest of the public and of the abutting property owners. In making this determination, the city commission shall consider, but not be limited to the following”:

a. 102-53(a) “The location of proposed buildings or structures, the location and nature of vehicular ingress or egress so that the use or appropriate development of adjacent land or buildings will not be hindered, nor the value thereof impaired.” The Application does not propose any new buildings or structures, but only proposes an addition to the Hawthorne house that is in compliance with Birmingham City Ordinances. No variances will be required and there will be no adverse impact on any surrounding property.

The Applicant proposes to move the Hawthorne property’s driveway 23 feet to the west in order to accommodate the addition to the Hawthorne house. This proposed shift in the location of the driveway will not adversely affect vehicular ingress or egress, and will not cause any hindrance to development of adjacent land or buildings. This proposed relocation actually creates a safer ingress and egress from Maple Road in that the entrance will allow a greater site distance for ingress and egress.
than currently exists. Further, the relocation will not affect ingress or egress to or from either Hawthorne or Aspen streets. The proposed shift will not affect proper development of the adjacent land or buildings, nor affect the value thereof, but rather permit the Applicant to increase the value of Hawthorne while not affecting the Aspen lot, which will remain practically unchanged.

b. **102-53(b)** “The effect of the proposed division upon any floodplain areas, wetlands and other natural features and the ability of the applicant to develop buildable sites on each resulting parcel without unreasonable disturbance of such natural features.” The proposed lot change will not adversely affect any floodplain areas, wetlands or other natural features because these properties are not in any floodplain areas or wetlands, nor do they have other natural features.

c. **102-53(c)** The location, size, density and site layout of any proposed structures or buildings as they may impact an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent properties and the capacity of essential public facilities such as police and fire protection, drainage structures, municipal sanitary sewer and water, and refuse disposal: Because this application affects only the movement of a rear lot line, the proposed lot change will not adversely impact the adequate supply of light and air to adjacent properties, nor will it affect the ability of the City to provide essential public facilities such as police and fire protection, drainage, municipal sanitary and sewer and water and refuse disposal. The movement of this rear lot line does not affect the side yards of Aspen or Hawthorne. The City will be able to provide essential public facilities in the same manner as before the proposed lot line adjustment.

Adjusting the property lines for 120 Hawthorne and 125 Aspen will not disrupt the harmony and character of the streetscape. The lot at the southern end of Aspen and Hawthorne streets at 567 Aspen was several lots that have been combined into one lot. The movement of the rear lot line of Hawthorne does not disturb the front yard symmetry of this attractive residential area. This is a lot split that is not seen from the street and only concerns the rear yards of the two lots bordering on Maple Road. One would be able to drive down Aspen or Hawthorne after the relocation of the lot line and not notice any change in the symmetry, character or continuity of this neighborhood.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Birmingham City Commission grant this Application as proposed.
Should you have any further questions or comments please contact me at your convenience. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAMS, WILLIAMS, RATTNER & PLUNKETT, P.C.

[Signature]

Richard D. Ratner

RDR/cmc

Enclosure
EXHIBIT B
PROPOSED PARCELS

PARCEL A
Lot 91 and the East 22.08 feet of Lot 90 of Birmingham Park Allotment, recorded in Liber 23 of Plats, Page 25. Oakland County Records

PARCEL B
Lot 90 Except the East 22.08 feet of Birmingham Park Allotment, recorded in Liber 23 of Plats, Page 25. Oakland County Records

This Survey and corresponding Legal Descriptions are subject to municipal approval, state division laws and local ordinances.

Since our survey work does not include a title search, there may be easements or other encumbrances upon the land which are not shown on our survey at this time.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I have surveyed and mapped the land above plotted and/or described on 8/23/2018

And that the ratio of closure on the unadjusted field observations of such survey was within accepted limits.

LEGEND

Fenn & Associates, Inc. Land Surveying and Civil Engineering
14933 Commercial Drive, Shelby Township, MI 48315
Phone: 866-254-9577 Fax: 866-254-9060 www.fennsweeping.com
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DATE: October 8, 2018

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: Tiffany J. Gunter, Assistant City Manager

SUBJECT: BSD Annual Holiday Marketing Campaign

Once again this year, the Birmingham Shopping District will air a holiday marketing campaign to include advertising on WXYZ TV Channel 7, WDIV Channel 4 and Comcast cable channels.

The ads will highlight the downtown shopping, dining and spa experience. Each of the ads will promote the popular “2 Hours Free Parking in the Decks” program, as they have in years past. The goal of the ads is to drive traffic to downtown Birmingham, benefiting merchants and the parking system.

This year the Birmingham Shopping District is committing a total of $55,000 for the holiday shopping campaign. The Advisory Parking Committee voted to approve a $25,000 commitment from the parking fund for the campaign at the October 3, 2018 meeting. This would be the sixth year of a financial commitment from the APC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holiday Advertising</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The advertising vignettes will provide a strong push for the parking system, as the host will close out every segment with a strong statement about parking in Birmingham. These 15 and 30 second ads will feature a graphic at the end of the spot highlighting “2 Hours Free Parking in the Decks” incorporating the parking logo for the shopping district.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:

To authorize an expenditure of $25,000 from the Parking Enterprise Fund #585-538.001-901.0300 in support of the BSD holiday television campaign.
DATE: September 13, 2018
TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager
FROM: Mark H. Clemence, Chief of Police
SUBJECT: Police Department Clerical Area– Purchase of Office Furniture

The furniture in the police department clerical area is in need of replacement due to age and condition. The current equipment was purchased in 1990 and is in poor condition. Included in the list of items to be replaced are (2) workstations with tack boards and task lights, (16) lateral files, and (2) secured cabinets for storage of prisoner property.

This project was identified in the 2018-19 police department general fund budget, capital outlay furniture account number 101-301-000-972.0000. Sufficient funds are available to provide for the purchase of this office furniture.

On September 4, 2018 the police department requested sealed proposals for police department clerical furniture with a bid opening on September 13, 2018. The Invitation to Bid (ITB) was published on the Michigan Intergovernmental Trade Network (MITN). One bid was received from Kentwood Office Furniture, Inc. in the amount of $16,744.42. The proposal reflects furniture and equipment manufactured by HON (workstations / desks) and Great Openings (lateral files). The Kentwood proposal included all requested workstations and cabinets, freight, delivery, and removal of existing furniture. Kentwood was the sole bidder for this project.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:

To approve the purchase of (2) workstations, (2) secure storage cabinets and (16) lateral files in the amount of $16,744.42 from Kentwood Office Furniture, Inc.; further to authorize this budgeted expenditure from account number 101-301-000-972.0000; further authorizing and directing the mayor and city clerk to sign the agreement on behalf of the city.
IN VITATION TO BID

Sealed bids endorsed “POLICE DEPARTMENT CLERICAL FURNITURE 2018” will be received by the City of Birmingham, Michigan at the Office of City Clerk, 151 Martin Street, P.O. Box 3001, Birmingham, MI, 48012 until Thursday, September 13, 2018 at 10:00 a.m., at which time the bids will be publicly opened and read.

The City of Birmingham, Michigan is accepting sealed bids from qualified vendors for the purchase of (16) LATERAL FILES, (2) WORKSTATIONS, AND (2) CABINETS FOR BIN STORAGE. All proposals must include total shipping, delivery costs and the estimated delivery date.

A list of the furniture to be purchased is on the attached sheets. All desk and workstation furniture must be Allsteel or equivalent. All lateral files and bin storage units must be Great Openings or equivalent.

Materials and bids shall be in submitted in accordance with the attached specifications and bid forms prepared by the Birmingham Police Department. The equipment must be delivered as detailed in accordance with the specifications contained in the Invitation to Bid (ITB).

The City reserves the right to request additional information or clarification from bidders. At the discretion of the City, vendors submitting bids may be requested to provide sample materials or equipment.

Bids must be submitted in a sealed envelope marked “POLICE DEPARTMENT CLERICAL FURNITURE 2018”. The date and time of the bid opening must also be marked on the envelope.

The acceptance of any proposal made pursuant to this invitation shall not be binding upon the City until an agreement has been executed and a written purchase order has been delivered to the successful bidder.

The ITB, including the specifications, may be obtained online from the Michigan Inter-governmental Trade Network at http://www.mitn.info or at the City of Birmingham, 151 Martin St., Birmingham, Michigan, ATTN: Ellen DeView.

Submitted to MITN: September 4, 2018
Deadline for Submissions: September 13, 2018 10:00 a.m.
Contact Person: Ellen DeView, Staff & Services Coordinator
Birmingham Police Department
P.O. Box 3001, 151 Martin Street
Birmingham, MI 48012
Phone: (248) 530-1869
Email: edeview@bhamgov.org
GENERAL CONDITIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS

All information requested of the vendor shall be entered in the appropriate space on the attached form(s). Failure to do so may disqualify the bid.

All information shall be entered in ink or typewritten. Mistakes may be crossed out and corrections inserted before submission of the bid. The person signing the bid shall initial corrections in ink.

Corrections and/or modifications received after the closing time specified will not be accepted.

All bids shall be signed by an authorized officer or employee of the bidder.

Bids must be submitted by the date and at or prior to the time specified to be considered. No late bids, telegraphic bids, telephone bids, or facsimile bids will be accepted.

The City of Birmingham is exempt from State of Michigan and federal excise taxes.

All proposals shall include the following information: Vendor name, address, city, state, zip code, telephone number, and fax number. The company shall also provide the name, address, telephone number and e-mail address of an individual in their organization to whom notices and inquiries by the City should be directed as part of the bid.

The City of Birmingham reserves the right:

1. To award bids received on the basis of individual items, or group of items, or on the entire list of items.
2. To reject any and all bids, or any part thereof.
3. To waive any informality in the bids received.
4. To accept the bid that the City Commission shall deem to be in the best interest of City of Birmingham.
INVITATION TO BID
For POLICE DEPARTMENT CLERICAL FURNITURE 2018
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Invitation to Bid (ITB) is to request sealed bids from qualified parties presenting their qualifications, capabilities and costs to provide (2) Allsteel or equivalent workstations, (16) Great Openings or equivalent lateral files, and (2) Great Openings or equivalent bin storage cabinets per the specifications on the attached sheets.

For purposes of this Invitation to Bid the City of Birmingham will hereby be referred to as “City” and the vendor will hereby be referred to as “Contractor”.

The City of Birmingham, Michigan will grant to the successful bidder a purchase order for the following:

POLICE DEPARTMENT CLERICAL FURNITURE 2018

The Birmingham Police Department is accepting sealed bids from qualified vendors for the purchase of furniture including (2) workstations, (16) lateral files, and (2) bin storage cabinets for the clerical office area. A list of the furniture to be purchased is on the attached sheets. All desk and workstation furniture must be Allsteel or equivalent. All lateral files and wardrobe / bin storage units must be Great Openings or equivalent. The equipment must be delivered as specified in accordance with the specifications outlined by the Scope of Work contained in this ITB.

THE FURNITURE MUST BE DELIVERED AND SET UP DURING NON-BUSINESS HOURS (SATURDAY) WHEN POLICE DEPARTMENT CLERICAL ACTIVITY IS MINIMAL.

Materials and bids shall be submitted in accordance with the attached specifications and bid forms prepared by the Birmingham Police Department.

The City reserves the right to request additional information or clarification from bidders. At the discretion of the City, vendors submitting bids may be requested to provide sample materials or equipment.

During the evaluation process, the City reserves the right where it may serve the City’s best interest to request additional information or clarification from bidders, or to allow corrections of errors or omissions. At the discretion of the City, vendors submitting bids may be requested to make oral presentations as part of the evaluation.

It is anticipated the selection of a vendor will be completed by the Birmingham Police Department by September 15, 2018. It is anticipated that the agreement will be presented to the City Commission for approval on October 8, 2018. A purchase order will be issued to the selected Contractor following execution of the agreement.
INVITATION TO SUBMIT A BID

Proposals shall be submitted no later than September 13, 2018 at 10:00 a.m. to:

City of Birmingham
Attn: City Clerk
151 Martin Street
Birmingham, Michigan 48009

One (1) original and one (1) copy of the proposal shall be submitted. The bid should be firmly sealed in an envelope, which shall be clearly marked on the outside, “POLICE DEPARTMENT CLERICAL FURNITURE 2018”. The date and time of the bid opening must also be marked on the envelope.

Any bid received after the due date cannot be accepted and will be rejected and returned, unopened, to the bidder.

INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS

1. Any and all forms requesting information from the bidder must be completed on the attached forms contained herein (see Contractor’s Responsibilities).

2. Any request for clarification of this ITB shall be made in writing and delivered to: Ellen DeVie\n
3. All bids must be submitted following the ITB format as stated in this document and shall be subject to all requirements of this document including the instruction to respondents and general information sections. All proposals must be regular in every respect and no interlineations, excisions, or special conditions shall be made or included in the ITB format by the respondent.

4. The contract will be awarded by the City of Birmingham to the most responsive and responsible bidder with the lowest price and the contract will require the delivery of the equipment pursuant to these documents.

5. Each respondent shall include in his or her bid, in the format requested, the cost of the equipment. Municipalities are exempt from Michigan State Sales and Federal Excise taxes. Do not include such taxes in the proposal figure. The City will furnish the successful contractor with tax exemption information when requested.

6. Each respondent shall include in their bid the following information: Firm name, address, city, state, zip code, telephone number, and fax number. The company shall also provide the name, address, telephone number and e-mail address of an individual in their organization to whom notices and inquiries by the City should be directed as part of their proposal.
EVALUATION PROCEDURE AND CRITERIA

The evaluation panel will consist of City staff and any other person(s) designated by the City who will evaluate the proposals based on, but not limited to, the following criteria:

1. Ability to provide services and equipment as outlined.
2. Related experience with similar projects, vendor background, and personnel qualifications.
3. Quality of materials proposed.
4. Overall costs.
5. References.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1. The City reserves the right to reject any or all bids received, waive informalities, or accept any proposal, in whole or in part, as it deems best. The City reserves the right to award the contract to the next most qualified Contractor if the successful Contractor does not execute a contract within ten (10) days after the award of the proposal.

2. The City reserves the right to request clarification of information submitted and to request additional information of one or more Contractors.

3. The City reserves the right to terminate the contract at its discretion should it be determined that the services provided do not meet the specifications contained herein. The City may terminate this Agreement at any point in the process upon notice to Contractor sufficient to indicate the City’s desire to do so. In the case of such a stoppage, the City agrees to pay Contractor for services rendered to the time of notice, subject to the contract maximum amount.

4. Any bid may be withdrawn up until the date and time set above for the opening of the proposals. Any bids not so withdrawn shall constitute an irrevocable offer, for a period of ninety (90) days, to provide the services set forth in the proposal.

5. The cost of preparing and submitting a bid proposal is the responsibility of the Contractor and shall not be chargeable in any manner to the City.

6. Payment will be made within thirty (30) days after invoice. Acceptance by the City is defined as authorization by the designated City representative to this project that all the criteria requested under the Scope of Work contained herein have been provided. Invoices are to be rendered each month following the date of execution of an Agreement with the City.

7. The Contractor will not exceed the timelines established for the completion of this project.

8. The successful bidder shall enter into and will execute the contract as set forth and attached as Attachment A.
CONTRACTOR’S RESPONSIBILITIES

Each bidder shall provide the following as part of their proposal:

1. Complete and sign all forms requested for completion within this ITB.
   a. Bidder’s Agreement (Attachment B - p. 19)
   b. Cost Proposal (Attachment C - pp. 20-22)
   c. Iran Sanctions Act Vendor Certification Form (Attachment D - p. 23)
   d. Agreement (pp. 13-18 (only if selected by the City)).

   Provide a description of completed projects that demonstrate the vendor’s ability to
   complete projects of similar scope, size, and purpose, and in a timely manner, and
   within budget.

2. Provide a written plan detailing the anticipated timeline for completion of the tasks set
   forth in the Scope of Work (p. 10).

3. The Contractor will be responsible for any changes necessary for the plans to be
   approved by the City of Birmingham.

4. Provide a description of the firm, including resumes and professional qualifications of
   the principals involved in administering the project.

5. Provide a list of sub-contractors and their qualifications, if applicable.

6. Provide three (3) client references from past projects, include current phone numbers.
   At least two (2) of the client references should be for projects utilizing the same
   materials included in the Contractor’s proposal.

7. The Contractor will be responsible for the disposal of all material and any damages
   which occur as a result of any of employees or subcontractors of the Contractor during
   this project.

8. The Contractor will be responsible for obtaining any associated permits at no cost to the
   Contractor.

9. Provide a project timeline addressing each section within the Scope of Work and a
   description of the overall project approach. Include a statement that the Contractor will
   be available according to the proposed timeline.

CITY RESPONSIBILITY

1. The City will provide a designated representative to work with the Contractor to
   coordinate both the City’s and Contractor’s efforts and to inspect and verify any work
   performed by the Contractor.
2. The City will provide access to the City of Birmingham during regular business hours or during nights and weekends as approved by the City’s designated representative.

**SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES**

The successful bidder agrees to certain dispute resolution avenues/limitations. Please refer to paragraph 17 of the Agreement attached as Attachment A for the details and what is required of the successful bidder.

**INSURANCE**

The successful bidder is required to procure and maintain certain types of insurances. Please refer to paragraph 12 of the Agreement attached as Attachment A for the details and what is required of the successful bidder.

**CONTINUATION OF COVERAGE**

The Contractor also agrees to provide all insurance coverages as specified. Upon failure of the Contractor to obtain or maintain such insurance coverage for the term of the agreement, the City may, at its option, purchase such coverage and subtract the cost of obtaining such coverage from the contract amount. In obtaining such coverage, The City shall have no obligation to procure the most cost effective coverage but may contract with any insurer for such coverage.

**EXECUTION OF CONTRACT**

The bidder whose proposal is accepted shall be required to execute the contract and to furnish all insurance coverages as specified within ten (10) days after receiving notice of such acceptance. Any contract awarded pursuant to any bid shall not be binding upon the City until a written contract has been executed by both parties. Failure or refusal to execute the contract shall be considered an abandoned all rights and interest in the award and the contract may be awarded to another. The successful bidder agrees to enter into and will execute the contract as set forth and attached as Attachment A.

**INDEMNIFICATION**

The successful bidder agrees to indemnify the City and various associated persons. Please refer to paragraph 13 of the Agreement attached as Attachment A for the details and what is required of the successful bidder.
CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The successful bidder is subject to certain conflict of interest requirements/restrictions. Please refer to paragraph 14 of the Agreement attached as Attachment A for the details and what is required of the successful bidder.

EXAMINATION OF BID MATERIALS

The submission of a proposal shall be deemed a representation and warranty by the Contractor that it has investigated all aspects of the ITB, that it is aware of the applicable facts pertaining to the ITB process and its procedures and requirements, and that it has read and understands the ITB. Statistical information which may be contained in the ITB or any addendum thereto is for informational purposes only.

PROJECT TIMELINE

September 4, 2018 POLICE DEPARTMENT CLERICAL FURNITURE 2018 posted on MITN
September 13, 2018 Bids Due - open at 10:00 a.m. Office of the City Clerk
October 8, 2018 Agreement to City Commission for Approval
October 10, 2018 Purchase order for POLICE DEPARTMENT CLERICAL FURNITURE 2018 awarded to successful vendor

The Contractor will not exceed the timelines established for the completion of this project.
SCOPE OF WORK

The Contractor shall provide the following equipment and services in accordance with the requirements as defined and noted herein: POLICE DEPARTMENT CLERICAL FURNITURE 2018

PROJECT LOCATION: Birmingham, Michigan 48009

1. The City of Birmingham is accepting sealed bids from qualified vendors to provide (2) WORKSTATIONS, (16) LATERAL FILES, AND (2) BIN STORAGE CABINETS for the clerical office area. The City intends to award one contract to a single vendor.

2. The Contractor shall provide any and all manuals and/or warranty information related to this project to the City upon completion of the project.

3. This section and referenced documents shall constitute the Scope of Work for this project and as such all requirements must be met.

4. All bids submitted for the POLICE DEPARTMENT CLERICAL FURNITURE 2018 must include the following equipment specifications:

   • (2) WORKSTATIONS, (16) LATERAL FILES, AND (2) BIN STORAGE CABINETS (see attached sheets for model numbers).

   • INCLUDE ANY APPLICABLE FEES AND COSTS FOR RECEIPT, SHIPPING, DELIVERY, INSTALLATION, AND LABOR. (LABOR TO BE COMPLETED ON A SATURDAY AT THE BIRMINGHAM POLICE DEPARTMENT).

   • PROVIDE ESTIMATED DELIVERY DATE FROM RECEIPT OF PURCHASE ORDER.

   • NOTE THAT REMOVAL OF EXISTING FURNITURE WILL NOT BE REQUIRED AS PART OF THE SCOPE OF WORK.
The Birmingham Police Department is accepting sealed bids from qualified vendors for **POLICE DEPARTMENT CLERICAL FURNITURE 2018**. The specifications are detailed on the attached sheets.

### POLICE DEPARTMENT CLERICAL FURNITURE 2018 LISTING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>ALLSTEEL PRODUCT #</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION - MUST BE ALLSTEEL OR EQUIVALENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AFNLFTP-841 ALF04 8LS2</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE TOP 84Wx18D LAM-TO SPAN 2 UNITS L1 CORE LAM OPTS LAM: CANYON ZEPHER EDGE = LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AFNLFTP-721 ALF04 8LS2</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE TOP 72Wx18D LAM-TO SPAN 2 UNITS L1 CORE LAM OPTS LAM: CANYON ZEPHER EDGE = LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AFNLFTP-361 ALF04 8L</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE TOP 42Wx18D LAMINATE L1 CORE LAM OPTS LAM: CANYON ZEPHER EDGE = LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TK05030WR ATD02</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL RACEWAY PNL FR-NO TOP TRIM 50Hx30W P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TK05036WR ATD02</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL RACEWAY PNL FR-NO TOP TRIM 50Hx36W P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TKG45030T ATD02</td>
<td>TER TACKABLE ACOUSTIC TILE 50Hx30W GRD A FAB FAB: APPOINT CLR: MOREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TKG45036T ATD02</td>
<td>TER TACKABLE ACOUSTIC TILE 50Hx36W GRD A FAB FAB: APPOINT CLR: MOREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TK366PT ATD02</td>
<td>EXTENDED RADIUS TOP TRIM 66W P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TK330PT ATD02</td>
<td>RADIUS TOP TRIM 30W P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TK350L ATD02</td>
<td>L 90-DEGREE RADIUS CONN KIT 50H BASE PNL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TK350E ATD02</td>
<td>E END TRIM RADIUS CONN KIT 50H BASE PNL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TS3066S AWK01</td>
<td>PRIMARY 30Dx66W FLAT EG LAM W/GROMMETS L1 CORE LAM OPTS LAM: CANYON ZEPHER EDGE: LOFT PLASTIC GROMMET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y62930PENP AWK01</td>
<td>PNL MNT 30Dx29-1/2H END SUP PNL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y62930FENP AWK01</td>
<td>FRSTND 30Dx29-1/2H END SUP PNL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Z55C66 AWK01</td>
<td>54W EXTERNAL SUPT CHANNEL FOR 66W W/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CBK29 AWK01</td>
<td>BRIDGE KIT 29-1/2H P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CS549 AWK01</td>
<td>FULL-HGT 29-1/2Hx54W MOD PNL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PF197-233I APE01</td>
<td>ESSENTIALS SUPPORT PED BBF 28Hx22-7/8Dx15W INTEGRAL PULL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT OMT CORE TO ORD KEY ALIKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PM187-233I APE01</td>
<td>ESSENTIALS MOBILE PED BBF 28Hx22-7/8Dx15W INTEGRAL PULL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT OMT CORE TO ORD KEY ALIKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UH6566FD AHDO1</td>
<td>UNIVERSAL 66W HUTCH SQUARE FLIPPER DRAWER NO PULL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT OMT 2 CORES TO ORD KEY ALIKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UHTB66 AHDO1</td>
<td>UNIVERSAL 66 TACKBOARD FOR UNIVERSAL 66W HUTCH P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT GRD A FABRIC FAB: APPOINT CLR: MOREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A870824 AEA01</td>
<td>TASKLIGHT W/ELEC BALLAST FOR 24W CLR: NO COLOR CHOICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LKFE1SLV APE01</td>
<td>LOCK CORE KIT SILVER - 1 CORE 2 KEYS KEY NUMBER 115 QUANTITY 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TK03530WR ATD02</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL RACEWAY PANEL FRAME-NO TOP TRIM 35Hx30W P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TK03536WR ATD02</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL RACEWAY PANEL FRAME-NO TOP TRIM 35Hx36W P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TKG43030T ATD02</td>
<td>TER TACKABLE ACOUSTIC TILE 30Hx30W GRD A FAB FAB: APPOINT CLR: MOREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TKG43036T ATD02</td>
<td>TER TACKABLE ACOUSTIC TILE 30Hx36W GRD A FAB FAB: APPOINT CLR: MOREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TK366PT ATD02</td>
<td>EXTENDED RADIUS TOP TRIM 66W P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TK335E ATD02</td>
<td>E END TRIM RADIUS CONN KIT 35H BASE PNL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TS3066S AWK01</td>
<td>PRIMARY 30Dx66W FLAT EG LAM W/GROMMETS L1 CORE LAM OPTS LAM: CANYON ZEPHYR EDG: LOFT PLASTIC GROMMET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>ALLSTEEL PRODUCT #</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION - MUST BE ALLSTEEL OR EQUIVALENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T52442S AWK01</td>
<td>PRIMARY 24Dx42W FLAT EG LAM W/GROMMETS L1 CORE LAM OPTS LAM: CANYON ZEPHYR EDG: LOFT PLASTIC GROMMET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y6293OPENP AWK01</td>
<td>PNL MNT30Dx29-1/2H END SUP PNL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TKPPBL AWK01</td>
<td>PEDESTAL-TO-PANEL BRACKET LH P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TKPPBR AWK01</td>
<td>PEDESTAL-TO-PANEL BRACKET RH P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PF197-303I APE01</td>
<td>ESSENTIALS SUPPORT PED BBF 28hx22-7/8dx15W INTEGRAL PULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT OMT CORE TO ORD KEY ALIKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CSDC19 AAC01</td>
<td>CENTER DRAWER 19Wx14-3/4Dx3H W/LOCK METAL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT OMT CORE TO ORD KEY ALIKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LKFE1SLV APE01</td>
<td>LOCK CORE KIT SILVER - 1 CORE 2 KEYS KEY NUMBER 116 QUANTITY 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LKFE1SLV APE01</td>
<td>LOCK CORE KIT SILVER - 1 CORE 2 KEYS KEY NUMBER 117 QUANTITY 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>PRODUCT #</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION - MUST BE GREAT OPENINGS OR EQUIVALENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RG-1104</td>
<td>ESS LAT 36Wx64-1/4H R/O 4-1/2&quot; DRAWERS BEV PULL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT OMT CORE TO ORD KEY ALIKE NOTE: TOP ROLLOUT SHELF W/RECESSED FLIPPER DOOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RG-1204</td>
<td>ESS LAT 42Wx64-1/4H R/O 4-1/2&quot; DRAWERS BEV PULL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT OMT CORE TO ORD KEY ALIKE NOTE: TOP ROLLOUT SHELF W/RECESSED FLIPPER DOOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LOCK CORE KIT - KEY 112</td>
<td>LOCK CORE KIT SILVER - 1 CORE 2 KEYS KEY NUMBER 112 QUANTITY 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CG-U7F3</td>
<td>ESSENTIALS 64-1/4&quot;R/36W STORAGE CABINET BEVELED P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT OMT CORE TO ORD KEY ALIKE NOTE: (1) TO BE WARDROBE LEFT / STORAGE RIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LOCK CORE KIT - KEY 113</td>
<td>LOCK CORE KIT SILVER - 1 CORE 2 KEYS KEY NUMBER 113 QUANTITY 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RG-C602</td>
<td>LAT FILE / 3 DRAWER 30Wx18-1/4Dx39-7/8H AL-LOFT 3-DWR C-WT FULL PULL SQUARE FRONT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RG-C741</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE 36Wx18-1/4Dx39-7/8H W/ (2) BOX &amp; (2) FILE DRW FULL PULL SQUARE FRONT AL-LOFT 3-DWR C-WT LL SERIES CHROME NICKEL SCALLOPED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RG-C806</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE 42Wx18-1/4Dx39-7/8H W/ (6) BOX DRAWER FULL PULL SQUARE FRONT AL-LOFT 3-DWR C-WT LL SERIES CHROME NICKEL SCALLOPED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RG-D205</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE 42Wx18-1/4Dx51-3/8H W/ (8) BOX DRAWERS FULL PULL SQUARE FRONT AL-LOFT 4-DWR C-WT LL SERIES CHROME NICKEL SCALLOPED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RG-D240</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE 42Wx18-1/4Dx51-3/8H W/ (2) BOX &amp; (3) FILE DRAWERS AL-LOFT 4-DWR C-WT LL SERIES CHROME NICKEL SCALLOPED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RG-C702</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE 3 DRAWER 36Wx18-1/4Dx39-7/8H AL-LOFT 3-DWR C-WT FULL PULL SQUARE FRONT LL SERIES CHROME NICKEL SCALLOPED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RG-C841</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE 42Wx18-1/4Dx39-7/8H (2) BOX &amp; (2) FILE DRAWERS FULL PULL SQUARE FRONT AL-LOFT 3-DWR C-WT LL SERIES CHROME NICKEL SCALLOPED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RG-C802</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE 42Wx18-1/4Dx39-7/8H W (3) FILE DRAWERS FULL PULL SQUARE FRONT AL-LOFT 3-DWR C-WT LL SERIES CHROME NICKEL SCALLOPED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LABOR</td>
<td>REMOVAL OF EXISTING FURNITURE LABOR (SATURDAY RATE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LABOR</td>
<td>RECEIVE, DELIVER, AND INSTALL (3) WORKSTATIONS, (16) LATERAL FILES OVERTIME LABOR SATURDAY RATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT A - AGREEMENT
For POLICE DEPARTMENT CLERICAL FURNITURE 2018

This AGREEMENT, made this ___ day of October, 2018, by and between CITY OF BIRMINGHAM, having its principal municipal office at 151 Martin Street, Birmingham, MI (hereinafter sometimes called "City"), and Kentwood Office Furniture, Inc., having its principal office at 40500 Grand River Ave, Novi, MI 48375 (hereinafter called "Contractor"), provides as follows:

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the City is desirous of selecting a vendor for the purchase of (16) LATERAL FILES, (2) WORKSTATIONS, AND (2) CABINETS FOR BIN STORAGE and has heretofore advertised for bids for the procurement for the purchase of a (16) LATERAL FILES, (2) WORKSTATIONS, AND (2) CABINETS FOR BIN STORAGE, and in connection therewith has prepared an Invitation to Bid ("ITB"), which includes certain instructions to bidders, specifications, terms and conditions.

WHEREAS, the Contractor has professional qualifications that meet the project requirements and has made a bid in accordance with such request for cost proposals to provide (16) LATERAL FILES, (2) WORKSTATIONS, AND (2) CABINETS FOR BIN STORAGE.

NOW, THEREFORE, for and in consideration of the respective agreements and undertakings herein contained, the parties agree as follows:

1. It is mutually agreed by and between the parties that the documents consisting of the Request for Proposal to provide (16) LATERAL FILES, (2) WORKSTATIONS, AND (2) CABINETS FOR BIN STORAGE and the Contractor's cost proposal dated September 5, 2018, shall be incorporated herein by reference and shall become a part of this Agreement, and shall be binding upon both parties hereto. If any of the documents are in conflict with one another, this Agreement shall take precedence, then the ITB.

2. The City shall pay the Contractor for the performance of this Agreement in a sum not to exceed the amount proposed for the purchase of a (16) LATERAL FILES, (2) WORKSTATIONS, AND (2) CABINETS FOR BIN STORAGE per the Contractor’s September 5, 2018 cost proposal.

3. This Agreement shall commence upon execution by both parties, unless the City exercises its option to terminate the Agreement in accordance with the Invitation to Bid.

4. The Contractor shall employ personnel of good moral character and fitness in performing all services under this Agreement.
5. The Contractor and the City agree that the Contractor is acting as an independent Contractor with respect to the Contractor’s role in providing services to the City pursuant to this Agreement, and as such, shall be liable for its own actions and neither the Contractor nor its employees shall be construed as employees of the City. Nothing contained in this Agreement shall be construed to imply a joint venture or partnership and neither party, by virtue of this Agreement, shall have any right, power or authority to act or create any obligation, express or implied, on behalf of the other party, except as specifically outlined herein. Neither the City nor the Contractor shall be considered or construed to be the agent of the other, nor shall either have the right to bind the other in any manner whatsoever, except as specifically provided in this Agreement, and this Agreement shall not be construed as a contract of agency. The Contractor shall not be entitled or eligible to participate in any benefits or privileges given or extended by the City, or be deemed an employee of the City for purposes of federal or state withholding taxes, FICA taxes, unemployment, workers' compensation or any other employer contributions on behalf of the City.

6. The Contractor acknowledges that in performing services pursuant to this Agreement, certain confidential and/or proprietary information (including, but not limited to, internal organization, methodology, personnel and financial information, etc.) may become involved. The Contractor recognizes that unauthorized exposure of such confidential or proprietary information could irreparably damage the City. Therefore, the Contractor agrees to use reasonable care to safeguard the confidential and proprietary information and to prevent the unauthorized use or disclosure thereof. The Contractor shall inform its employees of the confidential or proprietary nature of such information and shall limit access thereto to employees rendering services pursuant to this Agreement. The Contractor further agrees to use such confidential or proprietary information only for the purpose of performing services pursuant to this Agreement.

7. This Agreement shall be governed by and performed, interpreted and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of Michigan. The Contractor agrees to perform all services provided for in this Agreement in accordance with and in full compliance with all local, state and federal laws and regulations.

8. If any provision of this Agreement is declared invalid, illegal or unenforceable, such provision shall be severed from this Agreement and all other provisions shall remain in full force and effect.

9. This Agreement shall be binding upon the successors and assigns of the parties hereto, but no such assignment shall be made by the Contractor without the prior written consent of the City. Any attempt at assignment without prior written consent shall be void and of no effect.

10. The Contractor agrees that neither it nor its subcontractors will discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment with respect to hire, tenure, terms, conditions or privileges of employment, or a matter directly or indirectly related to employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, height, weight or marital status. The Contractor
shall inform the City of all claims or suits asserted against it by the Contractor's employees who work pursuant to this Agreement. The Contractor shall provide the City with periodic status reports concerning all such claims or suits, at intervals established by the City.

11. The Contractor shall not commence work under this Agreement until it has, at its sole expense, obtained the insurance required under this paragraph. All coverages shall be with insurance companies licensed and admitted to do business in the State of Michigan. All coverages shall be with carriers acceptable to the City of Birmingham.

12. The Contractor shall maintain during the life of this Agreement the types of insurance coverage and minimum limits as set forth below:

   A. Workers' Compensation Insurance: Contractor shall procure and maintain during the life of this Agreement, Workers' Compensation Insurance, including Employers Liability Coverage, in accordance with all applicable statutes of the State of Michigan.

   B. Commercial General Liability Insurance: Contractor shall procure and maintain during the life of this Agreement, Commercial General Liability Insurance on an "Occurrence Basis" with limits of liability not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence combined single limit, Personal Injury, Bodily Injury and Property Damage. Coverage shall include the following extensions: (A) Contractual Liability; (B) Products and Completed Operations; (C) Independent Contractors Coverage; (D) Broad Form General Liability Extensions or equivalent; (E) Deletion of all Explosion, Collapse and Underground (XCU) Exclusions, if applicable.

   C. Motor Vehicle Liability: Contractor shall procure and maintain during the life of this Agreement Motor Vehicle Liability Insurance, including all applicable no-fault coverages, with limits of liability of not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence combined single limit Bodily Injury and Property Damage. Coverage shall include all owned vehicles, all non-owned vehicles, and all hired vehicles.

   D. Additional Insured: Commercial General Liability and Motor Vehicle Liability Insurance, as described above, shall include an endorsement stating the following shall be Additional Insureds: The City of Birmingham, including all elected and appointed officials, all employee and volunteers, all boards, commissions and/or authorities and board members, including employees and volunteers thereof. This coverage shall be primary to any other coverage that may be available to the additional insured, whether any other available coverage by primary, contributing or excess.

   E. Professional Liability: Professional liability insurance with limits of not less than $1,000,000 per claim if Contractor will provide service that are customarily subject to this type of coverage.
F. Cancellation Notice: Workers' Compensation Insurance, Commercial General Liability Insurance and Motor Vehicle Liability Insurance (and Professional Liability Insurance, if applicable), as described above, shall include an endorsement stating the following: “Thirty (30) days Advance Written Notice of Cancellation or Non-Renewal, shall be sent to: Finance Director, City of Birmingham, PO Box 3001, 151 Martin Street, Birmingham, MI 48012-3001.

G. Proof of Insurance Coverage: Contractor shall provide the City of Birmingham at the time the Agreement is returned for execution, Certificates of Insurance and/or policies, acceptable to the City of Birmingham, as listed below.

1) Two (2) copies of Certificate of Insurance for Workers’ Compensation Insurance;
2) Two (2) copies of Certificate of Insurance for Commercial General Liability Insurance;
3) Two (2) copies of Certificate of Insurance for Vehicle Liability Insurance;
4) Two (2) copies of Certificate of Insurance for Professional Liability Insurance;
5) If so requested, Certified Copies of all policies mentioned above will be furnished.

H. Coverage Expiration: If any of the above coverages expire during the term of this Agreement, Contractor shall deliver renewal certificates and/or policies to the City of Birmingham at least (10) days prior to the expiration date.

I. Maintaining Insurance: Upon failure of the Contractor to obtain or maintain such insurance coverage for the term of the Agreement, the City of Birmingham may, at its option, purchase such coverage and subtract the cost of obtaining such coverage from the Agreement amount. In obtaining such coverage, the City of Birmingham shall have no obligation to procure the most cost-effective coverage but may contract with any insurer for such coverage.

13. To the fullest extent permitted by law, the Contractor and any entity or person for whom the Contractor is legally liable, agrees to be responsible for any liability, defend, pay on behalf of, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Birmingham, its elected and appointed officials, employees and volunteers and others working on behalf of the City of Birmingham against any and all claims, demands, suits, or loss, including all costs and reasonable attorney fees connected therewith, and for any damages which may be asserted, claimed or recovered against or from the City of Birmingham, its elected and appointed officials, employees, volunteers or others working on behalf of the City of Birmingham, by reason of personal injury, including bodily injury and death and/or property damage, including loss of use thereof, which arises out of or is in any way connected or associated with this Agreement. Such responsibility shall not be construed as liability for damage caused by or resulting from the sole act or omission of its elected or appointed officials, employees, volunteers or others working on behalf of the City of Birmingham.

14. If, after the effective date of this Agreement, any official of the City, or spouse, child, parent or in-law of such official or employee shall become directly or indirectly interested in this
Agreement or the affairs of the Contractor, the City shall have the right to terminate this Agreement without further liability to the Contractor if the disqualification has not been removed within thirty (30) days after the City has given the Contractor notice of the disqualifying interest. Ownership of less than one percent (1%) of the stock or other equity interest in a corporation or partnership shall not be a disqualifying interest. Employment shall be a disqualifying interest.

15. If Contractor fails to perform its obligations hereunder, the City may take any and all remedial actions provided by the general specifications or otherwise permitted by law.

16. All notices required to be sent pursuant to this Agreement shall be mailed to the following addresses:

CITY OF BIRMINGHAM
Attn: Ellen DeVie\n151 Martin Street
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 530-1869

CONTRACTOR
Kentwood Office Furniture, Inc.
40500 Grand River Ave.
Novi, MI 48375
(248) 442-4888

17. Any controversy or claim arising out of or relating to this Agreement, or the breach thereof, shall be settled either by commencement of a suit in Oakland County Circuit Court, the 48th District Court or by arbitration. If both parties elect to have the dispute resolved by arbitration, it shall be settled pursuant to Chapter 50 of the Revised Judicature Act for the State of Michigan and administered by the American Arbitration Association with one arbitrator being used, or three arbitrators in the event any party's claim exceeds $1,000,000. Each party shall bear its own costs and expenses and an equal share of the arbitrator's and administrative fees of arbitration. Such arbitration shall qualify as statutory arbitration pursuant to MCL§600.5001 et. seq., and the Oakland County Circuit Court or any court having jurisdiction shall render judgment upon the award of the arbitrator made pursuant to this Agreement. The laws of the State of Michigan shall govern this Agreement, and the arbitration shall take place in Oakland County, Michigan. In the event that the parties elect not to have the matter in dispute arbitrated, any dispute between the parties may be resolved by the filing of a suit in the Oakland County Circuit Court or the 48th District Court.

18. FAIR PROCUREMENT OPPORTUNITY: Procurement for the City of Birmingham will be handled in a manner providing fair opportunity for all businesses. This will be accomplished without abrogation or sacrifice of quality and as determined to be in the best interest of the City of Birmingham.

19. IRAN SANCTIONS ACT VENDOR CERTIFICATION FORM: The attached Iran Sanctions Act Vendor Certification Form must be completed and included with the sealed bid.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said parties have caused this Agreement to be executed as of the date and year above written.

WITNESSES: 

CONTRACTOR

By: Katie VanderVeen

Katie VanderVeen
Its: Business Development Designer

CITY OF BIRMINGHAM

By: Andrew M. Harris
Its: Mayor

By: J. Cherilynn Mynsberge
Its: City Clerk

Approved:

Mark H. Clemence, Chief of Police  
(Approved as to substance)

Timothy J. Corrier, City Attorney  
(Approved as to form)

Mark Gerber, Director of Finance  
(Approved as to financial obligation)

Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager  
(Approved as to substance)
ATTACHMENT B - BIDDER'S AGREEMENT

For POLICE DEPARTMENT CLERICAL FURNITURE 2018

In submitting this proposal, as herein described, the Contractor agrees that:

1. They have carefully examined the specifications, terms and Agreement of the Invitation to Bid and all other provisions of this document and understand the meaning, intent, and requirement of it.

2. They will enter into a written contract and furnish the item or items in the time specified in conformance with the specifications and conditions contained therein for the price quoted by the proponent on this proposal.

PREPARED BY
(Print Name)

TITLE

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

COMPANY

ADDRESS

NAME OF PARENT COMPANY

ADDRESS

DATE

DATE

DATE

DATE

DATE

DATE

E-MAIL ADDRESS

PHONE

PHONE

9/5/18

9/5/18

9/5/18

9/5/18

katie.vanderveen@kentwoodoffice.com

Kentwood Office

40500 Grand River Avenue
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>ALL STEEL PRODUCT #</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION - MUST BE ALL STEEL OR EQUIVALENT</th>
<th>TAG</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AFNLFTP-841 ALF04 8L52</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE TOP 84Wx18D LAM-TO SPAN 2 UNITS L1 CORE LAM OPTS LAM: CANYON</td>
<td>CFB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZEPHYR EDGE = LOFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AFNLFTP-721 ALF04 8L52</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE TOP 72Wx18D LAM-TO SPAN 2 UNITS L1 CORE LAM OPTS LAM: CANYON</td>
<td>CFB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZEPHYR EDGE = LOFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AFNLFTP-361 ALF04 8L</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE TOP 42Wx18D LAMINATE L1 CORE LAM OPTS LAM: CANYON</td>
<td>CFB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZEPHYR EDGE = LOFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TK05030WR ATD02</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL RACEWAY PNL FR-NO TOP TRIM 50Hx30W</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TK05036WR ATD02</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL RACEWAY PNL FR-NO TOP TRIM 50Hx36W</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TTDG5036T ATD02</td>
<td>TER TACKABLE ACOUSTIC TILE 50Hx30W GRD A FAB FAB: APPOINT CLR: MOREL</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TGK45036T ATD02</td>
<td>TER TACKABLE ACOUSTIC TILE 50Hx36W GRD A FAB FAB: APPOINT CLR: MOREL</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TK366PT ATD02</td>
<td>EXTENDED RADIUS TOP TRIM 66W P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TK330PT ATD02</td>
<td>RADIUS TOP TRIM 30W P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TK350L ATD02</td>
<td>L 90-DEGREE RADIUS CONNNKIT 50H BASE PNL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TK350E ATD02</td>
<td>E END TRIM RADIUS CONNNKIT 50H BASE PNL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TS3066S AWK01</td>
<td>PRIMARY 30DX66W FLAT EG LAM W/GROMMETS L1 CORE LAM OPTS LAM: CANYON</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZEPHYR EDGE: LOFT PLASTIC GROMMET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TS2442S AWK01</td>
<td>PRIMARY 240X42W FLAT EG LAM W/GROMMETS L1 CORE LAM OPTS LAM: CANYON</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZEPHYR EDGE: LOFT PLASTIC GROMMET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y62930PENP AWK01</td>
<td>PNL MNT 30X29-1/2H END SUP PNL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y62930FENP AWK01</td>
<td>FIRSTND 30X29-1/2H END SUP PNL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Z655C66 AWK01</td>
<td>54W EXTERNAL SUFT CHANNEL FOR 66W W/ S</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CBK29 AWK01</td>
<td>BRIDGE KIT 29-1/2H P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CS549 AWK01</td>
<td>FULL-HGT 29-1/2Hx54W MOD PNL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PF197-2331 APE01</td>
<td>ESSENTIALS SUPPORT PED BBF 28Hx22-7/8Dx15W INTEGRAL PULL</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT OMT CORE TO ORD KEY ALIKE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PM187-2331 APE01</td>
<td>ESSENTIALS MOBILE PED BBF 28Hx22-7/8Dx15W INTEGRAL PULL</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT OMT CORE TO ORD KEY ALIKE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UH6566FD AHDO1</td>
<td>UNIVERSAL 66&quot; HUTCH SQUARE FLIPPER DRAWER NO PULL</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT 2 CORES TO ORD KEY ALIKE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UHTB866 AHDO1</td>
<td>UNIVERSAL 66 TACKBOARD FOR UNIVERSAL 66W HUTCH</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT GRD A FABRIC FAB: APPOINT CLR: MOREL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A870824 AEA01</td>
<td>TASKLIGHT W/ELEC BALLAST FOR 24W CLR: NO COLOR CHOICE</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LKFE1SLV APE01</td>
<td>LOCK CORE KIT SILVER - 1 CORE 2 KEYS KEY NUMBER 115 QUANTITY 4</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TK03530WR ATD02</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL RACEWAY PANEL FRAME-NO TOP TRIM 35Hx30W</td>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TK03536WR ATD02</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL RACEWAY PANEL FRAME-NO TOP TRIM 35Hx36W</td>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TGK43030T ATD02</td>
<td>TER TACKABLE ACOUSTIC TILE 30Hx30W GRD A FABRIC FAB: APPOINT CLR: MOREL</td>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TGK43036T ATD02</td>
<td>TER TACKABLE ACOUSTIC TILE 30Hx36W GRD A FABRIC FAB: APPOINT CLR: MOREL</td>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TK366PT ATD02</td>
<td>EXTENDED RADIUS TOP TRIM 66W P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TK335E ATD02</td>
<td>E END TRIM RADIUS CONNNKIT 35H BASE PNL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TS3066S AWK01</td>
<td>PRIMARY 30DX66W FLAT EG LAM W/GROMMETS L1 CORE LAM OPTS LAM: CANYON</td>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZEPHYR EDG: LOFT PLASTIC GROMMET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BIDDER TO COMPLETE ALL BLANKS IN THIS DOCUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>PRODUCT #</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION - MUST BE GREAT OPENINGS OR EQUIVALENT</th>
<th>TAG</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T524425 AWK01</td>
<td>PRIMARY 24dx42W FLAT EG LAM W/GROMMETS L1 CORE LAM OPTS LAM: CANYON</td>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZEPHYR EDG: LOFT PLASTIC GROMMET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y62930PENP AWK01</td>
<td>PNL MNT30Dx29-1/2H END SUP PNL P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TPKPB1 AWK01</td>
<td>PEDESTAL-TO-PANEL BRACKET LH P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TPKPPR AWK01</td>
<td>PEDESTAL-TO-PANEL BRACKET RH P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT</td>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PF197-3031 APE01</td>
<td>ESSENTIALS SUPPORT PED BBF 28hx22-7/8dx15W INTEGRAL PULL</td>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT OMT CORE TO ORD KEY ALIKE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CSDC19 AAC01</td>
<td>CENTER DRAWER 19WX14-3/4Dx3H W/Lock Metal</td>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P1 PAINT OPS CLR: LOFT OMT CORE TO ORD KEY ALIKE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LKFE1SLV APE01</td>
<td>LOCK CORE KIT SILVER - 1 CORE 2 KEYS KEY NUMBER 116 QUANTITY 3</td>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LKFE1SLV APE01</td>
<td>LOCK CORE KIT SILVER - 1 CORE 2 KEYS KEY NUMBER 117 QUANTITY 3</td>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RG-1104</td>
<td>ESS LAT 36Wx64-1/4H 12&quot; R/O 4-12&quot; DRAWERS BEV PULL P1 PAINT OPS CLR:</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOFT OMT CORE TO ORD KEY ALIKE NOTE: TOP ROLLOUT SHELF W/RECESSED FLIPPER DOOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RG-1204</td>
<td>ESS LAT 42WX64-1/4H 12&quot; R/O 4-12&quot; DRAWERS BEV PULL P1 PAINT OPS CLR:</td>
<td>CFIR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOFT OMT CORE TO ORD KEY ALIKE NOTE: TOP ROLLOUT SHELF W/RECESSED FLIPPER DOOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LOCK CORE KIT - KEY 112</td>
<td>LOCK CORE KIT SILVER - 1 CORE 2 KEYS KEY NUMBER 112 QUANTITY 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CG-U7F3</td>
<td>ESSENTIALS 645-7/8Hx36Wx23-1/2D STORAGE CABINET BEVELED P1 PAINT OPS CLR:</td>
<td>PPBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOFT OMT CORE TO ORD KEY ALIKE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LOCK CORE KIT - KEY 113</td>
<td>LOCK CORE KIT SILVER - 1 CORE 2 KEYS KEY NUMBER 113 QUANTITY 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RG-C602</td>
<td>LAT FILE / 3 DRAWER 30WX18-1/4Dx39-7/8H AL-LOFT 3-DWR C-WT</td>
<td>SO/SL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RG-C741</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE 36WX18-1/4Dx39-7/8H W/ (2) BOX &amp; (2) FILE DRW</td>
<td>MB/FP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RG-CB06</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE 42WX18-1/4Dx39-7/8H W/ (6) BOX DRAWER</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RG-D205</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE 42WX18-1/4Dx39-7/8H W/ (8) BOX DRAWERS</td>
<td>OAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RG-D240</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE 42WX18-1/4Dx39-7/8H W/ (2) BOX &amp; (3) FILE DRAWERS</td>
<td>FNG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RG-C702</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE 3 DRAWER 36WX18-1/4Dx39-7/8H</td>
<td>CA/DS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RG-C841</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE 42WX18-1/4Dx39-7/8H W/ (2) BOX &amp; (2) FILE DRAWERS</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RG-C802</td>
<td>LATERAL FILE 42WX18-1/4Dx39-7/8H W (3) FILE DRAWERS</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LABOR</td>
<td>REMOVAL OF EXISTING FURNITURE LABOR (SATURDAY RATE)</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LABOR</td>
<td>RECEIVE, DELIVER, AND INSTALL (3) WORKSTATIONS, (16) LATERAL FILES</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEE NEXT PAGE FOR TAG CODES**

### PROJECT TIMELINE - ESTIMATED FURNITURE DELIVERY AND INSTALLATION DATE:

It is understood and agreed that all bids prices shall remain in effect for at least ninety (90) days from the date of bid opening to allow for the award of the bid.

**BIDDER'S SIGNATURE:**

**DATE:**

---

**SEE ATTACHED BILL OF MATERIAL**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAG CODE</th>
<th>FILE LOCATION AND STORAGE</th>
<th>FOR REFERENCE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>ARREST CARDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/DS</td>
<td>CA/DS</td>
<td>CITY ATTORNEY FILES / D-SHEETS &amp; FORMS FILES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFB</td>
<td>CFB</td>
<td>CENTER FILE BANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFIR</td>
<td>CFIR</td>
<td>CASE FILES INCIDENT REPORTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td>DRUGS AND GUNS FILES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNG</td>
<td>FNG</td>
<td>FINGERPRINT FILE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB/FP</td>
<td>MB/FP</td>
<td>METER BAGS / FINGERPRINTS FILE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAC</td>
<td>OAC</td>
<td>OLD ARREST CARDS FILE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES FILES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>PARKING PERMITS FILE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPBS</td>
<td>PPBS</td>
<td>PRISONER PROPERTY BIN AND HANGAR STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO/SL</td>
<td>SO/SL</td>
<td>SEX OFFENDER / STATE LAW WARRANTS FILES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>UNDER MILLWORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td>WORKSTATION 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td>WORKSTATION 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Quotation

**Prepared For:**
Ellen DeVie
City of Birmingham PD
151 Martin Street
Birmingham MI 48012
248-644-2567
edeview@bhamgov.org

**Prepared By:**
Katie VanderVeen
248 919 1971
katievanderveen@kentwoodoffice.com

**Quote Date:** 9/10/2018

**Project Name / Number:**
PD Clerical Furniture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Mfg</th>
<th>Part Number</th>
<th>Area/Section</th>
<th>Sell</th>
<th>Ext Sell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KOF</td>
<td>KA2310.2084L</td>
<td>A-Lat Tops</td>
<td>$97.13</td>
<td>$97.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+Work Surf, Sq-Edge Rect Lam 18D 84W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WA Wilsonart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LAM Canyon Zephyr 4842-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COLOR Loft Grey C600065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 No Grommet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KOF</td>
<td>KA2310.2072L</td>
<td>A-Lat Tops</td>
<td>$78.40</td>
<td>$78.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+Work Surf, Sq-Edge Rect Lam 18D 72W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WA Wilsonart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LAM Canyon Zephyr 4842-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COLOR Loft Grey C600062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 No Grommet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KOF</td>
<td>KA2310.2042L</td>
<td>A-Lat Tops</td>
<td>$53.73</td>
<td>$53.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+Work Surf, Sq-Edge Rect Lam 18D 42W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WA Wilsonart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LAM Canyon Zephyr 4842-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COLOR Loft Grey C600062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 No Grommet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total**
$229.26

| 4   | 2   | HON | HRVF5030P | B-Workstation 1 | $84.48 | $168.96 |
|     |     |     | Panel Frame 50H x 30W |             |      |         |
|     |     |     | $(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint |         |      |         |
|     |     |     | LOFT PAINT: Loft |         |      |         |

*Let's Get to Work.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Mfg</th>
<th>Part Number</th>
<th>Area/Section</th>
<th>Sell</th>
<th>Ext Sell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HRVF5036P</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$94.48</td>
<td>$94.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Panel Frame 50H x 36W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HRVT4530T</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$46.86</td>
<td>$187.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abound Fabric Tile 45H x 30W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(A) Gr A Fabric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.APN FABRIC: Appoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09 COLOR: Morel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HRVT4536T</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$54.45</td>
<td>$108.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abound Fabric Tile 45H x 36W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(A) Gr A Fabric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.APN FABRIC: Appoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09 COLOR: Morel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HRVTC66</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$30.36</td>
<td>$30.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abound Top Cap Trim 66&quot;W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HRVTC30</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$13.53</td>
<td>$13.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abound Top Cap Trim 30&quot;W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HRVC50PL</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$47.85</td>
<td>$47.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abound L Connector Painted 50&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HRVC50PF</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$29.04</td>
<td>$58.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abound Finished End Painted 50&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let's Get to Work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Mfg</th>
<th>Part Number</th>
<th>Area/Section</th>
<th>Sell</th>
<th>Ext Sell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HWR3066P</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$175.55</td>
<td>$353.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Systems Rectangular Worksurface Edgeband 30D x 66W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$L1STD</td>
<td>Grd L1 Standard Laminates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.K9</td>
<td>LAM: Canyon Zephyr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT</td>
<td>EDGE: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT</td>
<td>Grommet: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HWR2442P</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$120.78</td>
<td>$120.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Systems Rectangular Worksurface Edgeband 24D x 42W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$L1STD</td>
<td>Grd L1 Standard Laminates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.K9</td>
<td>LAM: Canyon Zephyr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT</td>
<td>EDGE: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT</td>
<td>Grommet: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HRVEP3629R</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$76.89</td>
<td>$76.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abound 29&quot;H x 30&quot;D Right End Panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$CORE</td>
<td>PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT</td>
<td>PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HSDEP3629F</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$67.98</td>
<td>$135.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30&quot;D End-Panel Supports: Freestanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$CORE</td>
<td>PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT</td>
<td>PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HLSLZ55C54</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$38.28</td>
<td>$38.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42&quot;W Exernal Stiffener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.P</td>
<td>Color: Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HSDBK29</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$61.05</td>
<td>$61.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.5&quot;H Bridge Kit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$CORE</td>
<td>PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT</td>
<td>PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HSDMP549</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$62.37</td>
<td>$62.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Hgt 29-1/2Hx54W Mod Pnl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$CORE</td>
<td>PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let's Get to Work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Mfg</th>
<th>Part Number</th>
<th>Area/Section</th>
<th>Sell</th>
<th>Ext Sell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HSDMP669</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$64.35</td>
<td>$64.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Hgt 29-1/2Hx66W Mod Pnl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HVFB23R</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$169.95</td>
<td>$169.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Box/Box/File 28H x 22 7/8D x 15W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L Lock: Lock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>H83723R</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$192.72</td>
<td>$192.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brigade Ped &quot;R&quot; Pull Mobile B/B/F 23&quot;D x 28&quot;H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L Lock: Lock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>H365566N</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$355.52</td>
<td>$355.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stack-on Full Clearance 13 1/2Dx86Wx34 3/4x25H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>H386515</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$200.76</td>
<td>$200.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38000 2 with 33w x 15h flipper doors w/ lock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X Omt 2 Cores to Order Key Alike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HT66ND</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$193.62</td>
<td>$193.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66 Tack Board for 66W Hutch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Gr A Fab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APN FABRIC: Appoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09 COLOR: Morel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line #</td>
<td>Qty</td>
<td>Mfg</td>
<td>Part Number</td>
<td>Area/Section</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Ext Sell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HH870924</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$70.29</td>
<td>$70.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tasklight 24W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HF23C</td>
<td>B-Workstation 1</td>
<td>$16.80</td>
<td>$67.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lock Core Replacement Kit Brushed Chrome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X103E</td>
<td>KEY NUMBER: 103E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,862.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HRVF3530P</td>
<td>C-Workstation 2</td>
<td>$75.24</td>
<td>$75.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Panel Frame 35H x 30W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HRVF3536P</td>
<td>C-Workstation 2</td>
<td>$76.89</td>
<td>$76.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Panel Frame 35H x 36W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HRVT3030T</td>
<td>C-Workstation 2</td>
<td>$33.33</td>
<td>$56.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abound Fabric Tile 30H x 30W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Gr A Fabric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APN FABRIC: Appoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09 COLOR: Morel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HRVT3036T</td>
<td>C-Workstation 2</td>
<td>$37.29</td>
<td>$74.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abound Fabric Tile 30H x 36W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Gr A Fabric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APN FABRIC: Appoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09 COLOR: Morel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HRVT56</td>
<td>C-Workstation 2</td>
<td>$30.36</td>
<td>$30.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abound Top Cap Trim 66&quot;W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Let's Get to Work.*

Grand Rapids | Detroit | Lansing | Jackson | Chicago | Indianapolis
KentwoodOffice.com | 1.877.698.6250
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Mfg</th>
<th>Part Number</th>
<th>Area/Section</th>
<th>Sell</th>
<th>Ext Sell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HRVC35PF</td>
<td>C-Workstation 2</td>
<td>$23.76</td>
<td>$47.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abound Finish End Painted 35°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HWR3066P</td>
<td>C-Workstation 2</td>
<td>$176.55</td>
<td>$353.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Systems Rectangular Worksurface Edgeband 30D x 66W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(L1STD) Grd L1 Standard Laminates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.K9 LAM: Canyon Zephyr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT EDGE: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT Grommet: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HWR2442P</td>
<td>C-Workstation 2</td>
<td>$120.78</td>
<td>$241.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Systems Rectangular Worksurface Edgeband 24D x 42W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(L1STD) Grd L1 Standard Laminates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.K9 LAM: Canyon Zephyr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT EDGE: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT Grommet: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HRVEP3029L</td>
<td>C-Workstation 2</td>
<td>$76.89</td>
<td>$153.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abound 29&quot;H x 30&quot;D Left End Panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HRVEP3029R</td>
<td>C-Workstation 2</td>
<td>$76.89</td>
<td>$153.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abound 29&quot;H x 30&quot;D Right End Panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HVFB23R</td>
<td>C-Workstation 2</td>
<td>$169.95</td>
<td>$379.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Box/Box/File 28H x 22 7/8D x 15W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.L Lock: Lock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line #</td>
<td>Qty</td>
<td>Mfg</td>
<td>Part Number</td>
<td>Area/Section</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Ext Sell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HD2</td>
<td>C-Workstation 2</td>
<td>$107.35</td>
<td>$214.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal Center Drawer 19W x 14D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S(CORE) PAINT: Select Core Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.LOFT PAINT: Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HHN831124</td>
<td>C-Workstation 2</td>
<td>$20.13</td>
<td>$40.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flat Bracket 24D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.S Color: Charcoal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HSLZ5SC54</td>
<td>C-Workstation 2</td>
<td>$38.28</td>
<td>$76.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42&quot;W External Stiffener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.P Color: Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HF23C</td>
<td>C-Workstation 2</td>
<td>$16.80</td>
<td>$50.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lock Core Replacement Kit Brushed Chrome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.X102E KEY NUMBER: 102E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>HF23C</td>
<td>C-Workstation 2</td>
<td>$16.80</td>
<td>$50.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lock Core Replacement Kit Brushed Chrome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.X101E KEY NUMBER: 101E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total: $2,385.61

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Mfg</th>
<th>Part Number</th>
<th>Area/Section</th>
<th>Sell</th>
<th>Ext Sell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>RG-1104</td>
<td>D-Filing</td>
<td>$585.71</td>
<td>$585.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recessed Lat File, 5 High, top roll-out shelf 36Wx17-3/8Dx84-1/8H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A <strong>Full Pull Square Front</strong>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0536 AL-Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W 5-Dwr c-wt. Factory Installed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~ No Selection Upgrade___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL <strong>LL Series Chrome-Nickel Scallop</strong>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UM KEY ALIKSpecify Key Plan on PO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>RG-1204</td>
<td>D-Filing</td>
<td>$603.90</td>
<td>$2,415.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recessed Lat File, 5 High, top roll-out shelf 42Wx17-3/8Dx64-1/8H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A <strong>Full Pull Square Front</strong>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0536 AL-Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W 5-Dwr c-wt. Factory Installed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line #</td>
<td>Qty</td>
<td>Mfg</td>
<td>Part Number</td>
<td>Area/Section</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Ext Sell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>Keys</td>
<td>D-Filing</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keys Locks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UM 112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>CG-U7F3</td>
<td>D-Filling</td>
<td>$789.61</td>
<td>$1,579.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36&quot;WX23 D2&quot;DX65 7/8&quot;HDouble Door Storage Cabinet 5 High, with 4 Adjustable Shelves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Full Pull Square Front</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0536 AL-Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~ Skip Option is Standard UM Series Lock-Flat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K KEY ALIKE Specify Key Plan on PO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>Keys</td>
<td>D-Filing</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keys Locks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UM 113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>RG-C602</td>
<td>D-Filing</td>
<td>$337.66</td>
<td>$675.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trace Lat File, 3 Drw, 30Wx18-1/4Dx39-7/8H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0536 AL-Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W 3-Dwr c-wt. Factory Installed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~ No Selection Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Full Pull Square Front</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL Chrome-Nickel Scalloped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>RG-C741</td>
<td>D-Filing</td>
<td>$406.49</td>
<td>$406.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lateral File 36&quot;WX18 1/4&quot;DX39 7/8&quot;H W/ (2) Box &amp; (2) File Drw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Full Pull Square Front</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0536 AL-Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W 3-Dwr c-wt. Factory Installed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~ No Selection Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL Chrome-Nickel Scalloped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~ No Selection of Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line #</td>
<td>Qty</td>
<td>Mfg</td>
<td>Part Number</td>
<td>Area/Section</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Ext Sell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>RG-C806</td>
<td>D-Filing</td>
<td>$512.99</td>
<td>$512.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lateral File 42&quot;Wx18 1/4&quot;Dx 39 7/8&quot;H W/ (6) Box Dwr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td><em>Full Pull Square Front</em>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0536</td>
<td>AL-Loft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3-Dwr c-wt. Factory Installed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~</td>
<td>No Selection Upgrade___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
<td><em>LL Series Chrome-Nickel Scalloped</em>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~</td>
<td>No Selection of Option</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>RG-D205</td>
<td>D-Filing</td>
<td>$638.96</td>
<td>$638.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lateral File 42&quot;Wx18 1/4&quot;Dx 51 3/8&quot;H W/ (8) Box Dwr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td><em>Full Pull Square Front</em>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0536</td>
<td>AL-Loft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4-Dwr c-wt. Factory Installed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~</td>
<td>No Selection Upgrade___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
<td><em>LL Series Chrome-Nickel Scalloped</em>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~</td>
<td>No Selection of Option</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>RG-D240</td>
<td>D-Filing</td>
<td>$536.36</td>
<td>$536.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lateral File 42&quot;Zx18 1/4&quot;Dx51 3/8&quot;H W/ (2) Box &amp; (3) File Dwr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td><em>Full Pull Square Front</em>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0536</td>
<td>AL-Loft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4-Dwr c-wt. Factory Installed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~</td>
<td>No Selection Upgrade___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
<td><em>LL Series Chrome-Nickel Scalloped</em>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~</td>
<td>No Selection of Option</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>RG-C702</td>
<td>D-Filing</td>
<td>$359.74</td>
<td>$719.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trace Lat File,3 Dwr,36Wx18-1/4Dx39-7/8H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0536</td>
<td>AL-Loft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3-Dwr c-wt. Factory Installed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~</td>
<td>No Selection Upgrade___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td><em>Full Pull Square Front</em>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>LL Chrome-Nickel Scalloped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line #</td>
<td>Qty</td>
<td>Mfg</td>
<td>Part Number</td>
<td>Area/Section</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Ext Sell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>RG-C841</td>
<td>D-Filing</td>
<td>$438.96</td>
<td>$877.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lateral File 42&quot;Wx18 1/4&quot;Dx39 7/8&quot;H W/ (2) Box &amp; (2) File Drw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Full Pull Square Front</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0536</td>
<td>AL-Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3-Dwr c-wt. Factory Installed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~</td>
<td>No Selection Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>LL Series Chrome-Nickel Scalloped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~</td>
<td>No Selection of Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>RG-C802</td>
<td>D-Filing</td>
<td>$438.96</td>
<td>$438.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trace Lat File .3 Drw, 42Wx18-1/4Dx39-7/8H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0536</td>
<td>AL-Loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3-Dwr c-wt. Factory Installed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~</td>
<td>No Selection Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Full Pull Square Front</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>LL Chrome-Nickel Scalloped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total: $9,387.01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Mfg</th>
<th>Part Number</th>
<th>Area/Section</th>
<th>Sell</th>
<th>Ext Sell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>Z-Freight</td>
<td>$255.11</td>
<td>$255.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Great Openings Freight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MRS</td>
<td>RDI</td>
<td>Z-Freight</td>
<td>$1,340.00</td>
<td>$1,340.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Receive, Deliver and Install-Overtime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MRS</td>
<td>Removal</td>
<td>Z-Freight</td>
<td>$315.00</td>
<td>$315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tear Down and Removal of Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total: $1,910.11

Grand Total: $16,774.43
ATTACHMENT D - IRAN SANCTIONS ACT VENDOR CERTIFICATION FORM
For "POLICE DEPARTMENT CLERICAL FURNITURE 2018"

Pursuant to Michigan law and the Iran Economic Sanctions Act, 2012 PA 517 ("Act"), prior to
the City accepting any bid or proposal, or entering into any contract for goods or services with
any prospective Vendor, the Vendor must certify that it is not an "Iran Linked Business", as
defined by the Act.

By completing this form, the Vendor certifies that it is not an "Iran Linked Business", as defined
by the Act and is in full compliance with all provisions of the Act and is legally eligible to submit
a bid for consideration by the City.

Katie Vander Veen 9/4/18
PREPARED BY DATE
(Print Name)

TITLE DATE

Katie Vander Veen Katievanderveen@kentwoodoffice.com
AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE E-MAIL ADDRESS

Kentwood Office Furniture, Inc.
COMPANY

40000 Grand River Avenue, Novi Mi 48375 248-919-1971
ADDRESS PHONE

NAME OF PARENT COMPANY PHONE

ADDRESS

38-3598290

TAXPAYER I.D.#
CONTRACTOR’S RESPONSIBILITIES See Responses Below

Each bidder shall provide the following as part of their proposal:

1. Complete and sign all forms requested for completion within this ITB. See Enclosed
   b. Cost Proposal (Attachment C - pp. 20-22) See Enclosed
   c. Iran Sanctions Act Vendor Certification Form (Attachment D - p. 23) See Enclosed
   d. Agreement (pp. 13-18 (only if selected by the City)). See Enclosed

Provide a description of completed projects that demonstrate the vendor’s ability to complete projects of similar scope, size, and purpose, and in a timely manner, and within budget.


Kemkrest, Brighton, MI 2018. HON Workstations. Details available upon request.

Magna Closures, Plymouth, MI 2017. Hon Workstations, Hon Seating, Private Offices, Common Areas. Details available upon request.

2. Provide a written plan detailing the anticipated timeline for completion of the tasks set forth in the Scope of Work (p. 10).

Furniture arrival in approx. 5-6 weeks following receipt of purchase order. Installation duration 1-2 full days.

3. The Contractor will be responsible for any changes necessary for the plans to be approved by the City of Birmingham.

4. Provide a description of the firm, including resumes and professional qualifications of the principals involved in administering the project.

   Resumes available upon request.

5. Provide a list of sub-contractors and their qualifications, if applicable.

   Marshalls, Installations, Jackson MI. References available upon request.

6. Provide three (3) client references from past projects, include current phone numbers. At least two (2) of the client references should be for projects utilizing the same materials included in the Contractor’s proposal.

   Charter Township of West Bloomfield. Pam Synch 248-151-1815
   Kemkrest. Brian Carter 248-587-1193
   Magna Closures. Nicole Randolph 734-582-2356

Let’s Get to Work.

Grand Rapids | Detroit | Lansing | Jackson | Chicago | Indianapolis
KentwoodOffice.com | 1.877.598.6250
7. The Contractor will be responsible for the disposal of all material and any damages which occur as a result of any of employees or subcontractors of the Contractor during this project.

8. The Contractor will be responsible for obtaining any associated permits at no cost to the Contractor.

9. Provide a project timeline addressing each section within the Scope of Work and a description of the overall project approach. Include a statement that the Contractor will be available according to the proposed timeline.

Furniture arrival in approx. 5-6 weeks following receipt of purchase order. Installation duration 1-2 full days. A project manager will be assigned upon award.
The City will receive $19,760 in Municipal Credits and $29,149 in Community Credits this year for a total of $48,909 under a program administered by the Suburban Mobility Authority for Regional Transportation (SMART). This is a $3,802 increase from the prior year. Municipal Credits are derived from money collected by the state, mainly from gasoline taxes, and distributed by SMART directly to local communities for transit needs. Community Credits are derived from taxes levied to support SMART. A share of these millage dollars collected by SMART is returned to communities to support or expand current transportation programs. Funds received under the Municipal Credits program must be spent within 2 years. Funds received under the Community Credits program must be spent within 3 years.

In addition, SMART has allocated an additional $1,901 in Community Credits for fiscal year 2018’s contract.

Last year the City received $45,107 in Municipal and Community Credits and allocated the entire amount in support of Next’s specialized transportation service. At the time, the City had sufficient funding from prior year SMART contracts to support its current plans for bus shelters. Those bus shelters have now been purchased and installed.

On September 17, 2018, the City Commission approved a new priority list for bus shelters. It is recommended that the City Commission allocated $21,932 (current cost of a bus shelter and installation) of Community Credits in support of these bus shelters. It is also recommended that the remaining funding of $26,977 ($19,760 in Municipal Credits and $7,217 in Community Credits) for fiscal year 2019 be allocated to Next in support of their transportation program. In addition, it is also recommended to allocate the additional $1,901 in fiscal year 2018 Community Credits to Next.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION: To approve $19,760 in Municipal Credits and $7,217 in Community Credits from fiscal year 2019 and $1,901 in Community Credits from fiscal year 2018 to Next in support of their specialized transportation program; to approve $21,932 in Community Credits from fiscal year 2019 to purchase and install a bus shelter (location to be determined); and further to direct the Mayor to sign the Municipal Credit and Community Credit contract for fiscal year 2019 and the amendment to the fiscal year 2018 contract on behalf of the City.
MUNICIPAL CREDIT and COMMUNITY CREDIT CONTRACT FOR FY2019

I, _____________________, as the __________________ of the City of Birmingham (hereinafter, the “Community”) hereby apply to SMART and agree to the terms and conditions herein, for the receipt and expenditure of Municipal Credits available for the period July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019 (Section 1 below), and Community Credits available for the period July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 (Section 2 below); and further agree that the Municipal and Community Credits Master Agreement between the parties is incorporated herein by reference. A description of the service the Community shall provide hereunder is set forth in Exhibit A, and the operating budget for that service is set forth in Exhibit B, both of which are attached hereto and incorporated herein.

1. The Community agrees to use $19,760.00 in Municipal Credit funds as follows:

(a) Transfer to __________________________ Funding of: $ ______________

(b) Van/Bus Operations
   (Including Charter and Taxi services)
   At the cost of: $ ______________

(c) Services Purchased from SMART
   (Including Tickets, Shuttle Services/Dial-a-Ride)
   At the cost of: $ ______________

(d) Services Purchased from Subcontractor
   (NAME OF SUBCONTRACTOR)
   (See attached Subcontractor Service Agreement)
   At the cost of: $ 19,760.00

Total $19,760.00

SMART intends to provide Municipal Credit funds under this contract to the extent funds for the program are made available to it by the Michigan Legislature pursuant to Michigan Public Act 51 of 1951. Municipal Credit funds made available to SMART through legislative appropriation are based on the State’s approved budget. In the event that revenue actually received is insufficient to support the Legislature’s appropriation, it will result in an equivalent reduction in funding provided to the Community pursuant to this Contract. In such event, SMART reserves the right, without notice, to reduce the payment of Municipal Credit funds by the amount of any reduction by the legislature to SMART. All Municipal Credit funding must be spent by June 30, 2020; all funds not spent by that date will revert back to SMART pursuant to Michigan Public Act 51 of 1951, for expenditure consistent with Michigan law and SMART policy.

2. The Community agrees to use $29,149.00 in Community Credit funds available as follows:

(a) Transfer to __________________________ Funding of: $ ______________

(b) Van/Bus Operations
   (Including Charter and Taxi services)
   At the cost of: $ ______________
(c) Services Purchased from SMART
   (Including Tickets, Shuttle Services/Dial-a-Ride) At the cost of: $ ______________

(d) Capital Purchases At the cost of: $ 21,932

(e) Services Purchased from Subcontractor At the cost of: $ 7,217
   (NAME OF SUBCONTRACTOR)
   (See attached Subcontractor Service Agreement)

Total $29,149.00

To the extent that this Contract calls for a payment of funds directly from SMART to a subcontractor, Community hereby acknowledges that it is the party entitled to receive such funds and is affirmatively authorizing and directing SMART to pay such funds directly to the subcontractor on its behalf. Capital purchases permitted with Community Credits are subject to applicable state and federal regulations, and SMART policy, including procurement guidelines. When advantageous, SMART may make procurements directly. Reimbursement for purchases made by Community requires submission of proper documentation to support the purchase (i.e. purchase orders, receiving reports, invoices, etc.). Community Credit dollars available in FY2019, may be required to serve local employer transportation needs per the coordination requirements set forth in the aforementioned Master Agreement. All Community Credit funds must be spent by June 30, 2021; any funds not spent by that date may revert back to SMART for expenditure consistent with SMART policy.

This agreement shall be binding once signed by both parties.

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM

By: _________________________________________
   Andrew M. Harris
   Mayor

Date ______________ Its: __________________________

SUBURBAN MOBILITY AUTHORITY FOR REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION

Date ______________ By: __________________________
   John C. Hertel
   General Manager
AMENDMENT TO THE MUNICIPAL CREDIT and COMMUNITY CREDIT CONTRACT FOR FY 2018

I, Andrew M. Harris, as the Mayor of the City of Birmingham (hereinafter, the “Community”) hereby apply to SMART and agree to the terms and conditions herein, for the receipt and expenditure of Community Credits available for the period July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2020; and further agree that the Municipal and Community Credits Master Agreement between the parties is incorporated herein by reference. A description of the service the Community shall provide hereunder is set forth in Exhibit A, and the operating budget for that service is set forth in Exhibit B, both of which are attached hereto and incorporated herein. This Amendment relates to January 2018 – June 2018 7.5% increase to community credits.

The Community agrees to use $1,901.00 in Community Credit funds available as follows:

(a) Transfer to ____________________________ Funding of: $ _____________

(b) Van/Bus Operations
    (Including Charter and Taxi services) At the cost of: $ _____________

(c) Services Purchased from SMART
    (Including Tickets, Shuttle Services/Dial-a-Ride) At the cost of: $ _____________

(d) Capital Purchases At the cost of: $ _____________

(e) Services Purchased from Subcontractor
    (NAME OF SUBCONTRACTOR) At the cost of: $ ___1,901.00___
    Next (See attached Subcontractor Service Agreement)

Total $1,901.00

To the extent that this Contract calls for a payment of funds directly from SMART to a subcontractor, Community hereby acknowledges that it is the party entitled to receive such funds and is affirmatively authorizing and directing SMART to pay such funds directly to the subcontractor on its behalf. Capital purchases permitted with Community Credits are subject to applicable state and federal regulations, and SMART policy, including procurement guidelines. When advantageous, SMART may make procurements directly. Reimbursement for purchases made by Community requires submission of proper documentation to support the purchase (i.e. purchase orders, receiving reports, invoices, etc.). Community Credit dollars available in FY 18, may be required to serve local employer transportation needs per the coordination requirements set forth in the aforementioned Master Agreement. All Community Credit funds must be spent by June 30, 2020; any funds not spent by that date may revert back to SMART for expenditure consistent with SMART policy.

This agreement shall be binding once signed by both parties.

SUBURBAN MOBILITY AUTHORITY FOR REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION
By: ____________________________
    John C. Hertel
Its: General Manager
Date: ____________________________

CITY OF BIRMINGHAM
By: ____________________________
    Andrew M. Harris
Its: Mayor
Date: ____________________________
EXHIBIT A

BIRMINGHAM PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Overall Project Description (Provide a descriptive narrative):
**Funding will be used to purchase and install a bus shelter.**

Service Area (Provide geographic boundaries):
**Location to be determined.**

Service Times (Provide days and hours of service):
**N/A**

Eligible User Groups (Users eligible to use the service):
**N/A**

Fare Structure: (Cost to use service)
**N/A**

Service Mode (Describe the amount and type of vehicles available, and whether they are wheelchair lift-equipped):
**N/A**
**EXHIBIT B**

**PROJECT OPERATING BUDGET**

Municipality: City of Birmingham

Contract Period: July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019

Account Number: 48206

**OPERATING EXPENSES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Fee: <em>(All employees other than drivers and dispatchers)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(10% max. of MC &amp; CC funds)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Wages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline &amp; Lubricants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts, Maintenance Supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic Wages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch Wages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other <em>(Specify)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total (Operating Expenses)</strong></td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PURCHASED SERVICE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxi Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART Bus Tickets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART Shuttle Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART Dial-A-Ride</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other <em>(Specify)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total (Purchased Service)</strong></td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAPITAL EQUIPMENT:**

*(Only list purchases to be made with Community Credits)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other <em>(Specify)</em> Bus Shelter</td>
<td>$21,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total (Capital Equipment)</strong></td>
<td>$21,932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENSES:**

Operating Expenses, Purchased Service, and Capital Equipment

**$21,932**
# EXHIBIT B, continued (Page 2)

**REVENUES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Credit Funds</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Credit Funds</td>
<td>$21,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Services Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Kind Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Fares (Contracted Service)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REVENUE:** $21,932

(Note: TOTAL EXPENSES must equal TOTAL REVENUE)
### Priority Locations for Enhanced Transit Stops – 08-05-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Stop ID</th>
<th>Routes</th>
<th>Bus Stop</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>2017 Ridership</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22059</td>
<td>460,780</td>
<td>E. Maple &amp; Coolidge Westbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11300</td>
<td>450,460, 780</td>
<td>W. Maple &amp; Old Woodward Eastbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>W. Maple &amp; Old Woodward Westbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>450,460</td>
<td>S Old Woodward &amp; Daines Northbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12082</td>
<td>445, 450,460</td>
<td>Woodward &amp; Bennaville Southbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10676</td>
<td>450,460</td>
<td>Bowers &amp; S. Old Woodward Northbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12099</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>W. Maple Rd &amp; Pleasant Eastbound</td>
<td>ARC 7/15/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10691</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>W Maple Rd &amp; Woodward Westbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23830</td>
<td>461,462</td>
<td>Woodward &amp; Maple Southbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Too soon for ridership figures</td>
<td>FAST stop (SMART offering to pay for shelter of different design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23829</td>
<td>461,462</td>
<td>Woodward &amp; Maple Northbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Too soon for ridership figures</td>
<td>FAST stop (may relocate)- Near shelter on Maple (SMART offering to pay for shelter of different design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>22375</td>
<td>415,420</td>
<td>14 Mile Rd &amp; Woodward Westbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: October 10, 2018

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: Joellen Haines, Assistant to the City Manager

SUBJECT: Michigan Municipal League Liability and Property Pool Board of Directors Election

The City of Birmingham is a member of the Michigan Municipal League Liability and Property Pool. The Michigan Municipal League is the state’s leading provider of municipal workers’ compensation and risk management services.

The Michigan Municipal League Liability and Property Pool is holding an election for this year’s Board of Directors. Two of the Board’s incumbent Directors have agreed to seek re-election. A brief biographical sketch of each candidate is attached for your review. The two incumbent Board members are:

Robert Clark, Mayor, City of Monroe
Paula Zelenko, Mayor, City of Burton

A resolution is required to authorize the City of Birmingham’s vote to be cast for the above persons to serve as Directors of the Michigan Municipal League Liability and Property Pool Board. These two incumbents are the only two candidates seeking re-election to this Board.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:

To authorize the City Manager to cast a vote, on the City’s behalf, for the two incumbent members of the Michigan Municipal League Liability and Property Pool Board of Directors for three year terms, beginning January 1, 2019.
Dear Pool Member:

Enclosed is your ballot for this year’s Board of Directors election. Two (2) incumbent Directors have agreed to seek re-election. You also may write in one or more candidates if you wish.

A brief biographical sketch of each candidate is provided for your review.

I hope you will affirm the work of the Nominating Committee by returning your completed ballot in the enclosed return envelope, no later than November 9. You may also submit your ballot online by going to www.mml.org. Click on Insurance, then Liability and Property Pool; the official ballot is located in the left navigation bar under Online Forms.

The MML Liability & Property Pool is owned and controlled by its members. Your comments and suggestions on how we can serve you better are very much appreciated. Thank you again for your membership in the Pool, and for participating in the election of your governing board.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Forster
Pool Administrator
Robert Clark, Mayor, City of Monroe

Robert has more than eight years experience as a municipal official, serving as the mayor in the City of Monroe since 2010. He is a member of the Michigan Association of Mayors. Robert retired as Major, Michigan State Police after thirty years of service. He is active in several local civic organizations, including the River Raisin National Battlefield Park Foundation and Monroe County Business Development Corporation. He also serves as First Vice-Chair for the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG). Robert is seeking re-election to his third term.

Paula Zelenko, Mayor, City of Burton

Paula has more than twenty-one years experience as a municipal official, serving as the mayor in the City of Burton since 2010. She was a member of the Burton city council from 1991 – 2000 and 2008 – 2010. From 2001 – 2006 Paula was the 50th District State Representative. She is active in several local civic organizations. Paula is seeking re-election to her third term.
DATE: September 26, 2018

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: Paul T. O’Meara, City Engineer

SUBJECT: 2018 Sewer Inspection Program
          Contract 9-18(SW)
          Contract Extension

At the meeting of June 25, 2018, the City Commission awarded Part 1 of Contract #9-18(S) to Doetsch Industrial Services, Inc. As explained in the attached memo, Doetsch was hired to take advantage of Michigan’s SAW Grant funds that the City has been awarded, enabling the City to internally inspect the majority of its sewer system. The SAW Grant allows 90% reimbursement of eligible expenditures up to $1,000,000. With award of parts 2 and 3, we will move into the second part of the grant, which reimburses expenses at 75%.

When the bids for this contract were prepared, the work was split up into three geographic areas. Since the work takes about 12 months to accomplish, bidders were asked to provide pricing for all three parts of the contract, with the understanding that only Part 1 would be awarded at the beginning. Bidders were advised that the successful bidder would be required to demonstrate that they are capable of conducting the inspections and providing the videos and written documentation for each sewer segment in a format that met the specifications of the contract. If the successful bidder demonstrated that they were not capable of meeting the contract specifications, then the City would have the option of rebidding the remaining parts of the contract and awarding it to another firm.

We are pleased to report that Doetsch has been very good to work with. The contractor currently has two independent crews working on various sewer segments five days a week, working on jetting and televising with an internal camera in the west sections of the City (primarily west of the Rouge River). Our sewer consultant Hubbell, Roth, & Clark, Inc. (HRC), is currently reviewing information that has been submitted from Part 1 inspections, and have found that it is consistently meeting the contract specifications.

The Engineering Dept. recommends that parts 2 and 3 of Contract 9-18(S) be awarded to Doetsch Industrial Services of Warren, MI, in the amount of 691,485.02, to be charged to account number 590-536.001-981.0100. Further, to approve the appropriation and budget amendment as follows:

Revenues:
- Draw from Net Position  590-000.000-400.0000 $120,371.25 (City share)
- State Grant  590-000.000-540.0000 $571,113.77 (Grant share)
- Total Revenues  $691,485.02

Expenses:
- Other Contractual Service  590-536.001-811.0000 $691,485.02 (Total contract)
September 26, 2018

City of Birmingham
151 Martin Street
P.O. Box 3001
Birmingham, MI 48012

Attn: Mr. Paul T. O’Meara, P.E., Director of Engineering

Re: City of Birmingham SAW Grant
2018 Sewer Inspection Program Contract #9-18(S)

Dear Mr. O’Meara:

On June 25, 2018, Part 1 of the subject project was awarded to Doetsch Environmental Services. Doetsch began work in August, provided a week of inspection data initially for review, and provided the remaining data to date on September 24, 2018. The data provided meets the requirements of the Specification and is easily integrated into the City’s GIS database.

The project was divided into three (3) parts; Part 1 was awarded to Doetsch initially. As of the date of this letter, Doetsch has completed just under half of the cleaning and televising included in Part 1, in accordance with the Specification. Based on their performance to date, including timely response to requests related to data format and clear communications regarding conditions in the field, we recommend the City award the remainder of the contract, Parts 2 and 3, to Doetsch Environmental Services.

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

HUBBELL, ROTH & CLARK, INC.

James J. Surhigh, P.E.
Associate

Helen Davis, PE
Project Engineer

Attachment

pc: HRC; M. MacDonald, K. Stickel, S. Duffy, File
Starting in 2013, the State of Michigan began awarding grants to eligible sewer system owners designed to encourage jurisdictions to make an effort to inspect and identify issues with public sewer systems, improve data and maps of the sewer systems, and finally, develop an asset management plan. The plan is intended to help the jurisdiction understand the needs of the sewer system, and to collect enough revenue to not only pay current expenses, but to develop an appropriate capital improvement program to keep the system solvent and operating adequately well into the future.

Grants known as SAW grants were awarded in three groups over three years, with Birmingham being named as an eligible system in 2016. The grant awarded to Birmingham totals about $1,614,000, with the City agreeing to match about $315,800 over three years. At the time of the grant kickoff, information about the program was forwarded to the Commission, although no formal action was taken at that time.

Since then, our consultant Hubbell, Roth, & Clark (HRC) has been assisting the City in moving through the process. The first large effort taken was with respect to collecting electronic data on the sewer system. Every manhole and catch basin is currently being located electronically, with satellite locating precision, to allow us to improve the accuracy of the sewer maps. Historical data relative to the sewer system has also been moved into a GIS mapping format for easier retrieval in the future. The largest expenditure planned in the SAW grant program is to hire an internal sewer inspection contractor, with the intention that they would clean and inspect with a camera all sewers in Birmingham’s system that are 20 or more years old, up to and including 48 inch pipe. This constitutes the vast majority of the system, and totals over 418,000 ft. of pipe. The work must be completed by August of 2019 in order to allow time for the data to be reviewed, and final Asset Management Plan prepared for submittal to the Michigan Dept. of Environmental Quality (MDEQ).

Given size of the contract, it was decided to split the work into three equal parts. Only Part 1 will be awarded at this time. The City will have the opportunity to fully review the quality and pace of the contractor’s work over the first half of Part 1. If the work is being executed as well as hoped, then staff would make a decision to award Parts 2 and 3 to the contractor as well. This would be done as a separate action approved later by the City Commission. If the contractor is not executing the work satisfactorily, then City staff would make the decision to have them finish the work started under Part 1, and then move to issue a new bidding document seeking bids on Parts 2 and 3.
On June 18, 2018, the Engineering Department opened bids on the above-referenced project. Seven (7) contractors submitted bids for this project. A bid summary is attached for your reference.

The low bidder was Taplin Group, LLC, with their base bid of $999,119.98. We have determined that Taplin Group recently acquired a company known as Terra Contracting, LLC. Terra was the contractor for a much smaller sewer cleaning and inspection contract bid by the City, contracted in 2011. That contract was valued at $65,200. Due to difficulties with timely and complete deliverables, that contract was not fully finished and closed out until 2013. A check on references regarding Taplin’s more recent performance still reveals similar problems of not being able to perform completely or timely.

The second low bidder was Doetsch Industrial Services, Inc., with their bid of $1,036,709.91. (The engineer’s estimate for this contract is $1,060,000.) The second low bid was $37,600 more than the low bid, or an increase of 3.8%. Doetsch Industrial Services, Inc. has a good track record with other clients. They are currently used on a regular basis by the Oakland Co. Water Resources Commissioner’s office, as one of only two contractors that they hire for these services.

Timely delivery will be an important factor on this contract. Once video inspections have been completed, and data is turned over to the City and our consultant, HRC, the analysis of this data will need to be done quickly in order to meet our SAW grant deadline of November, 2019. Given the small difference in overall cost, and the amount of money that could be spent on staff time due to extra effort if the contractor is not timely, staff recommends that the second to the low bidder be awarded the project at this time. It is important to note that the grant is anticipated to fund approximately $905,000 of the total cost of this contract. The City’s match is expected to be about $131,000, or less than 13% of the total cost.

While the contract will have work on virtually every street in the City, impact on adjacent residents will be minimal. The contractor will access sewers from manholes typically located in City streets. Traffic will generally be maintained when working on local streets. Work on major streets will be planned at times when traffic demand is lower. Sewers that must be accessed in backyards or private property will require 24 hour property owner notice in advance of the work.

As is required for all of the City’s construction projects, Doetsch Industrial Services has submitted a 5% bid security with their bid which will be forfeited if they do not provide the signed contracts, bonds and insurance required by the contract following the award by the City Commission.

It is recommended that Part 1 of the 2018 Sewer Inspection Program be awarded to Doetsch Industrial Services of Warren, MI in the amount of $345,224.89. All costs will be charged to the Sewer Fund, account number 590-536.001-981.0100.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:

To award the 2018 Sewer Inspection Program, to Doetsch Industrial Services of Warren, MI in the amount of $345,224.89 to be charged to account number 590-536.001-981.0100. Further, to approve the appropriation and budget amendment as follows:
Sewer Fund:

Revenues:
Draw from Net Position 590-000.000-400.0000 $ 34,522.49 (City share)
State Grant 590-000.000-540.0000 $310,702.40 (Grant share)
Total Revenues $345,224.89

Expenses:
Other Contractual Service 590-536.001-811.0000 $345,224.89 (Total contract)
## CITY OF BIRMINGHAM
### 2018 SEWER INSPECTION PROJECT
#### CONTRACT # 9-18 (S)
#### BID SUMMARY

June 18, 2018 - 2:00 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Addendums</th>
<th>5% Bid Security</th>
<th>Base Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAPLIN GROUP, LLC</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 999,119.98</td>
<td>$ 999,119.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOETSCH INDUSTRIAL SERVICES, INC.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 1,036,709.91</td>
<td>$ 1,036,709.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPETEK INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 1,104,916.55</td>
<td>$ 1,104,916.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversified Infrastructure Services, Inc.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 1,297,313.15</td>
<td>$ 1,297,313.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corby Energy Services</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 1,520,470.80</td>
<td>$ 1,520,470.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Resources LLC</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 1,586,134.75</td>
<td>$ 1,586,134.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.V.M. Utilities, INC</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 2,197,002.45</td>
<td>$ 2,197,002.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Corrected by the Engineer
Memorandum

To: Mr. Paul O’Meara

From: Helen Davis, PE, Project Engineer

Date: June 19, 2018

Subject: Review of References

On June 18, 2018, the City of Birmingham received bids for the subject contract. This project includes over 400,000 feet of sewer cleaning and televising, to be completed as part of the Stormwater, Asset Management, and Wastewater (SAW) grant.

Taplin Group was the as-read low bid and Doetsch Environmental Services was the next lowest bid. HRC contacted references for both contractors asking about each company’s use of GIS, the deliverables provided, and if timelines were met.

Each of the five references provided by Taplin were reached and below is a summary of the comments:

- Had issues during earlier phases of the program, since Steve Taplin re-purchased the company and the name changed from Terra to Taplin, experience has been better.
- Overall, has not seen much improvement since the change in ownership.
- Has had issues with the management team with changeover of project managers during the project.
- Having issues with Taplin on other projects that were not included on the reference sheet.
- Have not started this project yet. Had to follow-up for emergency contact information. Hired inspectors full time to monitor work.
- When Steve Taplin is involved more with projects, they seem to go better.
- Worked on several projects and has had very good experiences.
- Taplin’s work is very good, been using them for about 20 years now. Has history with their system and knows it well.
- There are challenging components to their system that two other companies said they could not clean, and Taplin successfully cleaned.
- They have worked with this contractor as Downunder, then Terra, and now Taplin and find them satisfactory.
- The large diameter crew from San Antonio is doing a good job on a project that was not referenced.
- Mentioned the large pipe crew being very good.
- One local CCTV operator and crew seem to work better.
- Has worked with them in San Antonio, were able to accomplish tasks done that he thought no other contractor could have done.
- Taplin sends GIS mapping changes as they go when they find a new manhole.
- The owner/engineer provides Taplin a shape file and everything is done electronically using Pipelogix.
- Deliverable with the defects mapped has not been provided yet, but is expected at the end of the project.
- Have received the deliverables quickly, have not received a file with the defects mapped in the past.
• Has had issues where pipe was damaged during cleaning.
• In the past, Taplin switched some manhole ID numbers.

Three of four references for Doetsch were reached and a message was left for the remaining reference. Below is a summary of the comments received as of today’s date:

• Great firm, easy to work with.
• Chesterfield was over a million dollars in CCTV.
• Receive reports and videos and put them into GIS manually for this project, no experience with the GIS extension.
• Provides Doetsch a database, they import into their program and provide a database back.
• Have hired them directly for other clients.
• Worked with Doetsch for over 25 years, they can get the job done.
• Go-to contractor, cannot say enough good things, no grief, good with public, reasonably priced, do not ask for extras.
• Have partnered with Doetsch in the past.
• Doetsch will get the project done on time and within the budget.

The City of Birmingham and HRC worked with Taplin Group when they were Terra Contracting on a project in 2011. While the CCTV work was completed in a timely manner, Terra had to return in 2013 to re-televise some segments where the video files were not completely readable. Delivery of acceptable videos and reports was a slow process due mainly to technical glitches with pipe inspection software. The contract was closed out in 2013.

We hope this information is helpful as the City selects a contract for the project.
DATE: October 8, 2018

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: Tiffany J. Gunter, Assistant City Manager

SUBJECT: Parking Garage – Sweeper Replacement

In an effort to maintain a pleasant environment and cleanliness of each of our parking garages, staff recommends the replacement of the existing sweeper that currently requires significant maintenance after each use and at times is inoperable.

The amount required for the purchase has been included in the current fiscal year budget. Two quotes have been obtained, which are described in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Purchase Price</th>
<th>General Warranty</th>
<th>Labor Warranty</th>
<th>Component Part Warranty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nilfisk, Inc</td>
<td>$43,911.71</td>
<td>4 Years</td>
<td>180 Days</td>
<td>8 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennant</td>
<td>$37,843.00</td>
<td>4 Years</td>
<td>180 Days</td>
<td>10 Years (500 Hours)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On October 3, 2018, the Advisory Parking Committee made a recommendation to select the Tennant quote, which is $6,000 less than the Nilfisk, Inc. quote due to a partnership agreement between Tennant and SP+.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:

To authorize the purchase of the Tennant Sweeper in the amount of $37,843.00. Funds are available in account #585-538.001-971.0100.
SP PLUS CORP
180 CHESTER ST
BIRMINGHAM, Michigan, 48009
Sarah Burton

Bruce Jones
Tennant Sales and Service Company
701 North Lilac Drive
Minneapolis, MN 55440-1452
800-553-8033

BUILT-IN “TENNANT VALUE” INCLUDES

50 hp (37 kW) 2.0 L @ 2300 RPMs Gas/LP Engine EPA Tier 3
24.8 hp (19 kW) 1.5 L Kubota Diesel EPA Tier 4i Engine @2300 RPMs
Catalytic muffler (G/LPG only)

Rugged construction:
- Steel T-beam frame and channel wrap around bumper
- Triple accessory pumps
- Oversized, industrial hydraulics and oil cooler
- 21 in (535 mm) Soft ride solid front tires
- 18 in (460 mm) Pneumatic rear tire on 3 wheel models
- 15.5 in (395 mm) foam-filled rear tires on 4 wheel model
- Head and Tail Lights

High-Capacity, Duramer™ Multi-Level Dump Hopper
- 14 ft³ (396 L) or 1080 lbs (490 kg) Usable Capacity
- 60-inch (152 cm) Variable Dump Height
- Thermo-Sentry™ Hopper Fire Sensor
- Locking Hopper Safety Arm

ErgoSpace™ Operator Compartment:
- Tilt Steering Wheel w/ Horn
- Adjustable Propel Pedal

XP and X4 Models include:
- 1-STEP™ Button Memory Controls (Sweeping)
- Built-In Maintenance Diagnostics w/ Service Reminder
- Deluxe Suspension Seat w/ retractable belt

Operator and Parts Manual
Underwriters Laboratory (UL®) Certification, G, LP, D

TENNANT COMPANY WARRANTY
4 YEARS OR 2800 HOURS - PARTS
6 MONTHS - LABOR
6 MONTHS - TRAVEL
10 YEARS OR 5000 HOURS ON DURAMERTM
CUSTOM Solution options will add at least one-week to st
SweepMax® Plus 3 stage air filtration and dust control
Stage 1: Perma-filter™
Stage 2: SweepMax Plus Cyclonic pre-filter
Stage 3: Nanofiber, surface loading cannister filter (no tool change)
  - 80 ft² (7.4 m²) Pleated Media
  - Nanofiber filtration of (up to) .5 micron particles @ 99% efficiency
II-Speed™ sweeping system
62.5 in (1590 mm) Sweeping path w/ single side broom
No tool brush change
Wet sweeping by-pass
Damage-resistant, spring loaded recirculation flap
S30 Touch-N-Go™ Operation Panel:
LCD Screen Display
Hour meter
Fuel Level Indicator
Water & Hydraulic Temperature Indicators
Clogged Filter Indicator
Battery Indicator
Low Oil Pressure/High Coolant Temp Shutdown (G/LPG only)
Glow plug indicator (Diesel)
Check engine indicator (G/LPG)
Hopper door open & closed indicator
Standard main brush (Select One)
Retractable standard side brush (Select One)

TANKS

Standard lead times.

Fax (quote only)
Mail (quote,il, specs)
Fax + Mail

Primary Use
Inside
Outside
## Description

### Stock Configurations (Note 1)

### Base Configuration

**Cleaning Type**
- S30 Gasoline (Petrol)

**Trim Level (Note 3)**

**UL Rating**
- UL® Type G,LP or D

### Packages
- Steel Hopper, Rear Tower Bumpers & Solid Front/Rear tires
- Left hand side brush & Rear Tower Bumpers
- Safety Light Package: Indoor
- Flashing light and A/V back-up alarm
- Strobe light, A/V back-up alarm, turn signal/brake light.
- Dry Dust Control (RH), HEPA Filter System
- Dry Dust Control (Dual), HEPA Filter System
- Cab, AC/Heater/Pressurizer, HEPA Cab Filter

### Cleaning Performance

### Machine Protection & Safety
- Cab Assembly
- Deluxe Seat (Upgrade for S30 Base Model)
- Tires, 3 Wheel Versions: S30 & S30XP
- Rear Tire, Solid Non Marking (in lieu of standard) (Note 9)
- Rear Tire, Foam Filled (in lieu of standard)

### Brushes

**Main Brush**
- Polypropylene & Wire Brush

**Side Sweep Brushes (Standard with Side Brush Assembly - Pick One)**
- Polypropylene

### Support (Note 10)
- Operator Manual G/LP (English)
- Parts Manual G/LP
- Operator DVD (English, Spanish, French) Verify Languages
- Machine Communication (Note IRIS)

**Packaging (Note 12)**
- Pad Wrap

### Custom Solutions

### AFTERMARKET ITEMS (ordered separately):

### Brushes (Replacements)

**Main Brush**

**Side Sweep Brushes (Standard with Side Brush Assembly - Pick One)**

### PrePaid Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Optional Accessories

*Optional Vac. Wand #325685  add $972
*Operator must get off machine to use vac wand. Designed for small debris/dust.

### Discounts

**SP Plus Agreement discount**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference #</th>
<th>Price Each</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Extended Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S30-G</td>
<td>$39,320.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$39,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9003863</td>
<td>$620.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$620.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9003833</td>
<td>$517.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325453</td>
<td>$267.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54925</td>
<td>N/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1027380</td>
<td>N/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9004080</td>
<td>N/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9004085</td>
<td>N/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9008178</td>
<td>N/C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>N/C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour/Month</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>“Financing rates do not&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE**:

*see note

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custom</th>
<th>0 $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Machine Subtotal** $40,724.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discount %</th>
<th>Discount $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>$(4,072.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$(4,072.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ot include Pre-Paid Service"
Select Tennant Program
Prepaid and Add
Subject to all applicable taxes

Quote Special Instructions:

Terms and Conditions
Ask your local sales rep for estimated lead times. Verify when placing order
All orders subject to acceptance by Tennant Sales and Service Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Prices subject to change without notice.
Terms: Net 30 days. Subject to any applicable taxes.
Freight: Machines and accessory orders delivered FOB shipping point Frt PPD & Add
Parts, supplies, detergents and floor treating material orders delivered FOB
shipping point Frt PPD
Tennant handles all loss and damage claims on behalf of customers.
All orders are subject to Tennant’s General Terms and Conditions available at http://www.tennantco
Printed General Terms and Conditions are also available upon request.

Order Placement Information: To place your order,
call or fax to the numbers listed below. Customer
If information is missing, orders will be entered and he

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Number</th>
<th>0004658031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Who Owns the Machine? (Sold-To Info) (Please Verify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>SP PLUS CORP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>180 CHESTER ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BIRMINGHAM, Michigan, 48009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Sarah Burton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>248-540-9690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where is the Machine Being Shipped? (Ship-To Info) (Please Verify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>SP PLUS CORP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>180 CHESTER ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BIRMINGHAM, Michigan, 48009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Sarah Burton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>248-540-9690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shipping / Carrier Instructions:

0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,191.00</td>
<td>$1,191.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discount Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(4,072.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MACHINE TOTAL**

$37,843.00

---

Quote Date: 5/10/2018

fill in PO# and customer signatures, Purchase Order is required. Id until all information is received.

Cust Grp 3

Order Special Instructions:
This goes to "My Documents"
Customer Purchase Order No.
(please attach copy)

Tax Exempt
If Yes, attach a copy of your exemption certificate.

Requested Delivery Date

Authorized Buyer (please print)

Authorized Buyer Signature

Bruce Jones
Tennant Representative
10/4/18

Tiffany Gunter
Assistant City Manager, City of Birmingham
151 Martin Street
Birmingham, MI 48009

RE: Parking Garage-Sweeper Replacement

Dear Tiffany,

In order to maintain the cleanliness of the 5 city parking structures, staff recommends the replacement of the existing sweeper that currently requires continuous maintenance.

Staff recommends the purchase of the Tennant Sweeper in the total of $37,843.00, which includes a discount of $4,072.00 due to a partnership agreement between Tennant and SP+. Even though the city will be purchasing the sweeper directly, they still will get the discount per the SP+ relationship.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sarah Burton
Senior Facility Manager

p: 248-540-9690
c: 734-771-8049
e: sburton@spplus.com
180 Chester, Birmingham, MI 48009
MEMORANDUM

Department of Public Services

DATE:         September 27, 2018

TO:           Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM:         Lauren A. Wood, Director of Public Services

SUBJECT:      Vehicle #227 Replacement

City vehicle #227 is a 2006 GMC Sierra 2500 HD 4x4 pickup used extensively by DPS for snow removal and salting, as well as other functions. Due to its age and condition, the Department of Public Services recommends replacement, as indicated by the evaluation score below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1 point each year of age</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles/Hours</td>
<td>1 point each 10,000 miles of usage</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Service</td>
<td>Type 4 – Any vehicle involved in snow/ice removal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Level 2 – In shop 1 time within 3 month period; 1 breakdown/road call within 3 month period</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; R Costs</td>
<td>Level 2 – Maintenance costs are 21-40% of replacement costs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Level 4 – Previous accident damage, poor paint and body condition, rust (holes), bad interior (tears, rips, cracked dash), major damage from add-on equipment, and 1 drive train component bad</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL POINTS 28+, **POOR** – Needs priority replacement 31

This vehicle regularly endures extreme operating conditions, and is subject to premature corrosion because of its exposure to road salt. Recently, the driver-side floorboard rotted through, presenting a significant safety concern. Thus, despite not being listed in the 2018-19 replacement schedule, DPS recommends prioritizing its replacement.

The Department of Public Services recommends replacing this vehicle with a new 2018 GMC Sierra 2500 HD pickup truck through the Oakland County cooperative purchasing contract #5222 – awarded to Todd Wenzel Buick GMC, located in Westland, MI for a total expenditure of $36,838.00, which includes the cost of a dealer-installed snow plow package. Funds for this purchase are available in the Auto Equipment Fund, account #641-441.006.971.0100.

Upon delivery – expected within 1-2 weeks - the old vehicle will be stripped of any transferrable equipment and will be listed on the Michigan Inter-Governmental Trade Network for public auction.

**SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:**
To approve the purchase of one (1) new 2018 GMC Sierra 2500 HD from Todd Wenzel Buick GMC through the Oakland County cooperative purchasing contract #5222 in the amount of $36,838.00 from account #641-441.006.971.0100.
Each year, the City conducts an annual sidewalk inspection program in a designated area of the City. During the past winter, sidewalks were inspected in the area east of Adams Rd. and north of Maple Rd. Written standards are used to designate which sidewalks need to be repaired using one of two methods:

1. Traditional concrete removal and replacement, for cracked or surface damaged sidewalk, or when a raised sidewalk creates a trip hazard that measures in excess of 1.5 inches in height.
2. Sidewalk sawcutting services, for raised sidewalk creating a trip hazard that measures 0.5 to 1.5 inches in height.

This year, the City hired Precision Concrete Cutting to conduct its patented program of sawcutting trip hazards that result in a smooth transition from one sidewalk flag to the next. In January, the City’s sidewalk inspector identified over 700 locations within the program area where the services of Precision Concrete Cutting would be beneficial. Based on that information, the above contract was put together, and the attached contract award was approved at a total cost of $48,000.

The contractor arrived in Birmingham in early July with three teams of sawcutters, with the goal of completing the entire project area within two work weeks. Since our field team was fully engaged in other projects at the time, a junior inspector was assigned the task of marking the locations for work ahead of the contractor, using the criteria that had been specified.

After three days of sawcutting, the contractor’s on-site manager contacted our office, indicating that the amount of work they were doing was adding up to more than what had been planned. At that time, they were anticipating that the total cost would result in an increase of about $12,000. It was presumed that the additional locations would reduce the total amount of work required of the traditional remove and replace concrete contractor, who had not yet arrived to the job. Since the sawcutting option is about 50% less than removal and replacement, they were instructed to proceed with this understanding.

After about 2.5 weeks, the contractor completed their work. An invoice was received indicating that the total value of the contract was measured at $82,173.60, an increase of $34,173.60. By the time the invoice was received, the City’s regular sidewalk contractor was beginning their work in the same area. I directed the staff to complete a full investigation to determine:
1. If the quantity indicated by Precision Concrete Cutting was accurate.
2. If the locations worked on were appropriate and justified.
3. If the locations worked on would result in a substantial reduction in the workload to be completed by our sidewalk contractor.

At the end of the investigation, the following was determined:

1. The quantity reported by Precision Concrete Cutting was accurate.
2. The work locations completed by Precision were justified to the extent that their method does not allow sawing of sidewalk unless there is truly a trip hazard.
3. The sawing work did indeed remove locations that would have been removed and replaced by traditional sidewalk removal and replacement methods. As a result, $12,983 was saved, meaning that the total cost to the City for this work between the two contracts is an increase of $21,190.

Other factors that can be attributed to the additional final work list includes:

1. Concrete sidewalk conditions change with the seasons. Sidewalks can shift up and down based on the amount of frost in the ground. While we try to conduct sidewalk surveys in the autumn of the year before to help avoid this problem, a lot of the survey work was done during freezing temperatures. Changing temperature conditions appear to have created additional work locations that had to be addressed.
2. The inspector that did the original survey was not the same inspector that marked locations for the contractor just before the work was done. Different inspectors can interpret locations differently, even though the designated criteria was the same.

To summarize, the total amount of sidewalk sections needing repair increased from what was originally forecasted, resulting in a total increase in cost of $21,190, out of a total authorized amount between the two contracts of $143,770. The increase in work represents an increase of less than 15%. The increased cost must be directed to the sawcutting contractor, Precision Concrete Cutting, therefore, an increase in the authorized expenditure for this contract of $34,174 is recommended.

SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION:

To authorize an increase in the authorized amount for the 2018 Sidewalk Trip Elimination Program, Contract #6-18(SW), to Precision Concrete Cutting, Inc., in the amount of $34,174, to be charged to the Sidewalk Fund, account number 101-444.001-981.0100.
## INVOICE Summary

**Invoice:** 180702  
**Date:** 07/16/18

### Work Completed:

**14-Jul-18**

**Job Site:** City of Birmingham  
**Bill to:** City of Birmingham  
**Remit to:** Precision Concrete, Inc.

**Supplier Number:**

**Job Site:**  
**City of Birmingham**  
**Job Site:**  
**Select Sites, see locations below**  
**Bill to:** City of Birmingham  
**Remit to:** City of Birmingham

**Work Completed:**

**14-Jul-18**

**Phone:** (248) 530-1840  
**Fax:** (616) 582-5951

**Email:** pomeara@bhamgov.org

### Cost Per Linear Foot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job No. (Area)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>RR (Remove and Replace) or out of scope</th>
<th># of Trip Hazards Cut</th>
<th>Linear Feet</th>
<th>Inch Feet</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Derby Rd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>583.0</td>
<td>261.69</td>
<td>$6,996.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pembroke Rd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>845.0</td>
<td>355.53</td>
<td>$10,140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Manchester Rd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>344.0</td>
<td>148.97</td>
<td>$4,128.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Windemere Rd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>231.5</td>
<td>109.56</td>
<td>$2,778.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Graefield Rd, Graefield Ct and N Eton St</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>428.5</td>
<td>182.31</td>
<td>$5,142.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Buckingham Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1075.0</td>
<td>495.50</td>
<td>$12,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dorchester Rd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1252.5</td>
<td>600.13</td>
<td>$15,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yorkshire Rd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1426.8</td>
<td>594.79</td>
<td>$17,121.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>E Maple Rd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>394.5</td>
<td>184.34</td>
<td>$4,734.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Coolidge Hwy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>222.0</td>
<td>115.84</td>
<td>$2,664.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>E Lincoln St - cuts added by City outside of initial work area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>20.44</td>
<td>$540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>6,847.8</td>
<td>$82,173.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost:** $12.00

### Terms:

Net 15

**Project Name:** Sidewalk Trip Hazard Removal 2018

**Notes:** This invoice is for work completed by Precision Concrete Cutting (PCC) based on the April 24, 2018 proposal as accepted by Paul O'Meara.

*Work was performed July 2, 2018 thru July 14, 2018.*

*Additional scope approved by Paul O'Meara on July 10, 2018 to complete all areas marked by City.*

*PCC removed the trip hazards within specification making a slope according to customer specifications for the specified Areas or Jobs.*

*All concrete has been cut to a neat and uniform finish.*

*Each trip hazard has been cut at a "0" point of differential (0 inch vertical height delta)*

*Each trip hazard has been completely cut all the way to the edges of the walkway (sod and temporary patches removed)*

*All areas around cuts including walkways, grass, and landscaping left clean.*

*Itemized invoicing (Invoice Detail) per cut is attached for your audit.*

**APPROVALS** (acceptance of work completed):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precision Concrete, Inc.</th>
<th>Customer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Sarah Temple</td>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position: Project Coordinator</td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Signature:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Form: INVOICE 180702 for City of Birmingham

Summary
As you know, each year the Engineering Dept. inspects all public sidewalks in a designated section of the City, documenting all defects that could be considered a trip hazard. A larger “residential” section of the City is inspected on a seven year rotating cycle, and a smaller “commercial” section of the Central Business District is inspected on a four year rotating cycle. Once a list of defects has been prepared, the City then issues a concrete repair program contract. The contract involves hiring a concrete contractor that can address several needs throughout the City such as:

1. Removing and replacing defective sections of sidewalk.
2. Removing and replacing defective concrete road sections, primarily repairing the road from utility trench damage, as well as other damages such as water main breaks.

More recently, the concrete contract has also addressed other needs, such as:

1. Construction of special projects, such as those recommended by the Multi-Modal Transportation Board.
2. Installation of handicap ramps needed to keep the cape seal program in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
3. Improved maintenance of the streetscape in the Central Business District, such as installing clear sealer on exposed aggregate sidewalks, or replacing caulk in joints.

As various new processes and equipment becomes available, the Engineering Dept. has attempted to simplify the construction process by varying the requirements for smaller, simpler defects. Most notable are those conditions where the sidewalk is not cracked, but has been heaved relative to the sidewalk next to it, causing a trip hazard. Instead of removing and replacing the concrete, a process that involves several steps, newer equipment allows other potentially simpler means to do this work. Other methods include grinding off the concrete surface that is now too high, sawing it off with a horizontal saw, or pushing the lower section up by pumping grout underneath it. Understanding that concrete grinding is the most common method currently being used to remove the surface of concrete, starting in 2015, we added a new pay item to our contracts requiring that the concrete contractor reduce the amount of concrete being removed, and instead fixing simpler defects through concrete grinding.

While there has been a cost advantage to this initiative, overall we have seen mixed results, depending on the contractor. Concrete contractors are typically not set up to conduct this type
of work, as it is not in their area of expertise. Achieving the consistent level of quality on the finished product that we need has been difficult. In the 2017 concrete contract, the contractor attempted to complete the concrete grinding portion of the contract using recently bought equipment. The quality of the results was not acceptable, and we had to ask them to stop. Having been introduced to a contractor that specializes in the area of horizontal sawing such defects using a patented system, a free demonstration was set up. The specialty contractor is known as Precision Concrete Cutting, Inc. Both the City and the concrete contractor were very impressed with the results, and they were able to be hired as a subcontractor to get the “grinding” portion of the work done to specs, at no additional cost to the City. Further, the work, which involved over 900 individual locations, was done remarkably quick (in less than three weeks).

As a result of these impressive results, staff considered the feasibility of bidding a separate contract for sawcutting services. However, we understand that the system that Precision Concrete Cutting has developed is patented, and that there would be no other contractors that compete specifically with their system. Knowing that there are other ways to address trip hazards other than sawing, such as grinding, raising sidewalk by pumping grout, or simply removing and replacing the concrete, we strove to create a bidding document that would be more open to any methodology. To achieve this, rather than issuing a traditional contract document that narrowed the scope of potential methods, a Request for Proposals (RFP) document was prepared. The RFP was identified as “Sidewalk Trip Elimination Services, Contract #6-18(SW).” In this document, the desired scope of work was clarified, but the method used to achieve the results was left open to any that bidders may suggest. The document reserved the right of the City to choose the methodology that the City deemed to be best, considering not only total cost, but quality of product, disruption to the adjacent property owners, and staff time required to monitor the work.

The area selected for the focus of this contract is known as Sidewalk Area 8, the same area that was inspected for traditional sidewalk repairs, or specifically, the area north of Maple Rd., and east of Adams Rd. In this area, about 715 locations were identified as being good candidates for this work, adding up to a total of 4,000 linear feet.

The RFP was advertised using the Michigan Intergovernmental Trade Network (MITN), the statewide bidding program being used by the majority of public agencies and contractors to disseminate information about construction bids. Bids were opened on April 24, 2018. A summary of the bid results is attached.

Only one bid was received from this solicitation, that being Precision Concrete Cutting, of Holland, MI, with their bid of $48,000. Having not bid a project of this nature before, and not knowing what work would be authorized, an Engineer’s estimate was not established. However, the unit rate of $12 per foot is within the expected cost range for this type of work. Having worked with Precision Concrete Cutting as a subcontractor, and knowing that the process they use not only saves money, but greatly reduces staff time and neighborhood disruption, we are excited to hire this company directly for this type of work. If the City attempted to repair over 700 trip hazards using conventional concrete replacement, the cost would be approximately double, meaning that the City is saving about $50,000 just in contract costs. Additional savings in staff time and effort will also be realized.
A suggested resolution follows. Given the funds already authorized for the traditional sidewalk program is using the majority of the current funding available in this account, a budget amendment for this account will be required as included below in the suggested resolution.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:

To award the 2018 Sidewalk Trip Hazard Elimination Program, Contract #6-18(SW) to Precision Concrete, Inc., in the amount of $48,000.00, to be charged to the Sidewalk Fund, account number 101-444.001-981.0100, contingent upon execution of the agreement and meeting all insurance requirements. Further, to approve an amendment to the 2017-18 Fiscal Year Budget as follows:

Sidewalk Fund
Revenues:
Draw from Fund Balance #101-000.000-400.0000 $48,000
Total Revenue Adjustments $48,000

Expenditures:
Public Improvements #101-444.001-981.0100 $48,000
Total Expenditure Adjustments $48,000
MEMORANDUM

Engineering Department

DATE:   April 13, 2018
TO:   Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager
FROM:  Paul T. O’Meara, City Engineer
SUBJECT: 2018 Concrete Sidewalk Repair Program – Contract 2-18(SW)
Contract Award

On April 12, 2018, the Engineering Department opened bids on the above referenced project. A summary of the bid results is attached.

Five (5) companies submitted bids for this project. The low bidder was Italia Construction, Inc., of Washington Twp., with their bid of $732,129.00. The Engineer’s estimate was $812,000. Italia Construction was hired by the City to complete the 2017 project, which was similar in nature, although larger in scope. Italia proved themselves capable of completing the work, and were very flexible as the work needed to be added to or modified. The same management team is planned for this year, and we are confident that they are qualified to perform satisfactorily on this contract.

This year’s sidewalk replacement program focuses on Area 8 (north of Maple Rd. and east of Adams Rd.) and the southeast quarter of the Central Business District, as shown on the attached map. Work planned in the CBD will be limited in scope given the current Old Woodward Ave. work currently underway.

This contract also includes a large number of scattered concrete repairs throughout the city, some of which include:

1. Sidewalk, curb, and/or pavement repairs where sewer and/or water services have been installed (to new houses) or upgraded.
2. Repairs where excavation to repair water main breaks have damaged driveways, sidewalks, curb, and/or pavement.
3. A small amount of concrete slab replacement on both major & local streets where the existing slabs are fractured.
4. Curb replacement that are damaged or are deteriorating.

A map showing the locations of the scattered concrete repairs is attached for your information.
Other work of interest added to the job for this year include:

1. Handicap ramps on streets planned for cape sealing, to be reimbursed as a part of the proposed special assessment district. As required by federal rules, ramps will be installed throughout a large portion of the Quarton Lake Subdivision (see attached map).

2. Pedestrian islands for improved crosswalks on W. Maple Rd., located at the Lakepark Ave. intersection, and east of Hawthorne Rd.

3. Pedestrian and bicycle improvements Oakland Ave., east of Woodward Ave.

4. Sidewalk improvements at the southwest corner of Woodward Ave. & Quarton Rd.

The estimated distribution of costs for this project will be assigned as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Sidewalk</td>
<td>101-444.001-981.0100</td>
<td>$224,717.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Streets Fund</td>
<td>202-449.001-981.0100</td>
<td>$181,891.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets Fund</td>
<td>203-449.001-981.0100</td>
<td>$27,495.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets (Cape Seal Program)</td>
<td>203-449.001-937.0400</td>
<td>$130,580.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Fund</td>
<td>590-536.001-811.0000</td>
<td>$51,565.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Main Fund</td>
<td>591-537.001-811.0000</td>
<td>$40,380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Service Fund</td>
<td>591-537.005-811.0000</td>
<td>$57,840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley Maintenance</td>
<td>101-444.002-981.0100</td>
<td>$17,660.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$732,129.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the bid amounts exceed budgeted amounts for certain accounts, a budget amendment for those accounts will be required as included below in the suggested resolution.

**SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:**

To award the 2018 Concrete Sidewalk Repair Program, Contract #2-18(SW) to Italia Construction, Inc., in the amount of $732,129.00, to be charged to the various accounts as detailed in the report; and further to approve the appropriations and budget amendments to the 2017-2018 budget as follows:

**Major Street Fund**

Revenues:
- Draw from Fund Balance #202-000.000-400.0000 $47,000
- Total Revenue Adjustments $47,000

Expenditures:
- Public Improvements #202-449.001-981.0100 $47,000
- Total Expenditure Adjustments $47,000
**Local Street Fund**

Revenues:
- Draw from Fund Balance #203-000.000-400.0000 $ 2,500
  
  **Total Revenue Adjustments** $ 2,500

Expenditures:
- Public Improvement #203-449.001-981.0100 $ 2,500
  
  **Total Expenditure Adjustments** $ 2,500

**Water Fund**

Revenues:
- Draw from net position #591-000.000-400.0000 $ 12,200
  
  **Total Revenue Adjustments** $ 12,200

Expenditures:
- Other Contractual Services-Water Mains #591-537.004-811.0000 $ 12,200
  
  **Total Expenditure Adjustments** $ 12,200
Disclaimer: The information provided by this program has been compiled from recorded deeds, plats, taxmaps, surveys, and other public records and data. It is not a legally recorded map or survey. The data provided hereon may be inaccurate or out of date and any person or entity who relies on said information for any purpose whatsoever does so at his or her own risk.

Data Sources: Oakland County GIS Utility, City of Birmingham

1 inch = 500 feet
DATE: October 8, 2018

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: Tiffany J. Gunter, Assistant City Manager

SUBJECT: Lot 12 Parking Count Survey

SP+ was asked to observe utilization of parking spaces in the newly constructed Lot 12. The observation period took place from September 13 through September 28, 2018. The results are attached to this memo.

SP+ has sold the total authorized number of passes (150). Despite the sales on record, we have observed no more than 11 cars parking in the lot daily. These passes are sold quarterly. The Advisory Parking Committee met October 3, 2018 to discuss the findings and recommends that the City increase the number of permits to be sold on Lot 12 by another 75 for the upcoming quarter. There was shared concern that with the existing waitlist for parking that having a lot in downtown Birmingham that is virtually empty is unacceptable. The committee did agree that the City should monitor usage closely to evaluate the effect of this incremental increase of permits on a quarterly basis.

Staff will continue to observe utilization patterns to manage the oversell rates consistent with actual usage.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:

To accept the recommendation of the Advisory Parking Committee to authorize an additional 75 parking permits for Lot 12 located at the southeast corner of Woodward and Maple Road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>10a</th>
<th>11a</th>
<th>12p</th>
<th>1p</th>
<th>2p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 13, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 14, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 19, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 20, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 21, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 25, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 26, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 27, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 28, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the official Election Commission for the City of Birmingham, election law requires the City Commission to appoint at least three election inspectors and at least one election inspector from each major political party for each precinct. Under MCL 168.16 only the Republican and Democratic parties qualify as a “major party”.

The deadline to appoint election inspectors for the November 6, 2018 General Election is October 16, 2018. Attached is a list of inspectors that have been assigned to serve for the November 6, 2018 General Election.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:
Resolution approving the appointment of election inspectors, absentee voter counting board inspectors, receiving board inspectors and other election officials as recommended by the City Clerk for the November 6, 2018 General Election pursuant to MCL 168.674(1) and granting the City Clerk authority to make emergency appointments of qualified candidates should circumstances warrant to maintain adequate staffing in the various precincts, counting boards and receiving boards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRECINCT</th>
<th>SERVING AS:</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>PARTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Stoessel</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Bender</td>
<td>Alec R.</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Brunhofer</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>DeGraff</td>
<td>Drieka</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Foerster</td>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Pobst</td>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Saylor</td>
<td>Annette L.</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Schlie</td>
<td>Maryann</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Stoessel</td>
<td>Mary Lee</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Baukamp</td>
<td>Marianne</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Cadd</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Cin</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Darmody</td>
<td>Suann</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Dreer</td>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Guilmet</td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Roush-Logue</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Woodward</td>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Super-Chair</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>Webb</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Connery</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Flynn</td>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Gonzalez</td>
<td>Maria A.</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Guevara, Jr.</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Stenzel</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Number</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Wandyez</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Faudman</td>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student Inspector</td>
<td>Trimble</td>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Meredith</td>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Lundal</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Rogowski</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Romanelli</td>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Swain</td>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Tate</td>
<td>Taneka</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Tresh</td>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Conyers</td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Mallon</td>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Corcoran</td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>INSPECTOR</td>
<td>Cwikiel-Glavin</td>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Duff</td>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Goodwin</td>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Gemmell</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Burns</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Gabler</td>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Hoff</td>
<td>Rackeline</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>O’Connor</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>O’Connor</td>
<td>Thomas H.</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Suzanne C.</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Sheldon S.</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Davison</td>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>DeGroat</td>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Kristi</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Pifer</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Richey</td>
<td>Lester</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Torner</td>
<td>Maryanne</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CHAIR</td>
<td>Cornillie</td>
<td>Ronald J.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>Dulce</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Hildebrand</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Linnell</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Pauler</td>
<td>David J.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Rodzik</td>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Turney</td>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Hodge</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Killiany</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Bernhardt</td>
<td>Doreen</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Kristin</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Khoury</td>
<td>Priscilla</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>McElroy</td>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate Inspector</td>
<td>Bentley</td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Inspector</td>
<td>Butler Paula</td>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Inspector</td>
<td>Cline William</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Inspector</td>
<td>Cline Catherine</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Inspector</td>
<td>Coyne Martha</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Inspector</td>
<td>Dolin Gail</td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Inspector</td>
<td>Friedman Jane Allison</td>
<td>Jane Allison</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Inspector</td>
<td>Hepburn Jan</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Inspector</td>
<td>McDonald Portia</td>
<td>Portia</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Inspector</td>
<td>Piceu Jacqueline</td>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Inspector</td>
<td>Pinson Janice</td>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Inspector</td>
<td>Rock Karen</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Co-Chair</td>
<td>Tellier Anneke</td>
<td>Anneke</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Chairperson</td>
<td>Giffin James</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Inspector</td>
<td>Folin Carolyn</td>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Inspector</td>
<td>Folin Robert</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Inspector</td>
<td>Lang Chantal</td>
<td>Chantal</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Inspector</td>
<td>Macintosh Ronald</td>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Inspector</td>
<td>Reese Oberia</td>
<td>Oberia</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Inspector</td>
<td>Sanders Greta</td>
<td>Greta</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Inspector</td>
<td>Sims Sandra J.</td>
<td>Sandra J.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Inspector</td>
<td>Von Storch Gisela</td>
<td>Gisela</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Inspector</td>
<td>Garnham Edward</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Inspector</td>
<td>Olson Frances</td>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Co-Chair</td>
<td>Howell Cherry</td>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving Bd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Mio</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Arft</td>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Larson</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Roush</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Election Commission Member

Date

Election Commission Member

Date

Election Commission Member

Date

Election Commission Member

Date
MEMORANDUM
City Clerk’s Office

DATE: October 5, 2018
TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager
FROM: J. Cherilynn Mynsberge, City Clerk
SUBJECT: Conduct of Public Accuracy Test for November 6, 2018 General Election

The Birmingham City Charter names the city commission as the election commission:
Chapter IV. – Registrations, Nominations and Elections
Section 22. - [Election commission.]
The city commission shall constitute the election commission for the city and shall perform all of the duties required of the city election commissions by the general laws of the state.

The attached excerpt from the Election Officials’ Manual of the Michigan Bureau of Elections (BOE) cites the duties of a city election commission and draws distinctions between those which must be conducted by the election commission and those which may be delegated to designated representatives.

One of the duties which must be handled via an Open Meeting by Election Commission members or their designated representatives is the conduct and certification of the Public Accuracy Test. The Test is required by Michigan Election Law, MCL 168.798 “to determine if the electronic tabulating equipment will accurately count the votes cast for all offices” (attached). This is done by creating a chart of predetermined results in compliance with promulgated rule R 168.778, and marking a set of test ballots to correspond. The results produced by the tabulator must match the totals in the chart of predetermined results.

Only a quorum of the Election Commission needs to be present to conduct the Public Accuracy Test. I anticipate the test will take approximately 45 minutes. If a quorum is available before the regular City Commission meeting of October 29, I recommend holding the Election Commission meeting at 6:30 p.m.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:
To schedule a meeting of the Election Commission on Monday, October 29, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. for the purpose of conducting the Public Accuracy Test for the November 6, 2018 General Election.
DATE: October 1, 2018  
TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager  
FROM: Jana Ecker, Planning Director  
SUBJECT: Continuation of Public Hearing for Bistro Ordinance Amendments

At the joint City Commission/Planning Board meeting of June 19th, 2017 the issue of bistro regulations was discussed at length. There was a consensus that a review of the bistro requirements and how they relate to the various areas in which they are permitted was warranted. Additionally, Commission members saw good reason to potentially regulate bistros differently depending on the district in which they are located.

Accordingly, the Planning Board began studying the existing bistro regulations and discussing potential new regulations. Over the past year, the Planning Board studied existing bistros and discussed the goals of the bistro program in the future. On August 8, 2018, the Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend approval of the following ordinance amendments to the City Commission:

1. Section 3.04, Specific Standards, Building Use, to amend the regulations of the bistro Special Land Use Permit;  
2. Section 5.06, O1 – Office District, Specific Standards, Building Use, to amend the regulations of the bistro Special Land Use Permit;  
3. Section 5.07, O2 – Office District, Specific Standards, Building Use, to amend the regulations of the bistro Special Land Use Permit;  
4. Section 5.08, P – Parking District, Specific Standards, Building Use, to amend the regulations of the bistro Special Land Use Permit;  
5. Section 5.10, B2 – General Business District, B2B – General Business District, B2C – General Business District, Specific Standards, Building Use, to amend the regulations of the bistro Special Land Use Permit;  
6. Section 5.11, B3 – Office-Residential District, Specific Standards, Building Use, to amend the regulations of the bistro Special Land Use Permit;  
7. Section 5.12, B4 – Business-Residential District, Specific Standards, Building Use, to amend the regulations of the bistro Special Land Use Permit;  
8. Section 5.13, MX – Mixed Use District, Specific Standards, Building Use, to amend the regulations of the bistro Special Land Use Permit; and  

On September 17, 2018, the City Commission held a public hearing to consider the proposed amendments to the existing bistro regulations. After much discussion, the City Commission voted to approve the amendments listed above to Articles 3 and 5, and continued the public hearing to consider the amendment of Article 9, section 9.02 to October 10, 2018. The City Commission
requested staff provide additional information on the number of seats (both indoor and outdoor) for all restaurants serving alcohol in the City. Accordingly, please find attached a chart listing details on all restaurants within the City, as well as the proposed ordinance language for the definition of a bistro for your review.

SUGGESTED ACTION:

To approve an ordinance amendment to Chapter 126, Zoning, Article 9, Section 9.02, Definitions, to amend the definition of bistro to establish a maximum of 65 seats indoors, and 65 seats outdoors for bistros located within the Downtown Overlay District and to establish a maximum of 85 seats indoors and 85 seats outdoors for bistros located within the Triangle and Rail Districts as recommended by the Planning Board on August 8, 2018.

OR

To approve an ordinance amendment to Chapter 126, Zoning, Article 9, Section 9.02, Definitions, to amend the definition of bistro to establish a maximum of ___ seats indoors, and ___ seats outdoors for bistros located within the Downtown Overlay District and to establish a maximum of ___ seats indoors and ___ seats outdoors for bistros located within the Triangle and Rail Districts.
## 2018 Birmingham Restaurants Serving Alcohol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restaurant Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Liquor License</th>
<th>Sq Ft.</th>
<th>Seats for dining, incl. seats at bar</th>
<th>Seats for Outdoor Dining on Public Sidewalk</th>
<th>Seats for Outdoor Dining on Private Property</th>
<th>Total Outdoor Dining Seats for Establishment</th>
<th>Total Seating for Establishment</th>
<th>License not in use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bistro Licenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Adachi Sushi</td>
<td>325 S Old Woodward</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bella Piatti</td>
<td>1677 Townsend Street</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Birmingham Sushi Café</td>
<td>377 Hamilton Row</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Bistro Joe’s</td>
<td>32244 Woodward Avenue</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cafe Via</td>
<td>310 East Maple Road</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Churchill’s Bistro &amp; Cigar Bar</td>
<td>116 South Old Woodward Avenue</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>2468</td>
<td>2468</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Elle’s Mediterranean Grill/Bar</td>
<td>263 Pierce Street</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Forest Grill</td>
<td>735 Forest Avenue</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>6,038</td>
<td>6,038</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 La Strada Caffe</td>
<td>243 E. Merrill Street</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Luxe Bar &amp; Grill</td>
<td>525 North Old Woodward Avenue</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Mad Hatter Café</td>
<td>185 North Old Woodward</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Market North End</td>
<td>474 North Old Woodward</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Salvatore Scialopini</td>
<td>505 North Old Woodward</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Social Kitchen &amp; Bar</td>
<td>225 East Maple Road</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Tallulah Wine Bar and Bistro</td>
<td>155 South Bates Street</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Toast</td>
<td>203 Pierce Street</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Townhouse</td>
<td>180 Pierce Street</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Whole Foods</td>
<td>2100 E Maple</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quota licenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 220 Restaurant</td>
<td>220 East Merrill Street</td>
<td>Quota LL</td>
<td>6,107</td>
<td>6,107</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Vinoteca</td>
<td>210 South Old Woodward</td>
<td>Bistro LL</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Cameron’s Steakhouse</td>
<td>115 Willis Street</td>
<td>Quota LL**</td>
<td>6,692</td>
<td>6,692</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Dick O’Dow’s</td>
<td>160 West Maple Road</td>
<td>Quota LL**</td>
<td>5,575</td>
<td>5,575</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Emagine Theatre</td>
<td>250 N. Old Woodward</td>
<td>Quota LL</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Hyde Park Prime Steakhouse</td>
<td>201 South Old Woodward</td>
<td>Quota LL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12, 2 Sofas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Phoenix</td>
<td>598 South Old Woodward</td>
<td>Quota LL</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Royo Mexican Bistro</td>
<td>250 East Merrill Street</td>
<td>Quota LL</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sidecar Slab Bar</td>
<td>2506 Merrill</td>
<td>Quota LL</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Springdale Golf Course</td>
<td>316 Strathmore</td>
<td>Quota LL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Streetside Seafood</td>
<td>273 Pierce Street</td>
<td>Quota LL</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 The Community House Café</td>
<td>180 South Bates Street</td>
<td>Quota LL</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 The Rugby Grille</td>
<td>100 Townsend Street</td>
<td>Quota LL</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside PSD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Big Rock</td>
<td>245 S Eton</td>
<td>Quota LL</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Springdale Golf Course</td>
<td>318 Strathmore</td>
<td>Development LL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Lincoln Hills Golf Course</td>
<td>2666 West 14 Mile Road</td>
<td>Quota LL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Griffins Claw</td>
<td>575 S. Eton</td>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Licenses Not In Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Peabody’s Dining &amp; Spirits</td>
<td>34965 Woodward Avenue</td>
<td>Quota LL</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Palladium (Au Cochon &amp; Arthur Ave)</td>
<td>260 N. Old Woodward</td>
<td>Quota LL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Palladium (Barrios)</td>
<td>205 Hamilton Row</td>
<td>Quota LL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 RHG Fish Market</td>
<td>115 Willits</td>
<td>Quota LL**</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development Licenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 All Seasons</td>
<td>111 Elm</td>
<td>Development LL</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 The Stand Gastro Bistro</td>
<td>34977 Woodward Avenue</td>
<td>Development LL</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Triple Nickel</td>
<td>555 South Old Woodward</td>
<td>Development LL</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 <strong>Temporarily closed for renovations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Mitchell’s and Camerons were sharing one license. The other license is being held by the company.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS: AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND ARTICLE 9, SECTION 9.02, DEFINITIONS, TO AMEND THE EXISTING DEFINITION OF BISTRO.

9.02 Definitions

**Bistro**: When located in the Downtown Overlay District, a restaurant with a full service kitchen with interior seating for no more than 65 people and additional seating for outdoor dining of no more than 65 people. When located in the Triangle District or Rail District, a restaurant with a full service kitchen with interior seating for no more than 85 people and seating for outdoor dining of no more than 85 people.

ORDAINED this _____ day of __________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, City Clerk
MEMORANDUM
Planning Division

DATE:               August 8th, 2018
TO:       Planning Board
FROM:              Jana L. Ecker, Planning Director
SUBJECT:        Public Hearing for Bistro Regulations

As the bistro concept has evolved over the past 10 years, new applicants have sought creative ways to make the establishments distinctive from other restaurants and bistros in the City, and to increase the number of seats through the use of all season outdoor dining. The following issues have been raised:

- **Use of Eisenglass** – Doing so extends the time period outdoor dining areas are in operation which increases the number of seats for the restaurant as a whole for a majority of the year;
- **District Requirements** – The Downtown District, Triangle District, and Rail District have different opportunities which could merit different requirements for bistros locating within them;
- **On-street Dining/Rooftop Dining** – the use of on-street parking spaces and rooftops in addition to the sidewalk area allows the addition of larger outdoor dining areas;
- **Parking Needs** – the expansion of outdoor dining increases the number of people dining at the restaurant, which increases parking demand;
- **Building Code Requirements** – the enclosure of outdoor dining areas triggers Building Code regulations such as Energy Code compliance, fire suppression requirements, fire separation distances and exterior wall fire resistive ratings; and
- **Incentivizing Seating Capacity Tiers** – Allowing an increased amount of indoor seating and/or outdoor dining seating for bistros based upon conditional standards such as shared parking, landscaping, greenspace, etc.

At the joint City Commission/Planning Board meeting of June 19th, 2017 the issue of bistro regulations was discussed at length. There was a consensus that a review of the bistro requirements and how they relate to the various areas in which they are permitted was warranted. Additionally, Commission members saw good reason to potentially regulate bistros differently depending on the district in which they are located.

Accordingly, the Planning Board began studying the existing bistro regulations and discussing potential new regulations. Over several months, the Planning Board studied existing bistros and discussed the goals of the bistro program in the future.
On August 9th, 2017, the Planning Board considered ordinance language stating “Outdoor seating on public property shall not exceed 40 seats.” The discussion on this topic was that some may not agree with an exorbitant amount of outdoor seating, but each bistro should be reviewed on an individual basis.

On September 13th, 2017, the Planning Board revisited the issue of limiting the number of outdoor seating, and decided that this should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. There was general consensus that the Board will see the outdoor dining plans in each application, and if they think the number of seats exceeds what is reasonable, they will ask the applicant to change the number and/or formation of outdoor seating.

Rooftop dining was also discussed on September 13th, 2017, where the Board also decided that this should be reviewed on an individual basis. It was noted that outdoor dining on the street level was preferable, and if the applicant met this requirement, then the Board would generally be in support of rooftop dining.

On April 11, 2018, the Planning Board conducted a public hearing and unanimously passed a motion recommending approval of the attached ordinance amendments for bistro regulations to the City Commission. Please find attached the draft ordinance language and meeting minutes for your consideration. Language related to limiting the number of outdoor seats or rooftop dining was not included because the Board agreed that these should be reviewed on an individual basis.

On April 23, 2018 the City Commission set a public hearing for May 14, 2018 to consider approval of the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance related to bistros.

On May 14th, 2018 after reviewing the proposed changes, the general consensus from the City Commission was that they like the 42” rail standards as well as the rule banning year round outdoor dining enclosures. However, the City Commission did not vote on the proposal because they wanted the Planning Board to reconsider setting a limit on the number of outdoor seating allowed at bistros, and to address rooftop dining.

On June 13th, 2018 The Planning Board considered the request of the City Council to discuss the number of outdoor dining seats bistros are allowed and permissible rooftop dining. The Board decided to examine language stating that outdoor seating may not exceed the number of permissible seats indoors. They also decided on evaluating language that would permit rooftop dining as long as adequate street level dining is provided. Sample ordinance language reflecting these changes has been provided below.

On July 11th, 2018 language regarding the number of permissible outdoor dining seats and rooftop dining was finalized with amendments including conditions that rooftop dining may not impact surrounding properties in a negative manner and that rooftop seats count towards outdoor dining provisions.
SUGGESTED ACTION:

To recommend approval to the City Commission of the following amendments to Chapter 126, Zoning, of the Birmingham City Code:

TO AMEND SECTION 3.04, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.

AND

TO AMEND SECTION 5.06, O1 – OFFICE DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.

AND

TO AMEND SECTION 5.07, O2 – OFFICE DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.

AND

TO AMEND SECTION 5.08, P – PARKING DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.

AND

TO AMEND SECTION 5.10, B2 – GENERAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, B2B – GENERAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, B2C – GENERAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.

AND

TO AMEND SECTION 5.11, B3 – OFFICE-RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.

AND

TO AMEND SECTION 5.12, B4 – BUSINESS-RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.

AND

TO AMEND SECTION 5.13, MX – MIXED USE DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.

AND

TO AMEND SECTION 9.02, DEFINITIONS: BISTRO
As the bistro concept has evolved over the past 10 years, new applicants have sought creative ways to make the establishments distinctive from other restaurants and bistro in the City, and to increase the number of seats through the use of all season outdoor dining. The following issues have been raised:

- **Use of Eisenglass** – Doing so extends the time period outdoor dining areas are in operation which increases the number of seats for the restaurant as a whole for a majority of the year;
- **District Requirements** – The Downtown District, Triangle District, and Rail District have different opportunities which could merit different requirements for bistros locating within them;
- **On-street Dining/Rooftop Dining** – the use of on-street parking spaces and rooftops in addition to the sidewalk area allows the addition of larger outdoor dining areas;
- **Parking Needs** – the expansion of outdoor dining increases the number of people dining at the restaurant, which increases parking demand;
- **Building Code Requirements** – the enclosure of outdoor dining areas triggers Building Code regulations such as Energy Code compliance, fire suppression requirements, fire separation distances and exterior wall fire resistive ratings; and
- **Incentivizing Seating Capacity Tiers** – Allowing an increased amount of indoor seating and/or outdoor dining seating for bistros based upon conditional standards such as shared parking, landscaping, greenspace, etc.

At the joint City Commission/Planning Board meeting of June 19<sup>th</sup>, 2017 the issue of bistro regulations was discussed at length. There was a consensus that a review of the bistro requirements and how they relate to the various areas in which they are permitted was warranted. Additionally, Commission members saw good reason to potentially regulate bistros differently depending on the district in which they are located.

Accordingly, the Planning Board began studying the existing bistro regulations and discussing potential new regulations. Over several months, the Planning Board studied existing bistros and discussed the goals of the bistro program in the future.
On August 9th, 2017, the Planning Board considered ordinance language stating “Outdoor seating on public property shall not exceed 40 seats.” The discussion on this topic was that some may not agree with an exorbitant amount of outdoor seating, but each bistro should be reviewed on an individual basis.

On September 13th, 2017, the Planning Board revisited the issue of limiting the number of outdoor seating, and decided that this should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. There was general consensus that the Board will see the outdoor dining plans in each application, and if they think the number of seats exceeds what is reasonable, they will ask the applicant to change the number and/or formation of outdoor seating.

Rooftop dining was also discussed on September 13th, 2017, where the Board also decided that this should be reviewed on an individual basis. It was noted that outdoor dining on the street level was preferable, and if the applicant met this requirement, then the Board would generally be in support of rooftop dining.

On April 11, 2018, the Planning Board conducted a public hearing and unanimously passed a motion recommending approval of the attached ordinance amendments for bistro regulations to the City Commission. Please find attached the draft ordinance language and meeting minutes for your consideration. Language related to limiting the number of outdoor seats or rooftop dining was not included because the Board agreed that these should be reviewed on an individual basis.

On April 23, 2018 the City Commission set a public hearing for May 14, 2018 to consider approval of the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance related to bistros.

On May 14th, after reviewing the proposed changes, the general consensus from the City Commission was that they like the 42” rail standards as well as the rule banning year round outdoor dining enclosures. However, the City Commission did not vote on the proposal because they wanted the Planning Board to reconsider setting a limit on the number of outdoor seating allowed at bistros, and to address rooftop dining.

On June 13th, The Planning Board considered the request of the City Council to discuss the number of outdoor dining seats bistros are allowed and permissible rooftop dining. The Board decided to examine language stating that outdoor seating may not exceed the number of permissible seats indoors. They also decided on evaluating language that would permit rooftop dining as long as adequate street level dining is provided. Sample ordinance language reflecting these changes has been provided below.
I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
   Mayor Mark Nickita called the meeting to order at 8:00 PM.

II. ROLL CALL
   PRESENT:
   Mayor Nickita
   Mayor Pro
   Tem Harris
   Commissioner
   Bordman
   Commissioner
   Boutros
   Commissioner DeWeese
   Commissioner
   Hoff
   Commissioner
   Sherman
   Scott Clein, Planning Board Chairman
   Stuart Jeffares, Member
   Bert Koseck, Member
   Janelle Whipple-Boyce, Member
   J. Bryan Williams, Member

   ABSENT:
   Robin Boyle,
   Member
   Gillian Lazar,
   Member Lisa
   Prasad,
   Member
   Daniel Share,
   Member

   ADMINISTRATION: City Manager Valentine, City Attorney Studt, Deputy Clerk Arft,
   Planning Director, Ecker, Building Official Johnson

III. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION
   Mayor Nickita explained that this is a workshop session to discuss and evaluate various
   planning issues, with the intent to create an Action List for the Planning Board. City
   Manager Valentine added that more discussion will be needed on each item by the City
   Commission. The priorities will be determined by the Commission at a future meeting.

E. BISTRO ALLOWANCES AND RESTRICTIONS
Ms. Ecker said there has been concern expressed over the size of Bistros recently. She explained that a Bistro is defined as a restaurant with 65 seats or less, with no more than 10 of them at a bar, with a full service kitchen, low key entertainment, tables that must line the storefront, and outdoor dining. The biggest issue has been how much is too much outdoor dining. The intent when Bistros was started was to encourage outdoor dining, but it was not apparent at the time how far owners would look for creative opportunities to expand the outdoor dining. She suggested clarifications as to maximums, location, enclosures and the building code issues such as energy code, fire suppression might be needed. Parking needs are also a big concern.

Mayor Nickita added that the original concept for Bistros was just in the downtown area and that has changed. Once the area expanded to the Triangle area and Rail District, it changed the circumstance because of parking and available outdoor space.

Commissioner Bordman suggested considering different rules for different areas. The needs are different. Perhaps part of the study should be whether to have the exact same requirements in each of our districts.

Commissioner DeWeese suggested we need an intermediate level that applies in different situations. He considers this a high priority issue.

Mr. Koseck suggested that we should study the materials used and also the intent.

Commissioner Hoff agreed it is time to review the Bistro ordinance. It has developed differently than what was planned.

Mayor Nickita commented that it is time to review the ordinance.
4. Bistro Regulations

Mr. Baka recalled that in 2007 the City of Birmingham amended the Zoning Ordinance to create the bistro concept that allows small eclectic restaurants to obtain a liquor license if they have no more than 65 seats, including 10 at a bar, and low key entertainment only. Mr. Baka observed that as the bistro concept has evolved over the past 10 years, new applicants have sought creative ways to make their establishments distinctive from other restaurants and bistros in the City, and to increase the number of seats through the use of all season outdoor dining. The following issues have been raised:

- Use of Eisenglass – extends the time period outdoor dining areas are in operation which increases the number of seats for restaurant as a whole for a majority of the year;
- On-street Dining/Rooftop Dining – the use of on-street parking spaces and rooftops in addition to the sidewalk area allows the addition of larger outdoor dining areas;
- Parking Needs – the expansion of outdoor dining increases the number of people dining at the restaurant, which increases parking demand;
- Building Code Requirements – the enclosure of outdoor dining areas triggers Building Code regulations such as Energy Code compliance, fire suppression requirements, fire separation distances and exterior wall fire resistive ratings.

At the joint City Commission/Planning Board meeting of June 19, 2017, this issue was discussed at length. There seemed to be consensus that a review of the bistro requirements and how they relate to the various areas in which they are permitted is warranted. Accordingly, the Planning Division is now requesting that the Planning Board begin discussions on how these concerns should be addressed.

Mr. Williams indicated he never envisioned 10 years ago that some of the sites would be so disproportionately large based on outdoor dining. Ms. Whipple-Boyce said the bistros should be looked at from the standpoint of their locations in different districts throughout the City. Chairman Klein thought there is a need to study the general parking requirement in the MX District based on the number of outdoor dining seats. Mr. Boyle added that bistros might be incentivized there by allowing more seating outside. Further, also consider that the Triangle District is different.

Mr. Williams noted the single biggest thing the board never anticipated was the extent to which Eisenglass would provide for almost four season use.

Ms. Ecker added maybe the board doesn’t mind having Eisenglass on a rainy day but they don’t want to see it extend the season past November 1st through March 31st. There are two issues: the look of it, and whether it changes the character of use from seasonal to permanent. There was consensus to look at including the opportunity for rooftop dining for bistros.

Ms. Lazar agreed the larger spaces, particularly in the MX District, might be increased. But, the neighbors may be upset if they feel there will be increased intrusion into the neighborhoods as a
result. Maybe some type of parking requirement might have to be imposed. Chairman Clein thought that Residential Permit Parking might be needed in that case.
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STUDY SESSIONS
1. Bistro Regulations

Mr. Baka noted that in 2007 the City of Birmingham amended the Zoning Ordinance to create the bistro concept that allows small eclectic restaurants to obtain a Liquor License. Bistros are permitted in certain zone districts with a valid Special Land Use Permit ("SLUP") under several conditions. As the bistro concept has evolved over the past ten years, new applicants have sought creative ways to make their establishments distinctive from the other restaurants and bistros in the City, and to increase the number of seats through the use of all season outdoor dining. At the joint City Commission/Planning Board meeting of June 19, 2017 the issue of clarifying bistro regulations was discussed at length. There seemed to be consensus that a review of the bistro requirements and how they relate to the various areas in which they are permitted is warranted. Additionally, Commission members saw good reason to potentially regulate bistros differently depending on the district in which they are located.

The Planning Division would like to begin to consider addressing the issues of parking, outdoor dining and Eisenglass enclosures via ordinance language changes. The following examples of potential ordinance language changes are based on two methods of regulating bistros. The thinking is that current bistros would not be impacted by what is being proposed.

The first option would be to amend Chapter 126, Zoning, to universally create development standards for bistros that would apply to all zoning districts that permit bistros. Universal regulation would ensure that the dining experience in one bistro (outside of menu, service, theme etc.) is the same as dining in any other bistro. This could mean putting a limit on outdoor seating of 40 seats for all districts, even if there is room (public property or private property) for more. Eisenglass or vinyl enclosures could be prohibited entirely as to not abuse the outdoor dining season limit set forth by the City (April-November). As for parking, requiring all bistros to include their outdoor dining square footage in parking requirements could make sure that there will be enough parking for all of those extra seats. Creating extra parking requirements, though, could also discourage outdoor seating and counteract a key intent of the Bistro Ordinance.

The second approach to clarifying bistro regulations would be to amend Chapter 126, Zoning, to create separate bistro standards depending on the bistro’s location in the Downtown, Triangle or Rail Districts. In doing so separately, the City can take into account the different space and parking conditions present in different districts. Adding parking requirements, like including outdoor dining area square footage in the parking calculation, to the conditions of certain bistro location districts could help alleviate parking issues. Outdoor dining maximums are a reasonable consideration Downtown because there is less space for a large outdoor dining area. In the Rail and Triangle
Districts where street frontage is typically larger, outdoor dining maximums of 40 or 60 seats could be appropriate. Finally, Eisenglass or vinyl enclosures might be considered in some areas along the Woodward Ave. frontage of the Triangle District to alleviate the noise pollution patrons receive from the major road.

Mr. Williams thought the major focus should be that one size doesn't fit all. Mr. Jeffares commented that it would be interesting to find out how much of the lunch crowd consists of office users who are already parked in town. It was consensus that there should not be an enclosure that allows bistros to extend their outdoor dining season. The bistro concept is being pushed beyond its original boundaries.

Mr. Boyle thought they should be discussing the issue of 65 indoor seats. The board needs to review that and consider the possibility that number could go up. Then bistros could rely less on large outdoor seating and have a stronger business that doesn't tie them to 65 indoor seats.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce thought there could be implications to allowing more indoor seating. They don't want Birmingham to become an all restaurant city. She doesn't think parking is that much of a concern because when the offices clear out the restaurants become busy. Don't forget that there are many local residents who walk from their homes to the Downtown bistros. She does not want to encourage a bistro model behind the building. She likes the outdoor seating in the front of buildings to activate the sidewalk space. Look at each bistro independently and see what makes sense, rather than putting a number to it. Also, consider opportunities for rooftop dining. Maybe the districts need be viewed differently because they are different and because some of the parking situations are different.

Mr. Koseck said in his opinion the bistros are working. The intent was to attract small scale, unique establishments with a variety of different food types. Why treat the districts differently? Forty outdoor seats is fine and he doesn't want to get caught up in parking for outdoor dining. He totally thinks the outdoor dining should not be enclosed. Pick half of the number of interior seating for outdoor dining; 40 seats is fine. He would rather see three small bistros in the Rail District than one that has 150 seats.

Mr. Williams echoed that and added if seating is outdoor, it shouldn't be enclosed. The total seating ought be the combination of both indoor and outdoor. Parking generally works and the only time it doesn't is the 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. window. Lunch is problematic in the Downtown area.

Chairman Clein observed he doesn't think including parking in the count really matters. To him the issue is not so much the size of the bistros; it is that they are allowed to be wrapped in plastic and located in places the board doesn't like. Perhaps some incentives could be put forth for establishments to meet if they want to increase their outdoor dining.

Mr. Boyle hoped to find a way to make the industrial land use in the Rail District work for bistros.

Mr. Baka summarized that the board is divided on whether or not there should be a limit on the number of outside seats. Board members stated they were definitely not in favor of outdoor dining enclosures, and most of the board is leaning against adding additional parking
requirements for outdoor dining seats. Nearly everyone wants to keep the districts separate. Mr. Williams added they need to look at the parking, but not Downtown.

No one from the public wanted to comment at 10:10 p.m.
2. **Bistro Regulations**

Mr. Baka noted that in 2007 the City of Birmingham amended the Zoning Ordinance to create the bistro concept that allows small eclectic restaurants to obtain a liquor license. Bistros are defined in Article 09 of the Zoning Ordinance as restaurants with a full service kitchen with interior seating for no more than 65 people and additional seating for outdoor dining. Bistros are permitted in certain zone districts with a valid Special Land Use Permit ("SLUP") along with several conditions. As the bistro concept has evolved over the past 10 years, new applicants have sought creative ways to make their establishments distinctive from other restaurants and bistros in the City, and to increase the number of seats through the use of all season outdoor dining.

There have been several issues raised:

- Use of Eisenglass – extends the time period outdoor dining areas are in operation which increases the number of seats for restaurant as a whole for a majority of the year;
- On-street Dining/Rooftop Dining – the use of on-street parking spaces and rooftops in addition to the sidewalk area allows the addition of larger outdoor dining areas;
- Parking Needs – the expansion of outdoor dining increases the number of people dining at the restaurant, which increases parking demand;
- Building Code Requirements – the enclosure of outdoor dining areas triggers Building Code regulations such as Energy Code compliance, fire suppression requirements, fire separation distances and exterior wall fire resistive ratings.

At the joint City Commission/Planning Board meeting of June 19, 2017 the issue of clarifying bistro regulations was discussed at length. On July 24th, 2017 the City Commission moved the review of bistros up on the Planning Board’s Action List.

On August 9, 2017 the Planning Board held a study session to begin to consider addressing the issues of parking, outdoor dining and Eisenglass enclosures. Discussion revealed that the Planning Board did not support regulating the number of outdoor dining seats, or requiring additional parking for such outdoor dining areas. There was unanimous support on the board for restricting the use of enclosures on outdoor dining areas to ensure that outdoor dining is truly seasonal. There was also discussion about setting different standards for the interior number of seats in different areas.

Accordingly the draft language has been revised to provide options that would eliminate the ability to utilize enclosures year round. The language is now silent on the issues of limiting the number of outdoor seats and requiring additional parking for those seating areas.

At this time four proposed options have been added to the ordinance language:

- Permanent enclosures shall not be permitted for outdoor dining areas.
- Weather proof enclosures facilitating year around dining outdoors are not permitted.
- Outdoor dining is not permitted between November 16 and March 31.
- The use of any type of enclosure system (including but not limited to fabric, Eisenglass, vinyl panels, drapes, plant materials shall not be permitted for outdoor dining areas.

Mr. Koseck indicated that in his mind outdoor dining areas should not be framed with walls whether they are temporary or permanent. These areas were never intended to be quasi interior space. Discussion considered eliminating the date restriction and eliminating walls and plastic enclosures. People can sit outdoors on a nice winter day if they choose; however outdoor furniture must be brought inside each night and platforms have to come down in the winter. Board members thought that railings on decks in the street should be limited to 42 in. in height.

To sum up the issues that were previously discussed:
- The use of Eisenglass and the Building Code requirements of such enclosures have been covered in that outdoor dining areas must truly be outdoors, not within enclosed areas;
- The board was not interested in adding extra parking requirements for outdoor dining;
- Setting a maximum number of outdoor dining seats is not a concern as they are all SLUPs and thus subject to individual review;
- Everyone was okay with rooftop dining, but the priority is that there must be outdoor dining in the front first and foremost.

Mr. Jeffares was in favor of increasing the capacity of bistros for the Triangle and Rail Districts and Mr. Williams liked that concept. It was discussed that providing shared parking might be an incentive to increase inside seating from 65. However, Mr. Koseck thought that requiring shared parking complicates things. **Mr. Baka agreed to bring draft ordinance language for the next meeting.**
Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Planning Board held on January 10, 2018. Chairman Scott Clein convened the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

**Present:** Chairman Scott Clein; Board Members Robin Boyle, Stuart Jeffares, Bert Koseck, Janelle Whipple-Boyce, Bryan Williams Alternate Board Members Nasseen Ramin, Daniel Share

**Absent:** Board Member Vice-Chairperson Gillian Lazar; Student Representatives Ariana Afrakhteh, Isabella Niskar

**Administration:** Matthew Baka, Sr. Planner

Jana Ecker, Planning Director

Carole Salutes, Recording Secretary

**01-05-18**

2. **Bistro Regulations**

Mr. Williams rejoined the board and Ms. Ramin left.

Mr. Baka advised that recently there has been discussion between the City Commission and the Planning Board that perhaps there should be a re-examination of the bistro requirements which already began last year with several study sessions.

As the bistro concept has evolved over the past 10 years, new applicants have sought creative ways to make the establishments distinctive from other restaurants and bistros in the City, and to increase the number of seats through the use of all season outdoor dining. The following issues have been raised:

- **Use of Eisenglass** – Doing so extends the time period outdoor dining areas are in operation which increases the number of seats for the restaurant as a whole for a majority of the year;
- **District Requirements** – The Downtown District, Triangle District, and Rail District have different opportunities which could merit different requirements for bistros locating within them;
- **On-street Dining/Rooftop Dining** –The use of on-street parking spaces and rooftops in addition to the sidewalk area allows the addition of larger outdoor dining areas;
- **Parking Needs** – The expansion of outdoor dining increases the number of people dining at the restaurant, which increases parking demand;
• Building Code Requirements – The enclosure of outdoor dining areas triggers Building Code regulations such as Energy Code compliance, fire suppression requirements, fire separation distances and exterior wall fire resistive ratings.
• Incentivizing Seating Capacity Tiers – Allowing an increased amount of indoor seating and/or outdoor dining seating for bistros based upon conditional standards such as shared parking, landscaping, green space, etc.

At the joint City Commission/Planning Board meeting of June 19th, 2017 the issue of bistro regulations was discussed at length. There was consensus that a review of the requirements and how they relate to the various areas in which they are permitted is warranted. Additionally, Commission members saw good reason to potentially regulate bistros differently depending on the district in which they are located.

The Planning Board held several study sessions on this matter and potential revisions and additions to the bistro standards were discussed. Draft language was created to provide options that would eliminate the ability to utilize enclosures year-round, and would not limit the number of outdoor dining seats or require additional parking for those seating areas. There was discussion on whether or not the 65 seat limit should be revised, or whether rooftop dining should be encouraged and what an acceptable railing height is for platform decks. It was suggested that perhaps the Triangle District and Rail District could establish different standards for maximum seating. New draft language was presented that expands interior seating for bistros in the Triangle and Rail Districts to 85 seats with 15 at the bar, while interior seating for the Downtown District remains at 65. Current rooftop dining standards were deemed acceptable, but the board wished to see railings on platform decks limited to 42 in. in height.

There was not a consensus on requiring shared parking as an incentive to get more seats at the bar.

Mr. Baka discussed Chapter 126 of the Code, sections 3.04, 5.06, 5.07, 5.08, 5.10, 5.11, 5.12, 5.13 and 9.02.

Consensus was for sections 3.04, 5.06, 5.07, 5.08, 5.10, 5.11, 5.12, change "enclosed platform" to "enclosed platform with a guard rail." Also find a way to consolidate I., J., and K in section 3.04 and other sections with the same language to a more precise limitation for enclosure systems for outdoor dining areas.

Mr. Baka clarified for Ms. Whipple-Boyce that vegetation can be planted above the 42 in. railing height.

There was general support for a larger number of indoor seating allowed by right for bistros located in the Rail and Triangle Districts.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce said it has been proven now that the Class C Liquor License holders and the bistro license holders are succeeding well side-by-side. Therefore, she is very supportive of allowing 85 indoor seats in the Rail and Triangle Districts. Losing parking spaces in the summer with more on-street dining doesn't concern her.
Mr. Williams observed that the issue of bistro locations in the Rail District has not been addressed. Ms. Ecker advised that currently they are allowed anywhere within the boundaries of the Rail District with a Special Land Use Permit ("SLUP"). Mr. Williams thought a bistro would significantly adversely impact the residential and live/work areas in the neighborhood.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce agreed with establishing some boundaries. From DPS north it is pretty well developed. She would like to see a bistro somewhere south of DPS.

Mr. Jeffares was not in favor of boundaries because he would like to see all applications. Mr. Koseck agreed with Mr. Jeffares.

Mr. Williams thought maybe it is enough to say there are sensitive areas both in the Rail District and in the Triangle District that need attention whenever a SLUP comes up. Other members agreed.

Mr. Williams stated he is in favor of expanding the number of outdoor dining seats in the Rail and Triangle Districts, but is adamantly opposed to increasing them Downtown. That is where most of the Class C Licenses are and he noted that one just closed. There is no question in his mind that bistros have had an effect on some of the Class C licenses in the Downtown area.

Further, he suggested having the new rules apply to existing bistros. Ms. Ecker explained that could happen if they came back for any changes.

Board members discussed putting a maximum formula in effect for outdoor dining in relationship to indoor dining in the Rail and Triangle Districts. Mr. Share was in favor of a 200% cap there that applies to all outdoor dining, thus outdoor dining (including rooftop dining) could be no more than twice the number of interior dining seats.

Mr. Jeffares did not want a cap. He said he would rather have the Planning Board be able to make decisions on the applications vs. having strict rules and not having any applications.

The board's consensus was to see this one more time before moving forward.
Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Planning Board held on March 14, 2018. Chairman Scott Clein convened the meeting at 7:32 p.m.

Present: Chairman Scott Clein; Board Members Stuart Jeffares, Bert Koseck, Janelle Whipple-Boyce, Bryan Williams; Alternate Board Members Nasseen Ramin, Daniel Share; Student Representative Ellie McElroy (left at 9:07 p.m.)

Absent: Board Members Robin Boyle, Gillian Lazar; Student Representatives Madison Dominato, Sam Fogel

Administration: Matthew Baka, Sr. Planner
Brooks Cowan, Planner
Jana Ecker, Planning Director
Carole Salutes, Recording Secretary

03-39-18

3. Bistro Regulations

Background: Mr. Baka advised that recently there has been discussion between the City Commission and the Planning Board that perhaps there should be a re-examination of the bistro requirements which already began last year with several study sessions.

Issue: As the bistro concept has evolved over the past 10 years, new applicants have sought creative ways to make the establishments distinctive from other restaurants and bistros in the City, and to increase the number of seats through the use of all season outdoor dining. The following issues have been raised:

• Use of Eisenglass – Doing so extends the time period outdoor dining areas are in operation which increases the number of seats for the restaurant as a whole for a majority of the year;
• District Requirements – The Downtown District, Triangle District, and Rail District have different opportunities which could merit different requirements for bistros locating within them;
• On-street Dining/Rooftop Dining – the use of on-street parking spaces and rooftops in addition to the sidewalk area allows the addition of larger outdoor dining areas;
• Parking Needs – the expansion of outdoor dining increases the number of people dining at the restaurant, which increases parking demand;
• Building Code Requirements – the enclosure of outdoor dining areas triggers Building Code regulations such as Energy Code compliance, fire suppression requirements, fire separation distances and exterior wall fire resistive ratings.
• Incentivizing Seating Capacity Tiers – Allowing an increased amount of indoor seating and/or outdoor dining seating for bistros based upon conditional standards such as shared parking, landscaping, green space, etc.

At the joint City Commission/Planning Board meeting of June 19th, 2017 the issue of bistro regulations was discussed at length. There was consensus that a review of the requirements and how they relate to the various areas in which they are permitted is warranted. Additionally, Commission members saw good reason to potentially regulate bistros differently depending on the district in which they are located.

The Planning Board held several study sessions on this matter and potential revisions and additions to the bistro standards were discussed. Draft language was created to provide options that would eliminate the ability to utilize enclosures year-round, and not to limit the number of outdoor dining seats or require additional parking for those seating areas. There was discussion on whether or not the 65 seat limit should be revised, or whether rooftop dining should be encouraged and what an acceptable railing height is for platform decks. It was suggested that perhaps the Triangle District and Rail District could establish different standards for maximum seating. New draft language has been presented that expands interior seating for bistros in the Triangle and Rail Districts to 85 seats with 15 at the bar, while interior seating for the Downtown District remains at 65. Current rooftop dining standards were deemed acceptable, but the board wished to see railings on platform decks limited to 42 in. in height.

On January 10, 2018 the Planning Board reviewed the latest draft ordinance language for the proposed bistro regulation changes. The board requested that the language regarding on-street platforms be adjusted so that the reference to enclosing them is eliminated. Also, eliminate permanent enclosures facilitating year-round dining outdoors. Lastly, railings on platform decks may not exceed 42 in. in height in order to create an open atmosphere where the dining adds vitality to the streetscape. Board members wanted to see the final draft language prior to setting a public hearing.

It was agreed the word "permanent" in front of "enclosures" should be eliminated.

Discussion confirmed that rooftop dining is allowable under SLUPs on a case-by-case basis. Outdoor dining on the street is excluded from the rooftop number of seats.

**Motion by Mr. Williams**

**Seconded by Mr. Koseck** to set a public hearing for April 11, 2018 to consider the proposed ordinance amendment.

There were no comments from the public at 9:18 p.m.

**Motion carried, 7-0.**

**VOICE VOTE**

Yeas: Williams, Koseck, Clein, Jeffares, Ramin, Share, Whipple-Boyce

Nays: None

Absent: Boyle, Lazar
Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Planning Board held on March 28, 2018. Chairman Scott Clein convened the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

**Present:** Chairman Scott Clein; Board Members Robin Boyle, Stuart Jeffares, Bert Koseck, Janelle Whipple-Boyce, Bryan Williams; Member Daniel Share; Student Representative Ellie McElroy (arrived at 8:35 p.m.)

**Absent:** Alternate Board Member Nasseen Ramin; Student Representatives Madison Dominato, Sam Fogel

**Administration:** Brooks Cowan, Planner  
Jana Ecker, Planning Director  
Carole Salutes, Recording Secretary

04-57-18

**PUBLIC HEARING**

1. **AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:**

TO AMEND SECTION 3.04, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.

AND

TO AMEND SECTION 5.06, O1 – OFFICE DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.

AND

TO AMEND SECTION 5.07, O2 – OFFICE DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.

AND

TO AMEND SECTION 5.08, P – PARKING DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.

AND

TO AMEND SECTION 5.10, B2 – GENERAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, B2B – GENERAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, B2C – GENERAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.

AND

TO AMEND SECTION 5.11, B3 – OFFICE-RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.

AND

TO AMEND SECTION 5.12, B4 – BUSINESS-RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.
The Chairman opened the public hearing at 7:34 p.m.

Ms. Ecker recalled the board has been talking about the bistro regulations for almost a year. At a joint City Commission/Planning Board on June 19, 2017 several issues came up that the Commission asked the Planning Board to look at. So, over the past several months the board has been studying this and they have agreed upon language and brought it to a public hearing tonight.

Primarily the changes were to set up two different types of bistros, keeping the standards for the number of interior seats and number of seats at the bar the same for Downtown because they are in the Parking Assessment District and there isn't an excessive amount of parking. Also, creating another section for bistros in the Rail District and Triangle District that would allow a greater number of interior seats and a greater number of seats at the bar, given the fact that they couldn't do that unless they provided the required parking.

Several other changes were made:
- Enclosures facilitating year-around dining are not permitted;
- At the suggestion of the Building Official, railings, platforms or similar barriers should not exceed 42 in. in height;
- The Building Official also suggested that the word "enclosed" be taken out and replaced with "defined" when talking about an elevated ADA compliant enclosed platform.
- The bistro standards are proposed to be added in the MX District.
- Language was added to the existing regulations with regard to the B-3 and B-4 standards on bistros: "No direct connect additional bar permit is allowed and the maximum seating at a bar cannot exceed 10 seats in the Downtown Overlay District, or 15 seats in the Triangle District and Rail District."

Board members were in agreement with the changes.

**Motion by Mr. Williams**  
**Seconded by Mr. Share** to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance amendments to the City Commission with the changes outlined tonight.

**Motion carried, 7-0.**

**VOICE VOTE**  
Yeas: Williams, Share, Boyle, Jeffares, Koseck, Whipple-Boyece, Williams  
Nays: None  
Absent: None

The public hearing closed at 7:40 p.m.
I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Harris called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

ROLL CALL: Present, Mayor Harris
Mayor Pro Tem Bordman
Commissioner Boutros
Commissioner DeWeese
Commissioner Hoff
Commissioner Nickita
Commissioner Sherman

Absent, None

Administration: City Manager Valentine, City Attorney Currier, Senior Planner Baka, Communications Director Byrnes, Assistant City Planner Chapman, Planning Director Ecker, DPS Manager Filipski, Building Official Johnson, Assistant Building Official Morad, City Clerk Mynsberge, City Engineer O’Meara, Director of Public Services Wood

05-137-18 PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS TO BISTRO ORDINANCE

Mayor Harris opened the public hearing at 8:41 p.m.

Senior Planner Baka reviewed the joint Commission/Planning Board effort to consider possible amendments to the Bistro Ordinances, and the proposed Bistro Ordinance amendments as suggested by the Planning Board to the Commission.

Senior Planner Baka said the Planning Board recommended eliminating enclosed platforms for dining because another ordinance prohibits enclosures.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman stated:

- If the desire is to require a platform with a railing, the language should read “platform with a railing”.
- If Planning Board does not address rooftop dining so as not to encourage it, rooftop dining will be implicitly allowed by the lack of any language addressing the issue.

Planning Director Ecker explained that the Planning Board sought:

- To not be overbroad in the requirements for outdoor dining, rooftop dining, and parking for outdoor dining so as to encourage its development while still allowing its regulation through the SLUP application process.
- To maintain the difference between a smaller bistro license and a Class C license by prohibiting enclosed year-round outdoor dining for a Bistro.
Commissioner Nickita believed the prohibition on year-round outdoor dining insufficiently addresses the need to keep bistro-licensed restaurants smaller than Class C-licensed restaurants, especially since bistro licenses already technically preclude year-round outdoor dining.

Planning Director Ecker explained the Planning Board did not want to limit total outdoor seating by ordinance, but that the SLUP application process may allow the City to sufficiently limit the seating in a bistro-licensed restaurant on a case-by-case basis.

Planning Director Ecker confirmed that the proposals potentially allow bistro-licensed restaurants to have unlimited seating in the warmer months, and that this was the Planning Board’s intent.

Commissioner Nickita stated:
- His concerns regarding seating capacity were enough for him to not move these amendments forward as currently proposed.
- A 42”-inch maximum rail would be sufficient, though he would like to see them smaller.
- Preventing the use of eisenglass around outdoor seating is a positive move to control seating capacity.
- It might be wise to codify platform standards.

Planning Director Ecker replied that when platforms were first discussed by the Planning Board in 2007, they decided to leave the requirements open so as not to inhibit creativity. She continued that the Commission could ask the Planning Board to revisit that, should the Commission see fit.

Commissioner Nickita clarified he does not seek to regulate design standards for platforms, but fundamental building standards such as size, materials, edge conditions, sleeper channels, non-skid texture and other related criteria.

City Manager Valentine stated that city staff can create a formalized platform standard for the Commission to review and potentially adopt.

Commissioner DeWeese said the intended benefits of the bistro were:
- Activation of the street;
- Focus on food and not alcohol; and,
- The creation of intimacy within a so-licensed restaurant.

Commissioner DeWeese continued that:
- Moving seating up to higher floors or rooftops fails to activate the street.
- He would like to see bistro licenses remain closer to their original intent.
- Different districts could potentially have different bistro requirements.

Mayor Harris suggested that the Commission could approve the proposed ordinance language and direct staff and the Planning Board to re-address outdoor seating issues.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman said:
- A reconsideration of the outdoor seating issue may also affect the indoor capacity of a bistro-licensed establishment.
- There are enough other concerns that all proposed amendments should return to the Planning Board.

Commissioner Nickita said:
- The Planning Board should provide seating parameters, and not require the Commission to determine said parameters with every individual bistro SLUP application.
- He would be comfortable having the Planning Board review the amendments and send them back to the Commission.

Norman LePage, owner of Big Rock Chop House, voiced his support for the Commission’s suggestions.

Senior Planner Baka told Mr. LePage that the bistro seating regulations increased from 65 indoor seats to 85 indoor seats in order to encourage more bistro applications in certain areas of the City.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman told Mr. LePage that should any existing establishment come before the Commission seeking to change their SLUP bistro license, the Commission can require that the establishment come into alignment with the new bistro requirements.

Jeremy Sassoon appeared before the Commission and said:
- There should be a focus group to consider the difference between a bistro license and a Class C license.
- The City should clarify its standards for bistro licenses and other applications, because he feels he has been denied two licenses for subjective, not objective, reasons.

Joe Zane appeared before the Commission and said he would like to see bistro licenses granted in the Triangle District, even if it requires relaxing the standards a bit.

There being no further comment, Mayor Harris closed the public hearing at 9:24 p.m.

The Commission agreed to send the proposed ordinance amendments back to the Planning Board for reconsideration.
2. Bistro Regulations

Mr. Cowan advised that as the bistro concept has evolved over the past 10 years, new applicants have sought creative ways to make the establishments distinctive from other restaurants and bistros in the City, and to increase the number of seats through the use of all season outdoor dining. At the joint City Commission/Planning Board meeting last year, the issue was discussed and there was consensus that a review of the bistro regulations is warranted.

Accordingly, the Planning Board began studying the existing bistro regulations and discussing potential new regulations. Over several months the Planning Board studied existing bistros and discussed the goals of the bistro program in the future.

On August 9, 2017 the Planning Board considered ordinance language suggesting outdoor seating on public property should not exceed 40 seats. The discussion on this topic was that some may not agree with an exorbitant amount of outdoor seating but each bistro should be reviewed on an individual basis. There was unanimous support for restricting the use of enclosures on outdoor dining to ensure that outdoor dining is truly seasonal.

On September 13, 2017 the Planning Board revisited the issue of limiting the number of outdoor seating and decided it should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. There was also general consensus that if the board thinks the number of seats exceeds what is reasonable they will ask the applicant to change that number. Rooftop dining was also discussed and the board decided it should be reviewed on an individual basis. It was noted that outdoor dining on the street level was preferable, and if the applicant met this requirement, then the Board would generally be in support of rooftop dining.

On April 11, 2018, the Planning Board conducted a public hearing and unanimously passed a motion recommending approval of the attached ordinance amendments for bistro regulations to the City Commission. Language related to the maximum number of outdoor seats or rooftop dining was not included because the board had agreed that these should be reviewed on an individual basis.
On May 14, 2018, after reviewing the proposed changes, the general consensus from the City Commission was that they like the 42 in. rail standards as well as the rule banning year-round outdoor dining enclosures. However, the Commission did not vote on the proposal because they wanted the Planning Board to reconsider setting a limit on the number of outdoor seating allowed at bistros, and to address rooftop dining.

Therefore, as directed by the City Commission, issues for discussion related to bistro requirements include:

- Maximum number of outdoor dining seats bistros are allowed; and
- Permissible rooftop dining.

Ms. Ecker thought the main point that the Commission was trying to get across was they feel that with the outdoor dining being so large, it makes a bistro too close to the size of what a Class C establishment could be. Some of the existing Class C holders could potentially be upset that a bistro was morphing into a standard Class C establishment.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce thought that what the Commission would really like from the Board is to put a restriction on the number of outdoor seats in the Rail and Triangle Districts.

Mr. Koseck said he likes the quaintness and smallness of a bistro. Ms. Whipple-Boyce added that she thinks it is all about fairness to the quota license holders and she believes the Commission wants a cap on the number of outdoor seats so as not to compete with the quota license holders.

Chairman Clein noticed that there are a few bistros that have more seats outside than they are allowed to have inside, doubling their size and allowing them to get quite close to the quota license capacity.

Mr. Jeffares received confirmation that what is decided will not affect any existing bistro.

Mr. Boyle said the chart that reflects the bistros should be amended to include Whole Foods. Also, the Planning Board is being asked to make a decision because it would be fair to another license holder. That is a political decision and it should be taken up by the political body and not the Planning Board.

Chairman Clein made it clear that in his opinion the motivation of this board has not been to look at this as fairness or equity or economics. However, the motivation of the elected officials may have been that, and thus their reasoning for sending it to the Planning Board to look at it from a land planning perspective.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce proposed saying that outdoor seating for bistros should not exceed their permissible maximum indoor seating. However, Mr. Share did not see that it makes sense from a planning perspective to impose an artificial number Downtown. He likes the ability to control and react to individual situations.
It was thought that this matter can be discussed at the end of the joint Planning Board/City Commission meeting.

Mr. Jeffares did not think that long-term, rooftop dining will be a big issue because of the limited number of sites where it could exist.

Mr. Boyle said that other than Griffin Claw and Big Rock they have not seen that bistros work effectively outside of Downtown. It strikes him as odd that the board is trying to weaken the incentive for bistros in the Rail and Triangle Districts rather than improving it.

The Chairman said with respect to rooftop dining they could say that it is allowed with approval of the City Commission and provided the applicant has satisfied street level outdoor dining requirements and there is no negative impact on surrounding properties. He added they will have had the joint meeting before the next regular Planning Board meeting and will be able to make a determination on the language. The hours of operation for rooftop dining can also be discussed.
STUDY SESSION

1. Bistro Regulations

Mr. Cowan recalled that over several months the Planning Board studied existing bistros and discussed the future goals of the bistro program. One of the issues has been the number of seats that are permitted for outdoor dining. The Planning Board had determined that they wanted to review outdoor dining seating on a case-by-case basis. They sent that proposal to the City Commission; however the Commission sent it back saying that with no limit on the outdoor dining seats for bistros they felt the bistros were getting too large and felt they were competing with the Class C Liquor License holders. Also, they asked the Planning Board to review rooftop dining. Therefore, Mr. Cowan included draft language this time stating that rooftop dining is permitted as long as adequate street-level dining is provided, as determined by the Planning Board and City Commission.

Then for the definition of Bistro, Section 9.02 he added that when located in the Triangle District or Rail District, a bistro is a restaurant that has a full service kitchen with interior seating for no more than 85 people and seating for outdoor dining of no more than 85 people. So, outdoor seating is kept equal to indoor seating.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce did not know how this proposal would be received but she thought it is a good starting place. Mr. Jeffares did not think it would hurt anything and agreed it could be tried for a bit to see how it works.

Chairman Clein agreed and noted it is abundantly clear to him that the City Commission wants a number. With respect to rooftop dining, he suggested language in paragraph 11 read that rooftop dining is permitted as long as adequate street level dining is provided and the rooftop dining will not pose any negative impact on surrounding properties as determined by the Planning Board and the City Commission.

Board members agreed to also include in paragraph 11 that rooftop dining is permitted as a portion of allowable outdoor dining.

Motion by Mr. Williams

Seconded by Mr. Share to schedule a public hearing for August 8, knowing that if staff cannot get proper notice out it will be postponed to September.
Motion carried, 7-0.

There was no audience present.
PUBLIC HEARING

The Chairman opened the public hearing at 7:33 p.m.

1. AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 3.04, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.
AND
TO AMEND SECTION 5.06, O1 – OFFICE DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.
AND
TO AMEND SECTION 5.07, O2 – OFFICE DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.
AND
TO AMEND SECTION 5.08, P – PARKING DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.
AND
TO AMEND SECTION 5.10, B2 – GENERAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, B2B – GENERAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, B2C – GENERAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.
AND
TO AMEND SECTION 5.11, B3 – OFFICE-RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.
AND
TO AMEND SECTION 5.12, B4 – BUSINESS-RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.
AND
TO AMEND SECTION 5.13, MX – MIXED USE DISTRICT, SPECIFIC STANDARDS, BUILDING USE, TO AMEND THE CONDITIONS OF THE BISTRO SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT.
AND
TO AMEND SECTION 9.02, DEFINITIONS: BISTRO.

Ms. Ecker recalled this topic was initiated at the joint City Commission/Planning Board in June of 2017. There was discussion about putting additional regulations in place for bistros. So, over several months the Planning Board has studied existing bistros and discussed the future goals of the bistro program. One of the issues has been the number of seats that are permitted for outdoor dining. The Planning Board had determined that they wanted to review outdoor dining seating on a case-by-case basis. They sent that proposal to the City Commission; however the Commission sent it back saying they felt it was competing with the Class C Liquor License holders. Also they asked the Planning Board to review rooftop dining. The general consensus from the City Commission has been that they like the 42 in. rail standards as well as the rule banning year-round outdoor dining enclosures.
On June 13, 2018, the Planning Board considered the City Commission's request to discuss the number of outdoor dining seats bistros are allowed as well as permissible rooftop dining. The Board decided to examine language stating that outdoor seating may not exceed the number of permissible seats indoors. Also, they decided to evaluate language that would permit rooftop dining as long as adequate street level dining is provided.

On July 11, 2018 language regarding the number of permissible outdoor dining seats and rooftop dining was finalized with amendments including conditions that rooftop dining may not impact surrounding properties in a negative manner and that rooftop dining is only permitted if adequate street level dining is provided as determined by the Planning Board and City Commission. Also added was that rooftop dining seats count towards the total number of permissible outdoor dining seats.

The other change was to the definition of bistro. That limited the number of outdoor seats and also created two different size requirements depending on the district where the bistro is located. For bistros in the Downtown Overlay, no more than 65 indoor dining seats are permitted. When located in the Triangle or Rail District, a bistro is a restaurant with interior seating for no more than 85 people. Outdoor seating in all of the districts is limited to match what is allowed inside.

The Planning Board passed a motion to hold a public hearing on August 8, 2018. No public was present.

Board members reviewed the ordinance amendments and concluded that paragraph 11 in all zone districts should be changed to read "Outdoor rooftop dining is permitted . . . "

Motion by Mr. Williams
Seconded by Mr. Koseck that subject to the additional language discussed, to recommend approval to the City Commission of the amendments to Chapter 126, Zoning, of the Birmingham City Code, sections 3.04, 5.06, 5.07, 5.08, 5.10, 5.11, 5.12, 5.13 and Definitions: Bistro in section 9.02, all as set forth in the materials.

Motion carried, 7-0.

VOICE VOTE
Yeas: Williams, Koseck, Clein, Boyle, Emerine, Jeffares, Ramine
Nays: None
Absent: Share, Whipple-Boyle

The Chairman closed the public hearing at 7:45 p.m.
DATE: October 2, 2018
TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager
FROM: Jana Ecker, Planning Director
SUBJECT: Master Plan Consultant Selection

On September 17, 2018, the City Commission considered the recommendation by the Ad Hoc Committee to select DPZ to provide an update to the City’s comprehensive master plan. After much discussion, the City Commission requested that they receive copies of the presentations conducted by both DPZ and MKSK before the Ad Hoc Committee, and requested that representatives from MKSK be present at the next meeting to respond to questions from the City Commission.

The City Commission clearly stated that no presentations would be conducted at the City Commission meeting on October 8, 2018 by either the DPZ or MKSK teams. The direction of the City Commission was to have MKSK team members present on October 8, 2018 to answer questions of clarification on their previously submitted proposal for the master plan only, as DPZ team members did on September 17, 2018.
DATE: September 28, 2018
TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager
FROM: Jana L. Ecker, Planning Director
SUBJECT: Master Plan Consultant Selection

On April 9, 2018 the City Commission voted to issue an RFP for a new Birmingham Master Plan. The deadline to submit proposals for consideration is June 1, 2018. During previous meetings regarding the Master Plan RFP there has been discussion on the consultant selection process. The final selection will be made by the City Commission. The part of the process that was discussed at the joint meeting was who should perform a preliminary review of all of the RFP submittals. This topic was extensively discussed at the joint City Commission/Planning Board meeting of September 16, 2016 (minutes attached). At that meeting several scenarios were considered. The options discussed were to have the Planning Board review the submittals and make a recommendation to the City Commission, which has been the process followed for many of the subarea plans. A second option discussed was to form a subcommittee that incorporates members of the Planning Board, select members of other relevant boards and Birmingham residents. Although no decision was made, as it was a study session, the conversation favored the ad hoc committee approach.

On May 14, 2018, the City Commission established an Ad Hoc Master Plan Selection Committee (“the Committee”) to assist in the selection of a consultant to update the City’s comprehensive master plan. The Committee was comprised of the following representatives:

- Two (2) Planning Board members
- Two (2) City residents, at least one of whom should be a former City Commissioner
- One (1) Multi-Modal Transportation Board member
- One (1) Advisory Parking Committee member
- One (1) Parks and Recreation Board member
- One (1) Design Review Board/Historic District Commission member
- One (1) Architectural Review Committee member

On July 31, 2018, the Committee met to review the three proposals received in response to the City’s RFP for a master plan consultant. After much deliberation, the Committee voted to eliminate the proposal submitted by Houseal Lavigne as it did not provide the requested parking study
component. Two finalists then remained and the Committee recommending inviting both the MKSK and DPZ consultant teams to come into the City for a formal interview. In addition, it was recommended that each of the two finalist consulting teams be asked to extend the term of their proposals by 45 days to allow the City to complete the selection process. Both teams agreed to do so.

On August 29, 2018, the Committee conducted interviews with both MKSK and DPZ, the top two finalists. Each team was given 1.5 hours to conduct a presentation and answer questions from the Committee. The Committee evaluated both teams, and voted 7-1 in favor of recommending to the City Commission that the DPZ team be selected to provide an update to the City’s comprehensive master plan.

On September 17, 2018, the City Commission considered the recommendation by the Ad Hoc Committee to select DPZ to provide an update to the City’s comprehensive master plan. The City Commission had numerous questions for the representatives of DPZ that were in attendance. After much discussion, the City Commission was unable to pass a motion to approve a contract with either DPZ or MKSK. The City Commission requested that they receive copies of the presentations conducted by both DPZ and MKSK before the Ad Hoc Committee, and requested that representatives from MKSK be present at the next meeting to respond to questions from the City Commission. The Commission voted to continue the matter to their regular meeting on October 8, 2018. Representatives from both DPZ and MKSK will be in attendance that evening. Please see attached presentations, as well as new correspondence from DPZ.

Please find attached the following documents for your review:

- A summary chart of all proposals received comparing the terms of each;
- The RFP that was issued by the City seeking qualified consultants to conduct an update of the City’s Master Plan;
- The three proposals received from the Houseal Lavigne, MKSK and DPZ consultant teams;
- Letters sent to DPZ and MKSK, with approval of each team to extend the term of their proposals by 45 days;
- The contract executed by DPZ;
- Copies of the presentations to the Ad Hoc Master Plan Selection Committee;
- Letter dated September 19, 2018 from DPZ to the City; and
- Letter dated September 26, 2018 from the City to DPZ.

SUGGESTED ACTION:

To APPROVE the contract with DPZ Partners, LLC, as recommended by the Ad Hoc Master Plan Selection Committee, in the amount of $298,000.00 payable from account # 101-721-000-811.000, to provide professional services to prepare an update to the City’s comprehensive master plan, and to direct the Mayor to execute same.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of Work</th>
<th>Housel Lavigne/DLZ/inFORM</th>
<th>DPZ/McKenna/Gibbs/Jacobs</th>
<th>MKSK/UDA/Nelson Nygaard/F&amp;V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>• Press releases, notices and newsletters • Interactive project website • Multi-day community charrette • Business workshop • Stakeholder interviews and focus group discussions • Do-it-yourself (DIY) workshop kits • Immersive outreach • Social media • map.social • Community outreach summary memo</td>
<td>• Detailed schedule of multi-day charrettes for public input • Project website • Social media • 2 online surveys • Unlimited telephone interviews • 10 in-person interviews</td>
<td>Community engagement will be prevalent in the six-phase master plan update proposal. Community engagement efforts will include: • Page on the City website • Community meetings starting at phase 3 including charrettes, interviews and events • Graphic-rich brochure • Public open house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>• Review of past plans, studies and reports • Demographic analysis and market overview • Existing land use and development • Zoning and development controls • Community facilities • Issues and opportunities memo • Staff coordination meeting • Planning Board meeting</td>
<td>• Update Birmingham, Oakland County and SE Michigan demographic data, future projections, and analysis of many demographic groups • Update of Birmingham’s residential housing section (visions, changes, typology, character) • Retail market study • Physical characteristics survey</td>
<td>• Review of past plans • Creation of a community profile – existing situation and trends • Existing landuse and focus area identification • Community tour/audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and Infrastructure Analysis</td>
<td>Firm has suggested that a separate independent parking study be obtained with a separate professional services firm specializing in parking. The firm has however outlined a transportation analysis in the proposal. NO PARKING ANALYSIS/PLAN IS PROPOSED.</td>
<td>• Identification of goals • Infrastructure analysis • Parking analysis • Recommendation of solutions • Prioritization of recommendations</td>
<td>• Project demand assessment • Review of Downtown Parking Assessment district • Current residential permit parking zone identification • Zoning requirements v. best practices • Street classifications • Traffic volumes and projections • Bike facilities • SMART transit ridership and bus stop features • Planned improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of Draft Plan</td>
<td>A draft plan will be available for review by City Staff, the Planning Board and Public-at-Large. A follow up staff coordination meeting and community open house will be available for feedback.</td>
<td>The Firm has proposed a four-phase process broken up into eleven tasks with specific agendas, deliverables and meeting details for each task: Phase 1: Initiation, assessment and analysis Phase 2: Preparation of draft master plan update Phase 3: Refinement of draft master plan update</td>
<td>The six-phase process will be combined into a final master plan update draft with meetings planned with City Staff, Planning Board, Multi-Modal Board, and City Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation and Adoption</td>
<td>• Planning Board public hearing • City Commission public hearing • Final draft of the Master Plan will be given to the City in both hard copy and digital formats, ensuring low-cost reproduction, revision, direct web and social media posting capabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentations will be made before the Planning Board after the 63-day review period, with an adoption meeting with the City Commission at the end. Meetings are included with all stakeholders before and in between the adoption meetings with revision time allowed for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Schedule</td>
<td>18-23 Months</td>
<td>16 Months</td>
<td>12-16 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Proposal</td>
<td>$134,000</td>
<td>$298,000</td>
<td>$289,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Services</td>
<td>The applicant has offered two additional services that may be recommended based on findings during the Master Planning Process for an added fee: 1. Subarea plans 2. Zoning code and regulations update</td>
<td>No additional services are proposed beyond those included in the proposal.</td>
<td>An additional service has been offered in the form of a Community Pattern Book that includes a community patterns description, urban patterns for infill, building types, architectural, landscape and garden patterns, green building guidelines, and a homeowners guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Qualifications of Team</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Experience</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum of 3 References</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP Deliverables</td>
<td>1 Digital Copy of Proposal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗ (USB Drive does not work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hard Copies of Proposal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Elements</td>
<td>MKSK Proposal</td>
<td>DPZ Proposal</td>
<td>H/L Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Community Engagement Plan</td>
<td>$104,500</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Data Collection &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Analysis</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Analysis</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at Meetings</td>
<td>34,600</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Preparation</td>
<td>29,800</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization &amp; Adoption</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$289,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$298,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$134,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Scores</td>
<td>MKSK Proposal</td>
<td>DPZ Proposal</td>
<td>H/L Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Score</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>86.46%</td>
<td>88.15%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On May 14, 2018, the City Commission established and Ad Hoc Master Plan Selection Committee (“the Committee”) to assist in the selection of a consultant to update the City’s comprehensive master plan. The Committee was comprised of the following representatives:

- Two (2) Planning Board members
- Two (2) City residents, at least one of whom should be a former City Commissioner
- One (1) Multi-Modal Transportation Board member
- One (1) Advisory Parking Committee member
- One (1) Parks and Recreation Board member
- One (1) Design Review Board/Historic District Commission member
- One (1) Architectural Review Committee member

On July 31, 2018, the Committee met to review the three proposals received in response to the City’s RFP for a master plan consultant. After much deliberation, the Committee voted to eliminate the proposal submitted by Houseal Lavigne as it did not provide the requested parking study component. Two finalists then remained and the Committee recommending inviting both the MKSK and DPZ consultant teams to come into the City for a formal interview.

Please find attached the following documents for your review:

- The RFP that was issued by the City seeking qualified consultants to conduct an update of the City’s Master Plan;
- A summary chart of all proposals received comparing the terms of each; and
- The three proposals received from the Houseal Lavigne, MKSK and DPZ consultant teams.

On August 29, 2018, the Committee conducted interviews with both MKSK and DPZ, the top two finalists. Each team was given 1.5 hours to conduct a presentation and answer questions from the Committee. The Committee evaluated both teams, and voted 7-1 in favor of recommending to the City Commission that the DPZ team be selected to provide an update to the City’s comprehensive master plan.
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
FOR MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Sealed proposals endorsed "MASTER PLAN UPDATE", will be received at the Office of the City Clerk, 151 Martin Street, PO Box 3001, Birmingham, Michigan, 48012; until June 1, 2018 at 3:00pm after which time bids will be publicly opened and read.

The City of Birmingham, Michigan is accepting sealed bid proposals from qualified professional firms to conduct a comprehensive master plan update. This work must be performed as specified in accordance with the specifications contained in the Request For Proposals (RFP).

The RFP, including the Specifications, may be obtained online from the Michigan Inter-governmental Trade Network at http://www.mitn.info or at the City of Birmingham, 151 Martin St., Birmingham, Michigan, ATTENTION: Jana L. Ecker, Planning Director.

The acceptance of any proposal made pursuant to this invitation shall not be binding upon the City until an agreement has been executed.

Submitted to MITN: April 11, 2018
Deadline for Submissions: June 1, 2018 at 3:00pm
Contact Person: Jana L. Ecker, Planning Director
P.O. Box 3001, 151 Martin Street
Birmingham, MI 48012-3001
Phone: 248-530-1841
Email: jecker@bhamgov.org
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
FOR MASTER PLAN UPDATE
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INTRODUCTION

For purposes of this request for proposals the City of Birmingham will hereby be referred to as “City” and the private consulting firm or firms will hereby be referred to as “Contractor.”

The City of Birmingham, Michigan is seeking a comprehensive update of the City-wide master plan, and is accepting sealed bid proposals from qualified professional planning firms who have experience drafting comprehensive master plan updates. Qualified Contractors must demonstrate experience in conducting strategic visioning sessions, encouraging public participation, community consensus building, demographic and land use analysis, parking analysis, planning best practices, and have a strong background working in traditional, walkable communities.

During the evaluation process, the City reserves the right where it may serve the City’s best interest to request additional information or clarification from proposers, or to allow corrections of errors or omissions. At the discretion of the City, firms submitting proposals may be requested to make oral presentations as part of the evaluation.

It is anticipated the selection of a firm will be completed by August 1, 2018. An Agreement for services will be required with the selected Contractor. A copy of the Agreement is contained herein as Attachment A. Contract services will commence upon execution of the service agreement by the City.

The purpose of this RFP is to request sealed bid proposals from qualified parties presenting their qualifications, capabilities and costs to provide a comprehensive update of the City-wide master plan. The City’s current comprehensive master plan is entitled The Birmingham Plan, and was adopted in 1980. Since the adoption of the master plan, several sub-area plans have also been adopted for specific sections of the City:

- Downtown 2016 Plan (1996);
- Eton Road Corridor Plan (1999);
- Triangle District Plan (2007);
- Alleys and Passages Plan (2012); and
- Multi-modal Transportation Plan (2013);
- Parks and Recreation Master Plan (TBD)

Each of these sub-area plans continue to be relevant and have essentially acted as updates to the City’s comprehensive master plan for portions of the City. The new comprehensive master plan should facilitate a collective utilization of the City’s various districts coming together. In addition, the review document produced as a result of Andres Duanys’ visit in 2014 should also be considered and incorporated into the development of a new comprehensive master plan.
At this time the City is seeking a comprehensive update of the 1980 Birmingham Plan, and the formal inclusion of each of the subarea plans into an updated comprehensive master plan (“the Plan”). Most of the plans noted above primarily address the City’s commercial areas, and thus the updated master plan should provide a clear focus and priority on the City’s residential areas which were last studied in the City’s 1980 comprehensive master plan. While some portions of the Birmingham Plan may continue to be relevant today, specific areas that need to be updated include:

- Community vision and planning objectives;
- Update of Population section to include current demographic data, future projections and analysis;
- Update of Regional and Surrounding Development section to include current and projected demographic data (residential, retail, office, mix of land uses) and analysis of the region, regional and downtown development trends and regional collaboration efforts;
- Update of Residential Housing section to include neighborhood vision in residential areas, analysis of changes in residential patterns and residential areas from 1980 to now, typology and character of neighborhoods, development trends, future projections and future direction;
- The physical characteristics of neighborhoods should be identified and documented including historic attributes, landscape conditions, housing type and the period of construction for each area;
- Review and update of Transportation section to include current local vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle data, recent and currently budgeted infrastructure improvements, current multi-modal trends, regional transportation projects, and future recommendations based on regional and national best practices;
- Update and review of existing land use, updated recommendations for future land uses and an updated future land use map including the area of Woodward between 14 Mile Rd. and Lincoln, known as the S. Woodward gateway;
- Parking analysis and recommendations for both public and private parking regulations throughout the entire City including consideration of parking requirements, public parking needs, residential parking permitting requirements, accessible parking needs, potential for shared parking and emerging and innovative technologies;
- Review and update of the Policies section to encourage the implementation of the City’s vision, current goals, best practices, current technological advances, and innovative policies.

This work must be performed as specified in accordance with the specifications outlined by the Scope of Work contained in this Request for Proposals (RFP). It is anticipated
that the master plan update will commence in August of 2018 and be completed by June of 2020.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**
Extensive public participation is vital to the success of the master plan update. During the master plan update process, the Contractor will solicit and garner the input of the public on the future vision for the City and build consensus to provide the basis for the overall direction of the master plan update. Extensive public input will also be encouraged throughout the entire master planning process, including specific discussions on residential areas, the downtown and commercial areas, and the transitional areas that connect these zones. The selected Contractor will be required to submit a detailed community engagement plan as a part of this RFP that allows for public input throughout the entire process from visioning to formal adoption of the Plan, utilizing contemporary technologies.

**SCOPE OF WORK**
The selected Contractor will work with the public, City staff, the Planning Board, and the City Commission to review and update Birmingham’s master plan. The Contractor will coordinate with City staff and the City Attorney to ensure compliance with all State and/or Federal laws related to a community master plan update. The scope of services is as follows:

1. **Comprehensive Community Engagement Plan.** Create a detailed and inclusive comprehensive Community Engagement Plan to encourage and facilitate ongoing public participation of all stakeholders in the master planning process, including workshops, charrettes, visioning process, surveys, walking tours and/or other such methods that have been demonstrated to stimulate public discourse to gather input from residents and business owners (property owners and retailers) for integration into the strategic vision for the residential neighborhoods and commercial areas within the Plan. This process is expected to include at a minimum, a multi-day workshop that provides substantial opportunities for various local stakeholders and residents to provide input to achieve consensus on the direction of the City moving forward and ongoing engagement with elected and appointed boards and commissions throughout the entire planning process.

2. **Updated Data Collection and Analysis.** Review and update all demographic, social, economic and market data and provide future projections and trends. Review and update existing land use and zoning patterns and evaluate future land uses (ie. zoning district boundaries, transitional zoning, lot consolidation etc.). Evaluate current trends and best practices in other dense, traditional, walkable communities to make policy recommendations for the future success of Birmingham.
3. **Infrastructure Analysis.** Review existing infrastructure, current construction practices, evaluate future needs and provide recommendations. Specific emphasis should be placed on transportation infrastructure, including analysis of existing vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities, current multi-modal trends, the formulation of recommendations based on future projections, best practices and the incorporation of Complete Streets principles and walkability priorities.

4. **Parking Analysis.** Review current parking regulations in effect in the City of Birmingham for both private and public property. Provide best practice analyses and recommendations for updating current parking regulations for both private developments and on street public parking in residential and commercial areas, including consideration of the following:

   1. A review of the Central Business District Parking Assessment District with regards to desired future land use, and the need to consider a restructuring of the Parking Assessment District to consider price variations for future expansion of buildings;
   2. A study of build-out capacity as it relates to parking needs and perceived parking issues Downtown;
   3. The potential need for a municipal parking system in the Triangle District and parking needs in the Rail District, with reference to recent analysis and recommendations;
   4. An analysis of the need for other public parking structures and locations along with ideas on financing strategies;
   5. A comprehensive review of the Zoning Ordinance parking regulations that apply outside of the Parking Assessment District;
   6. Analysis of the impact of ride sharing, autonomous vehicles and mass transit on future parking needs as it pertains to the Metro Detroit area;
   7. The need for a written standard relative to the maximum number of dining decks that can be installed in on street parking spaces per block or other defined distance;
   8. The need for demand pricing for parking that would create dynamic hourly rates depending on daily changes in demand both on the street and in the structures;
   9. Development of a policy for electric vehicle charging stations;
   10. Residential Permit parking and alternatives (City-wide);
   11. The need for restricted on-street parking between 2am-6am; and
   12. A review of options to transition public parking decks to other uses in the future if demand for parking declines.

5. **Attendance at Meetings.** The Contractor shall expect to attend the following meetings and base their fees accordingly:
   - A multi-day charrette as noted in subsection (1) above.
One (1) meeting with the Planning Board to discuss process and finalize a schedule to meet the requirements of this RFP.

Up to five (5) work sessions with City staff to discuss progress and recommendations.

Two (2) progress report meetings with the City Commission during the master planning process.

Up to three (3) work sessions/monthly meetings with the Planning Board to discuss updates to key segments of the Plan.

One (1) public hearing for review of the final draft at the Planning Board.

One (1) public hearing for review of the final draft at the City Commission.

The City reserves the right to reduce or increase the number of meetings depending on the progress of the project with an adjustment in the contract accordingly.

6. Plan Preparation. The Contractor will prepare a detailed progress report for review by the City Commission upon completion of 50% of the project, and another progress report for review by the City Commission upon completion of 75% of the project. The Contractor shall provide ongoing engagement with respective commissions and boards. The Contractor will prepare drafts of each key segment of the Plan for review by the Planning Board, and shall make changes as directed throughout the process. The Contractor will prepare one draft version of the Plan including updated census information, maps, charts, exhibits and graphics to create a vital and compelling statement of public policy. The Contractor will work with the public and the Planning Board to refine the draft Plan into a final draft for approval by the City Commission.

7. Finalization and Adoption. A draft of the updated Plan will be presented to the Planning Board for initial recommendation and to the City Commission for their concurrence. The Contractor will participate in the required public hearing(s) and prepare a completed final document with all necessary changes.

This outline is not necessarily all-inclusive and the Contractor shall include in the proposal any other tasks and services deemed necessary to satisfactorily complete the project.

DELIVERABLES
The Contractor shall provide a detailed, master graphic format of the Plan that incorporates all sub-area plans and includes an extensive use of illustrations, photos, before and after examples, charts and tables that clearly depict the plan content, vision and implementation in the following formats upon adoption of the final version of the Plan:
1. One (1) reproducible PDF digital file and twenty (20) hard copies of the draft Plan at 50% completion of plan;
2. One (1) reproducible PDF digital file and twenty (20) hard copies of the draft Plan at 75% completion of plan;
3. One (1) reproducible PDF digital file and twenty (20) hard color copies of the completed plan;
4. One reproducible PDF digital file of the final Plan for publication on the web and social media; and
5. One page infographic outlining vision, goals and recommendations of the Plan.

All data, illustrations and projections created or compiled throughout the project shall become the sole property of the City of Birmingham.

**TIME SCHEDULE AND COST PROPOSAL**

All proposals must include a proposed time schedule for completion of the project and a fixed price agreement with an associated fee schedule for extra meeting costs, should they be required. Reimbursable expenses will be billed at direct cost plus a 10% administrative charge. Normal reimbursable expenses including… associated with the project are to be included in the estimated fees as outlined in the proposal.

The Contractor shall perform all services outlined in this RFP in accordance with the requirements as defined and noted herein.

**INVITATION TO SUBMIT A PROPOSAL**

Proposals shall be submitted no later than Friday **June 1, 2018 at 3:00pm** to:

City of Birmingham  
Attn: City Clerk  
151 Martin Street  
Birmingham, Michigan  48009

One (1) electronic copy and ten (10) hard copies of the proposal must be submitted. The proposal should be firmly sealed in an envelope, which shall be clearly marked on the outside, **“MASTER PLAN UPDATE”**. Any proposal received after the due date cannot be accepted and will be rejected and returned, unopened, to the proposer. Proposer may submit more than one proposal provided each proposal meets the functional requirements.

**SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS**

All proposals that wish to be considered must contain the following:

(1) Cover Letter;
(2) Outline of qualifications of the Contractor and of the key employees that will be involved in the project, including an organizational chart of the roles and
responsibilities of each team member, and references for the team leader(s).
The project team should include each of the following skill sets:

- Urban design;
- Multi-modal transportation;
- Sustainability;
- Urban planning;
- Zoning and form-based code;
- Architecture;
- Physical design;
- Landscape architecture;
- Transportation engineering;
- Parking expertise; and
- National Charrette Institute certification and/or training.

3. Outline of Contractor(s) experience with the preparation of similar master plan updates, including references from at least two relevant communities where you have completed such plans. (Portions of sample plans prepared by the Contractor should be submitted with the proposal, up to a maximum of twenty-five (25) pages);

4. Outline presenting a description of the scope of work to be completed, broken down into the following separate components:
   (i) Community Engagement Plan;
   (ii) Data collection and analysis;
   (iii) Parking and infrastructure Analysis;
   (iv) Preparation of draft plan;
   (v) Presentation and Adoption;

5. Proposed time frame for completion of each component of the scope of work;

6. A statement of any additional services that you recommend, if any. Define hourly rates for additional services by discipline.

7. Bidders Agreement (Attachment B);
8. Cost Proposal (Attachment C); and

INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS

1. Any and all forms requesting information from the bidder must be completed on the attached forms contained herein (see Contractor’s Responsibilities). If more than one bid is submitted, a separate bid proposal form must be used for each.

2. Any request for clarification of this RFP shall be made in writing and delivered to: Jana L. Ecker, Planning Director, 151 Martin Street, Birmingham, MI, or via email to jecker@bhamgov.org. Such request for clarification shall be delivered, in writing, no later than 5 days prior to the deadline for
submissions. Email requests must contain in their subject line “Request for Clarification”.

3. All proposals must be submitted following the RFP format as stated in this document and shall be subject to all requirements of this document including the instruction to respondents and general information sections. All proposals must be regular in every respect and no interlineations, excisions, or special conditions shall be made or included in the RFP format by the respondent.

4. The contract will be awarded by the City of Birmingham to the most responsive and responsible bidder and the contract will require the completion of the work pursuant to these documents.

5. Each respondent shall include in their proposal, in the format requested, the cost of performing the work. Municipalities are exempt from Michigan State Sales and Federal Excise taxes. Do not include such taxes in the proposal figure. The City will furnish the successful company with tax exemption information when requested.

6. Each respondent shall include in their proposal the following information: Firm name, address, city, state, zip code, telephone number, and fax number. The company shall also provide the name, address, telephone number and e-mail address of an individual in their organization to whom notices and inquiries by the City should be directed as part of their proposal.

EVALUATION PROCEDURE AND CRITERIA
The City will utilize a qualifications-based selection process in choosing a Contractor for the completion of this work. The evaluation panel will consist of City staff, board members, and/or any other person(s) designated by the City who will evaluate the proposals based on, but not limited to, the following criteria:

- Ability to provide services as outlined.
- Experience of the Contractor with similar projects.
- Professional qualification of key employees assigned to the project.
- Public Involvement Process.
- Content of Proposal.
- Cost of Services.
- Timeline and Schedule for Completion.
- References.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS
1. The City reserves the right to reject any or all proposals received, waive informalities, or accept any proposal, in whole or in part, it deems best. The City reserves the right to award the contract to the next most qualified Contractor if
the successful Contractor does not execute a contract within ten (10) days after the award of the proposal.

2. The City reserves the right to request clarification of information submitted and to request additional information of one or more Contractors.

3. The City reserves the right to terminate the contract at its discretion should it be determined that the services provided do not meet the specifications contained herein. The City may terminate this Agreement at any point in the process upon notice to Contractor sufficient to indicate the City's desire to do so. In the case of such a stoppage, the City agrees to pay Contractor for services rendered to the time of notice, subject to the contract maximum amount.

4. Any proposal may be withdrawn up until the date and time set above for the opening of the proposals. Any proposals not so withdrawn shall constitute an irrevocable offer, for a period of ninety (90) days, to provide the services set forth in the proposal.

5. The cost of preparing and submitting a proposal is the responsibility of the Contractor and shall not be chargeable in any manner to the City.

6. Payment will be made within thirty (30) days after invoice. Acceptance by the City is defined as authorization by the designated City representative to this project that all the criteria requested under the Scope of Work contained herein have been provided. Invoices are to be rendered each month following the date of execution of an Agreement with the City.

7. The Contractor will not exceed the timelines established for the completion of this project.

8. The successful bidder shall enter into and will execute the contract as set forth and attached as Attachment A.

CONTRACTOR’S RESPONSIBILITIES
Each bidder shall provide the following as part of their proposal:

1. Complete and sign all forms requested for completion within this RFP.
   a. Bidder’s Agreement (Attachment B)
   b. Cost Proposal (Attachment C)
   c. Iran Sanctions Act Vendor Certification Form (Attachment D)
   d. Agreement (Attachment A – only if selected by the City).

2. Provide a description of completed projects that demonstrate the firm’s ability to complete projects of similar scope, size, and purpose, and in a timely manner, and within budget.
3. Provide a written plan detailing the anticipated timeline for completion of the tasks set forth in the Scope of Work.

4. The Contractor will be responsible for any changes necessary for the plans to be approved by the City of Birmingham.

5. Provide a description of the firm, including resumes and professional qualifications of the principals involved in administering the project.

6. Provide a list of sub-contractors and their qualifications, if applicable.

7. Provide three (3) client references from past projects, include current phone numbers. At least two (2) of the client references should be for similar projects.

8. Provide a project timeline addressing each section within the Scope of Work and a description of the overall project approach. Include a statement that the Contractor will be available according to the proposed timeline.

**CITY RESPONSIBILITY**

The City will provide a designated representative to work with the Contractor to coordinate both the City's and Contractor's efforts and to review and approve any work performed by the Contractor.

**SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES**

The successful bidder agrees to certain dispute resolution avenues/limitations. Please refer to paragraph 17 of the Agreement attached as Attachment A for the details and what is required of the successful bidder.

**INSURANCE**

The successful bidder is required to procure and maintain certain types of insurances. Please refer to paragraph 12 of the Agreement attached as Attachment A for the details and what is required of the successful bidder.

**CONTINUATION OF COVERAGE**

The Contractor also agrees to provide all insurance coverages as specified. Upon failure of the Contractor to obtain or maintain such insurance coverage for the term of the agreement, the City may, at its option, purchase such coverage and subtract the cost of obtaining such coverage from the contract amount. In obtaining such coverage, Birmingham shall have no obligation to procure the most cost effective coverage but may contract with any insurer for such coverage.
EXECUTION OF CONTRACT
The bidder whose proposal is accepted shall be required to execute the contract and to furnish all insurance coverages as specified within ten (10) days after receiving notice of such acceptance. Any contract awarded pursuant to any bid shall not be binding upon the City until a written contract has been executed by both parties. Failure or refusal to execute the contract shall be considered an abandonment of all rights and interest in the award and the contract may be awarded to another. The successful bidder agrees to enter into and will execute the contract as set forth and attached as Attachment A.

INDEMNIFICATION
The successful bidder agrees to indemnify the City and various associated persons. Please refer to paragraph 13 of the Agreement attached as Attachment A for the details and what is required of the successful bidder.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST
The successful bidder is subject to certain conflict of interest requirements/restrictions. Please refer to paragraph 14 of the Agreement attached as Attachment A for the details and what is required of the successful bidder.

EXAMINATION OF PROPOSAL MATERIALS
The submission of a proposal shall be deemed a representation and warranty by the Contractor that it has investigated all aspects of the RFP, that it is aware of the applicable facts pertaining to the RFP process and its procedures and requirements, and that it has read and understands the RFP. Statistical information which may be contained in the RFP or any addendum thereto is for informational purposes only.

PROJECT TIMELINE (MAXIMUM)
Evaluate Respondents June 2018
Interview Contractors June-July 2018
Award Contract July-August 2018
Project Kick Off Meeting August 2018
50% Completion of draft Plan August 2019
75% Completion of draft Plan February 2020
Final Draft of Plan Completed June 2020

The Contractor will not exceed the timelines established for the completion of this project. A shorter timeline is encouraged and preferred.
ATTACHMENT A - AGREEMENT
FOR MASTER PLAN UPDATE

This AGREEMENT, made this _______day of ____________, 2018, by and between CITY OF BIRMINGHAM, having its principal municipal office at 151 Martin Street, Birmingham, MI (hereinafter sometimes called “City”), and ______________, Inc., having its principal office at _____________________ (hereinafter called "Contractor"), provides as follows:

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the City has heretofore advertised for bids for the procurement and performance of services required to complete an update to the City-wide comprehensive master plan, and in connection therewith has prepared a request for sealed proposals (“RFP”), which includes certain instructions to bidders, specifications, terms and conditions.

WHEREAS, the Contractor has professional qualifications that meet the project requirements and has made a bid in accordance with such request for cost proposals to complete an update to the City-wide comprehensive master plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, for and in consideration of the respective agreements and undertakings herein contained, the parties agree as follows:

1. It is mutually agreed by and between the parties that the documents consisting of the Request for Proposal to complete an update to the City-wide comprehensive master plan and the Contractor’s cost proposal dated ______________, 2018 shall be incorporated herein by reference and shall become a part of this Agreement, and shall be binding upon both parties hereto. If any of the documents are in conflict with one another, this Agreement shall take precedence, then the RFP.

2. The City shall pay the Contractor for the performance of this Agreement in an amount not to exceed ________________, as set forth in the Contractor’s ____________ 2018 cost proposal.

3. This Agreement shall commence upon execution by both parties, unless the City exercises its option to terminate the Agreement in accordance with the Request for Proposals.

4. The Contractor shall employ personnel of good moral character and fitness in performing all services under this Agreement.

5. The Contractor and the City agree that the Contractor is acting as an independent contractor with respect to the Contractor’s role in providing services to the City pursuant to this Agreement, and as such, shall be liable for its own actions and neither the Contractor nor its employees shall be construed as employees of the
City. Nothing contained in this Agreement shall be construed to imply a joint venture or partnership and neither party, by virtue of this Agreement, shall have any right, power or authority to act or create any obligation, express or implied, on behalf of the other party, except as specifically outlined herein. Neither the City nor the Contractor shall be considered or construed to be the agent of the other, nor shall either have the right to bind the other in any manner whatsoever, except as specifically provided in this Agreement, and this Agreement shall not be construed as a contract of agency. The Contractor shall not be entitled or eligible to participate in any benefits or privileges given or extended by the City, or be deemed an employee of the City for purposes of federal or state withholding taxes, FICA taxes, unemployment, workers' compensation or any other employer contributions on behalf of the City.

6. The Contractor acknowledges that in performing services pursuant to this Agreement, certain confidential and/or proprietary information (including, but not limited to, internal organization, methodology, personnel and financial information, etc.) may become involved. The Contractor recognizes that unauthorized exposure of such confidential or proprietary information could irreparably damage the City. Therefore, the Contractor agrees to use reasonable care to safeguard the confidential and proprietary information and to prevent the unauthorized use or disclosure thereof. The Contractor shall inform its employees of the confidential or proprietary nature of such information and shall limit access thereto to employees rendering services pursuant to this Agreement. The Contractor further agrees to use such confidential or proprietary information only for the purpose of performing services pursuant to this Agreement. The Contractor agrees that it will require all subcontractors to sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement satisfactory to the City Attorney.

7. This Agreement shall be governed by and performed, interpreted and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of Michigan. The Contractor agrees to perform all services provided for in this Agreement in accordance with and in full compliance with all local, state and federal laws and regulations.

8. If any provision of this Agreement is declared invalid, illegal or unenforceable, such provision shall be severed from this Agreement and all other provisions shall remain in full force and effect.

9. This Agreement shall be binding upon the successors and assigns of the parties hereto, but no such assignment shall be made by the Contractor without the prior written consent of the City. Any attempt at assignment without prior written consent shall be void and of no effect.

10. The Contractor agrees that neither it nor its subcontractors will discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment with respect to hire, tenure, terms, conditions or privileges of employment, or a matter directly or indirectly related to
employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, height, weight or marital status. The Contractor shall inform the City of all claims or suits asserted against it by the Contractor’s employees who work pursuant to this Agreement. The Contractor shall provide the City with periodic status reports concerning all such claims or suits, at intervals established by the City.

11. The Contractor shall not commence work under this Agreement until it has, at its sole expense, obtained the insurance required under this paragraph. All coverages shall be with insurance companies licensed and admitted to do business in the State of Michigan. All coverages shall be with carriers acceptable to the City of Birmingham.

12. The Contractor shall maintain during the life of this Agreement the types of insurance coverage and minimum limits as set forth below:

   A. **Workers’ Compensation Insurance:** Contractor shall procure and maintain during the life of this Agreement, Workers’ Compensation Insurance, including Employers Liability Coverage, in accordance with all applicable statutes of the State of Michigan.

   B. **Commercial General Liability Insurance:** Contractor shall procure and maintain during the life of this Agreement, Commercial General Liability Insurance on an "Occurrence Basis" with limits of liability not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence combined single limit, Personal Injury, Bodily Injury and Property Damage. Coverage shall include the following extensions: (A) Contractual Liability; (B) Products and Completed Operations; (C) Independent Contractors Coverage; (D) Broad Form General Liability Extensions or equivalent; (E) Deletion of all Explosion, Collapse and Underground (XCU) Exclusions, if applicable.

   C. **Motor Vehicle Liability:** Contractor shall procure and maintain during the life of this Agreement Motor Vehicle Liability Insurance, including all applicable no-fault coverages, with limits of liability of not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence combined single limit Bodily Injury and Property Damage. Coverage shall include all owned vehicles, all non-owned vehicles, and all hired vehicles.

   D. **Additional Insured:** Commercial General Liability and Motor Vehicle Liability Insurance, as described above, shall include an endorsement stating the following shall be Additional Insureds: The City of Birmingham, including all elected and appointed officials, all employee and volunteers, all boards, commissions and/or authorities and board members, including employees and volunteers thereof. This coverage shall be primary to any other coverage that may be available to the additional insured, whether any other available coverage by primary, contributing or excess.
E. **Cancellation Notice:** Workers’ Compensation Insurance, Commercial General Liability Insurance and Motor Vehicle Liability Insurance (and Professional Liability Insurance, if applicable), as described above, shall include an endorsement stating the following: “Thirty (30) days Advance Written Notice of Cancellation or Non-Renewal, shall be sent to: Finance Director, City of Birmingham, PO Box 3001, 151 Martin Street, Birmingham, MI 48012-3001.

F. **Proof of Insurance Coverage:** Contractor shall provide the City of Birmingham, at the time the Agreement is returned for execution, Certificates of Insurance and/or policies, acceptable to the City of Birmingham, as listed below.

   1) Two (2) copies of Certificate of Insurance for Workers’ Compensation Insurance;
   2) Two (2) copies of Certificate of Insurance for Commercial General Liability Insurance;
   3) Two (2) copies of Certificate of Insurance for Vehicle Liability Insurance;
   4) Two (2) copies of Certificate of Insurance for Professional Liability Insurance;
   5) If so requested, Certified Copies of all policies mentioned above will be furnished.

G. **Coverage Expiration:** If any of the above coverages expire during the term of this Agreement, Contractor shall deliver renewal certificates and/or policies to the City of Birmingham at least (10) days prior to the expiration date.

H. **Maintaining Insurance:** Upon failure of the Contractor to obtain or maintain such insurance coverage for the term of the Agreement, the City of Birmingham may, at its option, purchase such coverage and subtract the cost of obtaining such coverage from the Agreement amount. In obtaining such coverage, the City of Birmingham shall have no obligation to procure the most cost-effective coverage but may contract with any insurer for such coverage.

13. To the fullest extent permitted by law, the Contractor and any entity or person for whom the Contractor is legally liable, agrees to be responsible for any liability, defend, pay on behalf of, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Birmingham, its elected and appointed officials, employees and volunteers and others working on behalf of the City of Birmingham against any and all claims, demands, suits, or loss, including all costs and reasonable attorney fees connected therewith, and for any damages which may be asserted, claimed or recovered against or from and the City of Birmingham, its elected and appointed officials, employees, volunteers or others working on behalf of the City of Birmingham, by reason of personal injury, including bodily injury and death and/or property damage, including loss of use thereof, which arises out of or is in any way connected or associated with this Agreement. Such responsibility shall
not be construed as liability for damage caused by or resulting from the sole act or omission of its elected or appointed officials, employees, volunteers or others working on behalf of the City of Birmingham.

14. If, after the effective date of this Agreement, any official of the City, or spouse, child, parent or in-law of such official or employee shall become directly or indirectly interested in this Agreement or the affairs of the Contractor, the City shall have the right to terminate this Agreement without further liability to the Contractor if the disqualification has not been removed within thirty (30) days after the City has given the Contractor notice of the disqualifying interest. Ownership of less than one percent (1%) of the stock or other equity interest in a corporation or partnership shall not be a disqualifying interest. Employment shall be a disqualifying interest.

15. If Contractor fails to perform its obligations hereunder, the City may take any and all remedial actions provided by the general specifications or otherwise permitted by law.

16. All notices required to be sent pursuant to this Agreement shall be mailed to the following addresses:

City of Birmingham
Attn: Jana L. Ecker
151 Martin Street
Birmingham, MI 48009
248-530-1841

CONTRACTOR

17. Any controversy or claim arising out of or relating to this Agreement, or the breach thereof, shall be settled either by commencement of a suit in Oakland County Circuit Court, the 48th District Court or by arbitration. If both parties elect to have the dispute resolved by arbitration, it shall be settled pursuant to Chapter 50 of the Revised Judicature Act for the State of Michigan and administered by the American Arbitration Association with one arbitrator being used, or three arbitrators in the event any party’s claim exceeds $1,000,000. Each party shall bear its own costs and expenses and an equal share of the arbitrator’s and administrative fees of arbitration. Such arbitration shall qualify as statutory arbitration pursuant to MCL§600.5001 et. seq., and the Oakland County Circuit Court or any court having jurisdiction shall render judgment upon the award of the arbitrator made pursuant to this Agreement. The laws of the State of Michigan shall govern this Agreement, and the arbitration shall take place in Oakland County, Michigan. In the event that the parties elect not to have the matter in dispute arbitrated, any dispute between the parties may be resolved by the filing of a suit in the Oakland County Circuit Court or the 48th District Court.

18. FAIR PROCUREMENT OPPORTUNITY: Procurement for the City of Birmingham will be handled in a manner providing fair opportunity for all businesses. This
will be accomplished without abrogation or sacrifice of quality and as determined to be in the best interest of the City of Birmingham.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said parties have caused this Agreement to be executed as of the date and year above written.**

WITNESSES:  

CONTRACTOR

_______________________________  By:_____________________________

Its:

CITY OF BIRMINGHAM

_______________________________  By:_____________________________

Andrew Harris
Its: Mayor

_______________________________  By:_____________________________

Cherilynn Mynsberge
Its: City Clerk

Approved:

________________________________
Jana L. Ecker, Planning Director
(Approved as to substance)

Joseph A. Valentine City Manager
(Approved as to substance)

________________________________
Timothy J. Currier, City Attorney
(Approved as to form)

________________________________
Mark Gerber, Director of Finance
(Approved as to financial obligation)
ATTACHMENT B - BIDDER’S AGREEMENT
FOR MASTER PLAN UPDATE

In submitting this proposal, as herein described, the Contractor agrees that:

1. They have carefully examined the specifications, terms and Agreement of the Request for Proposal and all other provisions of this document and understand the meaning, intent, and requirement of it.

2. They will enter into a written contract and furnish the item or items in the time specified in conformance with the specifications and conditions contained therein for the price quoted by the proponent on this proposal.

PREPARED BY
(Print Name)

DATE

TITLE

DATE

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

E-MAIL ADDRESS

COMPANY

ADDRESS

PHONE

NAME OF PARENT COMPANY

PHONE

ADDRESS
ATTACHMENT C - COST PROPOSAL
FOR MASTER PLAN UPDATE

In order for the bid to be considered valid, this form must be completed in its entirety. The cost for the Scope of Work as stated in the Request for Proposal documents shall be itemized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Elements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Comprehensive Community Engagement Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Updated Data Collection and Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Infrastructure Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parking Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attendance at Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Plan Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Finalization and Adoption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Elements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL AMOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Meeting Charge</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Services Recommended (if any):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firm Name__________________________________  Date______________

Authorized signature__________________________________  Date______________
Pursuant to Michigan Law and the Iran Economic Sanction Act, 2012 PA 517 ("Act"), prior to the City accepting any bid or proposal, or entering into any contract for goods or services with any prospective Vendor, the Vendor must certify that it is not an “Iran Linked Business”, as defined by the Act.

By completing this form, the Vendor certifies that it is not an “Iran Linked Business”, as defined by the Act and is in full compliance with all provisions of the Act and is legally eligible to submit a bid for consideration by the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREPARED BY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Print Name)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE</th>
<th>E-MAIL ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PARENT COMPANY</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAXPAYER I.D.#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
City of Birmingham, Michigan

Master Plan Update
Proposal

June 1, 2018
June 1, 2018

Jana L. Ecker, Planning Director
P.O. Box 3001
151 Martin Street
Birmingham, MI 48012-3001

Dear Ms. Ecker,

Houseal Lavigne Associates is pleased to present this proposal to the City of Birmingham in response to the request for proposals to update its existing Master Plan. We believe our project team is exceptionally qualified to undertake this assignment and provide the City with a relatable, responsive, visionary, and actionable Master Plan that will serve Birmingham for years to come.

Houseal Lavigne Associates is an award-winning community planning, economic development, and urban design firm. Since the firm’s inception in 2004, we have received 11 awards for “Best Plan” from several state chapters of the American Planning Association (APA), including the Daniel Burnham Award for a Comprehensive Plan by the Michigan chapter of the APA and the Mackinac Prize by the Michigan Chapter of the Congress for New Urbanism for our work on the Flint Master Plan. In 2014, we were awarded the APA’s National Planning Excellence Award for an Emerging Planning and Design Firm. This prestigious award recognizes our innovative planning approach, targeted implementation strategies, creative and effective outreach, integration of emergent technologies, industry-leading graphic communication, and overall influence on professional planning practice in the region and across the United States.

Our approach to preparing Birmingham’s Master Plan Update includes (1) establishing a strong sense of stewardship through creative outreach and community rapport; (2) fully examining plan alternatives by assessing physical constraints, market conditions, and development feasibility; (3) focusing on healthy, walkable, and sustainable solutions; (4) developing visionary, yet pragmatic planning recommendations; and (5) establishing targeted strategies that result in the tangible implementation of projects.

We have assembled a project team comprised of leading experts in the fields of planning, transportation and civil engineering, and urban design. In addition, all members of the project team have significant local and regional experience.

For this assignment, we are joined by staff from the firms DLZ Michigan, Inc., who will be providing all services relating to transportation and civil engineering, as well as inFORM studio, who will provide all services relating to historic preservation and as-needed design and architectural services.

We will work closely with City staff, officials, and City-retained consultants to ensure that local expertise and insight strengthens the planning process. This coordinated approach will result in a Master Plan that addresses issues of growth and development that have occurred since Birmingham prepared its last Master Plan and that sustains the City’s character and quality of life.

We appreciate the opportunity to be considered for this important project and look forward to the prospect of working with the City of Birmingham. Should you have any questions regarding this submittal, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Houseal Lavigne Associates

John Houseal, FAICP
Principal | Co-founder
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SECTION 1
TEAM QUALIFICATIONS
SECTION 1
TEAM QUALIFICATIONS

Our project team for the City of Birmingham’s Master Plan Update project is comprised of a group of planning professionals with specialized expertise in all areas of master planning, land use planning, downtown and corridor planning, neighborhood and special area planning, zoning, economic development, strategic visioning, community outreach and public participation, demographic and market analysis. Our team has been specifically assembled to provide the City of Birmingham with a responsive, effective, creative, and unique Master Plan.

Houseal Lavigne Associates (HLA) is an award-winning community planning, economic development, and urban design firm with extensive experience in a wide range of assignments. Since the firm’s inception, we have completed over 350 plans and studies for more than 250 clients, the majority of which are municipalities. We have received 11 awards for “Best Plan” from several state chapters of the American Planning Association (APA), including an award from the Michigan APA for our work on the City of Flint’s Master Plan. In 2014, we were awarded the APA’s National Planning Excellence Award for an Emerging Planning and Design Firm. This prestigious award recognizes our innovative planning approach, targeted implementation strategies, creative and effective outreach, integration of emergent technologies, industry-leading graphic communication, and overall influence on the planning profession across the United States.

DLZ Michigan, Inc. (DLZ) is a Michigan-based, full-service, multidisciplinary, and minority-owned business enterprise. DLZ will be assisting Houseal Lavigne Associates with the civil and transportation components of the Birmingham Master Plan Update project.

inFORM Studio is a Michigan-based architectural and urban design firm that will be assisting Houseal Lavigne Associates with all aspects of building preservation, as well as urban design, illustrations and renderings, and architectural services.
Firm Profile

Houseal Lavigne Associates is an award-winning consulting firm specializing in all areas of community planning, economic development and urban design, with expertise in comprehensive planning, corridor planning, downtown planning, neighborhood planning, zoning, market analysis, project implementation and financing, and citizen engagement. We strive for a true collaboration of disciplines and talents, infusing all of our projects with creativity, realism, and insight.

Houseal Lavigne Associates provides a fresh approach to urban planning, a strong foundation in contemporary development practices, an insightful understanding of market and economic analysis, and an effective ability to conduct engaging community outreach. Our firm is able to meet the unique challenges of any planning assignment and develop creative solutions that ensure compatibility between both the existing and the new, and the built and natural environments.

Houseal Lavigne Associates provides services ranging from detailed economic analysis to long-term community visioning; from smaller site planning and design projects to larger regional studies; from creating exciting new transit-oriented development plans to revitalizing historic downtowns; and from shaping broad community strategies to creating context-sensitive zoning regulations.

Houseal Lavigne Associates consists of a team dedicated professionals experienced in community planning, urban design, and economic development. Our firm has worked with more than 250 communities in states across the country, providing professional planning services for both public - and private - sector clients.

Houseal Lavigne Associates is founded on a set of core principles that, when combined with our professional experience and expertise, create a consulting firm that stands above the rest. These principles include Better Community Outreach, Commitment to Creativity, Graphic Communication, Technology Integration, and Client Satisfaction.
Founding Principles

Houseal Lavigne Associates began with a set of principles that still guide every project we undertake. By continually honoring these principles, we have reliably and repeatedly produced plans that don’t just meet our clients’ needs but are points of pride in their communities. Our principles result in plans that are recognized as some of the best in the industry. These founding principles are:

**Better Community Outreach.** Fostering a strong sense of “community stewardship” requires using an inclusive approach to citizen participation and is a foundation of our planning approach.

**Commitment to Creativity.** Vision and creativity are among the most important components of good planning and design, so we provide fresh, responsive, and intriguing ideas for local consideration.

**Graphic Communication.** All plans and documents should utilize a highly illustrative and graphic approach to better communicate planning and development concepts in a user-friendly, easy-to-understand, and attractive manner.

**Technology Integration.** The integration of appropriate technologies should be used to improve the planning process and product—increasing communication and involvement with the public, gathering and assessing vital information, and producing more effective documents and recommendations.

**Client Satisfaction.** Meeting the needs of our clients is a top priority. We strive to achieve this by developing and maintaining strong professional relationships, being responsive to clients’ concerns and aspirations, and always aiming to exceed expectations.

**RECENT AWARDS**

2017
- IL APA - Outreach Award
  Envision Oak Park Comprehensive Plan

2016
- MN APA - Innovation Award
  St. Cloud Comprehensive Plan

2015
- MI APA - Daniel Burnham Award (Best Plan)
  Imagine Flint Master Plan
- Michigan Chapter of Congress for the New Urbanism - Mackinaw Prize
  Imagine Flint Master Plan

2014
- American Planning Association
  National Planning Excellence Award for an Emerging Planning & Design Firm

- MI APA - Planning Excellence Award for Public Outreach - Imagine Flint Master Plan
- IA APA - Daniel Burnham Award (Best Plan)
  Coralville Community Plan

2013
- Kane County Plan of the Year Award
  City of St. Charles Comprehensive Plan

2012
- IL APA - Daniel Burnham Award (Best Plan)
  Village of Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan
- ACEC Illinois - Merit Award - Studies & Research
  IL 47 Corridor Plan

- Chaddick Institute - Development Regulation Award
  Oak Brook Commercial Areas Master Plan

2011
- IL APA - Gold Award - Implementation
  Village of Bartlett Town Center
Approach to Planning

Our philosophy of community planning, visioning, goal setting, and implementation is built on a foundation of professional experience, sound planning and design practices, and a track record of award-winning projects. Our approach combines extensive community outreach and participation, highly illustrative and user-friendly maps and graphics, and innovative utilization of cutting-edge technologies. Our process will help establish a community vision, set community goals, and foster community consensus. Our approach to this assignment will include and be guided by the following core principles, which will allow us to successfully engage the community, develop viable and visionary solutions, and comprehensively respond to local issues and needs.

Focus on Urban Planning and Community Development. Houseal Lavigne Associates specializes in community planning, urban design, and economic development. It is our focus, it is our passion, and it is our primary area of expertise. We are a specialized urban planning firm whose efforts are not diluted or compromised by bureaucracy or competing interests. Our focus and size allow us to provide the creativity, flexibility, and responsiveness needed to meet our clients’ needs without wasting precious resources.

Foundation of Experience. Houseal Lavigne Associates has extensive experience in community planning, visioning and goal setting, implementation strategies, comprehensive planning, economic development studies, urban design, and more. We have directed, managed, and assisted with similar planning assignments for communities across the country.

Engaging Community Outreach. One of our greatest strengths is our ability to design and conduct engaging and effective community outreach. It is a vital part of all of our planning projects, and we believe it is a necessary component of any successful planning process. It is important that all interested persons have the ability to participate in the planning process and to know they have been heard. We believe strongly in fostering a stewardship for the community and achieving a high level of community consensus for planning initiatives.

Illustrative Format and Quality Graphics. All our projects incorporate a highly illustrative and graphic approach to communicating planning and development policies and recommendations. We have developed a distinct design approach to urban planning and community development which we incorporate into all of our projects. The results of this approach are reports and plans that are attractive, distinctive, and easy to use and understand.
**Technology Integration.** Integrating appropriate technologies can greatly improve the planning process and product. We specialize in the use of GIS, designing and hosting project websites, online surveys, keypad polling, and utilizing 3D rendering to improve planning and development concepts. Our maps and graphics are attractive and compatible with existing and developing information systems. When designed and managed appropriately, these technologies greatly improve communication and involvement with the public.

**Vision, Creativity, and Innovation.** We believe vision and creativity are among the most important components of good planning and design. Too often, vision and creativity are lacking in the planning process and final planning product. With the help of the community, we will establish a “vision” that captures the local spirit and character, while presenting new ideas and concepts for consideration. Our fresh approach to planning and development will broaden the range of available options and maximize the potential of community resources.

**Targeted Implementation.** Identifying the “next steps” to be taken is an important part of any good plan. Plans are not meant to sit idle, but should be used on a regular and ongoing basis as a foundation for decision-making. Our plans identify key implementation steps that should be taken to “jump start” the ultimate realization of a plan’s vision and recommendations. Implementation steps outline the projects and actions to be taken and identify responsibilities, timing, and funding options.

**Commitment to Client Satisfaction.** Our Firm’s primary focus is on client satisfaction. We pride ourselves on our professional relationships, reputation, and client references. We develop strong relationships with our clients and are often considered to be an extension of staff. We are responsive to clients’ concerns, we are available at anytime to assist with unforeseen events and issues, and we are committed to doing whatever it takes to serve the client. Many of our initial engagements result in long-term, on-going professional relationships with client communities.
Firm Profile

DLZ, a Michigan Corporation, is a multidisciplinary, Minority-Owned Business Enterprise (MBE) that has been providing complete engineering, architectural, environmental, planning, construction, and survey services to both public and private sector clients since 1916. DLZ is an American success story, having graduated in 1984 from the 8(a) Small Disadvantaged Business Program and transforming into the full-service and one of the most reliable and experienced professional consulting firms in the Midwest.

Award-Winning Firm

Consistently ranked as one of Engineering News-Record (ENR)’s Top 150 Design Firms, DLZ’s continual growth and success is a testament to their work quality and client satisfaction. The commitment to excellence they provide has resulted in DLZ being ranked by Engineering News Record as the No. 1 Design Firm of the Year in the Midwest and firmly believes that these ratings come from only one source, the trust and confidence our clients have placed in our abilities.

Commitment to MBEs and WBEs

DLZ is very proud of its heritage as a minority-owned business within the state of Michigan and continues to place particular emphasis, in the procurement of subcontractors and suppliers, on small disadvantaged businesses (DBEs), minority-owned businesses (MBEs), and women-owned businesses (WBEs). DLZ is committed to the creation, growth and expansion of DBEs, MBEs and WBEs and currently serves as a mentoring firm for other minority firms through the Michigan Minority Business Development Council.

Office Locations

DLZ operates five full-service offices in Michigan, including: Lansing, Kalamazoo, Detroit, Melvindale, and Saint Joseph. Additionally, DLZ brings the support of its midwest presence, with offices in Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Kentucky, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania. Each office is equipped with intranet services and e-mail capabilities allowing for real-time transfer of data and project information, in addition to communication systems to enable production and transfer of documents between offices.
Firm Profile

inFORM studio is an urban and architectural design collective devoted to impacting communities and inspiring culture. Founded in 2000, inFORM is a woman-owned practice with offices in Detroit and Chicago. With over 40 designers representing 13 countries, inFORM works as a multidisciplinary team of architects, interior designers, engineers, and urban designers on projects of varying scales and typologies, all across the globe.

As a human-focused team of designers, they place a strong emphasis on creating connections between people and place. By integrating advanced design technologies throughout the design process, they are able to formulate solutions that go beyond formal expression into client envisioned measurables.

Recognized Design Excellence: inFORM has received continued peer recognition and community attention for design excellence in acquiring numerous state, national, and international design awards, authoring the winning entry for the Bagley Street Pedestrian Bridge as part of the $170 million Michigan Department of Transportation Ambassador Gateway Project and in June of 2003, was selected as one of eight international finalists out of 1,557 entries to present at the Grand Egyptian Museum Competition Symposium in Cairo, Egypt. In 2004, the firm was invited to participate, as one of 30 firms from around the world, in the prestigious Canadian Museum of Human Rights competition and recently received an honorable mention in the world-wide competition for the Museum of Contemporary Art and Planning Exhibition in Shenzhen, China.

Experienced Personnel: inFORM’s staff expertise and diversity is apparent in their work. Their staff maintains the highest expectations of all their work products, which result in consistent quality to design, planning, document preparation and detailing.

LEED-Accredited Professionals: inFORM staff also includes six LEED Accredited Professionals and a sustainability expert that has lectured extensively worldwide leading various support staff. Furthermore, the firm possesses the ability, through 3-dimensional representation and AutoCAD workstations, to provide all deliverables necessary for heightened graphic materials and final building design documentation.

Virtual Reality Experiences: inFORM has always pushed the boundaries of the architectural design process. While applications like Revit, Grasshopper, Dynamo and Rhino help create accessible graphics, work has traditionally been limited by a two-dimensional plane/static environment. Virtual reality headsets break beyond this barrier, and present an opportunity for design to become immersive. Working through our 3D software we are now capable of exporting development models and visualizations into InsiteVR and stepping into them with the HTC ViveVR headset. This allows designers and clients to engage in a fully immersive experience, while gaining a more complete understanding of the scale, aesthetics and overall feel of what will emerge as reality upon a project’s completion.

Computation & Analytics: The design industry is currently experiencing a disruption as a result of rapid technological advancements. We are in an era of building information modeling (BIM), which is embedding real world data into digital representation of the building element. While the industry is still embedding data, inFORM studio has moved into an era of building information optimization. They can leverage large amounts of data through the development of computational algorithms that establish a direct relationships between project stakeholder data and parameters, inclusive of construction, economic and fabrication constraints. Our data driven process allows us to run several environmental and performance analyses which are presented via interactive project dashboards that provide insight for better design decision making.
SECTION 2
KEY STAFF RESUMES
Our professional staff provide specialized expertise in a multitude of disciplines to benefit the City of Birmingham’s Master Plan Update, including community visioning, land use planning, market analysis, economic development, transportation planning, urban design, architecture, graphic design, visualizations, development strategies, fiscal impact analysis, corridor planning, and community outreach. We are committed to developing creative solutions for the Master Plan to ensure compatibility between the existing, new, built, and natural environments. Most importantly, our proposed team possesses the skills necessary to create a responsive, detailed, visionary, and achievable Master Plan for the City of Birmingham.

Resumes for the key personnel from Houseal Lavigne Associates, as well as from our subconsultant team members, can be found on the following pages.
John A. Houseal, FAICP  
Principal|Co-Founder

John is a Principal and Co-founder of Houseal Lavigne Associates and has established himself as one of the region's top urban planning professionals. John's reputation and expertise within the profession as a leader in urban planning, contemporary development practices, and community outreach has garnered him wide recognition and numerous planning awards. John has been a featured speaker at national, regional, state, and local events and conferences for issues related to urban planning, zoning, transportation, context sensitive design, and the environment. John is recognized as one of the top community facilitators, consensus builders, and citizen participation experts in the region.

John maintains professional memberships with Lambda Alpha International, American Planning Association, the American Institute of Certified Planners, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and Urban Land Institute. John received a Bachelor of Science in environmental sciences from University of Michigan and a Master of Environmental Planning for environmental and urban planning from Arizona State University. John is also an AICP inducted Fellow and certification instructor and has been responsible for preparing planners for professional certification since 2005.

Prior to co-founding Houseal Lavigne Associates, John was a Principal and the Director of Urban Planning for URS Corporation, a global multi-disciplinary engineering firm based in San Francisco, California. Working from the Michigan Avenue office in Downtown Chicago, John oversaw and directed the firm's urban planning and community development projects, often coordinating on assignments throughout the country. Prior to being the Director of Urban Planning for URS Corporation, John was a Principal with Trkla, Pettigrew, Allen and Payne (TPAP), a prominent planning and economic development firm in Chicago. While a Principal at TPAP, John directed a wide range of urban planning and community development assignments throughout the Midwest.

From revitalization plans for Chicago's south side neighborhoods to regional highway corridor studies, John has directed, managed, and assisted with a wide range of planning assignments. John has directed a number of planning and development related assignments in several states, including comprehensive plans, corridor plans, downtown plans, neighborhood plans, master development/site plans, and more. John has also directed the zoning updates and amendments, as well as the creation of entirely new zoning ordinances, sign ordinances, planned unit development ordinances, overlay districts, and design and development guidelines.

Several unique and very significant assignments have been directed by John and provided significant momentum in his career, including the IDOT SWS Tools for Balanced Growth Study, which was the State of Illinois’ first balance growth initiative; the Cap the Ike Study, which was a study examining the creation of "new land" by capping the Eisenhower Expressway for approximately 1.5 miles; and an FAA funded study to examine land use compatibility and the O’Hare Modernization Project (OMP). As project director, John's leadership skills and planning and design expertise were pivotal to the success of these, and many other assignments.

John has received several professional planning awards and distinctions, including an ILAPA Gold Award for Planning; an ILAPA Silver Award for Plan Implementation; an ILAPA Award for Planning Education; ILAPA Awards for Strategic Planning; the DePaul University Chaddick Institute Development Award; the Greater OBCC Commercial Revitalization Award, APA National Excellence Award, and induction into Lambda Alpha International, an international honorary fraternity for professional excellence in the field of land economics.
# Comprehensive Plans

60+ Comprehensive Plans including:

- Benton Harbor, MI
- Brookfield
- Brownsburg, IN
- Byron
- Carpentersville
- Coralville, IA
- Council Bluffs, IA
- Countryside
- Davis Junction
- Downers Grove
- Edinburgh, IN
- Evergreen Park
- Fairview Heights
- Flint, MI
- Frederick, CO
- Forest Park
- Geneva
- Glen Ellyn
- Greater Bridgeport Region, CT
- Hammond, IN
- Harwood Heights
- Homer Glen
- Jackson, MO
- Jackson, TN
- Kenilworth
- Lynwood
- Lansing
- Marion, IA
- Mattoon
- Maywood
- Melrose Park
- Montgomery
- Morton Grove
- Mundelein
- Niles
- Oakbrook Terrace
- Oak Park
- Palos Heights
- Palos Park
- Pleasant Hill, IA
- Prairie Grove
- River Forest
- St. Charles
- St. Cloud, MN
- Sugar Grove
- Tipton, IN
- Tipton County, IN
- Westmont
- Whiting, IN
- Windsor, CO

# Downtown Planning

30+ Downtown Plans including:

- Algonquin Downtown Plan
- Downers Grove Downtown
- Forest Park Madison Street Corridor
- Geneva Downtown Master Plan
- Huntley Downtown Master Plan
- Mchenry Downtown Plan
- Melrose Park Historic Broadway Avenue District Plan
- Morton Downtown Master Plan
- Murray, KY Main Street Plan
- Round Lake Downtown Plan
- Oshkosh, WI Downtown Plan
- Winfield Downtown/TOD Plan

# Special Area Planning

50+ Special Area Plans, including:

- Bellwood TOD master Development Plan
- Bellwood St. Charles Road Corridor/TOD Plan
- Countryside Dansher Industrial Park Subarea Plan
- Glenview The Glen Parcel 24 Master Plan
- Island Lake Commercial Areas Master Plan
- Marengo TOD & Western Corridor Planning Area
- Melrose Park Rose trail Neighborhood Master Plan
- Montgomery Preserve Subarea Master Plan
- Naperville Martin Mitchell Campus Master Plan
- Oak Brook Commercial Areas Master Plan
- Oakbrook Terrace Unit 5 Area Master Plan
- Palos Park Commercial Areas Master Plan
- Prairie Grove River Front Vision
- Rolling Meadows Golf Road Corridor Mobility Plan
- South Chicago Heights Station Area Plan
- Skokie Dempster Station Area Plan

# Corridor Planning

70+ Corridor Plans including:

- Bellwood - Mannheim Road Corridor; 25th Avenue Corridor Plan
- Brookfield - Ogden Ave. Corridor Plan; 47th Street Corridor Plan; 31st Street Corridor Plan
- Carpentersville - IL Route 31 Corridor Plan; IL Route 25 Corridor Plan; Randall Road Corridor Plan
- Countryside - LaGrange Road Corridor Plan; Joliet Road Corridor Plan; Road Corridor Plan
- Davis Junction - IL Route 172 Corridor Plan
- Hinsdale - Ogden Avenue Corridor Plan
- IL 47 Corridor Study
- Kenilworth - Green Bay Road Corridor Plan
- Lockport - I-355 Corridor Master Plan
- Melrose Park - Lake Street Corridor Plan; Broadway Avenue Corridor Plan; North Avenue Corridor Plan
- Melrose Park Broadway Avenue Corridor Plan
- Montgomery - Montgomery Road Corridor Plan; Blackberry Creek Corridor Plan
- Naperville - Ogden Avenue Enhancement Study
- Oak Brook - 22nd Street Corridor Plan
- Palos Heights - Harlem Avenue Corridor Plan
- Portage, IN - Highway 20 Corridor Plan
- River Forest Corridors Plan - Madison Street Corridor Plan; North Avenue Corridor Plan; Lake Street Corridor Plan; Harlem Avenue Corridor Plan
- Traverse City, MI - Eight Street Corridor Plan; East Front Street Corridor Plan West Front Street Corridor Plan Garfield Avenue Corridor Plan 14th Street Corridor Plan

# Zoning & Design Guidelines

30 Zoning & Design Guidelines Assignments, including:

- Benton Harbor, MI
- Bloomingdale
- Brookfield
- Carpentersville
- Cary
- Chicago
- Dunwoody, GA
- Fairview Heights
- Flint, MI
- Geneva
- Harwood Heights
- Hinsdale
- Kenilworth
- Marion, IA
- McHenry
- Melrose Park
- Montgomery
- Muskogee, OK
- Murray, KY
- Northbrook
- Oak Brook
- Oakbrook Terrace
- Pace TOD Guidelines Manual
- Palos Park
- Palos Heights
- Prairie Grove
- Richton Park
- River Forest
- Wilmette

# Strategic Planning

- Fond du Lac, WI
- Morton Grove
- Palos Park
- Warrenville
- West Chicago

# Retainer Services

- Brookfield
- Davis Junction
- Forest Park
- Harwood Heights
- Kenilworth
- Lockport
- Melrose Park
- Montgomery
- Oakbrook Terrace
- Palos Park
- Prairie Grove
- River Forest
- Round Lake
- Winnetka
Devin J. Lavigne, AICP, LEED AP
Principal | Co-Founder

Devin is a Principal and Co-founder of Houseal Lavigne Associates with special expertise in urban design, land-use planning, site planning, land planning, land-use regulation, graphic illustration and development visualization, geographic information systems, and web development. Devin received his Bachelor of Science from the School of Urban and Regional Planning at Ryerson Polytechnic University in Toronto Ontario.

Devin is regarded as one of the profession's top designers and graphic specialists. Devin has presented at both national and state planning conferences about the importance in graphics and instructed on how best to communicate plans and planning concepts as well as the importance of development visualization. Devin has garnered national attention and has helped distinguish the firm's body work. At the American Planning Association's 2010 National Conference his presentation Better Graphics, Better Plans was regarded as "best in show" and at 2008 National Conference, Devin’s SketchUp portfolio was presented by Google to show planners how the software can be used by the profession.

In 2005 Houseal Lavigne Associated completed a project for NAVTEQ (Chicago Landmarks & Districts Study), the world's largest employer of map making professionals. Houseal Lavigne Associates was hired to identify key corridors and community areas for more detailed mapping in portable GPS devices. NAVTEQ used the final product to secure additional capital for research and development, and has applied mapping styles presented by Houseal Lavigne Associates into mapping programs to better present data.

Prior to co-founding Houseal Lavigne Associates, Devin was the Senior Planning Manager for URS Corporation, a global multi-disciplined engineering firm based in San Francisco, California. Working from the Michigan Avenue office in Downtown Chicago, Devin managed, directed and provided technical assistance to numerous studies. Devin joined URS through their acquisition of Trkla, Pettigrew, Allen and Payne (TPAP) a prominent planning and economic development firm in the City of Chicago.

Devin has managed, directed, authored and contributed to more than 100 planning studies, including a number of downtown plans, corridor plans, subarea plans, park master plans, and comprehensive plans throughout the country.

In addition to his responsibilities at Houseal Lavigne Associates, Devin is an adjunct lecturer at the School of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Illinois in Champaign-Urbana. In 2011 Devin was asked by the school to revive the program's urban design studio, UP 426. The program introduces both graduate and undergraduate students to urban design and includes instruction on urban design analysis and planning graphics.

Devin maintains professional memberships with the American Planning Association, the American Institute of Certified Planners, the Congress for New Urbanism, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Urban Land Institute and the National Association of Photoshop Professionals.

**Education**
Bachelor of Science
School of Urban and Regional Planning
Ryerson Polytechnic University

**Memberships**
American Planning Association
American Institute of Certified Planners
National Trust for Historic Preservation
Congress for the New Urbanism
Urban Land Institute

**Awards**
American Planning Association National Planning Excellence Award for an Emerging Planning & Design Firm; 2014
Daniel Burnham Award
Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan
American Planning Association Illinois Chapter, 2012
Daniel Burnham Award
McHenry County 2030 Comprehensive Plan
American Planning Association Illinois Chapter, 2010
"Best Practice" Gold Award Planning Mapper
American Planning Association Illinois Chapter, 2010
SketchUp Design Award Google.com
“Plan” Gold Award
Carpentersville Comprehensive Plan
American Planning Association Illinois Chapter, 2007
"Project, Tool, or Program" Gold Award Planningprep.com
American Planning Association Illinois Chapter, 2007

**Lecturing/Instruction**
UP 426 Urban Design Studio
University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign 2012 to present

**AICP Certification Instructor**
2005 to present APA Illinois Chapter
2008 APA Missouri & Kansas Chapters
2012 to Present National (D.C.) APA Chapter
www.planningprep.com - site co-creator
Devon J. Lavigne, AICP, LEED AP  
Project Experience

### Comprehensive Plans
40 Comprehensive Plans Including:
- Brookfield
- Brownsburg, IN
- Carpentersville
- Coralville, IA
- Countryside
- Council Bluffs, IA
- Downers Grove
- Flint, MI
- Itasca
- Kenilworth
- Machesney Park
- Marion, IA
- McHenry County
- Melrose Park
- Montgomery
- Muskogee, OK
- Niles
- Oakbrook Terrace
- North Aurora
- Palos Park
- Prairie Grove
- Plainfield, IL
- River Forest
- Sugar Grove
- St. Charles
- St. Cloud

### Design and Development Guidelines
15 Guidelines including:
- Downers Grove
- Prairie Grove
- St. Charles
- Kenilworth
- McHenry
- Huntley
- IL Route 47
- Brookfield
- Round Lake
- Westmont
- Hinsdale
- Traverse City, MI

### Corridor Planning
50 Corridor Plans including:
- Brookfield, Ogden Avenue Corridor Plan
- Carpentersville, IL Route 31 Corridor Plan
- Countryside, LaGrange Road Corridor Plan
- Downers Grove, Ogden Avenue Corridor Plan
- Hinsdale, Ogden Avenue Corridor Plan
- Homer Glen, 159th Street Corridor Plan
- Illinois Route 47 Corridor Plan
- Kenilworth, Green Bay Road Corridor Plan
- Melrose Park, Broadway Avenue Corridor Plan
- Montgomery, Orchard Road/Blackberry Creek Corridor Plan
- Naperville, Ogden Avenue Enhancement Study
- Oak Brook, 22nd Street Corridor Plan
- River Forest, Corridors Plan
- St. Charles, Main Street & Randall Road
- Westmont, Ogden Avenue Corridor Plan
- Traverse City Corridors Master Plan

### Visualization & Illustration
25 assignments including:
- Carson City, NV Carson City Center
- Firestone Retail Development
- Westfield, Old Orchard Signage
- Naperville Park District, Naperville Riverwalk 3D Illustration
- Peoria River Trail Development Visualization
- Forest Park Shopping Plaza Redevelopment Sketch
- Center, Chicago Grove Shopping Center Redevelopment Sketch
- Plaza, Maywood River Pointe Plaza Rendering
- HOA, Las Vegas, NV, Taos Estates Entry Monument Render
- Machesney Park, Machesney Mall Redevelopment Concept
- Kenilworth, Green Bay Road Redevelopment Site Illustration
- Bellwood, TOD Development Visualization
- Hanover Park/Irving Park Road Development Concepts

### Parks & Recreation
10 Parks and Recreation assignments including:
- Geneva, Open Space & Recreation Master Plan
- Naperville Park District, Parks, Open Space & Recreation Master Plan
- Homer Glen, Open Space & Recreation Master Plan
- Naperville Park District, Naperville Trails Master Plan
- Robbins Green, Community Plan
- Machesney Park, Open Space Plan

### Special Area Planning (TOD, Neighborhoods, Special District)
8 Special Area Plans including:
- Chicago, Stockyards Market & Land Use Analysis
- Countryside, Dansher Industrial Park Subarea Plan
- Oak Brook, Oak Brook Commercial Areas Master Plan
- South Chicago Heights, Station Area Plan
- Marengo, Transit Oriented Development Plan
- Naperville, Martin Mitchell Campus Master Plan
- Oakbrook Terrace, Unit 5 Area Master Plan
- Winfield, Downtown Winfield Marketing & Capacity Study
- Dunwoody, Village Master Plan
- Dunwoody, Georgetown/North Shallowford Road Master Plan
- Tulsa, OK Sector Plans

### Special Projects
- NAVTEQ Chicago Landmarks & Districts Study
- IDOT Tools for Balanced Growth
- Healthy Chicago 2.0
- Chicago Neighborhoods Now

### Strategic Planning
3 Strategic Plans, including:
- Oak Brook
- Palos Park
- Warrenville
Dan Gardner has over twenty years of experience in planning, development, and real estate, with experience in both the private and public sectors. Prior to joining Houseal Lavigne Associates in 2007, Dan was the Director of Consulting Services for a prominent Chicago based real estate advisory firm where he directed numerous complex municipal projects related to fiscal, economic, and market analysis. Dan was also a Senior Manager with the Chicago office of Economics Research Associates (ERA), an international economic and real estate consulting firm where he was responsible for business development and overseeing both national and international projects.

His professional experience has involved projects ranging from the revitalization of large urban areas in Chicago, Milwaukee, and Omaha to small rural communities throughout the Midwest. His past projects include: analyzing market potential for residential, retail, office, entertainment and industrial development; instituting economic development programs and incentives; preparing grant applications for state and federal funds; facilitating community outreach; preparing developer requests for proposals and a range of related assignments.

In addition to his professional experience, Dan has served on several elected and appointed boards, commissions and advisory committees. His combination of professional and government experience gives him a unique perspective that is beneficial to clients. He understands and can relate to issues and concerns facing both private developers and public officials.

Dan was an elected Trustee for the Village of Glen Ellyn, Illinois (population 27,000) from 2003 to 2007, and prior to that served as the Chairman of the Village's Plan Commission. He currently serves on a Process Improvement Team to improve the business and economic climate in the Village. Throughout his tenure the Village maintained a balanced budget and significant cash reserves. From 2007 to 2012 he was a member of the Executive Committee of the Du Page County Community Development Commission and the Du Page County HOME Advisory Group, preparing policy recommendations and overseeing the allocation of millions of dollars in CDBG and HUD funds.

Dan has a Masters Degree in Public Administration (MPA) from the Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT) and a Bachelors of Science from Loyola University Chicago. In 2007 he was inducted into Lambda Alpha International, an organization recognizing career accomplishments in land economics. He is a member of the Urban Land Institute (ULI) where he formerly served on the Chicago Policy Committee and he is an active member of Illinois City/County Management Association (ILCMA) and the Illinois Development Council (IDC). Additionally he is certified with the National Charrette Institute.

He is well versed in public speaking and meeting facilitation, having conducted hundreds of meetings throughout his professional and civic career. He routinely presents to professional organizations and serves as a guest speaker on a variety of topics related to planning and development issues. He has also authored or coauthored articles for professional publications and journals.
Daniel T. Gardner  
Project Experience

Comprehensive Plans
- Benton Harbor, MI
- Brownsburg, IN
- Marion, IA
- Downers Grove
- Freeport
- Mundelein
- Highwood
- Glen Ellyn
- Jackson, MO
- Kenilworth
- Machesney Park
- Muskegon, OK
- Palos Heights
- Palos Park
- St. Charles

Downtown Planning
- Clarendon Hills
- Franklin Park
- Geneva
- Huntley
- Morton
- Round Lake
- Shorewood, WI
- Skokie
- Winfield

Zoning & Regulatory
Zoning and Regulatory Studies including:
- River Forest
- Zoning Ordinance Updates

Strategic Planning
- Oak Brook
- Lombard

Special Area Planning  
(TOD, Neighborhoods, Special District)
- Oak Brook, Oak Brook Commercial Areas Master Plan
- South Chicago Heights, Station Area Plan
- Marengo, TOD & Western Corridor Planning Area
- Lincolnwood Business Park
- Lake Barrington Business Park
- Bartlett Town Center

Corridor Planning
- City of Bellevue, NE
- Bellwood, Manheim Road Corridor
- City of Chicago, Lincoln Square
- City of Chicago, Commercial Avenue
- Freeport, West Galena Avenue
- Kane and McHenry Counties, Illinois Route 47
- Lockport, I-355 Corridor Master Plan
- Milwaukee, WI, 27th Street
- Naperville, 75th Street Master Study
- Oak Brook, 22nd Street Corridor Plan
- Omaha, NE, Maple Street
- River Forest, Village Corridors Plan
- Traverse City, MI (Study of 5 corridors)
- Rolling Meadows, Golf Road

Fiscal & Economic Impact Analysis
- Du Page County, Impact of O’Hare Airport expansion
- Village of Channahon
- City of Chicago
- Village of Glenview
- Village of Hoffman Estates
- Village of West Dundee
- Village of Plainfield
- City of Naperville
- Village of North Barrington

Special Projects
- Du Page County, Impact of Airport expansion
- Lombard, Downtown Vision
- New Urbanism Analysis of mall redevelopment sites
- IL Housing Dev. Auth. (IHDA) Tax Credit Studies
- Commonwealth Edison Valuation for easements

Market & Demographic Analysis
- Chicago
- Clarendon Hills
- Du Page County
- IL Housing Dev. Auth. (IHDA)
- Jackson, MO
- Kane County
- Marion, IA
- McHenry County
- Milwaukee, WI
- Mount Prospect
- Naperville
- North Barrington
- Oak Brook
- Omaha, NE
- Oklahoma City, OK
- Park Forest
- Skokie
- Mundelein
- Lockport
- South Chicago Heights
- Benton Harbor, MI
- Madison, AL
- Downers Grove
- Highwood
- Lombard
- Huntley
- River Forest
- Freeport
- Jackson, MO
- Marion, IA
- Macomb
- Peoria
- Bellevue, NE
- Carpentersville
- Cleveland, OH
- Colorado Springs, CO
- Coppell, TX
- Council Bluffs, IA
- Denver, CO
- Dubuque, IA
- East Dubuque
- Grayslake
- International development in Asia
- Indianapolis, IN

Market & Demographic Analysis Continued
- Channahon
- Flint, MI
- Johnsburg
- Kalamazoo, MI
- Lake Barrington
- Mount Prospect
- Nassau County, NY
- Palos Heights
- Palos Park
- Park Ridge
- Philadelphia, PA
- Rockford
- Round Lake
- Savanna
- Shorewood, WI
- Skokie
- Troy, OH
- West Dundee

Development Services
Assessment of development potential and review of developer pro formas for municipal and private sector clients in several municipalities including:
- Chicago
- Milwaukee, WI
- Omaha, NE
- Wheaton
- Hoffman Estates
- Prairie Grove
- Naperville
- River Forest

Department of Defense Projects
Base Redevelopment and Closure (BRAC) and United States Air Force base feasibility studies in:
- Alaska
- Texas
- Georgia
- Florida
- Washington D.C.
- Idaho
Nik Davis, ASLA
Principal

Nik brings more than 10 years of professional design and planning experience to Houseal Lavigne Associates and as a Principal manages much of the firm’s versatile studio work, as well as hones skill specializations in urban design, landscape architecture, site plan development, streetscape design, and sustainability planning, from the individual lot level up to the regional scale. He provides the connection between the planmaking process and document creation, focusing on concept and site design, graphics, document layout, geographic information and cartographic renderings, and urban-form 3d modeling, using a breadth of software tools and drafting techniques.

Nik has a diverse background in urban planning and design with experience in the preparation of research and inventory materials, site analysis maps, framework plans, preparation of conceptual development plans for a full range of residential, commercial, mixed-use, office and industrial park developments, and commercial corridors. Nik has extensive experience in landscape and planting design which includes conducting site visits and creating inventory and analysis maps, developing project bases, drafting general development and preliminary plans, producing hand and computer rendered sketches and plans, and submitting construction documents, specifications, plant list schedules, and cost estimates for review and installation.

Prior to joining Houseal Lavigne Associates, Nik worked for consulting firms specializing in landscape architecture, streetscape design, urban design, zoning, and development planning. Nik has a Bachelor of Science in Landscape Architecture from Purdue University. He is a member of the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA), and some of his past work has been awarded recognition in sustainability and environmental stewardship.

Education
Bachelor of Science in Landscape Architecture, Purdue University

Memberships
American Society of Landscape Architects

ASLA Positions
ILASLA Allied Professionals Liaison
ILASLA Legacy Project Co-Chair
Past ILASLA Public Awareness Chair
Past ILASLA External Communications Officer

Presentations
A Pedestrian’s PedPeeves
Fast and Funny Planning Presentation
2015 National APA Planning Conference
New Tools for Zoning & Development Visualization
2013 National APA Planning Conference
Putting Zoning on the Map
APA-CMS January, 2012
Integrating Sustainability
Into Development Regulations
October 2011, APA-IL State Conference

Awards
2014 APA-MI Public Outreach Award
Imagine Flint Master Plan

Winnebago County 2030 Land Resource Management Plan,
Honor Award for Environmental Stewardship, Illinois American Society of Landscape Architects, 2009
Nik Davis, ASLA
Principal

Comprehensive Plans
30+ Comprehensive Plans including:
- Aurora, CO
- Bentonville, AR
- Bristol, VA
- Buffalo, NY
- Cary
- Chicago Neighborhoods Now
- Council Bluffs, IA
- Eden Prairie, MN
- Elgin
- Flint Master Plan, MI
- Fort Dodge, IA*
- Frederick, CO
- Hudson, OH
- Lynwood
- Maywood
- New Buffalo, MI
- Pingree Grove
- Richton Park
- St. Charles
- St. Cloud, MN
- Westmont
- Windsor, CO

Downtown/TOD Plans
- Buffalo, NY BOAs*
- Chicago - Pilsen, South
- Chicago, North Lawndale
- Carbondale
- Carson City
- Elmhurst
- Fort Dodge, IA
- Geneva, IL
- Hopkinsville, KY
- Hudson, OH
- Lisle
- Oshkosh, WI
- Peoria Heights
- Rolling Meadows
- Terre Haute*

Corridors
25+ Corridors Plans including:
- Ames, IA
- Bentonville, AR
- Des Plaines*
- Elmhurst
- Island Lake
- Homer Glen
- Kenilworth
- New Lenox
- Oak Brook
- Park Ridge*
- Peoria Heights
- Portage, IN
- Rolling Meadows
- Traverse City, MI

Design Guidelines & Standards
- Chicago - Archer & Halsted
- Council Bluffs, IA
- Fort Dodge, IA*
- Mundelein
- Pace TOD Guidelines Manual

Zoning/Form-Based Codes
25+ Zoning/Form-Based Codes including:
- Baltimore, MD*
- Bentonville, AR
- Buffalo, NY*
- Cleveland Heights, OH*
- Council Bluffs, IA*
- Dunwoody, GA
- Flint, MI
- Fort Dodge, IA*
- Hinsdale*
- LaGrange Park*
- Mundelein*
- Muskogee, OK
- New Orleans, LA*
- Park Ridge*
- Riverside*
- Wilmette*
- Winnebago County*

Design Development & Concept Designs
50+ Design Development & Concept Designs including:
- Bensenville*
- Chicago
- Crystal Lake
- Deerfield*
- Grayslake*
- Linconwood*
- Mokena*
- New Lenox*
- Richton Park*
- St. Cloud, MN
- Olympia Fields*
- Oswego - Prairie Market*

Streetscape Designs
25+ Streetscape Designs including:
- Bourbonnais
- Bradley - Broadway Street
- Chicago - 87th & Stony, Lake Street, Uptown-Broadway Avenue, Auburn Gresham-79th Street
- Des Plaines
- Elmhurst - North York
- Glen Ellyn
- Grayslake
- Huntley
- New Buffalo, MI
- Richton Park

Landscape Designs
30+ Planting Designs including:
- Burr Ridge
- Chicago - Shetland, Metraflex, Dima Properties
- Deerfield
- Glenview
- Huntley
- New Lenox
- Olympia Fields
- Oswego
- St. Charles*
- Yorkville
- Rockford
Todd Meyer, PLA, CNU-A, LEED AP
Principal Associate

As a senior urban planning and design professional, Mr. Meyer began his career designing and implementing commercial and residential projects in a self-employed capacity in the Greater Saint Louis area. After graduating from Kansas State University, he worked on the West coast and in the Midwest for professional planning and design firms including EDAW, HOK and SWA on a wide variety of community planning and development projects. He has continued to work with public and private sector clients on projects of all types and scales including new towns, residential communities, districts, neighborhoods, corridors, mixed-use and transit-oriented development, urban infill, parks, open spaces, waterfronts, redevelopment strategies and smart growth initiatives.

As a Principal Associate with Houseal Lavigne Associates, Mr. Meyer’s responsibilities include client communication, agency coordination, project management, planning and design oversight as well as business development activities. With project work across the U.S. and globally — including Latin America, Asia and the Middle-East — he has a broad range of professional experience on a variety of assignments. He possesses a strong knowledge of land planning and urban design issues and is excellent in communicating with clients to understand their needs and to help them to achieve their goals and objectives.

A common theme of Todd's work is to promote a 'triple bottom line' approach, including ecological, social and economic goals — as well as to integrate sustainable planning principles in his projects, including the U.S. Green Building Council’s LEED-ND™ criteria. Inspired by Janine Benyus and Biomimicry 3.8, Todd has participated in the process of learning from and then emulating nature’s forms, processes, and ecosystems to create more sustainable master plans and designs. This includes studying the ecology of a site and then working to emulate the native characteristics of the land in the post-development condition.

His professional interest is also to promote ‘Cultural Urbanism’ in his projects, working to celebrate our regional differences and create unique places for social interaction. As a daily part of his work with clients and project teams, he is committed to creating beautiful, functional and high-quality environments for people. This in part addresses physical infrastructure, but also considers the natural systems that shape our urban areas, using appropriate materials and making the right choices for the environment. He also seeks to stimulate cities, neighborhoods and districts to be active and energetic in economic investment and unique cultural expression.

Todd is an active member of several professional organizations, particularly the Urban Land Institute (ULI). As a result of frequent interaction with public officials and private investors, he understands real estate development, including project planning, site selection, feasibility analysis, entitlements, design and construction. This includes balancing the desire to create high-quality places with the fact that many investment decisions are driven by ROI and IRR from a cost-benefit perspective. In an era of public-private partnerships, this approach of including all parties in the master-planning process and conversation about prospective projects has proven critical to success.

Mr. Meyer subscribes to the principles of the Charter for the New Urbanism, which seeks to curb suburban sprawl and promote authentic urban neighborhoods that are compact, walkable, provide an interesting mix of uses and promote a strong sense of identity and community for both visitors and residents. He believes as a society that we should promote our unique qualities and that not all places should look the same – or function in the same manner. His approach to planning is to be as rooted in the unique context and characteristics of the place as much as possible. Todd is fun, has a sense of humor and is easy to work with!

Education
Bachelor of Landscape Architecture
Kansas State University
Urban Design Studies
Centro Studi Santa Chiara, Italy

Memberships
American Society of Landscape Architects
Congress for the New Urbanism
Past Chair, Kansas State University
Landscape Architecture / Community Planning Advisory Board
Urban Land Institute
ULI Urban Development / Mixed-Use Product Council (Red Flight) - Chicago
ULI Urban Development / Mixed-Use National Product Council (Purple Flight)

Awards
ASLA Saint Louis, Riverfront Fort Wayne Phase 1 Schematic Design Document, Merit Award, Planning & Communications
ASLA Texas, Riverfront Fort Wayne Master Plan, Honor Award, Planning & Analysis
ASLA Texas, Nanguo Peach Garden Master Plan, Honor Award, Planning & Analysis
ASLA Merit Award, Yuan Dang Lake Conceptual Master Plan, Texas ASLA
Congress for New Urbanism Charter Award, Dasve Village Master Plan
ASLA National Honor Award, Dasve Master Plan
ASLA Merit Award, Yuan Dang Lake Conceptual Master Plan, Texas ASLA
ASLA Merit Award, East Taihu Lakefront Master Plan, Illinois Chapter

Publications
“Exploring Cultural Urbanism: A rational approach to creating authentic places…” Planning Magazine, April 2014
“Cultural Urbanism: Studying local traditions to create socially relevant design” SWA Ideas | Praxis, October 2012
“Ten ways to climb the ladder: How to succeed as a consultant…” Planning Magazine, November 2006
Todd Meyer, PLA, CNU-A, LEED AP
Selected Project Experience

191st Street Corridor,
Mokena, Illinois
Land use plan update and form-based code overlay for a large land area adjacent to the freeway

36th & Center Redevelopment,
Omaha, Nebraska
Conceptual master plan for redevelopment and densification of a mixed-use suburban corridor

Argyle + Bryn Mawr CTA Stations
Chicago, Illinois
Detailed Design + Construction Documents for viaducts and station area improvements

Aurora Riverfront Park
Aurora, Illinois
Conceptual landscape design for a riverfront park including ecological areas and recreational venues

Avanyu Community
Hurricane, Utah
Conceptual master plan for a new residential community nestled into the hillside

Barksdale Redevelopment District
Bossier City, Louisiana
A redevelopment plan for existing a commercial corridor, residential neighborhoods and open land

Basinview Planned Unit Development
Klamath Falls, Oregon
A master plan for a large master-planned community on a steep hillside site with strong natural features

Centennial Celebration of the Flight
Dayton, Ohio
Event plan and strategy for the 100-year celebration of the most notable invention of the Wright Brothers

Children’s Memorial Hospital
Chicago, Illinois
Site redevelopment options with extensive public input for a facility that was to be relocated

City Government Center
Thousand Oaks, California
Detailed design and construction documents around a new building designed by Antoine Predock

CMAP GOTO 2040
Arlington Heights, Illinois
Conceptual redevelopment plan for a primary arterial corridor located just north of Interstate 90/94

Desert Mountain Resort Community
Scottsdale, Arizona
Master plan amendment for the last phases of development of a large golf-oriented community

Elyson Master-Planned Community
West Houston, Texas
Detailed landscape design for Phase 1 of a new 5,000-acre development for Newland Communities

Ewing Waterfront Park
Chicago, Illinois
Conceptual site plans to redevelop an urban site on the Calumet River with Metropolitan Planning Council

Grand Basin + Post Dispatch Lake
Saint Louis, Missouri
Master plan and detailed design for a 76-acre historic site built for the 1904 World’s Fair in Forest Park

Garfield Boulevard corridor
Chicago, Illinois
Corridor plan for the original Burnham-designed boulevard from Washington Park to Western Avenue

Green Valley Ranch
Henderson, Nevada
Master land plan and detailed landscape design for a new residential community outside Las Vegas

Homestead Market Plaza
Houston, Texas
Conceptual redevelopment plan options for an inner-city site in a disadvantaged neighborhood

Lincoln, Ashland + Belmont
Chicago, Illinois
Detailed design and CD’s for 12 blocks of urban streetscape in the Lakeview neighborhood

Marriott Multi-Hotel Complex
Indianapolis, Indiana
Detailed master plan near the ballpark with views to the river and various hospitality product types

Metro Tourism Vision
Detroit, Michigan
A brochure and renderings to indicate the variety of tourism options located throughout the City

Mid-America Center
Council Bluffs, Iowa
Conceptual master plan for public realm improvements including streetscapes and sculptures

Moorpark Specific Plan #2
Moorpark, California
Land use plan for submittal to the City of Moorpark for zoning board review and approval

Motorola Headquarters
Schaumburg, Illinois
Conceptual campus plan for perimeter landscape improvements and adjacent to various buildings

Obama Presidential Center
Chicago, Illinois
Site analysis and site evaluation studies for potential sites including Washington and Jackson Parks

Old River Park
Dayton, Ohio
Conceptual master plan for a private park originally designed by Frederick Law Olmstead, Jr.

Ovation Riverfront Development
Newport, Kentucky
Master plan for a mixed-use project on a former public housing site with views to downtown Cincinnati

Park Lane Redevelopment
Reno, Nevada
Conceptual plan options for the redevelopment of a former mall into a mixed-use town center

Planned Manufacturing Districts
Chicago, Illinois
A study of policy options for districts to promote preservation of assembly jobs within special areas

Penn State Behrend
Erie, Pennsylvania
Conceptual development plans for three (3) parcels of land owned by and adjacent to the university

Peterkort TOD Development
Beaverton, Oregon
Conceptual master plan for a private development adjacent to a light rail station and bus plaza

Police + Fireman’s Memorial Plaza
Clayton, Missouri
Detailed design and construction documents for an urban park as a tribute to fallen public servants

Post Hurricane Katrina recovery
Moss Point, Mississippi
Master plan and form-based code for a small town that was flooded by storm surge during the storm

Redmond Ridge Community
Redmond, Washington
Conceptual master plan for a new residential community located on a hillside site east of town

Richland Master Plan
Belleville, Illinois
Conceptual master plan for new residential community on a former coal strip mine site

Riverfront Fort Wayne
Fort Wayne, Indiana
Conceptual master plan for the riverfront district and promenade just north of the downtown CBD

Seattle Commons
Seattle, Washington
Conceptual master plan for a redevelopment district at the south end of Lake Union focused on mixed-use

Saint Louis University High School
Saint Louis, Missouri
Campus master plan for a private high school focused on expansion and new sports facilities

University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois
Landscape design for the project entry and quads of the new Center for Physical + Computational Science

Upper Kirby Mixed-Use
Houston, Texas
Conceptual development options and massing studies for redevelopment of an urban site

Vermillion Village
Kanab, Utah
Conceptual master plan for a new residential community featuring a commercial town center

Walker Place
Bossier City, Louisiana
Conceptual master plan options for a mixed-use town center development including retail and residential

Whirlpool Corporation
Benton Harbor, Michigan
Campus master plan for expansion and enhancement of existing corporate R&D and distribution facilities

William Rainey Harper College
Palatine, Illinois
Campus master plan in preparation for new building construction and landscape enhancements

Woodson’s Reserve
Montgomery County, Texas
Detailed landscape design for a new Toll Brothers community focused on outdoor recreation
Michio Murakishi
Senior Associate

Michio is a Senior Associate at Houseal Lavigne Associates bringing over 15 years of experience in community planning and economic development. Recognizing the significance of economic viability, he feels strongly that professional planning practices must be firmly rooted in financial and market realities, as well as pragmatic fiscal policies. To this end, Michio brings special expertise to the firm in the areas of economic development strategy, public-private deal negotiation, financial feasibility analysis, fiscal impact analysis, and market analysis. In addition to his practice leadership in these areas, Michio is responsible for the management of comprehensive, corridor, and subarea plan assignments in his role at Houseal Lavigne Associates.

Michio’s consulting experience has concentrated principally on structuring complex real estate financial transactions for numerous public- and private-sector clients. He guides real estate development projects from the visioning stage through project implementation and construction, working closely with both municipalities and developers. His representative work includes the negotiation of a public-private financing structure for the $110 million Wheeling Town Center mixed-use development project, providing development advisory services to the ownership group of the iconic Cermak Plaza shopping center, securing public funding in support of a LEED-certified renovation of the historic Inland Steel Building, and serving as lead TIF analyst on the Olympic Village financing plan included in the Chicago 2016 bid book submitted to the International Olympic Committee.

Prior to joining Houseal Lavigne Associates, Michio worked at the Bureau of Economic Development in the City of Chicago’s Department of Planning and Development. Before that, he spent several years operating his own consulting practice, worked in the national Capital Markets group at Jones Lang LaSalle, and held a senior position at a Chicago-based development advisory firm. Michio received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology from Michigan State University and attended the University of Cincinnati, where he earned a Master of Community Planning degree as a HUD Fellow.

Project Experience

Development Advisory Services
- Chicago, IL
- Evanston, IL
- Hanover Park, IL
- Lincolnshire, IL
- Milwaukee, WI
- Oak Park, IL
- Palatine, IL
- Park Ridge, IL
- Prospect Heights, IL
- St. Charles, IL

Comprehensive Plans
- Ardmore, OK
- Aurora, CO
- Bentonville, AR
- Brentwood, MO
- Sioux City, IA

Subarea Plans
- Huntley, IL
- Oshkosh, WI
- Peoria Heights, IL

Public-Private Partnerships
- Capital Properties, Chicago, IL
- Cermak Plaza Properties, LLC, Berwyn, IL
- UJAMMA Construction, Inc., Chicago, IL
- The Lynmark Group, Wheeling, IL

Market Analysis
- Batavia, IL
- Franklin Park, IL
- Oak Creek, WI
- Palos Park, IL

Special Projects
- Chicago 2016, Olympic Village Financing Strategy
- Du Page County, O’Hare Airport Western Access
- Palos Park, IL, Fiscal Impact Analysis
- Prairie Grove, IL, Impact of Annexation
Jackie's Houseal Lavigne Associates experience includes a wide variety of planning and zoning-related projects for communities throughout the Midwest and beyond. Jackie's consulting experience includes projects ranging from parks and recreation and comprehensive plans to zoning updates and corridor studies. Jackie instills detail into all of her projects and is passionate about the communities in which she works. She is focused on the development of responsive and detailed planning and zoning recommendations that are actionable and which meet the specific and unique needs of each community.

Prior to joining Houseal Lavigne Associates, Jackie was the Housing and Development Planning Specialist for Danville, Virginia, a community of approximately 45,000. There, Jackie was responsible for: developing, implementing, and monitoring the City's five-year Consolidated Plan and Annual Plans, applying for and administering local, state and federal grant funding, acting as a liaison between the City and neighborhood and non-profit groups, spearheading the City's targeted efforts in the Schoolfield and Edgewood neighborhoods, planning and managing community engagement campaigns and events, and in this capacity, she gained valuable experience in developing programs and policies, applying for and administering local, state, and federal grants, and engaging community groups and supporting the establishment of new neighborhood associations.

Jackie is fluent in all regulations associated with the Community Development Block Grant and Home Investment Partnerships funding programs. Jackie uses her experience in local government to develop data-driven solutions that manage the needs of elected and appointed officials, department heads, non-profit partners, and residents of the community.

### Education
- Master of Urban Planning, University of Kansas
- Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, University of Kansas

### Memberships
- American Planning Association, VA
- American Planning Association, National
- Rotary International

### Presentations
- APA Quad State Conference: Economic Argument for Flexible Parking Requirements

### Project Experience

#### Zoning Ordinance Development
- Ardmore, OK - UDC
- Cary, IL - UDO
- Jackson, TN - Zoning / Regulatory Controls
- Chicago, IL - Roscoe Zoning / Regulatory Controls
- Sunset Hills, IL - Zoning / Regulatory Controls

#### Comprehensive and Master Planning
- Bensenville, IL - Parks & Recreation Master Plan
- Walker, MI - Master Plan
- Lawrence
- Oak Creek
- Fairfield, CT - Strategic Plan
- Northfield, IL - Comprehensive Plan
- Greenwich, CT - Comprehensive Plan
- Sioux City, IA - Comprehensive Plan
- Eden Prairie, MN - Comprehensive Plan

#### Corridor Planning
- Hasting, MN - Vermilion Street Corridor Plan
Education
Master of Public Affairs, Indiana University, 1994
B.A., Albion College, 1991

Advanced Training
Public Involvement Techniques for Transportation Decision-Making, National Highway Institute, 2000
Modern Roundabout Design, R. Barry Crown (Rodel Software), 2002
Environmental Justice Workshop, FHWA and FTA, 2001
Designing Streets for Walkable Communities, Oakland County, 2000
Pedestrians and Bicycles: Safety, Planning & Design, Michigan State University, 2000

Wesley A. Butch
Senior Transportation Planner

Mr. Butch has been involved with many dozens of complex traffic and road improvement projects. His transportation planning expertise, extensive knowledge, and experience span numerous disciplines including traffic analysis, signal analysis, non-motorized facilities, transit facilities, road concept designs, construction cost estimating, funding source investigation, public involvement, community and stakeholder engagement, access management and land use planning, preparation of plans and technical reports, environmental clearance documentation, and traffic signal and roundabout design. He has extensive experience planning and implementing inclusive community engagement programs for transportation projects, including many that were controversial. Mr. Butch has extensive experience working on MDOT and local agency traffic studies.

Project Experience
Dearborn West Downtown Streetscape Study and Design, City of Dearborn, Michigan: Senior Transportation Planner. This project involved a detailed study and design for streetscape improvements on Michigan Avenue in Dearborn. Services included traffic studies, public/stakeholder engagement, concept design, design development plans, construction documents, and geotechnical analysis.

Midland Downtown Streetscape Study and Design, City of Midland, Michigan: Senior Transportation Planner, Public Outreach Specialist. This project involved a detailed study and design for streetscape improvements on Main Street in Midland. Services included traffic studies, public/stakeholder engagement, surveying, concept design, design development plans, construction documents, and geotechnical analysis. Design process was completed on a very expedited schedule.

Marquette Hospital Transportation Improvements Study and Design – City of Marquette, Michigan: Project Manager. Comprehensive studies and design for major road and non-motorized improvements to support relocation of regional hospital. Infrastructure improvements were designed for US-41 and local roads. Main tasks included preparation of an Environmental Assessment, survey, geotechnical engineering, utility relocation and design, roadway design, traffic signal design, drainage design, complex hydraulic analysis, structural design, lighting design, design of non-motorized facilities, and construction cost estimates. Work also included extensive public/stakeholder coordination and obtaining MDOT ROW permit.

Traverse City Corridors Master Plan, City of Traverse City, Michigan: QA/QC Reviews. Performed reviews for roadway and non-motorized transportation improvements in four corridors in the City of Traverse City. Project included review of implementation of complete street elements and context sensitivity analysis.

East Lansing As-Needed Traffic Engineering Services, East Lansing, Michigan: Project Manager. Since 2012, DLZ has provided traffic engineering services to East Lansing. Assignments have included performing traffic studies, review of Traffic Impact Studies (TIS), preparation of updated TIS ordinance, preparation of technical memoranda, and presentations to the City's Transportation Commission. (Ongoing)

City of Marquette, City-Wide Traffic Study & Truck Corridor Study – City of Marquette, Michigan: Project Manager. Comprehensive traffic study for all of the main roads and intersections in the City to address vehicular and non-motorized travel. Study tasks included traffic data collection, analysis of existing and future conditions to identify deficiencies with the transportation network, recommendation of mitigation measures and coordination with stakeholders.

Capitol Region East Towne Gateway Feasibility Study and Roundabout Design, Lansing, Michigan: QA/QC. Developing conceptual roundabout designs and evaluating road and intersection improvements along Lake Lansing Road and at the Lake Lansing Road Interchange at U.S. Route 127 (US-127). The main elements of the study process include compilation of traffic data, trip generation and distribution for new developments, crash data analysis, traffic operational analysis using Rodel, development of roundabout concepts, access management investigation, coordination with MDOT, and preparation of a report. DLZ also prepared a landscaping concept for this gateway.
Jason T. Whitten
Project Planner

Mr. Whitten has 17 years of experience working as a Senior Transportation Planner and Project Manager for various transportation projects. He has been involved in more than 35 transportation planning projects for local agencies. His transportation expertise, extensive knowledge, and experience span numerous disciplines including traffic analysis, signal analysis, capital planning, transit facilities, road design, construction cost estimating, funding source investigation, public involvement, community and stakeholder engagement, access management and land use planning, preparation of plans and technical reports. Mr. Whitten has been involved with several city-wide transportation studies, complex corridor studies, and multi-modal studies.

Project Experience

Michigan Department of Transportation US-10 Business Route Corridor Study - Midland, Michigan: Project Manager. A comprehensive traffic study for the US-10 Business Route (BR) corridor through the City of Midland from Washington Street to the US-10 and US-10 BR/Eastman Avenue interchange. The purposes of the project were to identify potential corridor improvements that would accommodate future traffic volumes, alleviate current and anticipated traffic congestion, enhance safety and reduce crashes for all modes of transportation, increase connectivity to Downtown Midland and Discovery Square, improve non-motorized mobility and eliminate barriers for bicyclist/pedestrians without impacting traffic flow, make the one-way pair roadway system feel like part of the Downtown District, and support economic development within the corridor.

Traverse City Corridors Master Plan, City of Traverse City, Michigan: Planner. As a subconsultant to Houseal Lavigne Associates, responsible for review and analysis of roadways and non-motorized transportation improvements in four corridors in the City of Traverse City. Included review of implementation of complete street elements and context sensitivity analysis.

City of Marquette, City-Wide Traffic Study & Truck Corridor Study – City of Marquette, Michigan: Transportation Planner. Comprehensive traffic study for all of the main roads and intersections in the City to address vehicular and non-motorized travel. Study tasks included traffic data collection, analysis of existing and future conditions to identify deficiencies with the transportation network, recommendation of mitigation measures and coordination with stakeholders.

Marquette Hospital Transportation Improvements Project, Marquette, Michigan: Senior Planner. Worked on comprehensive traffic and road alternatives study for major road improvements to provide access to new regional hospital. Improvements included both auto and non-motorized facilities as well as utility work. Traffic Impact Study and Environmental Assessment were prepared to obtain MDOT and FHWA approval of the project. Project also included significant outreach to stakeholders and the general public as well as presentations to City Commission.

Lundin Truck Corridor Study - City of Marquette, Michigan: Senior Planner. The City of Marquette Lundin Truck Corridor Study was commissioned by the City of Marquette (City) in cooperation with the Lundin Mining Corporation and Northern Michigan University (NMU). The purpose of the study was to evaluate the existing transportation system in the study area and develop a prioritized list of potential capital improvements in relation to heavy truck traffic. The study process included data collection, field reconnaissance, traffic and safety analyses, development of potential improvement options, various engineering assessments, development of construction cost opinions; and stakeholder engagement.

State Road Improvement Project Early Preliminary Engineering Study, Pittsfield Township, Michigan, Washtenaw County Road Commission: Senior Planner, Roundabout Designer. Engineering study and environmental clearance for a 3-mile segment of State Road (from Ellsworth Road to Michigan Avenue). DLZ services included traffic studies, development of multi-modal road improvement alternatives, preparation of Environmental Assessment documentation and studies, and community engagement. Complete street elements and context-sensitive solutions included identifying potential bus routes and stops, on-street bike lanes, non-motorized pathways, boulevards, bioswales, lighting, wetland impact mitigations, and access management. Preferred alternative was a four-lane boulevard cross section with bicycle lanes, a multi-use path, and roundabout intersections.
Years of Experience
22

Education
Bachelor of Architecture, Lawrence Technical University

Bachelor of Science, Ryerson University

Registrations & Certifications
NCARB Certified & Registered: Michigan
American Institute of Architects
United State Green Building Council

Awards
2016 AIA Michigan Firm of the Year
2011 AIA Michigan Firm of the Year
2010 AIA Detroit Young Architect Award
2010 AIA Michigan Young Architect Award
2003 AIA Detroit Honor Award,
Howe Elementary, Detroit Public Schools
2003 ‘M’ Award Howe Elementary, Detroit Public Schools
2003 Learning by Design 2003 - Significant Project in Progress - Howe Elementary
2000 “2000 Laboratory of the Year”
- Crawford Hall - Lake Superior State University 2000 IESNA Design Award-
Karmanos Cancer Center 2000 IESNA Design Award, DRH Surgery Department
2000 IESNA Achievement Lighting, North Oakland
2000 Healthcare Media Award.
Karmanos Bone Marrow Unit 2000 Lighting Media Award,
Karmanos Bone Marrow Unit
1997 Gypsum Association’s Excellence in Gypsum Board Design
1997 North Oakland Medical Centers, Emergency Department Renovation
1997 Michigan Chapter of Illumination Engineering Society of North America
1997 North Oakland Medical Centers - Emergency Department Renovation
1997 Illumination Design Award

Cory is the Design Director and a principal at inFORM studio. His commitment and direction is illustrated within a broad range of projects which have achieved several professional distinctions. He leads holistic design on all projects, ensuring solutions achieve design excellence, and that teams are pushing ideas with a collaborative process. Cory’s achieved several professional awards and distinctions, including 21 AIA Design Awards, and has played key roles in 8 competition entries receiving commendation including 3 winning projects which have been constructed.

Relevant Projects
Beacon Park, New Urban Park, Urban Design / Detroit, MI
Bagley Pedestrian Bridge, New Pedestrian Bridge, Urban Design / Detroit, MI
Providence Pedestrian Bridge, New Pedestrian Bridge, Urban Design / Providence, RI
Lansing Community College, New Campus, Quadrangle, Urban Design / Lansing, MI
411 Piquette Place, Visioning, & Conceptual Design, Urban Design & Architecture / Detroit, MI
St. Regis, Mixed-use development Master Plan, Urban Design & Architecture / Detroit, MI

MICHAEL GUTHRIE, AIA, LEED AP
PARTNER / DESIGN PRINCIPAL
As a founding design principal, Michael is inFORM studio’s strategic lead that fuses client and design ambition. His philosophy on design and process pervades the atmosphere and stimulates innovation through the multitude of collaborations he leads. Michael has achieved significant professional awards and distinctions that include 34 AIA Design Awards, and was the team leader for 11 competition entries receiving commendation including 4 winning projects that have been constructed.

22 Years of Experience

Education
Master of Architecture, University of Michigan

Bachelor of Science in Architecture, Lawrence Technical University

NCARB Certified & Registered Architect

Ohio, North Carolina, South Carolina

CORY LAVIGNE, AIA, LEED AP
DIRECTOR OF ARCHITECTURE / PRINCIPAL
Cory is the Design Director and a principal at inFORM studio. His commitment and direction is illustrated within a broad range of projects which have achieved several professional distinctions. He leads holistic design on all projects, ensuring solutions achieve design excellence, and that teams are pushing ideas with a collaborative process. Cory’s achieved several professional awards and distinctions, including 21 AIA Design Awards, and has played key roles in 8 competition entries receiving commendation including 3 winning projects which have been constructed.
Michael Guthrie, AIA, LEED AP
Principal / Urban Design Lead

As a founding design principal, Michael is inFORM studio’s strategic lead who provides strategic direction for the firm, and fuses client and design ambition on all projects. His accomplishments range from professional to academic; and his commitment to the firm’s progressive work is illustrated by a broad range of projects including museums, libraries, cultural arts facilities, urban designs, and bridges. Additionally, Michael has been an adjunct lecturer in architecture at the University of Michigan for 10 years and served on juries for design studios at numerous universities throughout the country. He has been credited with over 30 design awards for projects and competitions all over the world.

Relevant Projects
Beacon Park, New Urban Park, Urban Design / Detroit, MI
Bagley Pedestrian Bridge, New Pedestrian Bridge, Urban Design / Detroit, MI
Providence Pedestrian Bridge, New Pedestrian Bridge, Urban Design / Providence, RI
Lansing Community College, New Campus, Quadrangle, Urban Design / Lansing, MI
411 Piquette Place, Visioning, & Conceptual Design, Urban Design & Architecture / Detroit, MI
St. Regis, Mixed-use development Master Plan, Urban Design & Architecture / Detroit, MI

Years of Experience
22

Education
Master of Architecture, University of Michigan
Bachelor of Science in Architecture, Lawrence Technological University

Registrations & Certifications
NCARB Certified & Registered: Michigan, Ohio, North Carolina, South Carolina
American Institute of Architects
United State Green Building Council
Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture

Academic Experience
Adjunct Assistant Professor: Lawrence Technological University 2005-2006
Adjunct Assistant Professor: University of Michigan, Taubman College of Architecture & Urban Planning 2001-2004
Visiting Critic: University of Michigan
University of Detroit-Mercy
Lawrence Technological University
State University of New York
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

Awards
2016 AIA Michigan Firm of the Year
2011 AIA Michigan Firm of the Year
2004 AIA Michigan Young Architect Award
2003 AIA Detroit Young Architect Award
1997 Alumni Society Award, University of Michigan
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Project Experience

Houseal Lavigne Associates strengthens communities through creative, dynamic, and viable approaches to planning, design, and development. From revitalizing downtowns to creating context-sensitive zoning regulations, Houseal Lavigne Associates provides the expertise necessary to improve the relationship between people and their environment.

Houseal Lavigne Associates has worked with more than 250 communities throughout the country. In the last 14 years, we have directed more than 70 comprehensive plans, 90 corridor plans, 35 downtown and TOD plans, 40 special area plans, 25 traditional and form-based zoning ordinances, 17 design guideline assignments, and much more. Our national experience includes planning, design, economic, and zoning assignments in Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Wisconsin, Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Virginia.

Master Planning Experience

The comprehensive and master plans developed by Houseal Lavigne Associates have proven to skillfully protect our clients communities’ important existing assets and resources, coordinate new growth and development within their boundaries, and establish a strong, positive community image and identity—all while administering sound implementation strategies.

Birmingham’s Master Plan Update should provide a foundation for decision-making that is based on an understanding of existing plans and conditions as well as future potential, community consensus, and a shared vision. In addition, we see the Master Plan as an important tool to promote the community’s unique assets and advantages.

Michigan Experience

The list below outlines Houseal Lavigne Associates’ experience in the State of Michigan:

- Battle Creek
- Benton Harbor
- Flint
- Livonia
- New Buffalo
- Shoreham
- Saginaw
- Traverse City
- West Bloomfield
**City of Flint, Michigan**

**Flint Master Plan**

Undertaking a planning effort the scale of which the City has never experienced, the Flint community is developing its first comprehensive plan in nearly 65 years – Imagine Flint. The Master Plan, developed by Houseal Lavigne Associates, focuses on the neighborhood unit as the essential and most important community building block, the City of Flint is forging a new direction for the community that has lost 50% of its population in the last 50 years (from 200,000 to 100,000). A central feature of the Imagine Flint Master Plan is the use of an innovative ‘placemaking’ approach to land use planning that builds on the idea of establishing unique and desirable places.

The City of Flint is in the process of updating its zoning ordinance and the placemaking approach has enabled a more seamless integration of land use and development regulations with Master Plan recommendations. The place types identified in the Land Use Plan are now serving as the foundation for future zoning districts and form-based overlays that together, prescribe the desired development, permitting it to occur in appropriate areas throughout the City.
West Bloomfield Township, Michigan

Township Center Framework Plan

The Orchard Lake Road corridor is the spine of the West Bloomfield Township, a prosperous community northwest of Detroit. The corridor includes significant retail, office, and service uses. However, existing development and current zoning regulations are not aligned with the community’s vision for the area. Through prior planning, residents expressed a vision for a walkable, mixed-use environment with a distinct local character.

The Township hired Houseal Lavigne Associates to assess its current plan and identify policy and regulatory actions that can be taken to help the community realize its vision. The resulting Township Center Framework Plan breaks the corridor into two categories. The first addresses current development that can be improved through corridor-wide land use policies, access management, site design enhancements, and public streetscaping. The second is a redevelopment concept for a specific portion of the corridor that would include walkable mixed-use blocks, strategic access and parking management, active open spaces, and phased implementation.

Urban Design Framework

West Bloomfield Township Center District

The Urban Design Framework highlights ways that the Township can enhance the aesthetic character and identity of the Town Center District and Orchard Lake Road Corridor. By improving public areas such as rights-of-way with streetscaping, gateways, and attractive open space, and guiding development and site amenities such as landscaping and building orientation, the Urban Design Framework seeks to improve the overall appearance of the corridor, distinguish it from other nearby commercial areas, and help to “brand” the area as uniquely West Bloomfield Township Center.
City of Traverse City, Michigan
Corridors Master Plan

The Traverse City Corridors Master Plan is designed to improve the appearance, function, and vitality of the City’s key commercial corridors. The Corridors Master Plan focuses on restoring economic vitality by identifying opportunities for housing, commercial activity, and improvements to public infrastructure, including both vehicular and pedestrian networks. An overarching goal of the project is to facilitate progress toward becoming a city of healthy and sustainable neighborhoods. Every aspect of the plan is aimed at improving livability and sense of place as the community strives to balance transportation and economic development interests.
In 2011, The City of Benton Harbor adopted the long-range Benton Harbor Master Plan prepared by Houseal Lavigne Associates. Following that project, Houseal Lavigne Associates also developed a Zoning Ordinance for the City to aid in the efficient implementation of plan recommendations.

Committed to appropriate, effective, and significant public input and participation, but faced with budgetary constraints, Houseal Lavigne Associates created a series of Do-It-Yourself (DIY) Community Workshop packets that would allow for additional cost-effective outreach. The DIY packets were distributed throughout the City to community leaders, religious institutions, neighborhood groups, and aldermen from each City Ward. Each of these community “facilitators” conducted their own local workshop with their neighbors, friends, and families. These DIY packets have been successful in providing public participation and consensus building at a grassroots level.
City of Battle Creek, Michigan

Master Plan

Battle Creek, dubbed “Cereal City”, is a regional economic center in Western Michigan and is the location of Kellogg’s Cereal global headquarters. In 2015, the City of Battle Creek partnered with Houseal Lavigne Associates to update their Master Plan to provide direction for future development and investment. The new Master Plan places strong emphasis on land use and development in a post-recession era, and promotes an urban growth boundary to combat sprawl and direct investment to the city’s established core.

A detailed corridor plan provides specific actions and improvements for Columbia Avenue, an aging auto-oriented corridor, including a redevelopment concept for a key intersection. The Master Plan also includes recommendations for Battle Creek’s green infrastructure, helping the City address stormwater and local flooding.
Village of Downers Grove, Illinois Comprehensive Plan

Building on the success of the Total Community Development 3 (TCD3) process, an extensive eight-month community outreach campaign involving more than a thousand residents and used as a foundation for prioritizing community issues and objectives, Houseal Lavigne Associates directed the update of the Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan. The Plan provides detailed recommendations for several sub-areas within the Village, including the Downtown and the Ogden Avenue Corridor, as well as plans for all areas of the Village, including land use and development, transportation, community facilities, environmental features and open space, and much more. Since the last Plan’s adoption in 1965, the Village has experienced significant population growth, as well as socio-economic and physical changes.

The Plan was created to better address the changing needs of the Village’s commercial and industrial areas while protecting and enhancing its attractive and well established residential neighborhoods. In 2012 the Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan received the Daniel Burnham Award by the Illinois Chapter of the American Planning Association for the best Comprehensive Plan in the State.
City of St. Cloud, Minnesota
Comprehensive Plan & Downtown Subarea

With a vibrant Downtown along the Mississippi River, a thriving local economy, and home to a major university, St. Cloud is a community that has strong foundation upon which to plan for its future. The City’s new comprehensive plan, directed by Houseal Lavigne Associates, focuses on revitalizing the core neighborhoods, guiding investment in the commercial corridors and employment areas, enhancing multi-modal connectivity, and establishing a strong economic development strategy. Rich in graphics and illustrations, the Plan includes a detailed Downtown Plan and Division Street Corridor Plan that enhances urban design, sense of place, and overall functionality. The Plan also identifies development opportunity catalyst sites and provides a development program and development visualization for market viable concepts.
City of Hudson, Ohio
Comprehensive Plan & Downtown Phase II Plan

The City of Hudson is an affluent municipality located in Northeastern Ohio in close proximity to both Akron and Cleveland. Houseal Lavigne Associates was engaged by the city to prepare a new comprehensive plan while concurrently developing a plan for the expansion of their very successful Downtown. The planning process included working with separate Comprehensive Plan and Downtown Plan steering committees in addition to extensive community outreach. A major complexity in the Downtown Plan involved identifying uses that had to remain on the 35 acre site as well as those that had to or should be relocated, including a public works and school bus facility.

The final plan includes an assessment of development potential, build out scenarios, a 3D model, and the creation of several different concept plans. Once adopted in December 2015, the plan will be used to solicit developers to the site.
**Town of Brownsburg, Indiana Comprehensive Plan**

The Town of Brownsburg is a quickly growing suburb of Indianapolis. To appropriately manage growth and development and to spur reinvestment in the Town’s commercial areas, the Town engaged Houseal Lavigne Associates to prepare a long-range comprehensive plan. The geographic area of the plan encompassed the Town of Brownsburg and two surrounding townships. In addition to plans for entire community, the Comprehensive Plan also includes detailed plans for 2 key corridors (Main Street and Green Street) and 3 subareas (Downtown, Ronald Reagan Parkway, Nitro Alley).

The planning process included several community workshops, including 3 separate visioning charrettes with the community. Postcards were created to help popularize the study, and an exhibit booth was created for the Town’s 4th of July Extravaganza. The project also featured an interactive project website, including a visual preference survey and Planning Mapper, an online mapping tool, each prepared by Houseal Lavigne Associates.
City of Coralville, Iowa
Community Plan

Propelled by a burgeoning tech, research, and medical community, Coralville is a rapidly growing City in eastern Iowa. Houseal Lavigne Associates directed the update of the City’s Community Plan, which provides guidance on future growth and development, with a focus on creating diverse residential areas, improving retail areas, establishing mixed-use areas, strengthening connections to the University of Iowa campus, and supporting R&D and technology-based industries. The Community Plan provides a growth plan that encourages the expansion of the University of Iowa Research Park, a STEM community college, and the University of Iowa Medical Center, while balancing the need for retail and residential diversity.
City of Bristol, Virginia
Comprehensive Plan

The City of Bristol is located along the Virginia/Tennessee state line with the Downtown being uniquely divided between Bristol, Virginia and Bristol, Tennessee. Houseal Lavigne Associates was retained by the City of Bristol, Virginia to prepare the City’s new comprehensive plan. The Planning process incorporated extensive community outreach and included an Advisory Committee and regular interaction with City staff and officials. The Draft Plan is expected to be considered for adoption by City Council in the Fall of 2016.

The City has many assets to build off of, but faces several challenges in the future. It is currently in the process of building out a new retail center “The Falls” which has required significant city investment. The plan addresses strategies and recommendations for maximizing success of the development which will be extremely important to the City’s future from both a planning and financial perspective. Other issues addressed include repositioning of a closed college campus and aging shopping mall and maintenance within the City’s many different residential neighborhoods. Separate detailed subarea plans were prepared for key locations including the Downtown.
City of Midland, Michigan
Downtown Midland Streetscape Redevelopment
Study & Design (DLZ)

Key Elements: Traffic Analysis | Public and Stakeholder Engagement | Non-Motorized Mobility | Alternative Development and Analysis | Access Management | Geotechnical Investigation | Topographic Survey | Road Design | Drainage Design | Streetscape Design | Utility Coordination | MOT Design

DLZ was contracted (on a team with Smith Group JJR) by the City of Midland (City) to perform a streetscape study and design for Main Street from M-20/Jerome Street to State Street in the City. The study phase of the project included a detailed traffic analysis of Main Street and all cross-roads, geotechnical investigations, cost estimation, topographic survey, and development of streetscape concept design plans.

The main work tasks performed by DLZ during the design phase of the project included geotechnical engineering, utility coordination, roadway design, traffic signal removal, drainage design, maintenance of traffic design, design of non-motorized facilities, 3-D model development, and construction cost estimates. In addition, DLZ work included preparation of front-end documents and specifications, signal warrant analyses, before/after study for All-Way Stop Control implementation, and preparation of an engineering report. A key component of the project entailed non-motorized mobility and connectivity throughout downtown Midland. DLZ worked closely with other team members to assure our design would support these goals. The studies and design tasks for this project were completed by DLZ under an extremely aggressive timeline.

DLZ participated in an extensive public outreach campaign including public workshops, local business input, and stakeholder meetings. Coordination was undertaken with the City, the Midland Downtown Development Authority, the Midland Area Transportation Study, Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), and various stakeholders such as Momentum Midland, and the Midland Chamber of Commerce.
City of Marquette, Michigan

City-Wide Traffic Study & Truck Corridor Study (DLZ)

DLZ was contracted by the City of Marquette to perform a comprehensive traffic study for all of the main roads and intersections in the City. This comprehensive study addressed both vehicular and non-motorized travel and included the following main study phases: (1) Data collection; (2) Analysis of existing and future conditions to identify deficiencies with the transportation network; (3) Recommendation of mitigation measures; and (4) Coordination with stakeholders. In carrying out this work, DLZ staff undertook the following specific tasks:

- Data collection included turning movement counts at more than 80 intersections using Miovision, pedestrian counts, collection of crash data, and ADT counts using HI-STAR counters.
- Identified mitigation measures that included road improvements, signal timing improvements, and enhanced non-motorized facilities.
- Study and identification of potential truck routes.
- Stakeholder coordination included interaction with MDOT, City committees, the local transit provider, non-motorized advocacy groups, business groups, and the utility company that maintains the traffic signal system.
- Signal warrant analyses for intersections under City and MDOT jurisdiction.
- Capacity analysis using SYNCHRO, SIMTRAFFIC, HCS, and RODEL.
- Detailed analysis of signal corridor operations, including optimization analysis.
- City Council presentation.
- Construction cost estimates.
- Traffic forecasting, including application of growth rates and ITE trip generation.
- Developed extensive graphics including use of GIS data.
- Preparation of a comprehensive report.
City of Dearborn, Michigan

West Downtown Streetscape Traffic Study & Road Design (DLZ)

This project involved preparation of road and streetscape design plans as well as traffic studies for revitalization of Dearborn’s West Downtown.

DLZ performed a traffic impact study, roadway design, and lighting design for improvements along Michigan Avenue (US-12) and several local streets. The project included proposed medians within Michigan Avenue, mid-block pedestrian crossings and a road diet on Monroe Street south of Michigan Avenue. The proposed Monroe Street road diet and proposed left turn restrictions on Michigan Avenue to accommodate the proposed median and mid-block crossings required detailed traffic analyses and coordination with MDOT. DLZ prepared a Traffic Impact Study to meet MDOT requirements to evaluate several median and left turn restriction alternatives. DLZ developed SYNCHRO/Sim-Traffic traffic models to evaluate the alternatives on this heavily travelled MDOT arterial. DLZ recommended signal timing improvements, turn bay lengths and other geometric improvements to accommodate the proposed streetscape improvements.

DLZ prepared lighting design plans for aesthetically pleasing festoon and catenary lighting that contributes to a pedestrian-oriented downtown.

DLZ also prepared a TAP Grant application for the improvements on Michigan Avenue and undertook extensive coordination with MDOT.

Figure 1 - Dearborn Streetscape Study Area
DTE Energy, one of the largest employers in Detroit, is playing a ground breaking role in the formation of a new public space on the fringe of their downtown campus which is intended to spur revitalization of the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed triangular–shaped public space lies one block to the east of the DTE Energy building, along Grand River Avenue in the heart of the city. In a collaborative effort with LivingLAB, inFORM studio has provided full design services for the HUB, an on-site cafe | pavilion intended to form the catalytic heart of the park. Programmatically the HUB will provide a full service kitchen, public restrooms, AV storage, bar area, balcony seating, a historical DTE narrative and a rooftop garden with provisions made to enclose seating for 150 people.

The proposed street facing public face of the HUB building aims to unify pedestrian circulation while creating an iconic wayfiding point within the park interior. The blackened steel and wood cladding pull from adjacent material palettes while a integrated Interactive Display System is optimized for augmented reality applications in which optical markers or real-life objects trigger information and accommodate an unlimited number of concurrent users with a high-tech LCD display. An EHTIE (Extensible Hybrid Tracking Engine) is configured to capture reflections, passive ambient light and shadows between alternating frame rates. The tracking system can be used to see virtually anything placed on the display and visible with IR, tracking and passing information to applications through finger points, hands, objects (shapes) or optical markers. The high technology display system is intended to support and entertain patrons of the Grand River Circle Park Site.

The HUB interior, the heart of the GRPS, supports so many of the activities with food, drink, rest rooms, dining & gathering areas, in addition to green roof access. Elements of the interior include; 1) An operable glass partitions which extends the seating area into the park, blurring the delineation between interior and exterior space. 2) A backlit acrylic bar top contrasts the darkened steel and illuminates the event space core. 3) CNC routed concrete formwork creates a unique texture of concave and convex domes on the exposed concrete ceiling. This texture will provide visual intrigue and help to diffuse sound. Lights will be stippled into the field of domes in the ceiling to provide a constellation of ambient light. 4) Ipe wood siding and concrete pavers used at the exterior are extended to the interior space, further reinforcing the connection between the two environments.
Lansing Community College, Lansing, Michigan

**Student Quadrangle (inFORM)**

The redevelopment of the Lansing Community College Quadrangle project creates a significant connection and a spatial mediator between a congress of energetic and diversified disciplines within the downtown campus. Working within the framework of a unified campus vision, this exciting project presents an opportunity to increase pedestrian accessibility and circulation functionality while define a signature gateway & wayfinding component at the heart of the school. The revitalized quadrangle will provide enhanced connectivity between the Gannon Building, Health & Human Services, Dart Auditorium and the Arts & Sciences Building.
City of Ann Arbor, Michigan

New District Library

In 2005, The Ann Arbor District Library (AADL) purchased approximately 4 acres of property for a new branch library to serve the Northeast quadrant of the city of Ann Arbor. The site, heavily wooded and densely vegetated, is located on the Southwest corner of Huron Parkway and Traverwood Drive. A thorough site analysis identified edges of the property along the Southwest corner which were scarred and sparsely vegetated, an ideal and well suited location for placement of the building footprint. Locating the building at the property corner accomplished three primary objectives:

• The creation of a protective barrier between the existing eco-systems within the woods and the inhabitants of the city.
• Established urban street presence along the street and sidewalk edge.
• Minimal site impact, maintaining biodiversity and reducing sprawl.

During the early stages of the site planning process, we collectively began to discuss and investigate considerations for harvesting wood from the site for re-use in the building. Although densely populated, many of the trees were Ash, suffering the effects of the Emerald Ash Borer (EAB), a destructive beetle, which aggressively attacks North American Ash trees through feeding on the water and nutrient conducting tissues under the bark, killing the tree over a period of three to five years. As of 2009 it is estimated that the EAB has killed over 70 million Ash throughout the Midwest and southern portions of Canada and threatens 7.5 billion ash trees nationwide. Preliminary research showed that this particular tree species is especially well-suited to milling, as the insect does not damage the interior portion of the wood. With so much value found in a close, abundant, natural resource, unique uses of the wood in the floors, walls, ceiling and structure of the new branch library were proposed and considered.

The utilization of the Ash would become a major component to the design of the library interior. Integrated as an interior wrapper, the Ash flows from the main entry floor and walls into a ceiling condition stretching along the entire eastern interior edge of the building and culminating in an Ash wrapped reading rooms whose primary views are focused westward into the forest. Additionally, large sections of the logs were used as structural columns, accommodating vertical and lateral loading along the large southwest expanse of glass. The bark has been stripped from these log columns exposing the randomized grooves and carvings left by the EAB larvae - creating, what is in essences, a visual and tactile testament to the life and destruction of the Ash tree in Michigan and surrounding area, allowing generations to be exposed to an autopsy report of an extinct species in the region.
City of Detroit, Michigan

411 Piquette Place (inFORM)

Piquette Place is located within an urban fabric defined by rich layers of history and latent potential. On the eastern periphery of New Center, the history of its neighborhood was defined by industrial expansion in the 1890s and became known as Milwaukee Junction. At the intersection of major railways and a hotbed of innovation, the district emerged as a significant player in automotive manufacturing. The chronicling of this storied tradition resulted in the formalization of two historic districts known as the Jam-Handy District along East Grand Boulevard and the Piquette Avenue Industrial District located south of the railway from Woodward Avenue to Hastings Street. While these historic districts highlight a rich historical fabric that imbues a certain quality of the region, they lack the characterization that the greater tapestry of context illustrates.

With an array of pure industrial spaces made of brick and concrete proliferating the region, the programmatic adaptive re-use of proximate spaces is evolving into a fertile nexus of design, education and entertainment. Additionally, new developments, anchored by the Platform, are breathing a strategic vision into a significant clustering within this neighborhood, bolstering the momentum of a unique branded location within the UNESCO City of Design. Music, art and culinary destinations are diversifying the reputation of the ‘Maker District’ into a hub of design and production excellence. The ¼ mile square zone will be anchored by Chroma to the northeast and Piquette Place along with the Ford Piquette Museum on the southeast corner. The synergy of design innovation and storied authenticity is creating one of the most unique neighborhoods in the rust belt of the United States. Piquette Place is distinctively located at the center of its heartbeat.
City of Providence, Rhode Island

New Pedestrian Bridge (inFORM)

The Providence River Pedestrian Bridge is a unique urban proposal in that the basis of its proposition is an exchange of transit medium. The relocation of a substantial, vehicular only conduit in favor of a pedestrian oriented connector will completely transform the spatial character of the Jewelry District/Old Harbor. Given this significant urban transformation, the project should envision a potential much larger than a pure connector. The proposed Providence River Pedestrian Bridge can become a spatial mediator between urban and ecological spaces and function as an integrated series of programs into the waterfront public spaces, allowing east and west to become a singular meandering public space. With this perspective, the proposal is better understood less as a bridge and more as an urban intervention. Additionally, the re-invigorated entrepreneurial spirit of Providence is poised to weather the global economic downturn with a future vision for the emerging Knowledge District and potential new biomedical corridor. The face of this future is one of innovation, intellectual fervor and progressive thinking. A project of this magnitude needs to reach out to this “creative class” and “knowledge economy.”
Lawrence Technological Institute, Southfield, Michigan

Integrated Student Housing (inFORM)

Lawrence Technological University’s Southfield campus is experiencing an in-flux of students with a desire to live on campus, impacted strongly by the LTU’s recent addition of a Student Athletic program which includes a new Varsity Football team. This fervor in student resident growth has created a dramatic and immediate need for on-campus student housing facilities.

inFORM studio was selected from a small group of national candidates and commissioned with providing a 300+ student bed dormitory with a focus on student attraction and retention for the University’s many design programs and relationships through cross-pollination of student social groups. Working with a very conservative budget of $180/sf, inFORM was tasked with creating an iconic residential flagship for the University.
City of Pontiac, Michigan

**M1 Concourse Racing Village (inFORM)**

One of the largest facilities of its kind in the world, the M1 Concourse provides exotic car and racing enthusiasts a full-service venue for an immersive experience including a 1.5-mile state of the art road course, an event center, restoration shops, aftermarket retail, restaurants, and private garages, known as car condos.

The Track One concept will be the debut phase of implementation for the new public village at the M1 Concourse in Pontiac, MI in late 2018. As the 87 acre auto-enthusiast development forays into the public realm, Track One will introduce a new paradigm of hospitality with a restaurant, cigar bar, rooftop lounge and ballroom | convention space. The concept drives a high-energy atmosphere with a tight proximity to exotic cars performing around the 1.5 mile race track, and connects to the urban village through a pedestrian oriented plaza. The project is a nexus between the best of automobile performance and the quality of a walkable environment.
REFERENCES

At Houseal Lavigne Associates, we are proud of our work and the long-term relationships we maintain with all of our clients. We believe each of these references demonstrates our ability to satisfy clients through an approach that meets their technical and financial needs.

The following references include clients who have worked with Houseal Lavigne Associates to complete similar work within the past five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Flint, Michigan</td>
<td>Kevin Schronce, Lead Planner</td>
<td>(810) 766-7426</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kschronce@cityofflint.com">kschronce@cityofflint.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Traverse City, Michigan</td>
<td>Russ Soyring, City Planning Director</td>
<td>(231) 922-4465</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rsoyring@ci.traverse-city.mi.us">rsoyring@ci.traverse-city.mi.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Benton Harbor, Michigan</td>
<td>Regina Sistrunk, Deputy Director of Community &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>(269) 927-8420</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rsistrunk@bhc.city.org">rsistrunk@bhc.city.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Battle Creek, Michigan</td>
<td>Christine Zuzga, Planning Manager</td>
<td>(269) 966-3320</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cmzuzga@battlecreekmi.gov">cmzuzga@battlecreekmi.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hudson, Ohio</td>
<td>Mark Richardson, Director of Community Development</td>
<td>(330) 342-1888</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mrichardson@hudson.oh.us">mrichardson@hudson.oh.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of St. Cloud, Minnesota</td>
<td>Matt Glaesman, Community Development Director</td>
<td>(320) 255-7218</td>
<td><a href="mailto:matt.glaesman@ci.stcloud.mn.us">matt.glaesman@ci.stcloud.mn.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Bristol, Virginia</td>
<td>Sally Morgan, City Planner</td>
<td>(276) 645-3784</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sally.morgan@bristolva.org">sally.morgan@bristolva.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coralville, Iowa</td>
<td>Ellen Habel, Assistant City Administrator</td>
<td>(319) 248-1700</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ehabel@ci.coralville.ia.us">ehabel@ci.coralville.ia.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WORK SAMPLES

For the City of Birmingham’s consideration, multiple copies of Houseal Lavigne Associates’ work samples on past comprehensive and master planning assignments have been included as separate bound documents. These samples include brief portions from the Flint Master Plan’s Land Use chapter and the Market Analysis and Community Profile chapter from the City of Bentonville’s Community Plan.
SECTION 4
SCOPE OF WORK

PROJECT UNDERSTANDING
Our Project team is excited about the opportunity to work with the City of Birmingham as it looks towards updating its City-wide Master Plan (the “Plan”). We understand the objective of the Plan is to focus on updating the existing master plan, which was adopted in 1980, and several subarea plans developed since. While most of the subarea plans focused on commercial areas, the purpose of this Plan update would be to provide a clear focus on the City’s residential areas. Our initial observations all require further analysis and investigation and all are subject to community outreach efforts that are integral to our proposed planning process. We believe our award-winning community outreach, planning, and design expertise will allow us to move quickly into the assignment and provide insight into how best to tackle issues and make the most of Birmingham’s opportunities.

Creating a downtown destination
Birmingham has implemented several recommendations from its Downtown 2016 Plan and created the downtown as a desirable destination. Large sites, which were once empty, are now occupied with multiple uses. The City’s main street, Woodward Avenue, was narrowed to two lanes by adding a center median and diagonal parking to calm the traffic. The City is one of the few communities in the region to adopt a form-based zoning code, which has resulted in over three million square feet of mixed-use projects in the last two decades. Single-story zoning regulations have been changed to those allowing multi-story buildings to create a high-density development environment and an enhanced “street-wall” character. Some of the commercial development, such as the Kroger grocery store and the iconic downtown movie theater, is built closer to the street and the movie theater is built right up to the pedestrian sidewalk. The parking is moved either to the side or the back of structures. Shared parking garages also supplement the parking requirement to support the businesses.

The Plan should embrace and build upon the success of Birmingham’s effort in managing commercial development in its downtown and other districts. The new plan should focus and put priority on residential areas of the City.

Building on positive momentum
The City has developed plans for several targeted district and strategically implemented and channeled investment to these districts with a great deal of success. The City’s downtown boom has continued through the Great Recession, when the it continued to see mixed-use development. Downtown Birmingham attracts shoppers from all over the Detroit area, featuring myriad stores such as coffee houses, ice cream parlors, upscale apparel and home furnishing shops, restaurants, and theaters. Through careful and intelligent planning, most new buildings in Birmingham’s downtown look very traditional and fit well with their surroundings.

The Rail District provides a luxury living in an exciting neighborhood in Birmingham. The district is surrounded by art galleries, antique shops and restaurants and is home to over 30 businesses. This district is culturally vibrant and Birmingham’s “hottest” new area. Popular restaurants such as Big Rock Chophouse and The Whistle Stop are located very close to the District’s residential area. The Triangle District Plan sets a new vision for the Triangle District as a vibrant, mixed-use neighborhood of homes, shops, restaurants, offices, and public plazas and identifies guidelines and recommendations to achieve this vision.

The Plan should utilize the collective impact of development in these targeted areas and focus on providing recommendations to other parts of the City.
**Incorporating new urbanist principles**

Andres Duany, an urban planner, gave a presentation at the City Hall in 2014. Duany talked about how the City should continue to maintain its high quality of architecture for new development in Birmingham. He indicated the City’s approach to managing certain uses as remarkable. Instead of declining a particular use, the City’s code provides a “range of criteria” to accommodate the use which results in the City to be viewed as a positive and attractive among development community. Duany also suggested the City act quickly in promoting new development so it can be aligned with the general development cycle of the industry. While Duany identified some key strengths and successes of Birmingham, he also identified several missed opportunities that City officials and resident prevented to implement.

The Plan should consider and address, to the extent possible, the “missed opportunities” identified by Andre Duany in 2014.

**Enhancing the Walkable Community**

In 2013, the City adopted its multi-modal transportation plan to provide more transportation choices to its residents. Since its adoption, the City has implemented the recommendations in accordance with the vision set forth in the transportation plan. This is evidenced by the City’s downtown “Walk Score” of 95. The plan focused on providing infrastructure for pedestrian, transit, and bicycle travel modes. The plan provided recommendations for building a well-connected community and giving residents various transportation choices.

The Plan should continue to build upon the vision and goals from the multi-modal transportation plan and provide recommendations to provide a myriad of transportation choices to Birmingham’s residents and make the City attractive to those looking for a walkable environment.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

We propose a multi-step process for preparing the City of Birmingham’s Master Plan Update. This program entails analyzing existing conditions to provide a concise and accurate assessment of the City’s strengths and weaknesses; developing and evaluating alternative plans and policies; preparing subarea plans; and formulating final Master Plan recommendations and implementation strategies that are both measurable and specific.

In addition, and equally important, our approach to master planning places a significant emphasis on community participation. We recognize the importance of using the planning process to establish community consensus and foster a sense of stewardship for the Master Plan. Our approach requires that residents, business leaders, City officials, and other stakeholders get involved at every step of the process and be active participants that can help to define issues, establish a vision, formulate innovative ideas, and shape lasting solutions. This approach casts a wide net of engagement by providing an assortment of both traditional and innovative web-based methods.

We believe our proposed scope of work will produce a meaningful and responsive Master Plan for the City of Birmingham. Should the City favor our approach, we will work closely with staff and other officials to further refine this process, ensuring that all local needs and requirements are met. Each step and project task of our proposed scope of services is presented in detail on the pages that follow.

**Step 1: Project initiation**

To “kick-off” the planning process, we will conduct meetings with key municipal staff and the City of Birmingham’s Planning Board. These meetings will help establish a project framework before community outreach activities commence.

**1a. Staff coordination meeting**

Before beginning work on the project, Houseal Lavigne Associates will meet with City staff to (1) review the project scope, schedule, and deliverables; (2) begin to identify data needs and critical issues; and (3) clarify any outstanding matters. We anticipate having a high level of direct interaction and communication with City staff and are committed to participating in regular coordination meetings and conference calls throughout the planning process.
1b. Planning Board meeting
Before our planning work begins, we will facilitate a first meeting with the Planning Board to set the foundation for the planning program and discuss the overall direction and policy issues facing the community. The primary purpose of this meeting is to gather vital insights and ideas from commission members, ensuring that the Master Plan accurately captures the shared sentiments of the community.

Step 2: Community outreach and engagement
We understand that a one-size-fits-all approach to community engagement is ineffective and that the City of Birmingham places great value on an extensive and authentic outreach process. Step 2 of our proposed scope of work will serve as the foundation of our civic engagement strategy. Houseal Lavigne Associates provides a multi-pronged approach to outreach and a variety of expertise that will be essential in engaging the community, addressing local issues, and most importantly, and ensuring the inclusion of a diverse swath of Birmingham’s residents and business owners.

2a. Press releases, notices, and newsletter articles
We will work with City staff to develop press releases, newsletter articles, and other means of public notice at different points in the planning process. These items will be disseminated on various platforms, including the City’s official website, local newspapers, and local media outlets. We advise that these platforms be updated regularly throughout the process of preparing the City’s Master Plan Update.

2b. Interactive project website
We will design and host an interactive project website that is linked to the City’s official website. We are committed to utilizing the internet to maximize the participation and communication between stakeholders for the duration of the planning process and beyond. This website can be used to post project schedules and meeting dates, display documents, address frequently asked questions, and host a community discussion forum. The website will be the “one-stop shop” for information related to the master planning process. In addition, the website will include two sets of survey questionnaires: one targeted at residents and another at Birmingham’s business community.

2c. Community charrette
A multi-day charrette will be scheduled to allow residents and community leaders to provide input before any plans or recommendations are formulated. The function of this charrette is to (1) define the purpose of the Master Plan Update, (2) review the planning process and project schedule, and (3) secure local views on concerns, issues, and potentials within Birmingham.

2d. Business workshop
This workshop will be targeted specifically to Birmingham’s business owners and corporate citizens, an important stakeholder group. The primary purpose of the workshop is to establish a dialogue and obtain feedback from those members of the business community that have a unique insight and perspective and whose assistance and involvement is crucial to the Master Plan’s ultimate success.

2e. Stakeholder interviews and focus group discussions
Stakeholder interviews and focus group discussions allow us to obtain first-hand insight into the community from a diverse array of perspectives. Houseal Lavigne Associates will conduct confidential interviews and focus group discussions to obtain vital information regarding local issues and opportunities. We will work with City staff to identify those individuals and groups to be interviewed, but we do recommend a broad sampling of interviewees who possess unique perspectives and special insights into Birmingham.
2f. Do-it-yourself (DIY) workshop kits

We will make DIY workshop kits available to City staff, as well as community groups throughout Birmingham (e.g., chamber organizations, homeowner associations, churches, and neighborhood groups). DIY kits will allow City staff and residents to self-facilitate workshops and gather input from specific segments of the population that may not otherwise participate in more formal planning activities.

2g. Immersive outreach

Our immersive outreach methods utilize an approach centered on bringing “planning to the people.” To this end, and to ensure we cast as wide a net of engagement as possible, we can attend certain agreed-upon events throughout the planning process to facilitate targeted discussions at community events. In addition, working with City staff, we will develop promotional collateral, including flyers, posters, and email blasts, to help get the message about the Master Plan Update throughout the community in an impactful and engaging manner. We will also develop postcard-sized surveys that can be distributed at any event, gathering, or location within the community. These materials will give staff the tools needed to continue community engagement outside of scoped outreach activities.

2h. Social media

If desired, we can integrate the project into the City’s existing social media accounts. For those residents that use social media platforms to stay informed, this is an essential tool to keep this population connected with local master planning activities. Social networking tools can also help increase awareness of the Master Plan Update and assist in increasing participation at outreach events, including traditional face-to-face meetings.

2i. map.social

As an innovative feature of our proposed scope of work, we will feature map.social, a web-based community issues mapping tool as part of Birmingham’s master planning process. Developed and used exclusively by Houseal Lavigne Associates, this award-winning tool allows website visitors to identify, map, and comment on geographic areas of concern and valued community amenities. Map.social simplifies the mapping process and familiarizes residents with all areas of the community in a manner that is exciting, interactive, and effective. Input from residents allows us to create a composite map of community issues to assist with the establishment of community goals.

2j. Community outreach summary memo

After the completion of the community outreach and engagement activities, Houseal Lavigne Associates will prepare a memo summarizing the input we received and identifying key issues.

Step 3: Data collection and existing conditions analysis

This step of the project will include the analysis of existing conditions and future possibilities within the community. It will be based on information provided by the City as well as feedback from community service providers. In addition, we will utilize information collected during field reconnaissance, obtained from surveys and inventories, and derived from planning analyses. We will emphasize the identification of the current conditions within Birmingham that will ultimately guide the formulation of the City’s vision, goals, and policies included in the final Master Plan.

3a. Review of past plans, studies, and reports

We will conduct a thorough review of Birmingham’s existing Master Plan along with other previously prepared plans, studies, and reports relevant to the planning process. This review process will help to (1) identify recently adopted City policies that need to be reflected in the new master plan, (2) assess changes within the community that have occurred since the adoption of previous plans, (3) find conflicts between, or deficiencies within, existing plans, and (4) determine the validity of previously collected data.
3b. Demographic analysis and market overview

We will prepare a demographic analysis of Birmingham that will include an analysis of recent trends in population, households, income, age and gender characteristics, racial and ethnic composition, and labor force and employment. We will concurrently formulate a market overview to assess high-level supply and demand trends, particularly as they relate to attracting and retaining residents and businesses.

In addition, this analysis will assess the development potential for a range of uses including residential, retail, office, and industrial. Our housing analysis will document the City’s existing housing inventory and identify the need and potential by product and price points for both owner-occupied and rental product.

3c. Existing land use and development

We will prepare an existing land use map comprised of all parcels within the City’s planning jurisdiction and then analyze this map to identify functional land use areas, compatible and incompatible land use arrangements, and other issues related to existing land use and development conditions. This inventory and assessment will include a detailed examination of the City’s residential, commercial, industrial, parks, and open space.

3d. Zoning and development controls

We will conduct a technical analysis and sustainability audit of Birmingham’s current zoning and development controls. This process will allow us to (1) assess how well current regulations effect established City policy and integrate with other ordinances and initiatives, (2) summarize consistencies or inconsistencies in the current code, and (3) evaluate general strengths and weaknesses of existing regulations—especially structure, organization, clarity, usability, district standards, regulations of general applicability, definitions, and procedures.

3e. Community facilities

We anticipate that much of the information related to community facilities will be provided by City staff. To supplement this, however, we will prepare a facilities survey for community service providers and will use the results—together with fieldwork and other research—to prepare a community facilities inventory, including detailed map exhibits.

3f. Issues and opportunities memo

The project team will outline the results of the community outreach activities and existing conditions analysis in a technical memo detailing issues, opportunities, and trends that will be addressed in the master plan. This working document will serve as a foundation for future steps in the planning process as we craft an understanding of Birmingham’s major priorities.

3g. Staff coordination meeting

In this meeting with City staff, we will review the information contained in the issues and opportunities memo ahead of its distribution to the Planning Board. We will also work to ensure that substantive comments provided by City staff are integrated into our ensuing plan development.

3h. Planning Board meeting

The primary purpose of the second meeting of the Planning Board will be to present the findings of the issues and opportunities memo and gather any feedback.
**Step 4: Infrastructure and transportation**

DLZ will assess existing transportation infrastructure in the City utilizing existing transportation information from City staff and other agencies, including the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) and SEMCOG, as well as data garnered from field observations.

The plan will include strategies to enhance pedestrian movement, implement complete street ideas, and manage the transportation system to meet future needs based on growth in demand, redevelopment scenarios, and changes in land uses. As part of the transportation analysis, the following transportation elements will be evaluated and graphically presented:

- Street characteristics including lanes, operations (one-way/two-way), width, and street distribution
- Transportation use such as bus route, truck route, bicycle lanes and non-motorized facilities
- Current road designations, functional classifications
- Intersection configurations
- Potential traffic control changes
- Typical cross sections related to current and future needs

**Step 5: Parking analysis**

The parking analysis outlined in the City’s request for proposals is, essentially, a separate study independent of the Master Plan Update. To ensure that the analysis receives the attention and resources required, we suggest that the City contract separately with a professional services firm specializing in parking. While this expertise could be included on our project team, it is our opinion that it would be far more effective to have a standalone parking study. To that end, we would work closely with the City’s selected consultant to ensure that plans and recommendations are consistent with the findings of the parking study.

**Step 6: Community vision, goals, and objectives**

The purpose of this step will be to establish an overall vision for the future of the City of Birmingham that can provide focus and direction for subsequent planning activities and serve as the cornerstone of the consensus-building process. Based on this vision, we will develop the preliminary goals and objectives that will serve as a framework for the detailed recommendations included in the final Master Plan.

**6a. Community visioning workshop**

The community visioning workshop will include members of the project team, City staff, the Planning Board, elected and appointed officials, and all interested members of the community. The session will include both large- and small-group working sessions to review and discuss conditions and potentials within the community. The large group will work together to identify issues and opportunities, and the smaller breakout groups will work together to develop visions for the future of Birmingham. The workshop will conclude with general agreement and understanding regarding the long-term role and character of the City, as well as the types of projects and improvements desired for the future.

**6b. Vision statement**

Following the visioning workshop, we will summarize the results of the group discussions and prepare a preliminary vision statement for the City of Birmingham. The preliminary vision statement will be based on the community visioning workshop, feedback from community outreach activities, and observations garnered from the existing conditions analysis.

**6c. Goals and objectives memo**

Based on previous steps in the planning process, we will develop the visionary goals, coupled with measureable objectives, to provide more specific focus and direction for planning recommendations. As a starting point, we will establish updated goals and objectives from Birmingham’s existing Master Plan. As desired by the City, we can develop additional categories for goals and objectives that were not addressed in this plan.
Step 7: Subarea plans
We will review the existing subarea plans including those prepared for Eton Road, Downtown, and The Triangle District, as well as materials related to the Andres Duany visit. Other documents, including the Alleys and Passageways Plan, multimodal transportation plan, and parks and recreation plan, will be reviewed as well. The relevance and continued long-term applicability of these plans will be analyzed and discussed with City staff, and the need to update components of each plan will be documented where necessary. Additional locations for subarea plans, such as the South Woodward Gateway, will be reviewed and discussed.

Step 8: Community-wide plans and policies
This step of the project will entail the preparation of plans that are consistent with Birmingham’s reputation as an exceptionally livable and walkable community. At a minimum, plans will address core planning themes, including land use and development, multi-modal transportation, public services and facilities, and environmental systems and natural resources. In addition, these plans will include a comprehensive implementation program, detailing actionable strategies to ensure essential elements of the final Master Plan are fully realized.

8a. Land use and development plan
The land use and development plan will include recommendations and policies for all land use areas in the City, including residential, commercial, industrial, and recreational areas. We will identify existing land uses and provide future land use designations for all areas within the City’s planning jurisdiction. The land use and development plan will utilize text and illustrative maps and graphics to communicate planning concepts and principles. It will clearly articulate recommendations related to the character and intensity of future development in Birmingham over the next 10 to 20 years. In addition, we will assess how well current zoning districts match the adopted future land use plan and existing development patterns to determine where current regulations meet or fail to meet public expectations as articulated during the planning process.

8b. Multi-modal transportation plan
DLZ will develop a multi-modal transportation plan consisting of improvements that address concerns stated in the public engagement process and deficiencies identified in the existing conditions assessment. The multi-modal transportation plan will also include a series of strategies that support our future land use recommendations. In addition, the project team will prepare a map that depicts the recommended transportation and infrastructure improvements and opportunities.

8c. Public facilities and services plan
The public facilities and services plan will identify and inventory all community facilities in the City and include recommendations and policies for municipal facilities and services, as well as intergovernmental coordination and cooperation. This plan will, at a minimum, include water, wastewater stormwater, police, and fire protection services.

8d. Implementation program
As a final component of the community-wide plans and policies, Houseal Lavigne Associates will prepare an implementation program that will describe the actions required to carry out the policies contained in the Master Plan Update, including immediate, short-term and longrange strategies and recommendations related to zoning and other land use regulations, priority improvement projects and redevelopment sites, Capital Improvement Program projects, funding sources and implementation methods, timing and prioritization, metrics and performance indicators, and general administration and management of the Master Plan. We will work to ensure that these implementation recommendations are both practical and actionable.
Step 9: Master Plan documents and adoption

The culmination of the planning process will be the preparation of the final Master Plan document that will be reviewed and adopted by the Planning Board and approved by the City Commission.

9a. Draft Master Plan document

Utilizing work completed in the preceding steps of the project, the project team will prepare a draft Master Plan document for review by City staff, the Planning Board, as well as the public-at-large.

9b. Staff coordination meeting

In the final staff coordination meeting, Houseal Lavigne Associates will compile any feedback and comment from City staff related to the draft Master Plan deliverable. In addition, we will review the next steps in the Master Plan adoption process and coordinate accordingly.

9c. Community open house

The project team, along with City staff, will be present for community open house will to allow Birmingham’s residents and community stakeholders to examine, discuss, and comment on the draft Master Plan. We will be available throughout the community open house to present material, answer questions, and get feedback prior to initiating the approval process.

9d. Final Master Plan adoption

Houseal Lavigne Associates, in conjunction with City staff, will present the final Master Plan to the Planning Board at a public hearing for adoption. This hearing will provide an opportunity for residents and the community at-large to comment on the Master Plan—and the recommendations therein—before its adoption.

9e. Final Master Plan City Commission presentation and approval

Once the Master Plan has been adopted by the Planning Board, the City Commission may complete an approval of the revised Master Plan. In addition, Houseal Lavigne Associates will provide City staff with the final plan in both hard copy and digital formats in this last step of the project. We will work with staff to ensure that the Master Plan formats will enable low-cost reproduction, revision, and direct web and social media posting.
Availability

The chart below outlines Houseal Lavigne Associates’ proposed timeframe to complete the services described in our Scope of Work. The team we have assembled for the City of Birmingham’s Master Plan Update is available to undertake this important assignment immediately upon selection and will be available for the duration of the schedule outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Project initiation</th>
<th>Step 2: Community outreach and engagement</th>
<th>Step 3: Data collection and existing conditions analysis</th>
<th>Step 4: Infrastructure and transportation</th>
<th>Step 5: Parking analysis</th>
<th>Step 6: Community vision, goals, and objectives</th>
<th>Step 7: Subarea plans</th>
<th>Step 8: Community-wide plans and policies</th>
<th>Step 9: Master Plan documents and adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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SECTION 6
ADDITIONAL SERVICES

Subarea plans
As noted in the subarea section of our scope of work, new subareas may be identified. Cost would be dependent upon the size and number of locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Name</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Houseal</td>
<td>Urban Planning</td>
<td>$205.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devin Lavigne</td>
<td>Urban Planning</td>
<td>$205.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Gardner</td>
<td>Economic Development &amp; Market Analysis</td>
<td>$185.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nik Davis</td>
<td>Urban Planning</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Meyer</td>
<td>Urban Planning</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michio Murakishi</td>
<td>Economic Development &amp; Market Analysis</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes Butch</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Civil Engineering</td>
<td>$209.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Whitten</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Civil Engineering</td>
<td>$124.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory Lavigne</td>
<td>Urban Design &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Guthrie</td>
<td>Urban Design &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zoning code and regulations update
At the completion of the Planning process, an update of the City’s zoning code and regulations could be prepared. This engagement would be scoped and budgeted separately at that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Name</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Houseal</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>$205.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Wells</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nik Davis</td>
<td>Graphics, Visualizations &amp; Plan Composition</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 7
BIDDER’S AGREEMENT
ATTACHMENT B - BIDDER’S AGREEMENT
FOR MASTER PLAN UPDATE

In submitting this proposal, as herein described, the Contractor agrees that:

1. They have carefully examined the specifications, terms and Agreement of the Request for Proposal and all other provisions of this document and understand the meaning, intent, and requirement of it.

2. They will enter into a written contract and furnish the item or items in the time specified in conformance with the specifications and conditions contained therein for the price quoted by the proponent on this proposal.

PREPARED BY
(Print Name)
Principal | Co-founder

DATE
06/01/2018

TITLE

DATE

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

E-MAIL ADDRESS
jhouseal@hlplanning.com

COMPANY

HOUSEAL LAVIGNE ASSOCIATES

ADDRESS
188 W. Randolph Street, Suite 200

PHONE
(312) 372-1008 x101

NAME OF PARENT COMPANY

PHONE

ADDRESS
N/A
In order for the bid to be considered valid, this form must be completed in its entirety. The cost for the Scope of Work as stated in the Request for Proposal documents shall be itemized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Elements</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Comprehensive Community Engagement Plan</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Updated Data Collection and Analysis</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Infrastructure Analysis</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parking Analysis</td>
<td>To be budgeted separately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attendance at Meetings</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Plan Preparation</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Finalization and Adoption</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL AMOUNT: $134,000

Additional Meeting Charge: $2,500 per meeting

Additional Services Recommended (if any):
- Subarea Plans: $ / hour
- Zoning: $110 to 205 / hour

Firm Name: Houseal Lavigne Associates

Authorized signature: ___________________________ Date: 06/01/2018
ATTACHMENT D - IRAN SANCTIONS ACT VENDOR CERTIFICATION FORM
FOR MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Pursuant to Michigan Law and the Iran Economic Sanction Act, 2012 PA 517 ("Act"), prior to the City accepting any bid or proposal, or entering into any contract for goods or services with any prospective Vendor, the Vendor must certify that it is not an "Iran Linked Business", as defined by the Act.

By completing this form, the Vendor certifies that it is not an “Iran Linked Business”, as defined by the Act and is in full compliance with all provisions of the Act and is legally eligible to submit a bid for consideration by the City.

John Houseal, FAICP 06/01/2018
PREPARED BY DATE
(Print Name)
Principal | Co-founder 06/01/2018
TITLE DATE

Authorized Signature
jhouseal@hlplanning.com

Houseal Lavigne Associates

COMPANY

188 W. Randolph Street, Suite 200, Chicago, IL 60601 (312) 372-1008 x101

ADDRESS PHONE

N/A N/A

NAME OF PARENT COMPANY PHONE

N/A

ADDRESS

13-4287640

TAXPAYER I.D.#
MAY 31, 2018

JANA L. ECKER, PLANNING DIRECTOR
CITY OF BIRMINGHAM
151 MARTIN STREET
BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009
JECKER@BHAMGOV.ORG  |  249.530.1841

CHRIS HERMANN, AICP
PRINCIPAL-IN-CHARGE
4219 WOODWARD AVE, SUITE 305
DETROIT, MI 48201

Re: City of Birmingham - MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Dear Ms. Ecker and Members of the Selection Committee,

On behalf of our team, MKSK is pleased to present our proposal to update the City’s Master Plan. We have carefully organized a team of planners, designers and community engagement specialists to lead the city through this Master Plan process. Our interdisciplinary team includes both national and local experts in charrette facilitation, land use, urban design-based plans, landscape architecture, Complete Streets, parking, infrastructure engineering and graphic communications. Our firms and individuals are committed to outcomes that promote sustainability, placemaking, multi-modal transportation and great urban environments. Our teams has demonstrated success working across a broad range of project scales and complexities. Most of us have experience working with Birmingham on a variety of other assignments.

MKSK will be the Prime firm. We are a leader in graphic-forward, broad-based comprehensive planning and imaginative solutions. Our resources include dozens of registered Landscape Architects, LEED AP certified professionals, AICP Certified Planners, Professional Transportation Planners and community involvement specialists. We have led planning efforts in many cities across the Midwest and Mid-Atlantic regions including: East Grand Rapids, Grand Rapids, Ann Arbor, Kalamazoo, and Midland MI, Columbus and Cincinnati OH, Greenville SC, Charleston WV, Lexington and Louisville KY, West Lafayette, IN, suburban Minneapolis and Tulsa Oklahoma. Our Principal-in-Charge will be Chris Hermann. Chris leads our planning team and has more than 25 years of experience. Chris provides a broad range of project planning experience to the firm, managing projects involving regional planning policy, comprehensive plans, downtown plans, focus area planning, community revitalization/reinvestment, economic development, urban design and form-based codes, transportation planning, consensus-building, and public engagement and facilitation. Chris is adept at helping communities create a unique, compelling vision and translating that vision into strategic steps that transform cities and spaces. Local Coordination will be led by Brad Strader of our Detroit office. Brad’s wealth of experience includes eight projects in Birmingham including the Downtown 2016 Plan, Triangle District, zoning studies and advising the Multi-Modal Board.

Our team includes:

UDA is our design charrette expert. They will lead the design charettes and development of neighborhood typologies. UDA has a well-developed Design Charrette process used as a tool to build consensus and identify implementation strategies. UDA has facilitated charrettes for mid-sized cities, downtowns, and mixed-use centers around the country and internationally. Recent similar projects include charrettes for the Chattanooga Arts District, Hershey West End Village in Derry Township, PA, Summers Corner village center in Dorchester County, SC, Cypress Village in West Vancouver, BC, downtown Huntsville, AL, Boca Raton, FL, and Alameda, CA.

Re: City of Birmingham - MASTER PLAN UPDATE
**Nelson\Nygaard is our parking expert.** Parking systems have always been complicated and demands and competing needs are only intensifying. We’ve partnered with Nelson\Nygaard for this project (and many others) because of their renowned innovative solutions for today’s parking needs that also take into account future changes in mobility. Nelson\Nygaard is currently leading the Birmingham’s Downtown Parking Study, which touches on some of the topics outlined in the Master Plan RFP.

**Fleiss & Vandenbrink is our traffic and engineering expert.** They will provide support in traffic engineering and construction staging. Julie Kroll and others from the firm have reviewed development impact studies and have served as the city’s Multi-Modal Board advisor for many years.

The combined talents of this team will provide Birmingham with:

- Leaders in innovative, action-oriented mid-sized city comprehensive and district plans,
- Leaders in the planning and placemaking field who are known for creating vibrant and livable communities,
- Confident professionals to facilitate and listen to diverse stakeholders and the public,
- Facilitators who have led design charrettes for decades,
- National leaders in Parking Management strategies,
- National leaders in Multi-modal and Complete Streets, linking land use with multi-modal transportation,
- Professionals who serve as instructors on best practice training on how to craft a Master Plan to be successful and meet the requirements of the Michigan Planning Act; and available support to help the city through implementation after the plan is developed,
- Experience in crafting easy to understand, visionary action plans followed by successful implementation,
- A group you have entrusted with many previous projects in Birmingham (three of our four firms).

Given our valued relationship with you and the positive experience working with the City on past undertakings, we would be delighted to continue our partnership with Birmingham with this project. We have crafted our work plan based on a combination of our past experience in developing city-wide and district comprehensive plans, as well as our specific understanding of Birmingham. We are prepared to refine the scope to best suit your expectations and budget to ensure the process and products deliver what you seek. We look forward to the opportunity to discuss our proposal with you for this exciting effort. Should you have any questions about our enclosed qualifications and proposal, please do not hesitate to write or call.

Sincerely,

MKSK

[Signature]

Chris Hermann, AICP, Principal-in-Charge
chermann@mkskstudios.com | DIRECT: 614.686.0128   FAX: 614.621.3604
OUTLINE OF QUALIFICATIONS
MKSK brings Planners, Urban Designers, and Landscape Architects together to offer creative planning, design, economic, and sustainable solutions. MKSK offers multidisciplinary professional services through our studios in Michigan, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, and South Carolina. As planners and landscape architects, we blend the art and science of land planning, placemaking, urban design and transportation; we are principled by a comprehensive view of sustainability that emphasizes not only environment, but also economy, energy, and society. We support our work with sound market data, engineering metrics, and community engagement. This information forms the backbone of our decision-making and allows us to give clients informed recommendations. We are leaders in helping communities plan and implement projects, because we help to seek out innovative funding and partnering strategies. We revisit work and measure outcomes. We strive to learn from our projects and we bring this knowledge to our clients.

Our approach focuses on helping communities fully realize their potential, by providing plans, collaborative services, design guidelines and policy tools that address each community’s specific needs and goals. Our team of highly qualified planners brings both private practice expertise, as well as a wide range of public planning experience to projects both large and small. By continually evolving planning processes and crafting individualized solutions for each community, our planners are able to create plans that clearly communicate effective strategies and facilitate success.
URBAN DESIGN, NEIGHBORHOOD TYPOLLOGIES, CHARRETTE LEAD

URBAN DESIGN ASSOCIATES (UDA)

Urban Design Associates (UDA), founded in 1964, is a multi-disciplined urban design and architecture practice headquartered in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. UDA’s design process features dynamic, three-dimensional graphics that allow everyone involved to visualize the scale and character of what is being proposed. This process creates consensus among stakeholders, development teams, political leaders, and the general public.

UDA establishes the character of new places through their research into the distinct patterns that have evolved in a region over time. Each place has its own DNA. These enduring qualities spring from the environment, culture, and heritage. By documenting these qualities and establishing design vocabularies that grow out of great places, new development can continue the sense of place into the future. This method makes it possible to design a rich and diverse environment that is sustainable and flexible for many different market sectors and uses over time.

CONTACT: MEGAN O’HARA, PRINCIPAL, MEGAN.OHARA@URBANDESIGNASSOCIATES.COM, 412.263.5200

PARKING

NELSON \ NYGAARD

Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates, Inc. is an internationally recognized firm committed to developing transportation systems that promote vibrant, sustainable, and accessible communities. Founded by two women in 1987, Nelson\Nygaard has grown from its roots in transit planning to a full-service transportation firm with over 130 people in offices across the United States. In keeping with the values set by the founders, Nelson\Nygaard puts people first. They recognize that transportation is not an end by itself but a platform for achieving broader community goals of mobility, equity, economic development, and healthy living. Their hands-on, national experience informs but doesn’t dictate local solutions. Built on consensus and a multimodal approach, their plans are renowned as practical and implementable.

CONTACT: CHRIS BONGORNO, SENIOR ASSOCIATE, CBONGORNO@NELSONNYGAARD.COM, 212.405.2534

INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS & MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING

FLEIS & VANDENBRINK ENGINEERING

Fleis & VandenBrink (F&V) has the most dedicated and experienced group of traffic professionals in SE Michigan. They have approximately 75% of all the traffic analyses performed in the state. Their clients include Kroger, Amazon, IKEA, Love’s Travel Stops, Pulte Homes, REDICO, Pinnacle Homes, and Beztak, just to name a few. They are also the traffic consultants for the City of Birmingham, Bloomfield Township and Commerce Township. They have worked on projects in every community in SE Michigan, including Detroit, where they have recently worked with FCA (Chrysler) to assist them with shift change operations and parking analysis at their Jefferson North facility.

CONTACT: JULIE KROLL, PE, PTOE, PRINCIPAL, JKROLL@FVENG.COM 248.536.0080
COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY MASTER PLANNING

MKSK understands the numerous factors that must be considered to create a robust and successful plan including assessments of existing conditions, environment, infrastructure, transportation systems, parking, demographics, market trends, development economics, fiscal implications, community character, cultural and historic structures, the built environment, and the public realm. We understand the relationships between the various types of land uses and their impacts on infrastructure and municipal services and funding.

Because of our work with the development community, we have a robust understanding of the types, yields, needs, and site layout of the myriad land developments of private developers. This ranges from subdivisions to multi-family developments, retail stores to town centers, corporate offices to industrial development, and true mixed-use urban centers. We also understand their infrastructure, parking, support, amenity, and open space needs. We specialize in planning for the public realm, including riverfronts, parks, signature spaces, plazas, civic building spaces, streetscapes, gateways, etc. Our goal in all of our community planning efforts is to identify catalytic projects that will attract investment, support the community, and greatly improve quality of life and economic opportunity.

Our planning practice is guided by the following principles:

1. **We invest** long-term commitments with the communities where we work, which is critical to plan implementation.
2. **MKSK brings a critical understanding** of placemaking trends and community development strategies.
3. **We recognize** key success factors for implementation such as funding, stakeholder, community buy-in, resource commitments, political will and leadership.
4. **We bring a comprehension** of both public and private sector goals, partnerships that can bring results, and understand the appropriate public investments that can spur substantial private development.
5. **We champion urban placemaking, walkable districts, multi-modal transportation enhancements, and sustainable healthy community design practices which have resulted in significant reinvestment.**
6. **We bring broad experience** in funding and regulatory tools.
7. **We create** exciting and achievable visions that motivate leaders, stakeholders, funders, and the public, that lead to successful built projects embraced by the community.
8. **We understand the importance of careful and thoughtful quality planning and design in creating catalytic and lasting projects.**
9. **We understand the importance of place and character that is unique to each community and strive to incorporate and reflect that in individual designs.**
URBAN DESIGN & PLANNING

MKSK’s approach focuses on helping communities fully realize their potential, by providing plans, collaborative services, design guidelines and policy tools that address each development’s specific needs and goals. Our team of highly-qualified urban designers brings both private and public practice expertise on large and small projects.

By continually evolving design processes and crafting individualized solutions for each community, our team is able to create visions that clearly communicate effective strategies and allow for an organic and extraordinary place to emerge. There are three elements that are consistent in our firm’s approach:

- A focus on quality design and placemaking;
- An inclusive, communication-based approach for coordination of stakeholder interests into a common goal;
- A strategic approach to implementation that is grounded in reality but innovative in its solutions.

These elements have directly led to renewed investment and improved quality-of-life in the places in which we have worked.

At MKSK, our designers have the unique ability to work in conjunction with the firm’s landscape architecture, planning, and transportation studios to bring multidisciplinary expertise, high-quality design, and achievable, real-world solutions to all of its urban design efforts. This, combined with the firm’s focus on high-quality graphic presentations, enhances the ability of the planning studio to effectively communicate and gain consensus on plan concepts, ideas and strategies. The end results are thoughtful, meaningful and implementable plans that spur action and provide a framework for transformational change.

ZONING & FORM-BASED CODES

Part of MKSK’s commitment to implementation extends into repair of existing zoning regulations and street design standards that may be barriers. We are currently helping Lansing, Dearborn and East Lansing develop new form-based codes. MKSK is frequently tapped as instructors by organizations such as the MI APA, National Form-Based Code Institute, MML, MEDC and the Michigan Bar. Once the concepts and plan are identified, we can audit your regulatory program and provide advice on changes to standards and procedures. We promote a variety of techniques such as waterfront overlay districts, form-based codes and special pedestrian or transit oriented street design standards. We can also help craft user guides and other tools to help spark redevelopment interest from the private sector.

PLACEMAKING

MKSK approaches placemaking with a clear understanding that each site has a unique story to tell influenced by distinctive natural, environmental, historical, and cultural influences which should be expressed through thoughtful, contextual sensitive design. Our design team’s interests and abilities are rich in all aspects of project design and implementation within the fields of landscape architecture and urban design, lending expertise in creative placemaking. The team’s approach is focused on helping the City of Birmingham identify their unique spirit and translate this identity into themes that can be represented physically, through various co-created placemaking strategies. This approach has been applied in many places including, but not limited to nationally prominent communities Detroit, Michigan, Lexington, Kentucky, and Athens, Ohio.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

MKSK has the largest dedicated landscape architecture studio in the Midwest, with 40 Registered Landscape Architects. Attention to detail and construction implementation of the design vision are core values of our practice. Understanding of construction process, costs, and maintenance operations inform our design decisions throughout the entire design process. Through our internal research, regional practice and on-going commitment to sustainable design, we strive for highly creative and innovative design in coordination with a practical, sustainable, and fiscally-responsible solution.
MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION & COMPLETE STREETS

**MKSK** is a leader in shaping place. We strive to create places that not only perform, but also transform and inspire. We are committed to a complete streets design approach that is holistic in nature, that seeks to balance the economic, environmental and societal impacts and opportunities and apply creativity and innovation to solve current issues while striving for responsible, long-term, practical solutions. This integrated approach considers all of the layers of activity along the street, from retail nodes to office and residential districts, the interrelationships between the public realm and other adjoining uses (whether public, semi-public, or private spaces) in order to accommodate multi-functionality. Our experience and expertise includes the design and implementation of hundreds of streetscapes throughout the Midwest.

The street is the most common form of public space in Midwestern cities and neighborhoods. **MKSK** is a leader in capturing the full value of streets for all users and uses, not just the automobile. Multi-modal design that treats streets as true places to spend time is central to our street design philosophy. We know that complete streets are the most equitable for the end user and the most successful in driving economic development and private investment along a street. When travel speeds slow down, streets not only become dramatically safer, the adjacent development realizes higher rental rates, better sales per square foot, and experiences less vacancy. When streets are safer, designed and inviting for pedestrians and bicyclists, more people walk and bike, improving community health and accessibility for everyone.

We also recognize that desired design for all types of users cannot always fit into the available space so we use a “Complete Network” perspective to identify priority networks for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, trucks and automobiles. We also promote transportation design that complements the desired character of the built and natural environment.

In our approach to transportation planning and complete streets planning and design, **MKSK** provides the following services:
- Multi-modal street and streetscape design
- Tactical street calming and activation strategies
- Bike and pedestrian master planning
- Street safety improvement design
- Transit station/stop planning
- Access management strategies
- Bike infrastructure and trail master planning
- Parking management studies
- Street and right-of-way design manuals
- Form-Based Codes
- Transportation Demand Management Strategies
- Smart Cities considerations

**PARKING MANAGEMENT**

**Nelson\Nygaard** believes effective parking management is the key to unlocking multiple community goals, from economic development to congestion management and historic preservation. With more than 50 projects completed for cities, public agencies, developers, universities and nonprofits, they can analyze and share best practices from all sides of the table. The senior staff at **Nelson\Nygaard** includes former parking managers who can lead clients through the implementation process for parking cash-out, shared parking, residential permit parking and other programs. They advise on how to take advantage of new payment and enforcement technologies, and implement customer-friendly information systems.

**DEMAND ANALYSIS**

**Nelson\Nygaard** helps developers and cities to go beyond the Parking Generation manual and accurately quantify parking demand for a new development, neighborhood plan or zoning ordinance. The firm’s integrated financial and transportation models incorporate the impacts of density, transit access, pricing and demand management, and the potential for shared parking. They can analyze when more parking is needed, and when it is more effective to invest in alternatives to driving.
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SUSTAINABILITY
History provides many examples of sustainable development patterns. The best towns and cities evolved over time as compact, mixed-use environments, designed for walking, transit, a wide range of choices and prices, and a supportive network of civic amenities. The rich interplay of streets, public spaces, and architecture provided beautiful settings for an entire range of daily activities. With the introduction of new building technologies, LEED® standards, new techniques for the disposal of waste, energy generation, and stormwater management, the environmental costs of urban development are further mitigated. UDA integrates these techniques and expertise into their multidisciplinary approach to urban design. They work collaboratively in teams of urban designers, ecologists, engineers, architects, and economists to design state-of-the-art environments in both urban and rural contexts.

MKSK is committed to the principles of sustainability and we endeavor to incorporate those principles into all of our projects based on our professional oath to serve as stewards of the environment. We seek a balance between economic, environmental, and societal impacts and opportunities, the underlying principles of sustainability and apply creativity and innovation to solve current issues while striving for responsible, long-term, practical solutions. Our design and planning projects begin with overall sustainability goals and consideration of LEED® certification. For each project site, we strive to achieve low-impact site development through means of preserving open space, accommodating multi-modal transportation and bicycle facilities, reducing impervious surfaces and heat island effects, incorporating passive solar design, retaining or creating natural habitat, integrating sustainable stormwater management through the use of permeable pavement, bio-swales, rain gardens and green roofs, and using recycled and regionally-available materials.

CITIES, NEIGHBORHOODS & ARCHITECTURE
Over the past 40 years, cities have found renewed life as both the civic and cultural core of regions and as 24-hour centers with residential, cultural, entertainment, retail, business, civic, and educational uses. UDA has been working with existing cities for over 40 years to create new investment opportunities and attractive urban infill developments to capture emerging markets. Their work has featured successful developments aided by UDA Pattern Books® and form-based codes, revolutionary implementation tools that ensure high quality standards throughout the life of the project. Their approach also assimilates green infrastructure design, mixed-use centers, walkable neighborhoods, and a variety of parks and open space systems.

The UDA architecture studio is committed to building designs that evolve from regional traditions with new technology and market requirements. UDA designs a variety of key buildings for many of our urban design and master plans to create the essential character and image. Their team includes LEED® accredited professionals for each project to complete the cycle of sustainable design from the city scale to the human scale.
INTERACTIVE MEETINGS

PROJECT WEBSITES

PUBLIC WORKSHOPS

COMMUNITY CHARRETTES
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PUBLIC & STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Community involvement and engagement is a fundamental part of our urban planning and design approach. The success of the public engagement process is a critical step in building understanding, support, and ownership of focus areas that will ultimately lead to effective implementation across time.

Our team views the early stages of a planning project as a time for learning and collaboration. It is here that we invite the public and stakeholders to share with us the issues and considerations important within a community. This knowledge, and the relationships built through this process, guides our planning efforts as we develop ideas and strategies to address project issues. The testing of those ideas, through further public engagement, ultimately provides us with a consensus-based direction. Our goal is to form a shared and “living” vision. To reach this goal, we cast a wide net, which often includes residents, business interests, development community members, key stakeholders, elected officials, and public agencies. Opportunities to engage the public can be in the form of traditional open houses, forums, or focus group sessions, or online through web-based meetings, surveys, and via social media platforms.

Our public participation toolbox blends traditional methods with fresh approaches adapted to hands-on engagement together with 24-hour community information and dialogue on web-based platforms. Every project and community is unique, so for each we refine an engagement tool kit in close consultation with the Working Group. The more traditional public participation and engagement opportunities incorporated in this process include stakeholder interviews, walking tours, and public meeting visioning workshops. Additional opportunities include:

- Interactive meetings & exhibits
- Pop-up displays
- Dedicated website & social media platforms
- Community mapping - geo locate ideas
- Online and telephone surveys
- Mail-in postcard concepts
- Tactical urbanism
- Youth activities

NATIONAL CHARRETTE INSTITUTE TRAINING

MKSK’s Haley Wolfe is NCI certified and will assist the planning team in the stakeholder engagement process to harness the talents and energies of all interested stakeholders to create and support a feasible plan. Haley’s holistic approach to planning begins with her passion to work with local residents and business owners by listening to their perceptions and positions within the city and results in designing a shared solution that resolves conflict and achieves a shared vision.

In addition, Brad Strader has helped facilitate over 15 charrettes including the Downtown 2016 Plan and Triangle District Plans in Birmingham. UDA has led dozens of charrettes from coast to coast.
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CITY OF BIRMINGHAM
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Tom Brown
Principal
Parking
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Senior Associate
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Alyson Fletcher
Associate
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Julie Kroll
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Julie Kroll
PE, PTOE
Infrastructure Analysis &
Multimodal Transportation Engineering
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PRINCIPAL PLANNER / PROJECT MANAGER

CHRIS HERMANN, AICP
PRINCIPAL PLANNER
PROJECT MANAGER
PRIMARY CLIENT CONTACT

EDUCATION
Master of City and Regional Planning, The University of North Carolina
Bachelor of Arts in Political Science, Miami University

EXPERIENCE
Chris is a certified city planner with more than 25 years of experience. Chris provides a broad range of project planning experience to the firm, managing projects involving regional planning policy, comprehensive plans, downtown plans, focus area planning, community revitalization/reinvestment, economic development, urban design and form-based codes, transportation planning, consensus-building, and public engagement and facilitation. Chris is adept at helping communities create a unique, compelling vision and translating that vision into strategic steps that transform cities and spaces. Highly acclaimed for creating plans that are implemented, Chris is skilled at building partnerships and translating plans into strategic steps that guide and attract investment for community betterment. His aptitude for transformational planning is complemented by his strong public presentation ability. Chris has been an adjunct professor at The Ohio State University, teaching masters students in planning. He is currently on the Columbus Board of Transit and a member of the ULI transportation and corridors committee that is helping to guide the MORPC Regional Corridors Study.

NEW ALBANY STRATEGIC PLAN
NEW ALBANY, OHIO
The Strategic Plan guides development of this rapidly growing community, focusing on creating great neighborhoods, providing first rate amenities, and developing a robust employment base. Of more particular focus is the mixed-use Village Center, interconnecting the community with multi-use trails and guiding densities and aesthetics.

POWELL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
POWELL, OHIO
The plan aims to guide the community in mitigating growth and development pressures. Aspects included determining appropriate housing types, land use and development patterns, resolving traffic congestion, and diversifying revenue sources to support needed infrastructure investments and high-quality public services.

2016 DOWNTOWN TOLEDO MASTER PLAN
TOLEDO, OHIO
MKSK is leading an interdisciplinary team to develop a Master Plan for Toledo focusing market-based catalytic solutions to build on the current momentum downtown is experiencing and to identify future opportunities. The plan was informed by a robust and unique public input process including a project website and storefront.

WESTERVILLE UPTOWN COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
WESTERVILLE, OHIO
The 2013 Uptown Westerville Comprehensive Plan evaluates the district’s existing conditions, exemplifying its strengths, and proposing catalytic projects and potential planning tools to address its challenges. By planning for the future, Uptown can ensure its continued success as the community core of the City of Westerville.
TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

BRAD STRADER, AICP, PTP
PRINCIPAL

EDUCATION
Bachelor of Science with Honors, in Urban Planning, Michigan State University

EXPERIENCE
Brad advocates linking land use with multi-modal transportation and design to create vibrant places. Brad has more than 33 years experience in parking and traffic studies, comprehensive and downtown plans, multi-modal transportation, and development regulations. His transportation projects include over 60 corridor and access management thoroughfare plans and other studies including transit for metropolitan planning organizations, municipalities, and road agencies. Brad is a frequent lecturer on planning and transportation topics at state, regional and national conferences and training.

OLD WOODWARD AVENUE/MAPLE STREET CORRIDOR PLAN
BIRMINGHAM, MICHIGAN
Brad led the development of a Transit-Oriented model code for the Woodward Avenue Action Association and rapid transit recommendations for the SE Michigan Regional Transit Authority in Detroit to Pontiac, including land use analysis, non-motorized concepts, station location workshops.

TRIANGLE DISTRICT FORM-BASED CODE
BIRMINGHAM, MICHIGAN
Brad led development of a new form-based code for the Triangle District to help transform that area into a more vibrant urban place. He also assisted the city in its plans and codes for the downtown, South Gateway along Woodward Ave, downtown transition zones, and parking strategies over the last 15+ years.

MIDLAND COMPREHENSIVE/DOWNTOWN PLANS, SPECIAL STUDIES & FORM-BASED CODE
MIDLAND, MICHIGAN
The Midland DDA commissioned a Redevelopment & Design Plan to explore new development opportunities and potential projects to enhance the downtown, create a commercial node, and improve the pedestrian environment connecting downtown and surrounding neighborhoods.

AUBURN AVENUE
CINCINNATI, OHIO
MKSK conducted a study to assess how Auburn Avenue, a major corridor servicing Christ Hospital—a key stakeholder, can better serve the local neighborhood and safely transport emergency vehicles into and out of the hospital. The study investigated development patterns and future development sites and how they both can better interact with the right-of-way.
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PROJECT PLANNER / ADMINISTRATOR

JUSTIN GOODWIN, AICP
ASSOCIATE

PROJECT PLANNER
ADMINISTRATOR

EDUCATION
Bachelor of Science in Geography, Ohio University
Master of Arts in Geography, Ohio University
Master of City and Regional Planning, The Ohio State University

EXPERIENCE
Justin has over a decade of experience in both public and private sector planning. He has completed transformational long-range plans, innovative form-based zoning regulations, and implementation strategies for catalytic development projects. He has a strong background in GIS and spatial analysis, which he combines with a broad skill set including research, writing, and public speaking to communicate complex issues in an accessible manner. Justin has managed a variety of projects and multi-disciplinary teams to create collaborative and holistic plans. His passion for walkable streets and livable cities drives Justin’s commitment to making urban places better for people.

POWELL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
POWELL, OHIO
The Plan aims to guide the community in mitigating growth and development pressures. Aspects included determining appropriate housing types, land use and development patterns, resolving traffic congestion, and diversifying revenue sources to support needed infrastructure investments and high-quality public services.

ENVISION SHAKOPEE 2040
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
SHAKOPEE, MINNESOTA
Shakopee engaged MKSK to lead a new type of planning process that will go beyond the Met Council’s technical standards. The planning process began in July 2017, kicking off with a community engagement effort including an interactive website, focus group meetings and mobile displays at community events.

EUCLID AVENUE AND SOUTH LIMESTONE STREET COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR STUDY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
In Lexington, two vastly different corridors are united by their economic potential to catalyze a revitalization of the neighborhoods that lie between the City’s economic engines: the downtown and University of Kentucky.

BRIDGE STREET DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT CODE*
DUBLIN, OHIO
The Code develops the urban design principles for an authentic, urban, mixed-use district, including new zoning districts, block standards, street and open space typologies, parking, and development review procedures. MKSK assisted in the implementation of the Code and the development of preliminary designs for several circulation and open space projects within the district.
EXPERIENCE
Jeff is committed to the implementation of a meaningful, green, and well-connected environment. His practice, steeped in Midwestern urbanism and a devotion to the creation of market-based aspirational strategies is exemplified in Columbus’ Arena District. As urban design lead and cross-discipline collaborator, Jeff’s contribution in the Arena District is evident as the dynamic public realm infrastructure network is now the key link connecting the C.B.D., the Short North, the Convention Center District, and the Columbus Scioto Mile Greenways. His process is focused and mindful of both the aesthetic details of robust social spaces as well as the greater urban strategy of complex urban centers and their clients, partnerships, and cities. His practice is based around a framework of performative, contemporary, and beautiful infrastructure systems of organized urban spaces, connected pedestrian ways, and performative green corridors all equally responsible in the creation of a successful, human-scaled urban pattern.

EDUCATION
Bachelor of Science Landscape Architecture, The Ohio State University

JEFFREY PONGONIS
PLA, ASLA, PRINCIPAL
PRINCIPAL URBAN DESIGN LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT

NATIONWIDE ARENA DISTRICT
MASTER PLAN
COLUMBUS, OHIO
The Arena District has served as the guiding development strategy for a vibrant, new downtown entertainment district. It has resulted in private investment and is a model success story in the country’s growing urban revitalization trend. Jeff served as Design Principal and Principal in Charge.

DOWNTOWN AKRON VISION & REDEVELOPMENT PLAN | AKRON, OHIO
The plan will help foster a rich diversity of downtown places and spaces that will attract and support people who live, work and play in Downtown Akron. The vision will articulate how to improve the character, identity, and connectivity of the downtown area and its surrounding neighborhoods and increase its vitality and prosperity.

LIBERTY CENTER
LIBERTY TOWNSHIP, OHIO
Liberty Center is a 64-acre mixed-use new town center for Liberty Township, including The Park & The Square. The Park is a open space with a custom designed pergola, an interactive fountain, splash pad, display garden, and event lawn space. The Square provides paved plaza space and larger event lawn for concerts and performances.

GRANDVIEW YARD
GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS, OHIO
A new mixed-use development that will include 1.5 - 2 million SF of commercial development and 600-800 residential units. Located on a former Brownfield site, the development will create a new vibrant neighborhood. Jeff served as Design Principal and Principal in Charge. The first LEED-ND (Silver) certified neighborhood in Ohio.
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PROJECT LANDSCAPE DESIGNER

HALEY WOLFE

DESIGNER
NATIONAL CHARRETTE
INSTITUTE CERTIFIED
(ANTICIPATED JUNE 2018)

EDUCATION
Bachelor of Landscape Architecture, The Ohio State University

EXPERIENCE
Haley believes that because everything is a part of the landscape, a landscape architect must know something about everything. She believes that designing on multiple layers will generate sites that are both beautiful and sustainable.

Haley’s foundation in hospitality and mixed-use development drives her to create environments that are as memorable as they are functional. Her additional experience in hand-drawing fosters an intimate relationship with her designs and allows her to communicate in real-time. This background informs Haley’s process from initial concept design to final construction of both private and public projects.

PROMOTING TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT IN THE CATA BUS RAPID TRANSIT CORRIDOR
LANSING, MICHIGAN
With a Federal Transit Administration TOD Pilot Grant, a form-based code was crafted to unify the character of future private development and public street design along the Avenue to create a vibrant, pedestrian-friendly and transit-oriented corridor.

OLENTANGY PARKWAY DEVELOPMENT
COLUMBUS, OHIO
This major Columbus river has the opportunity to be a fully realized, fully functioning green infrastructure corridor dedicated to stitching the city together east to west, north to south, for work and play, for open-space respite and ecological sustainability.

EAST GRAND RAPIDS MASTER PLAN
EAST GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN
The plan is revised with a fresh look at quality of life and economy, including e-commerce, housing preferences & multi-modal transport. Retaining, strengthening, and building upon these assets is essential to the long-term sustainability of the community.

DETOYIT MOBILITY PLAN
DETOYIT, MICHIGAN
Recent and upcoming investment in downtown provides an unprecedented opportunity to redesign the transportation system. Various new developments are transforming the downtown into a more vibrant, 24-hour, livable place.
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PROJECT PLANNER / PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT SUPPORT

NIKKI POLIZZOTTO

PROJECT PLANNER
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT SUPPORT

EDUCATION
Master of Urban Planning, University of Southern California
Bachelor of Cultural Anthropology & Sociology, University of Puget Sound

EXPERIENCE
Nikki has significant experience working with nonprofits, community organizations, and public agencies to build scalable and replicable solutions to promote equitable community development. Her passion and expertise as an urban planner stems from her desire to use research and meaningful engagement methods to improve the design and livability of cities and neighborhoods. Her background encompasses the research and analysis of commuting patterns and alternative modes of transportation, programming, marketing, and managing various forms of public engagement, and grant writing. Specifically, Nikki has led community engagement strategies on a variety of projects including several “First-last” mile transit projects and corridor redevelopment plans.

ST. CLAIR SHORES PARKS AND RECREATION MASTER PLAN
ST. CLAIR SHORES, MICHIGAN
In 2018, MKSK led community engagement and visualized several park redesigns for the City of St. Clair Shores. Through a successful series of stakeholder and public workshops, the Parks and Recreation Master Plan identified specific parks and tangible improvements valued most by the community.

BROWNFIELD REDEVELOPMENT AREA WIDE PLAN
RIVER ROUGE, MICHIGAN
The future decommissioning of the DTE River Rouge Power Plant and construction of the Gordie Howe International Bridge are expected to bring several opportunities for industrial and economic growth to the City of River Rouge and Southwest Detroit. This ongoing project uses technical analysis and community engagement to develop a comprehensive area wide plan with actionable next steps that supports community and economic development.

EQUITABLE ACCESS TO PARKS AND OPEN SPACE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
This research endeavor studied the relationship between equity, public health, and access to parks in L.A. County. Through the review of empirical data and the history of park resource investment in L.A. County, a policy for improving equitable access to parks through a new framework for resource management and investment as well as an integrated mobility plan was recommended.

CRITICAL CARTOGRAPHY + SPATIAL ETHNOGRAPHY: VIRGINIA AVENUE PARK
SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA
Virginia Avenue Park is a space that embodies the changing, gentrifying, yet diverse Pico neighborhood. This research endeavor explored how Virginia Avenue Park has been a cultural asset to the Pico Neighborhood over time through creative mapping exercises, film, and interviews.
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URBAN DESIGN/CHARRETTE LEAD

MEGAN G. O’HARA, AICP, LEED AP, PRINCIPAL

URBAN DESIGN, PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

EDUCATION
Masters in Sustainable Urban Development, University of Oxford
Bachelor of Architecture, University of Notre Dame

EXPERIENCE
Megan has over 10 years of expertise revitalizing urban neighborhoods and promoting social, economic, and environmental sustainability. At Urban Design Associates, she has led projects domestically and internationally, including infill, mixed-use and mixed-income neighborhood revitalization, form-based codes, and design guidelines. She has a passion for helping communities create consensus visions that benefit people equitably. At every stage of the design process, authentic community involvement and engagement is key to making these plans feel like home for the current and future residents. To support Megan’s focus on neighborhood stabilization in disadvantaged neighborhoods, she developed an expertise in policy, land use and zoning, and an understanding of the relationship between opportunity sites and the appropriate incentives and financing strategies. Megan has spoken at the American Planning Association, Congress for the New Urbanism, University of Notre Dame, U.S. Green Building Council, and the Remaking Cities Congress.

CHATANOOGA ARTS DISTRICT
CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE
Urban Design Associates prepared an arts district plan for downtown Chattanooga’s riverfront area. The plan proposes a pedestrian art promenade that connects the Hunter Art Museum with the Aquarium and Chattanooga Green and new residential and institutional development on key parcels in the downtown.

HERSEY GATEWAY
HERSEY, PENNSYLVANIA
UDA was selected by the Hershey School Trust to prepare a master plan for their “Gateway Site,” a large parcel of land adjacent to the Penn State Hershey Medical Center. This new mixed-use neighborhood will include residential, retail, entertainment and office space.

SUMMERS CORNER
SUMMERVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA
UDA prepared a pattern book for Summers Corner, a new village being developed by WestRock, in North Charleston. The stated goals include responsible management of natural environments, reconnecting individuals and families to a garden ethic, and fostering daily social connectivity that enhances the quality of life.

CYPRESS VILLAGE, VANCOUVER,
BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA
Cypress Village will be a high-density urban precinct with a mix of uses developed by British Pacific Properties within a 350-acre site adjacent to Cypress Falls Park at the base of Cypress Mountain. UDA led a diverse team in a 9-month long design process engaging with the West Vancouver community and the many stakeholders who work, live and play in this extraordinary region.
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**URBAN DESIGN/CHARRETTE LEAD, ILLUSTRATION**

**DAVID CSONT, ASAI**
**PRINCIPAL**
**URBAN DESIGN/CHARRETTE LEAD**
**CHIEF ILLUSTRATOR**

**EDUCATION**
Bachelor of Art History, State University College at Buffalo  
Bachelor of Science, State University College at Buffalo  
Master of Fine Arts, University of Wisconsin-Madison

**EXPERIENCE**
David is a nationally recognized illustrator and educator with over twenty-five years of experience in the visualization of architecture. A key member of the UDA design team, David’s unique talents include the ability to translate urban design and architectural concepts into three-dimensional perspective drawings in a variety of traditional and digital media. These images become an integral part of the marketing program for each project because they can easily communicate complex ideas to a varied audience. As a member of the American Society of Architectural Illustrators (ASAI), David’s work has been recognized in the juried exhibition, Architecture in Perspective, in 1989, 1996, 1998, and 2005 through 2012. He served as President of ASAI in 2007. He has conducted many seminars and lectures and is committed to the exploration of illustration as a means to effectively communicate design ideas.

**DOWNTOWN HUNTSVILLE MASTER PLAN**
**HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA**
The Master Plan guides the creation of a vibrant mixed-use historic downtown. UDA led the master plan which enhances mobility with bicycle lanes and walkable streets, connects and adds parking resources, embraces historical Big Spring Park, reconfigures City Hall, bridges the gap to the convention center, provides hundreds of mixed-income residential units, and helps activate its retail and dining district.

**MID-CITY**
**HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA**
Mid-City is a public-private redevelopment initiative of a regional shopping mall located just west of downtown Huntsville. The plan integrates a 13-acre city park as the focus of outdoor recreation and performance venues including a 3,000 seat amphitheater. The site will have retail, office space, a specialty hotel, and residential units designed with multiple modes of access for pedestrians, bicycles, and vehicles.

**DOWNTOWN BOCA RATON**
**BOCA RATON, FLORIDA**
UDA developed strategies for growth and revitalization of the district. Key among these strategies are enhancements that strengthen the connection between downtown and the waterfront, new architectural design guidelines and significant improvements to the quality of the public space.

**DOWNTOWN ALAMEDA MASTER PLAN**
**ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA**
The City of Alameda, in collaboration with UDA as their urban design consultants created vision plans for their Civic Center, Webster Street, and Encinal Terminals. The public planning process for each project engaged a broad range of citizens and stakeholders. UDA prepared digital models and perspective drawings that enabled everyone involved to visualize the scale and character of the recommendations.
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PARKING

TOM BROWN
PRINCIPAL
PARKING

EDUCATION
Bachelor of History, The Ohio State University
Master of Urban Planning, Hunter Collage

EXPERIENCE
Urban parking management has been a special focus during Tom’s 12+ years at Nelson\Nygaard. In his experience, nothing undermines the best of planning and design efforts as quickly or significantly as failing to get the parking right. Getting it right, however, invariably involves negotiating challenging and consequential tradeoffs. Years of engaging diverse, passionate, and thoughtful stakeholders on all aspects of parking, in a wide variety of contexts and opportunity environments, has afforded Tom the capacity to offer his clients a clear assessment of best available options, the essential pros and cons of each, and a viable path forward in serving transportation, growth, and broader community goals and objectives.

TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT STUDY
TRAVERSE CITY, MICHIGAN
Managed a study of mobility-improvement and demand-management opportunities to reduce parking needs for Traverse City’s thriving downtown district. The TDM plan takes advantage of an inverse cycle of parking demand that will allow it to reduce its downtown parking needs, without requiring 12-month mode-shift commitments from its commuters.

COMPREHENSIVE PARKING STUDY
ASHEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA
Asheville hired Nelson\Nygaard to perform a comprehensive parking study and develop a strategic plan for parking in the downtown area. It included a comprehensive survey of best practices, covering management policies/practices and technology/operations, as well as a financial model to project the impact of various rate-setting options on parking demand and revenues.

VITAL STREETS
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN
Led the parking and transportation demand management (TDM) component of this complete-streets study, which culminated in a Street Design guide for the City. Deliverables included a Neighborhood Commercial Center parking-management toolbox and a Citywide TDM Policy.

PARKING & TDM STUDY
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN
The DDA contracted Nelson\Nygaard to complete a Downtown Parking & TDM study designed to update a similar study, completed in 2007. The primary goal of the 2016 study was to ensure downtown’s continued growth, economic expansion, and rising quality of life, with little parking supply.

OFF-STREET PARKING & MOBILITY UPDATE STUDY
ASPEN, COLORADO
Managed a study to update the City’s off-Street parking requirements, with a particular focus on reducing single-occupancy travel in downtown while supporting desired levels and forms of economic and population growth in this thriving district. Built-out under a code that emphasized minimum parking requirements, most of downtown’s current parking supply is private and restricted, leaving drivers wishing to park in one place and walk around the downtown to hunt for on-street parking. The recommended code update, adopted in early 2017, integrates parking standards, mobility investments, and TDM commitments, as well as an In Lieu Fee alternative, into a Mobility Requirement that allows developers to right-right their options for their projects.

ZONING PARKING REQUIREMENTS REVIEW
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND
Led a comprehensive review of parking requirements for the County, as well as a peer review of the County’s parking lot district program for developing shared, public parking facilities in mixed-use urban centers.
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PARKING

CHRIS BONGORNO, SENIOR ASSOCIATE

EDUCATION
Bachelor of Urban Studies, University of Cincinnati
Master in Urban Planning, Design & Development, Cleveland State University

EXPERIENCE
Chris has more than 10 years of professional planning experience, applying a detail-oriented and client-focused skill set to extensive work in the fields of transportation and community planning, mixed-use and institutional development, and place management. His curiosity about how cities work drew him to the field and that curiosity has only grown with each new community he engages with. Chris’s recent work has tied together his passions for innovations in mobility, community accessibility, sustainability, civic engagement, and economic development. Chris is dedicated to the communities in which he works and lives, serving multiple non-profit and civic roles in both Cleveland and Yellow Springs, Ohio.

DOWN TOWN DETROIT TRANSPORTATION STUDY (SEMCOG)
DETROIT, MICHIGAN
Deputy Project Manager for a collaborative effort of the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG), the City of Detroit and the Michigan DOT. The study will consider all aspects of mobility in Downtown Detroit, including traffic, parking, transit, biking, and walking, beginning with evaluation of existing conditions and developing a holistic strategy to manage the future transportation demands of Downtown. As part of a strong consulting team, Nelson\Nygaard is leading strategies for Parking Management, TDM, and Curbside Management.

DUBLIN MOBILITY PLAN
DUBLIN, OHIO
Deputy Project Manager for Phase 2 of an effort to improve public health, expand residents’ multimodal travel options, and promote equitable access to mobility in Dublin, Ohio. Following development of a Mobility Vision and Toolkit, Nelson\Nygaard is working with the City to identify and evaluate action items for implementation. High-priority projects include the development of a citywide Complete Streets ordinance, a feasibility study of on-demand transit options, bike share pilot launch, bike route wayfinding, and municipal partnerships with shared mobility providers.

IUPUI TRANSPORTATION & PARKING PLAN
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA
Planner on an urban campus effort to improve opportunities for biking, walking, and transit use for IUPUI employees, students and visitors. Nelson\Nygaard is examining parking utilization and other travel pattern data to understand how the campus transportation system can be managed more effectively with a variety of demand management tools. Strategies for non-driving mobility options, including bike share, car share, and shuttle services, are being developed to meet the University’s goals.

MOVING GREATER UNIVERSITY CIRCLE TRANSPORTATION & MOBILITY PLAN
CLEVELAND, OHIO
Led scope and RFP development, fundraising and project management on behalf of the University Circle Inc. over a two-year period. The 3-part plan was completed by Nelson\Nygaard and included a Parking Management Plan, Transportation & Mobility Plan, and Implementation Plan. Recommendations have led to tangible projects and additional funding for implementation.

CIR CKE L INK CIRCULAR EVALUATION
CLEVELAND, OHIO
Served as project manager on behalf of the University Circle Inc. and worked with planning consultant Nelson\Nygaard to evaluate current service and enhancements to the neighborhood’s free circulator bus. Recommendations led to the addition of a second route, rebranding, and execution of a marketing plan. The improved service has expanded geography, grown ridership, increased visibility, and garnered more than $100,000, annually, in additional financial support.
OUTLINE OF QUALIFICATIONS

PARKING

ALYSON FLETCHER
ASSOCIATE

PARKING

EDUCATION
Master of Art History, Literary & Cultural Studies, College of William & Mary
Master of Landscape Architecture, Cornell University
Master of City and Regional Planning, Cornell University

EXPERIENCE
Alyson Fletcher focuses on street design and multimodal transportation studies, which encompass best practices for integrating modes. Alyson has an inter-disciplinary background in architecture, planning and landscape architecture. Before joining Nelson\Nygaard, Alyson not only worked for an architecture firm in Boston but also worked on civic landscape designs for stormwater infrastructure projects in Philadelphia and on the Neighborhood Bikeways Network for the Active Transportation Alliance in Chicago. Alyson’s Chicago work became part of a thesis presented at the Transportation Research Board’s 2012 Urban Street Symposium and the 2012 Velo-City in Vancouver, B.C.

NEWTON CENTRE PARKING STRATEGY
NEWTON, MASSACHUSETTS
Alyson assisted in the creation of a parking management plan for Newton Centre with principles to be replicated in other villages within the City of Newton.

DOWNTOWN CHELSEA PARKING & CIRCULATION STUDY
CHELSEA, MASSACHUSETTS
Alyson is studying parking demand patterns in the Broadway neighborhood of Chelsea to support a main street redesign and visioning process.

BRAINTREE PARKING INVENTORY
BRAINTREE, MASSACHUSETTS
Alyson created a GIS repository of all on- and off-street parking facilities within the two main village squares in Braintree.

ARLINGTON PARKING MANAGEMENT PLAN
ARLINGTON, MASSACHUSETTS
Alyson assisted in the development of a parking management plan with specific strategies to alleviate real and perceived parking problems in the core of the central business district.

LEXINGTON PARKING MANAGEMENT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
LEXINGTON, MASSACHUSETTS
Alyson provided planning assistance on this project, which included public participation, surveys, reviewing existing conditions, developing implementation options and outreach strategies, and studying their impacts.

CHARLOTTE SOUTH END PARKING STUDY
CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA
Alyson diagrammed recommendations to improve parking, pedestrian, and bicycling facilities. She also drew sections to illustrate possibilities within various street widths throughout the area for this project that evaluated existing transportation conditions and developed a multimodal transportation plan that addressed design best practices and recommendations for parking management strategies for mixed use developments.
OUTLINE OF QUALIFICATIONS

INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS & MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING

JULIE KROLL, PE, PTOE, PRINCIPAL

EDUCATION
Bachelor of Civil/Transportation Engineering, Michigan Technological University

EXPERIENCE
Julie has been involved in a wide variety traffic and transportation engineering projects for over 18 years, including all aspects of transportation planning, operations and design. She has provided the traffic and mobility analyses on hundreds of different Federal, State and local projects. As a Project Manager she is responsible for all aspects of the project scoping, analysis, design and delivery. Julie has a broad range of experience that is essential in evaluating each project and she is able to effectively and concisely communicate this information.

MAPLE ROAD LANE CONVERSION BEFORE/AFTER STUDY
BIRMINGHAM, MICHIGAN
Project Manager responsible for before and after study to evaluate the four lane road operations and the three lane roadway operations during the trial periods. This trail was done to determine if the implementation of a three-lane cross section would enhance operations for all transportation users including drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists. Study analyses included modeling of the study network, crash analysis, and calculation of intersection delays, Levels of Service (LOS), and vehicle queues. The results of the study showed a decrease in speeds, improved conditions for pedestrians, reduction in crashes and negligible increases in travel time. The study results were presented to the Multi-Modal Board and the City commission who recommended to maintain the three-lane section. The project was successful and constructed as recommended in summer 2016.

RAIL DISTRICT PARKING STUDY
BIRMINGHAM, MICHIGAN
Project Manager responsible for the evaluation of the existing peak period parking demand within the Rail District and an evaluation of pedestrian improvements at intersections identified by the Ad Hoc Rail District Commission for review. The Ad Hoc Rail District Commission members were tasked with developing a plan to address the current and future parking demands within the district that align with both the planning goals and multi-modal opportunities for the Rail District. This study was performed to assist in the development of this plan and achieving their goals. Recommendations included areas to provide shared parking and pedestrian crossing enhancements at several intersections along the corridor.

SOUTH ELTON BIKE LANES
BIRMINGHAM, MICHIGAN
Project Manager responsible for the evaluation of the bike lane alternatives on the S. Eton Street corridor between Maple Road and 14 Mile Road. The study included several options for the Multi-Board consideration. The options were all developed in accordance with guidance from the NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide, the NACTO Urban Street Design Guide and the recommendations from the City of Birmingham Multi-Modal Transportation Plan, with additional support from the Ad Hoc Rail Committee study.

DESIGN REVIEWS/ENGINEERING STUDIES/PLAN & STUDY REVIEW
BIRMINGHAM, MICHIGAN
- Neighborhood Connector Route Plan/Signing
- Lincoln and Pierce Bumpout Evaluation
- Lincoln and Ann Signing and Striping Evaluation
- Maple Road Mid Block Crossing Evaluation
- Southfield and Maple HSIP Application
- Saxon Roundabout Operational Analysis and Design
- Lincoln and Southfield Signal Evaluation
- Chesterfield and Quarton Traffic Analysis
- North Old Woodward Corridor
- Oak Street Traffic Engineering Analysis
- South Eton Street Engineering Review
- Brookside Terrance Engineering Review
- 277 Pierce Engineering Review
- 2010 Cole Engineering Review
- Boutique Hotel Engineering Review
OUTLINE OF QUALIFICATIONS

INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS & CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES

TODD RICHTER, PE
ASSOCIATE

INFRASTRUCETURE ANALYSIS & CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES

EDUCATION
Bachelor of Civil Engineering, Michigan State University
Master of Civil Engineering, Michigan State University

EXPERIENCE
Todd has experience in the design and construction of transportation projects. The majority of these consist of MDOT local agency projects.

His experience includes construction engineering and administration of state, municipal and private engineering projects. He has performed inspection and testing for quality control of concrete, asphalt and other construction materials and is familiar with the procedures and paperwork associated with local municipal and MDOT funded projects.

Todd is recognized as a Consultant Assistant for MDOT Local Agency Programs providing project delivery assistance for rural, and TAP (Enhancement and safe routes to schools) projects.

BALDWIN STREET BRIDGE OVER THE MUSKEGON RIVER
BIG RAPIDS, MICHIGAN
Project manager for the design and construction engineering services to replace the existing five-span structure with a new three-span spread concrete box beam bridge. The bridge was also realigned to improve visibility of approaches. Other improvements included sidewalks, bike lanes, street lighting, and steel railings. The project was awarded the 2017 Project of the Year Award from APWA.

MDOT TRAFFIC SIGNALS
OSCEOLA & WEXFORD COUNTIES, MICHIGAN
Project manager for the as needed construction inspection and testing services on traffic signal moderation and sidewalk ADA ramp upgrades across Osceola and Wexford Counties. Inspection included: removal and replacement of 23 existing traffic signals; installation of concrete sidewalk and ADA-compliant ramps and 10 pedestrian crossing signals; installation of 3 wireless vehicle detection systems with 36 wireless sensor nodes; installation of 1 solar powered flashing beacon on an advance warning sign; and direction placement of placement markings.

EAST WEST STREET RECONSTRUCTION
STURGIS, MICHIGAN
Project manager for the construction of 0.50 miles of E. West Street. Provided design, survey, permitting, and construction for the road. Work included watermain replacement, storm sewer improvements, and sidewalk improvements, including the addition of ADA-accessible ramps.

CONGRESS STREET RECONSTRUCTION
STURGIS, MICHIGAN
Project manager for 1,400 feet of Congress Street Reconstruction. Project included watermain and storm sewer replacement.

INDIAN RIVER PATHWAY
TUSCARORA TOWNSHIP
Project engineer for an $833,000 in grant funded trail along M-68 in Indian River, Michigan including financing from the MNRTF, MDOT-TE, and the SR2S programs. The project provided over a mile of universally accessible paved pathway and pedestrian bridge across the Sturgeon River from the North Country Trail on the north end to M-68 west on the south end. The pathway provides walkable access to the North Country Trail, the Village of Indian Rivers, Burt Lake State Park and the Inland Lakes Schools K-12 campus.

GRAND HAVEN ROAD
NORTON SHORES, MICHIGAN
Project engineer for 1.01 mi of residential and commercial road reconstruction and storm sewer replacements and extension. Work included drainage improvements, survey, construction testing, televising, legal descriptions / easements, Federal STIP funding, and permitting for MDOT /CRC ROW Permits.
OUTLINE OF CONTRACTOR EXPERIENCE
OUTLINE OF QUALIFICATIONS

MKSK - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT PROJECT EXPERIENCE

5 POINTS REDEVELOPMENT PLAN
WEST LAFAYETTE, INDIANA

15TH & HIGH URBAN FRAMEWORK AND URBAN DESIGN
COLUMBUS, OHIO

ALLIED INSURANCE CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS
DES MOINES, IOWA

ALLIANT ENERGY CENTER FEASIBILITY STUDY
MADISON, WISCONSIN

ARENA CROSSING, ARENA DISTRICT
COLUMBUS, OHIO

BATTENLE MEMORIAL INSTITUTE
COLUMBUS, OHIO

BIOHIO RESEARCH PARK MASTER PLAN
WOOSTER, OHIO

BOB EVANS CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS
NEW ALBANY, OHIO

BRIDGE STREET DISTRICT SCIOTO RIVER CORRIDOR FRAMEWORK
COLUMBUS, OHIO

BRIDGE STREET DISTRICT STREETSCAPE CHARACTER GUIDELINES
COLUMBUS, OHIO

BRIDGE PARK OPEN SPACES AND STREETS CAPES
DUBLIN, OHIO

BREWERY DISTRICT REDEVELOPMENT PLAN
COLUMBUS, OHIO

CAMBRIDGE REVITALIZATION/TURNER AVENUE VISION PLAN
CAMBRIDGE, OHIO

CENTER CITY ACTION PLAN
COVINGTON, KENTUCKY

CENTRIC PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT
CLEVELAND, OHIO

CERTIFIED TECHNOLOGY PARK MASTER PLAN
BLOOMINGTON, OHIO

‘IMAGINE CHARLESTON’ COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND DOWNTOWN PLAN
CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA

COLERAINE AVENUE CORRIDOR STUDY
COLERAIN TOWNSHIP, OHIO

COLUMBUS COMMONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN
COLUMBUS, OHIO

CROCKER PARK
WESTLAKE, OHIO

DAVENTRY AT SUMMIT PARK
BLUE ASH, OHIO

DETROIT MOBILITY & ACCESSIBILITY PLAN
DETROIT, MICHIGAN

DOWNTOWN AKRON VISION & REDEVELOPMENT PLAN
AKRON, OHIO

DOWNTOWN BUSINESS DISTRICT REVITALIZATION PLAN
AUBURN, INDIANA

DOWNTOWN COLUMBUS STRATEGIC PLAN
COLUMBUS, OHIO

DOWNTOWN AND EAST DOWNTOWN CONNECTIVITY STUDIES
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

DOWNTOWN DISTRICT STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT ACTION PLAN
EVANSVILLE, INDIANA

DOWNTOWN STRATEGIC REDEVELOPMENT PLAN
RICHMOND, INDIANA

DOWNTOWN TOLEDO MASTER PLAN
TOLEDO, OHIO

DUVENECK SQUARE
COVINGTON, KENTUCKY

EAST GRAND RAPIDS MASTER PLAN
EAST GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

EASTON FENLON SQUARE
COLUMBUS, OHIO

EASTON TOWNE CENTER GATEWAY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

EUCLID & SOUTH LIMESTONE COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR STUDY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

FINDLAY CATALYTIC OPPORTUNITIES SITES STUDY
FINDLAY, OHIO

FIRESTONE ALLEY AND BUGGYWORKS II, ARENA DISTRICT
COLUMBUS, OHIO

FLATS ON VINE AND FLATS II, ARENA DISTRICT
COLUMBUS, OHIO

GM STAMPING PLANT REDEVELOPMENT PLAN
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA

GREATER COLUMBUS CONVENTION CENTER EXPANSION
COLUMBUS, OHIO

HIGHLAND PARK DOWNTOWN STRATEGIC PLAN
HIGHLAND PARK, MICHIGAN

HUNTINGTON BALLPARK, ARENA DISTRICT
COLUMBUS, OHIO

INDIANAPOLIS RIVERFRONT VISION
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA

JACKSON SQUARE
COVINGTON, KENTUCKY

JEFFREY PARK
COLUMBUS, OHIO

JORDAN CROSSING REDEVELOPMENT PLAN
CINCINNATI, OHIO

LANSING DOWNTOWN FORM CODE
LANSING, MICHIGAN

LEBANON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
LEBANON, OHIO

LEXINGTON DISTILLERY DISTRICT
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON CENTREPOINT
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

LIBERTY CENTER
LIBERTY TOWNSHIP, OHIO

LOUISVILLE DOWNTOWN MASTER PLAN
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

MARATHON CORPORATION HEADQUARTERS MASTER PLAN & IMPLEMENTATION
FINDLAY, OHIO

MIDLAND DOWNTOWN STREETSCAPE PLAN
MIDLAND, MICHIGAN

MINNESOTA COMPREHENSIVE PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN
COLUMBUS, OHIO

MONROE COMPREHENSIVE PARKS MASTER PLAN
PIQUA, OHIO

NASHVILLE DOWNTOWN PLAN
NASHVILLE, INDIANA

NATIONWIDE ARENA DISTRICT MASTER PLAN
COLUMBUS, OHIO

NORTHERN KENTUCKY CONVENTION CENTER
COVINGTON, KENTUCKY

OLD WOODWARD AVENUE / MAPLE DRIVE CORRIDOR PLAN
BIRMINGHAM, MICHIGAN

OSU COMPREHENSIVE PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN
COLUMBUS, OHIO

PIQUA COMPREHENSIVE PARKS MASTER PLAN
PIQUA, OHIO

PITTSBURGH NORTH SHORE MASTER PLAN
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA

PORTAGE CROSSING
CUYAHOGA FALLS, OHIO

POWELL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
POWELL, OHIO

PURDUE INNOVATION DISTRICT
WEST LAFAYETTE, INDIANA

REEDY RIVER REDEVELOPMENT AREA AND CITY PARK
GREENVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA

RIVER WEST GREAT PLACE INVESTMENT STRATEGY
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA

SCIOTO PENINSULA MASTER PLAN
COLUMBUS, OHIO

SHAKOPEE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
SHAKOPEE, MINNESOTA

SHAPING THE AVENUE
LANSING, MICHIGAN

TRIANGLE DISTRICT URBAN DESIGN PLAN
BIRMINGHAM, MICHIGAN

UPTOWN WESTERVILLE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
WESTERVILLE, OHIO
OLD WOODWARD AVENUE / MAPLE DRIVE CORRIDOR PLAN
BIRMINGHAM, MICHIGAN

Old Woodward Avenue and Maple Road are the intersection of “Main and Main Streets” in this vibrant downtown north of Detroit. Set for its first reconstruction in 30 years, city leaders hired MKSK to identify a design concept that would best balance a variety of transportation and economic goals advocated by various groups and the public. Business leaders emphasized the need to retain the amount of convenient on-street parking and a thoughtfully designed streetscape. Planners sought wider sidewalks with more frequent pedestrian crossings and additional space for outdoor cafés. Others advocated better routing for bikes and use of long lasting green infrastructure elements. City engineers stressed the need for smooth traffic operations, radii for larger commercial vehicles and cost considerations. Some wanted to retain the traditional streetscape features while others felt it was time for a fresh design.

Due to the timing of funding, a final design concept was required within just a few months in early winter 2016. Through exploration of a range of alternatives, MKSK crafted a design that strikes a balance between those somewhat competing goals. Not only were the sidewalks widened, but a more linear landscape design increased the walkable sidewalk width by up to 25%. A new palette of trees, curbs, streetlights, and distinct pavement materials will provide a lasts design.
A master plan was needed to redevelop Birmingham’s Triangle District. Its goal would be to create a cohesive vision for the area that would direct future development and connect the downtown with the surrounding residential neighborhoods.

A two-day public charrette was held to guide and inform the design and build community support. It brought together prominent stakeholders, neighborhood residents, area developers, and business owners to share their hopes and visions for the area. Concepts of the final plan include mixed use buildings, new housing, parking structures, urban green spaces, public plazas, and the preservation of the existing neighborhood.

Architectural and design guidelines along with form-based code will help to control the future development of the area, ensure the long-term vision, and maintain the overall quality of design.
Envision Shakopee 2040 Comprehensive Plan  
Shakopee, Minnesota

An outer suburb of Minneapolis, the City of Shakopee boasts an historic downtown along a major highway and adjacent to the Minnesota River. The city’s population has seen tremendous employment and household growth, nearly doubling in population since 2000 and is expected to grow for decades to come. This growth has brought economic prosperity, but also challenges as the community grapples with rapid change, uncertainty and diverging perspectives on how the city should manage its resources.

All cities in the Twin Cities metro area are required to update their comprehensive plans every ten years to meet regional Metropolitan Council planning requirements. However, Shakopee has engaged MKSK to lead a new type of planning process that will go beyond the Met Council’s technical standards. The planning process began in July 2017, kicking off with a robust community engagement effort including an interactive website, focus group meetings, mobile displays at community events, and with more outreach to come. MKSK is engaging the community to establish a shared vision of what people want Shakopee to be in the future. The Envision Shakopee 2040 Plan will paint a compelling picture of what Shakopee can be – how it would like to grow and change, what it would like to improve, and what it would like to preserve and strengthen for future generations. The plan will establish a strong and aspirational vision for the future and will serve as a guidebook and plan of action for the community to achieve that vision.
CITY OF POWELL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

POWELL, OHIO

The City of Powell is a growing upscale ‘bedroom community’ in the Columbus Metropolitan Area. Located north of Columbus, State Route 750 serves as a major transportation corridor between the Columbus Zoo & Aquarium and Interstate 71, funneling traffic through historic downtown Powell. Resolving traffic congestion at the downtown’s ‘Four Corners’ intersection was a key goal of the planning process. MKSK also explored land use considerations in Powell’s downtown. The Plan aims to guide the community in determining what types of housing may be appropriate in the downtown area. This is of particular importance for a community with an aging population and few alternative housing options. The planning process also explored opportunities for Powell to expand and diversify its revenue sources to support needed infrastructure investments and maintain the high quality public services that residents desire. The planned extension of Sawmill Parkway through undeveloped farmland north of the City will increase pressure for growth and development. The Plan update guides the City in determining what types of land use and development patterns are appropriate in this expansion area, and will be fiscally sustainable in the long run. Key Components of the Plan include:

1. Traffic and infrastructure capacity
2. Annexation policy and relationship to surrounding communities
3. Downtown vitality
4. Taxation and finance policy
5. Economic development strategies
6. Preservation of community character
7. Response to changing development and market trends
Uptown Westerville represents one of the best preserved and prosperous historic town centers in Central Ohio. Decades of involved community members and active public figures have helped create a unique downtown that other communities in Central Ohio can only attempt to emulate. While, to date, Uptown has been very successful in preserving and fostering Westerville’s historic downtown, it lacks a comprehensive document to help guide future growth and development. The 2013 Uptown Westerville Comprehensive Plan provides this by evaluating the district’s existing conditions, exemplifying its strengths, and proposing catalytic projects and potential planning tools to address its challenges. By planning for the future, Uptown can ensure its continued success as the community core of the City of Westerville. The planning process was guided by a Steering Committee of residents, property owners, and business owners. Analysis of the study area resulted in recommendations for new civic spaces, infill development, and streetscape and transportation improvements including a new alley system, dedicated pedestrian vias; and bike improvements including important connections and improved amenities. In addition to the guidance of the Steering Committee, public input via stakeholder interviews, public meetings, and an interactive public input website helped to ensure that the final plan addresses the immediate concerns and needs of Uptown, while also advancing the interest of those in Uptown and the Westerville community. This plan will serve as a guiding document for city officials, employees, and any future developer of the Uptown area.
WESTERVILLE ZONING CODE UPDATE
WESTERVILLE, OHIO

MKSK is working with the City of Westerville as part of a multidisciplinary team to conduct an extensive update and modernization of the City’s zoning code. This is a key implementation action recommended by the City of Westerville’s 2016 Comprehensive Plan and will position the City to accommodate new growth and economic development by eliminating outmoded standards and processes.

MKSK conducted a comparative analysis of the City’s existing zoning map and districts against the Comprehensive Plan’s recommended land use character areas to determine areas of conflict and opportunities for simplification. MKSK is also leading the development of form-based districts in strategic planning areas to ensure that new walkable, mixed-use urban development is permitted and appropriately designed within the context of this suburban community.
OVER 17 PLANNING & DESIGN PROJECTS OVER
MORE THAN 19 YEARS OF CONTINUING SERVICE
CONTACTS INCLUDING:

1998-2014: Strategic Plan & Updates
2006: Village Center Plan & Strategy
2009: Form-Based Code
2007: Leisure Trails Master Plan
2012: Health New Albany
2014: Bike New Albany
2016: Rose Run Greenway
NEW ALBANY PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES 2000-2016
NEW ALBANY, OHIO

MKSK has been involved in planning and design services in New Albany for over 30 years, in which time New Albany has transformed from a small village to a vibrant city. Today, ranked as the Top Suburb in America by Business Insider, New Albany’s continued emphasis on planning and design have resulted in a thoughtfully planned community that has preserved and exemplified its small-town charm and character.

MKSK works closely with the Community Development Staff to regularly update the City’s Strategic Plan, provide site and landscape design review for new projects, continue to develop a city-wide multi-use trail system and on-street bicycle infrastructure, strategically plan for continued residential growth, ensuring a high standard of design in the City’s Business Park, and develop focus area planning studies to ensure the continued growth and development of New Albany supports the community’s vision. Through these efforts, the Village Center has continued to be prioritized as the downtown area for the city and the heart of the community. Additional studies such as the Village Center Study, the Village Center Form Based Code, and the Village Center Strategies Plan, the Village Center has become a pedestrian-oriented, civic and social hub, as well as a regional destination for festivals and special events in Central Ohio.

STRATEGIC PLAN
The New Albany Strategic Plan has been guiding development in the community since its adoption in 1998. New Albany has relied on this critical tool for this growing community to preserve character, reduce impacts of development, and encourage investment that contributes to the community. The plan focuses on promoting balanced growth, creating great neighborhoods, providing first rate amenities, and developing a robust business employment base. Of particular focus has been the development of a mixed use Village Center, interconnecting the community with leisure trails, and guiding densities and aesthetics.

The original plan has been regularly updated to reflect the evolving nature of New Albany and its rapid growth. With each update, the planning effort has been a highly collaborative process involving elected leaders, administration, and community members.

ACCORDS
The City of New Albany has relied on MKSK to develop several multi-jurisdictional planning accords including the Rocky Fork Blacklick Accord and the West Licking County Accord.
NEW ALBANY VILLAGE CENTER PLAN
NEW ALBANY, OHIO

The Village Center Plan establishes the long-term vision for the village core as an integrated, mixed-use town center with attention to the location of civic uses, the inclusion of high-density residential areas, and the quality of the built environment – buildings, streetscapes and public spaces.

Since the adoption of the Village Center Study a number of the planning recommendations have been accomplished including a revision of the Village Center Design Guidelines and development of a Form-Based Code. Quality development within the Village Venter includes City Hall, a public library, a community performing arts center, mixed use office and retail, higher density residential, and a community health and recreation center. Planning efforts in and around the Village Center have continued to emphasize this area as the heart of the New Albany community, which has created a vibrant and prosperous city core.
The Rose Run Corridor Vision Plan is intended to guide park development and urban redevelopment at the core of the Village Center and energize the downtown with new park space and an improved greenway. The plan envisions to intertwine the riparian edge of the Rose Run stream corridor with more urbanized pedestrian connections and green spaces linking the Learning Campus with the Village Center and Public Library and breaking the once divided land uses. Planned improvements begin with the realignment of Village Hall Road to reclaim park space between the Library and the Rose Run corridor. Acquirement of this land facilitates the new Library Gardens to the south which connects to the new pedestrian bridge crossing the stream. The pedestrian bridge leads to a new plaza overlook along Dublin Granville Road at the southern end of the existing Learning Campus entry greenspace. Both the pedestrian bridge and the plaza overlook will serve as a ceremonial gateway to the City of New Albany. Additionally, this new space will be a focal point of the project and programmed to accommodate City festivals, farmers markets, and other public gatherings. MKSK provided study plan services for the initial design and in conjunction with the Engineer team, and is continuing design services for the next phase of implementation.
The Huntsville Downtown Master Plan guides the creation of a vibrant mixed-use historic downtown. Home to NASA and aerospace technology, the City seeks to attract and retain talented workers and companies looking for urban vitality not present in the conventional office parks, and low-density neighborhoods far from downtown. UDA led the master plan which enhances mobility with bicycle lanes and walkable streets, connects and adds parking resources, embraces historical Big Spring Park, reconfigures City Hall, bridges the gap to the convention center, provides hundreds of mixed-income residential units, and helps activate its retail and dining district.
OUTLINE OF CONTRACTOR EXPERIENCE

SUMMERS CORNER
SUMMERSVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA

UDA prepared a pattern book for Summers Corner, a new village being developed by WestRock, in North Charleston. Summers Corner is emerging as a model for how new communities can become part of a continuum of regional settlement patterns that are deeply connected to both natural and cultural environments. This new community connects distinctive regional building traditions to today’s context of rapidly changing digital economies and working methods. The stated goals include responsible management of natural environments, reconnecting individuals and families to a garden ethic, and fostering daily social connectivity that enhances the quality of life.

CONTACT
West Rock
Joseph Barnes, Director
843.637.7735
joseph.barnes62@gmail.com

TEAM MEMBERS
OUTLINE OF CONTRACTOR EXPERIENCE

CYPRESS VILLAGE
WEST VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA

Cypress Village will be a high-density urban precinct with a mix of uses developed by British Pacific Properties within a 350-acre site adjacent to Cypress Falls Park at the base of Cypress Mountain in West Vancouver. UDA led a diverse team in a 9-month long design process engaging with the West Vancouver community and the many stakeholders who work, live and play in this extraordinary region. Three concept plans were developed over the course of the process to test sustainable and resilient programs, mixes of use, physical character, densities, conservation methods, community servicing, recreation networks, approach to urbanism in the mountain environment.

CONTACT:
British Pacific Properties Limited
Bryce Tupper
604.418.8525
btupper@britishproperties.com

TEAM MEMBERS:
CHATTANOOGA ART PROMENADE
CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE

River City Company and the Lyndhurst Foundation commissioned a team including Urban Design Associates and W.M. Whitaker and Associates to prepare an arts district plan for downtown Chattanooga’s riverfront area. The plan proposes a pedestrian art promenade that connects the Hunter Art Museum with the Aquarium and Chattanooga Green and new residential and institutional development on key parcels in the downtown. The plan defines three character zones along the walk and provides a creative framework for integrating art into the landscape. Development guidelines are provided for new performing arts theaters flanking a cultural square at the foot of Broad Street and residential and hospitality development on the riverfront.
**DOWNTOWN MASTER PLAN & PARKING STUDY**

**MONROE, MICHIGAN**

MKSK led a team to craft a redevelopment plan and parking management strategies for downtown Monroe, Michigan. Specialists in the marketplace (Bob Gibbs) and urban design (MKSK) outlined strategies to invigorate the downtown. Specific redevelopment concepts and actions were created for key sites.

A key part of the plan was an evaluation of the transportation and parking system. The team’s complete street specialists (MKSK) outlined a package of changes to streets including road diets and conversion of several one-way streets to two-way. Parking specialists from MKSK and Nelson\Nygaard outlined a series of changes to parking pricing and relocation of some parking lots to open development opportunities.

Concepts were widely embraced through meetings with business and city representatives, along with a very successful public open house at a unique downtown location. The Plan is going through the adoption process but implementation has already begun.

**CONTACT:**
City of Monroe
Annette M. Knowles
Economic/Downtown Development Coordinator
734.384.9146
annette.knowles@mionroemi.gov

**TEAM MEMBERS:**

![Team Member 1](image1)

![Team Member 2](image2)
The Vital Streets Plan revolutionized the approach of City of Grand Rapids, MI, to designing, maintaining, and using its streets. Adopted by the City Commission in December 2016, the Vital Streets Plan defines a community vision, principles, and design goals to build a network of accessible, inviting, and safe streets that serve all people. Going beyond a traditional complete streets policy, Vital Streets fully integrate green infrastructure into street design in order to protect the quality of region’s waterways while contributing to the vitality of Michigan’s second largest city. The Vital Streets Plan was developed collaboratively with public and private sector stakeholders, recognizing that roads aren’t just for moving vehicular traffic. Rather, streets are complex environments that must balance the needs of different types of users. The plan establishes a street typology that unites street design with local land use context; defines an integrated, multimodal network; provides guidance in street design; presents a methodology for facility selection amid competing demands; and provides a way to measure performance and evaluate outcomes.

To implement the vision included in the Plan, Nelson\Nygaard developed Vital Streets street design guidelines. With detailed graphics, context, and use requirements, the guidelines are a tool for city staff, developers, and community stakeholders to understand the tradeoffs and design considerations in building balanced streets. An implementation and performance monitoring section of the Vital Streets Design Guidelines includes a detailed equity analysis for use in project identification and selection. The equity analysis includes estimation of the areas of the city with the greatest mobility needs in consideration with places with the greatest opportunities. Further, the Vital Streets Design Guide includes a detailed community engagement framework to ensure Vital Streets projects meet community goals.
University Circle may be the most spectacular square mile in the state of Ohio. Anchored by major hospitals and universities, University Circle is the second largest employment center in the state and is continuing to grow. The Moving Greater University Circle Transportation & Mobility Plan was a three-part study and implementation plan assessing areas of need and opportunity in University Circle’s transportation system. The study identified short- and long-term strategies for effective transportation management. Moving Greater University Circle has four primary components:

1. The District Parking Study focused on understanding and evaluating existing and projected supply and demand in the study area and was completed in December 2014. Immediate action recommendations included increasing non-driving mobility among commuters and residents with a comprehensive TDM program coupled with improvements to walking, biking, and transit options; optimizing a park-once strategy for tourists and day trippers by addressing short-term/peak period demand; and offering shoppers and diners consistent availability through information and technology improvements.

2. The Transportation & Mobility Study focused on understanding and evaluating the comprehensive transportation systems, patterns, choices, and challenges that confront people as they travel to, through the District.

3. The Transportation Management Implementation Plan synthesized recommendations from the first two components and established a series of short- and long-term goals, metrics, action steps, and organizational responsibilities, based on stakeholder feedback.

4. The CircleLink component developed a new transit circulator system to connect the major locations throughout the area, including a schedule of service based on daily trip patterns.
PORTSMOUTH 2025 MASTER PLAN
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

Over the last ten years, Portsmouth has taken significant steps toward updating its transportation network, from incorporating complete streets principles into its road projects, to revising its zoning policy to promote a park-once environment, to improving public transit options for evening and weekend activities. While these changes led to measured improvement, Portsmouth remained predominately car-dependent, leading to outsized parking demand both within and beyond the urban core.

The Portsmouth 2025 Master Plan prioritized connectivity for all modes of transportation, envisioning a future for Portsmouth of safe and accessible streets for all users. Toward this vision, as subs to NBBJ, Nelson\Nygaard staffed three dynamic public input workshops and developed multimodal transportation recommendations for updating the City’s street standards to reflect current design best practices, including planning for full accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians. To address high parking demand, the firm provided recommendations and implementation action items for cost-effective ways to maximize the utilization of—and access to—existing parking infrastructure and adjust parking requirements to better account for demand, including tailored recommendations for how to address demand generated by accessory unit infill development.

Recommendations for fixed-route bus service to meet emerging demands were also developed.

Portsmouth 2025’s comprehensive strategies provide clear steps toward a more balanced transportation network, with less stress on the City’s parking supply, more travel options, and enhancements that support the vitality of the urban core.
F&V staff have provided the City with as-needed traffic and transportation engineering consulting services since 1986. Birmingham is a community of approximately 20,000 residents and nearly 300 retailers. Birmingham has focused on providing a walkable community and F&V has provided consulting services for various projects throughout the City to help them realize their vision. Services have included as-needed traffic engineering for operations analysis and safety studies, as well as site specific traffic impact study reviews.

Since 2015, F&V has also served as the City of Birmingham Multi-Modal Transportation Board’s traffic engineering consultant. Tasks performed have included road diet studies, bike route designs, and design of multi-modal facilities like sharrows, bike lanes and cycle tracks. F&V also confirms that any new development in the City follows the Multi-Modal Transportation Plan.

F&V participated in public meetings and provided recommendations to the City based on the results of these analyses, in order to maintain acceptable traffic operations for City residents, businesses, and visitors.

Sample projects include:
- Maple Road 4 to 3 Lane Conversion (Road Diet) Study
- Neighborhood Connector Route Plan/Signing
- Lincoln and Pierce Bumpout Evaluation
- Lincoln and Ann Signing and Striping Evaluation
- S. Eton Bike Lanes Study
- Maple Road Mid Block Crossing Evaluation
- Southfield and Maple HSIP Application
- Rail District Parking Study
- Saxon Roundabout Operational Analysis and Design
- Lincoln and Southfield Signal Evaluation
- Chesterfield and Quarton Traffic Analysis
MAPLE ROAD TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY
BIRMINGHAM, MICHIGAN

F&amp;V evaluated the existing four-lane cross section and lane usage on Maple Road between Cranbrook Road and Southfield Road in Birmingham, Michigan to determine if a “Road Diet” from a four lane cross section to a three lane cross section would enhance operations for all transportation users including drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The study included analysis of traffic operations for this road segment and the intersections along Maple Road to determine the feasibility of the proposed modifications.

Study analyses included modeling of the study network, crash analysis, and calculation of intersection delays, Levels of Service (LOS), and vehicle queues. Study analyses indicated that with capacity and geometric improvements at the intersection of Maple Road and Southfield Road the four lane to three lane conversion was feasible. The recommendations of the study were reviewed by the City of Birmingham and the city implemented a trial for the three lane conversion conducted from October 2015-March 2016 before accepting the recommendations.
FENTON ROAD REHABILITATION
FLINT, MICHIGAN

This MDOT LAP project included 4 to 3 lane Road Diet. F&V performed a crash analysis and safety review for Fenton Road from I-69 bridge to Hemphill Road. This section of Fenton Road was under consideration for a four-to-three lane conversion as part of the 3R project and as part of the review process a crash analysis was performed.

The results of the study showed that a road diet is recommended and it will help to reduce the number of crashes and crash severity.
Sample plans

DOWNTOWN TOLEDO MASTER PLAN, TOLEDO, OH_MKSK

SAMPLE PLANS
DOWNTOWN TOLEDO MASTER PLAN
Toledo 22nd Century Committee
randy.ostra@promedica.org
419.469.3824

DOWNTOWN AKRON VISION & REDEVELOPMENT PLAN
Downtown Akron Partnership
Susan Graham
103 S High Street, 4th Floor
Akron, Ohio 44308
sgraham@downtownakron.com
330.374.7610

MONROE DOWNTOWN MASTER PLAN & PARKING STUDY
City of Monroe
Annette Knowles, Downtown Economic Development Coordinator
120 E 1st Street
Monroe, Michigan 48161
annette.knowles@monroemi.gov
734.384.9146

WESTERVILLE UPTOWN PLAN
City of Westerville
Bassem Bitar, Senior Planner
21 S State Street
Westerville, OH 43081
bassem.bitar@westerville.org
614.901.6658

CITY OF WYOMING MASTER PLAN
City of Wyoming
Terry Vanderman, Community Development Director
800 Oak Avenue
Wyoming, Ohio 45215
tvanderman@wyomingohio.gov
513.821.7600
Downtown Toledo is at the cusp of a renaissance. Current and planned developments, along with world-class institutions, have re-energized the core and have the potential to have a transformative effect on downtown and the Toledo region. Downtown Toledo benefits from high-quality assets, such as the Toledo Main Library, Fifth Third Field, the Huntington Center, Farmer’s Market and the Valentine Theater. Within a short distance from downtown, the Toledo Museum of Art and the Toledo Zoo are nationally-recognized institutions that attract millions of visitors to the region. Also nearby is the University of Toledo, which has an enrollment of over 20,000 students.

Several downtown neighborhoods are currently experiencing an influx of young entrepreneurs, residents, and visitors. The Warehouse District and Uptown have emerging retail corridors in St. Clair Street and Adams Street, respectively. The Hensville development rehabilitated three historic buildings and added restaurant, retail and office space to St. Clair Street. Uptown is undergoing its own local arts-centered revitalization with the opening of Uptown Green and ProMedica’s Market on the Green.

In addition to Hensville, planned, under construction and recently opened investments downtown include the continued development of the Warehouse District, a new ProMedica headquarters that will bring 1,000 jobs downtown, Middlegrounds Metropark, the Anthony Wayne Trail Gateway, and the Renaissance Hotel along the waterfront. These are all potentially transformative projects that should be leveraged to the fullest extent possible.
Public Meeting 1

More than 350 Toledo area residents attended the First Public Meeting at the McMaster Family Center, located in the Toledo Main Library. Hosted by the 22nd Century Committee, the meeting took place on January 19, 2016 between 5 p.m. and 7:30 p.m. The planning team started the meeting with a presentation highlighting the process along with initial existing conditions and analysis.

After the presentation, participants were invited to interact with exhibits and the planning team for one-on-one conversations at eight themed stations, including:

- Riverfront
- Residential & Retail Opportunities
- Streets/Connectivity
- Transportation & Parking
- Greenspace/Recreation/Bike Network
- Business, Talent and Innovation
- General Comments/Ideas
- Downtown Visioning (Interactive Display)

It was an enthusiastic and highly engaged crowd. Participants expressed their vision and ideas for the future of Downtown Toledo through both conversations at the stations, and by participating in the hands-on activities. The interactive post-it and map display was transported from the Project Storefront to the Public Meeting, so meeting attendants were able to engage with the storefront activities.

Meeting attendants provided over 600 comments in the form of answers to questions on comment cards, notes added to the interactive displays/map exercises, and comments left on station materials. Comments focused on revitalizing the riverfront, attracting talent and young people to the city, and building a vibrant downtown retail and residential district. Public comments have been sorted and are summarized on page 28.
Located in the lobby of the Toledo Edison Building directly adjacent to the Downtown Toledo Improvement District Office, the Project Storefront included interactive and hands-on displays meant to engage downtown residents, workers, and visitors. The storefront was staffed by Toledo Design Center representatives between 12 PM and 1 PM on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. The lobby was fully accessible to all foot traffic during regular business hours.

Open to the public between January and May of 2016, the storefront materials included a post-it display with the following three questions:

The hands-on display also included two interactive maps where participants provided information on where they live and their perception of downtown. The display was temporarily transported to the First Public Meeting for the duration of the event.
**Existing Land Use and Zoning**

Current land use and zoning patterns show a heavily commercial core surrounded by primarily single-family residential neighborhoods. Corridors in these residential neighborhoods, such as Lagrange, Cherry, and Main Streets, radiate toward downtown and the river and are characterized by commercial uses of varying intensities. Commercial and office zoning designations are prevalent in the downtown area between Woodruff Avenue and the riverfront. Uptown is generally zoned office commercial, as is the Civic Center area. The Warehouse District, reminiscent of its rich industrial past, is mostly zoned limited industrial despite having a relatively high concentration of residential and commercial structures. Except for a downtown section consisting of parks and open space-zoned parcels, the riverfront is generally zoned commercial or general industrial, especially to the north of downtown.

More importantly, the City of Toledo Zoning Code establishes several Overlay Districts affecting downtown and its surrounding neighborhoods. These districts set review processes for development as well as design guidelines of various extents, some of which include guidelines for building setbacks, parking, and streetscape. The Overlay Districts relevant to the study area include: Downtown District (shown on map), Warehouse District, Uptown District, Maumee Riverfront, Monroe Street Corridor, Summit Street Corridor, and the Marina District. Each district is accompanied by a respective planning document that sets out a rationale and vision for future development.
WHAT WE HEARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southside</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main &amp; Exchange</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowery District</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 59</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Comments Received</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Meeting Attendees</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What We Heard**

- **42** Steering Committee Members
- **150** Stakeholders Interviewed
- **1,800** Website Visits
- **200** Survey Responses
- **505** Public Meeting Attendees
- **592** Total Comments Received
- **58** Ward Meeting Attendees

**Survey Responses**

- **200** Total Responses
- **150** Stakeholders Interviewed
- **1,800** Website Visits

**Stakeholders Interpreted**

- **42** Steering Committee Members
- **150** Stakeholders Interviewed

**Website Visits**

- **1,800** Visits

**Total Comments Received**

- **592** Comments

**Ward Meeting Attendees**

- **58** Attendees

**Website Visits**

- **1,800** Visits
EXISTING CONDITIONS

CONNECTIVITY & STREETS

Connectivity

Downtown’s connectivity to surrounding neighborhoods is challenged by a variety of factors, the first being geography. Due to its location along the Ohio and Erie Canal, downtown’s edges are defined by steep slopes that have been accentuated by decades of transportation decisions. Along the north and east, railroad tracks separate downtown from Cascade Valley and the University of Akron. Along the west, Route 59 has added a separated-highway in the valley between downtown and the West Hill Neighborhood. This barrier is now being undone by the Innerbelt Project, and its completion will improve connectivity to western neighborhoods. Along the south edge, Interstate 76 separates the downtown area from South Akron neighborhoods. The result is a downtown isolated from its surrounding neighborhoods, operating as a virtual island.

Streets

In response to topography, railroad lines, and the canal, downtown streets are better connected when traveling north-south versus east-west. As seen in the map on the following page, major streets are configured as paired one-way streets designed to move commuters in and out of downtown at fast speeds. Nonetheless, portions of one-way streets, such as Exchange and Cedar Streets, are being converted to two-way travel. This will result in calmer traffic and easier wayfinding for pedestrians and vehicles alike.
**FOCUS AREAS**

### 3 | BOWERY DISTRICT

**Catalytic Change**

Even with the improvements and development planned in the Bowery District, there is more work to be done to connect Main Street to Bowery Street and begin to extend the energy of downtown toward the redevelopment opportunities present along S.R. 59. There are two major mixed-use redevelopment opportunities along Bowery Street. On the west side of Bowery Street, the underutilized buildings and surface parking lot represent an opportunity for medical, mixed-use redevelopment that could serve the Akron Children’s Hospital campus. With the removal of S.R. 59, this site should feature double-sided architecture that fronts both Bowery Street and Rand Street. On the other side of Bowery Street, the city—owned parking lot also represents a mixed-use residential redevelopment opportunity.

To maximize the development potential along Bowery Street, Lock 3 needs to be properly integrated and connected east to west and both sides of the canal must be activated with public spaces and pathways. This should include new bridges across the canal with walkways between new buildings to link Bowery Street to Lock 3 and a new pathway should be created on the west side of the canal to connect State Street north toward Lock 4. Along Main Street, there are two sites adjacent to Lock 3 that have long been planned to be developed. While these should be mixed-use in nature, the one adjacent to the Civic Theatre could potentially have an arts and performance use that allows cultural activity to spill out onto both Main Street and Lock 3.
STATE STREET LOOKING NORTH: POTENTIAL

- MIXED USE INFILL
- EMBRACE BOTH SIDES OF THE CANAL
- MIXED USE INFILL WITH POTENTIAL ARTS FOCUS
- ENHANCE MAIN STREET CONNECTION

PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION

ACTIVATE LOCK 3
There are many regionally significant sites in proximity to downtown Monroe, including the River Raisin Battlefield Park, the La-Z Boy Headquarters, and the Promedica Monroe Regional Hospital, among others. Multiple direct access points to I-75 (Dixie Highway, Elm Avenue, First Street, and LaPlaisance Road) provide downtown with a greater level of connectivity to these assets and others throughout the region. In addition to I-75, two major state routes (M-50 and M-125) also connect into/pass through downtown Monroe, and U.S. Route 24 provides an alternative route just outside of downtown.

All of these routes provide critical access to the City of Monroe and serve as key gateways into downtown Monroe. An important aspect of this study will be looking at how downtown Monroe can capitalize on its regional connectivity and proximity to regional assets.

The project study area echoes the boundary for the Downtown Development Authority (DDA), but focuses more specifically around the core downtown. The study area boundary generally extends north to Willow Street, east to Murray Street, south to 5th Street, and west to Smith Street.

The DDA boundary extends farther south to the City’s edge, and slightly farther north across the river, but does not include every property within the project study area.
1,737 spaces are in private parking lots

1,147 spaces are in free, public parking lots, or on-street parking

232 spaces are metered in parking lots or on the street
Parking Assessment

PARKING SUPPLY AND OCCUPANCY

Parking occupancy counts were conducted for two distinct periods of parking demand downtown: Friday evening and weekday lunch. Between the two periods, the overall utilization of parking within the study area remained below 40% systemwide. This percentage includes all facility types (public and private, metered and free), but does not include any restricted spaces, such as designated handicap parking or police vehicles only.

Parking Occupancy on Friday Evening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Type</th>
<th>Total Spaces</th>
<th>Total Cars</th>
<th>Percent Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,126</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: these numbers do not include designated handicap parking or other restricted spaces.

PARKING OCCUPANCY LEGEND

Percent of Parking Occupied at Time of Count

- 0-30%
- 31-60%
- 61-80%
- 81-90%
- 91-98%
- 99%+

Note: St Mary’s parking lots were being used for festival setup during this time period.
Where do you typically park?

- 33% Free On-Street Parking
- 32% Free Parking Lot
- 21% Permit Parking Lot
- 3% Metered Parking Lot
- 11% Metered On-Street

How close to your destination do you usually park?

- 8% Over 3 Blocks
- 19% 2-3 Blocks (±1,000' - 1,500')
- 26% 1 Block (±500')
- 33% Same Block
- 4% Right in front
- 10% On Site

How satisfied are you with your downtown parking experience?

- Safety
  - Very Satisfied: 21%
  - Satisfied: 38%
  - Neutral: 26%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 8%
  - Dissatisfied: 8%

- Lighting
  - Very Satisfied: 13%
  - Satisfied: 42%
  - Neutral: 28%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 11%
  - Dissatisfied: 6%

- Proximity to your destination
  - Very Satisfied: 15%
  - Satisfied: 30%
  - Neutral: 22%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 18%
  - Dissatisfied: 15%

- Cost
  - Very Satisfied: 19%
  - Satisfied: 19%
  - Neutral: 28%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 13%
  - Dissatisfied: 20%

- Easy of paying
  - Very Satisfied: 10%
  - Satisfied: 19%
  - Neutral: 43%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 12%
  - Dissatisfied: 15%

- Easy of finding a space
  - Very Satisfied: 15%
  - Satisfied: 25%
  - Neutral: 19%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 23%
  - Dissatisfied: 18%

The results of the parking survey indicate that overall, the community is generally satisfied with parking downtown. Most respondents indicated that they are able to park within a block of their final destination, which equates to less than a 5-minute walk.

The most dissatisfaction was indicated with:
- the ease of finding a parking space
- the cost to park
- the proximity of parking to destinations

Additionally, the majority (65%) of respondents indicated that they typically park in free on-street or off-street parking when they travel downtown. Another 21% indicated that they park in permit parking, which is often provided for free through employers. Only 14% of respondents indicated that they typically pay for parking downtown.
Framework Plan

The Framework Plan to the right illustrates how all of the nine catalytic ideas could work together to transform Uptown. While many of the nine catalytic ideas have a set physical location for implementation, two do not (the Civic Space and the Parking Deck) and three are shown in generally preferred locations (the New Uptown Alleys, the Bike Connections, and the Infill Opportunities). It is also worth noting that several of these, such as the Infill Opportunities and the State Theater, require the property owner to initiate, and others require participation of the property owner, such as the Pedestrian Walkways/Vias.

In this Framework Plan, streetscape improvements are planned for State Street, Main Street, and College Avenue. Both Main Street and College Avenue are important corridors because they draw people into Uptown. These streets should be enhanced to continue the aesthetic charm of Uptown and act as gateways to Olde Westerville. The streetscape improvements to State Street are planned to enhance pedestrian enjoyment and safety along this vehicle-heavy corridor. Additional streetscape improvements are recommended for Park Street to allow it to act as a bike connector to Uptown.

Creating a public alley system that runs parallel to State Street allows cyclists to exit Park Street and easily access Uptown. These Uptown Alleys also help to re-organize parking and access, making it more intuitive, efficient, and attractive. The Framework Plan shows how these alleys approximately follow the drives that exist behind the State Street buildings today. Implementing this idea coupled with the embellishment of the current mid-block pedestrian walks will create an inviting and memorable way-finding system from the parking areas to the activity on State Street.

Other catalytic ideas include the creation of a civic space along State Street for community gathering and events, the renovation of the State Theater, and the development of potential infill sites -- for mixed-use buildings along State Street and residential infill along the cross streets -- to help strengthen the fabric and vitality of Uptown. Such projects could be serviced by a public parking deck located in close proximity to State Street, which could help address the existing parking challenges and encourage further redevelopment. While the location of certain catalytic ideas, such as the civic space and parking deck, would need to be determined with further study, all nine ideas work together to build upon Uptown’s strengths and enhance its ability to attract visitors, businesses, and residents.
State Street Streetscape Improvement Strategies
- Add bumpouts at intersections
- Curb extensions for pinch points (ex. Old Post Office, State Theater)
- On-street parking differentiation
- Unique crosswalk pattern
- Consistent sidewalk width
- Landscape for buffering

Main Street Streetscape Improvement Strategies
- Bury overhead utilities
- Improve streetscape
- Screen surface parking lots
- Create signature gateway elements
- Academic residential infill

College Avenue Streetscape Improvement Strategies
- Enhance College Avenue as ceremonial gateway to Otterbein University
- Maintain and extend brick street
- Bury overhead utilities
- Encourage residential and academic infill
- Maintain existing residential setback
- Create signature gateway elements
- Screen surface parking lots

Concept - State Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Bumpouts</th>
<th>Minimum Commercial Setback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved Crosswalks</td>
<td>Create Signature Gateway Features</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concept - Main Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved Crosswalks</th>
<th>Improved Streetscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create Signature Gateway Features</td>
<td>Maintain Residential Setback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concept - College Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintain Residential Setback</th>
<th>Improved Streetscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved Crosswalks</td>
<td>Maintain Commercial Setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Signature Gateway Features</td>
<td>Improve Academic and Residential Infill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CATALYTIC PROJECTS
REDEVELOPMENT & INFILL

North Gateway

The existing Church of the Messiah parking lot at the northeast corner of East Home Street and State Street is one of the sites that residents and stakeholders expressed interest in seeing redeveloped. Repurposing the site with mixed-use and residential would fill in the existing gap in the State Street streetscape, and allow the site to serve a more beneficial purpose for Uptown and the City of Westerville. This location at the northern corner of Uptown creates the potential for a strong gateway feature, defining the edge of Uptown and drawing people into the district. The illustration to the right demonstrates how a new mixed-use development could be complemented by residential use along East Home Street. The mixed-use building facing State Street creates continuous edge, while the residential use along East Home Street blends into the existing scale and character of the street. This helps strengthen residential within the Uptown district, while also introducing new commercial opportunities that would be included on the first floor of the new mixed-use building.
ESTIMATES OF POTENTIAL COST

Catalytic Projects

1. STREET IMPROVEMENTS
- State Street: $1.5 - 2.0 million
  • Curb extensions
  • Pavers
  • Crosswalks
  • Gateway structure (north & south ends)
- Main Street: $1.5 - 2.0 million
  • Gateway features
  • Utility burial
  • Street light, sidewalk, & street trees infill
- College Avenue: $1.7 - 2.2 million
  • Similar to Main St. above

$4.7 - 6.2 million total for all three streets *
(can be accomplished in phases by street)

2. PUBLIC ALLEYS
- Estimate Includes:
  • Demolition
  • Permeable pavers alley
  • Drainage
  • Sidewalk
  • Lighting
  • Trees
  • Bike/pedestrian lane & bollards
  • Note: Does not include any land aquisition

$3.8 - 5.0 million total for all alleys *
or roughly $1,200-1,800 per linear foot *
(can be accomplished in phases by block)

3. MID-BLOCK PEDESTRIAN WALKWAYS / VIAS
- Estimate Includes:
  • Demolition
  • Specialty pavement
  • Portal gateway elements
  • Site furnishings
  • Art elements
  • Drainage
  • Note: Does not include any land aquisition

$1.2 - 2.7 million for all pedestrian walkways *
or roughly $150,000-300,000 per walk
(assumes nine total walkways/vias)
(can be accomplished in phases by alley)

4. BIKE CONNECTIONS
- Estimate Includes:
  • Bikeway connecting the Ohio to Erie Trail to the
    Alum Creek Trail along existing Park Street
  • Sharrow (shared use) paint markings
  • Wayfinding signage

$25,000 - $35,000 for the connection markings *

* Note: Estimates provided are for budgeting purposes only. As projects are advanced
to conceptual design, more accurate cost estimates can be developed.
THE PROMENADE | ONE POSSIBLE VISION...

- Library Renovation
- Special Paver
- Pedestrian Crosswalk Bumpout
- Enhanced Tree Planters
- Parking Lane
- Turn Lane
- Planned Coffee Shop
- Relocated Utility Lines
- Sharrows
- Coordinated Streetscape and Widened Sidewalk

TODAY | What are the possibilities?

- Improve Springfield Pike Pedestrian Crossing?
- Add Crosswalks “Bumpouts”?
- Relocate Utility Poles & Lines?
- Improve Facade?
- Make Improvements to Promenade Streetscape?
- Planned Springfield Pike Improvements

* Any “Infill Development” or property improvements dependent on property owner.
A First Step Toward Future Opportunities

The road diet should be considered the first step toward a series of incremental improvements that will over time enhance the Pike as a public way in which the City can take pride. The improvements will provide safe and efficient travel options for people of all ages, including those who can’t or choose not to drive (such as children, the elderly, and cyclists).

Future additional improvements should be considered to improve pedestrian crossings along Springfield Pike. These could include additional or improved crosswalk designs and curb extensions (also referred to as “bump-outs”) at intersections to shorten pedestrian crossing distance and improve the streetscape quality at prominent locations.

In particular, the intersection of Wyoming, Chestnut, and Worthington Avenues, and Springfield Pike are recommended as priority locations for such a design. Where space allows, additional on-street parking could also be considered to serve businesses as redevelopment occurs. Such improvements will serve to transform Wyoming’s one arterial roadway into the type of place that truly captures the essence of the community and the small town, walkable character that residents love.
At the third public open house, held on April 12, 2017, participants were asked to engage in a fiscal prioritization exercise. Each person was allocated $1,000 (in play money!). This represents an approximate per capita annual City tax contribution. There were 10 topic-based stations, each with multiple options for municipal investments, plus, a station for the attendees to suggest their own priorities. The public was invited to consider their priorities, decide how much of their tax dollars should be allocated to each one of their priorities and make their contributions.

The diagram on this page shows the results of this exercise portraying overall and by generation top priorities. As an example, “retail and restaurant attraction” ranked first overall and was among the top three across generations.
**Public Open House 4**

The final public open house was held on June 28, 2017. Planning team opened the meeting with a short presentation to reinforce the Master Plan primary goals and themes, and introduce opportunities and possible vision for targeted areas.

Participants were asked to review and prioritize a series of draft objectives and strategies organized according to eight planning themes.

Participants were also invited to review conceptual graphic renderings of potential public improvements and private development ideas and to sketch their own ideas for the future.
SCOPE OF WORK
PROJECT UNDERSTANDING

Strong planning direction has helped guide the City through past challenges. It has played an important role in shaping Birmingham’s various mixed use districts into one of the premier cities in the Midwest. As the City continues its forward looking legacy, a new City-wide Master Plan is sought to a course for sustained prosperity. A successful process and eventual Plan needs to consider what different stakeholders and the community at-large feel is important.

For residents, it is the downtown and their immediate neighborhood including their home, schools, parks, and tree-lined streets. Different neighborhoods also include specialty shops such as LePetite Prince, Market Square, Mills Pharmacy, the Whistle Stop Diner, Big Rock Cop House, Papa Joe’s and many other unique places to enjoy. For weekend and evening visitors, it is the vibrant downtown with niche retail, restaurants, library and events. For employees, it is the attractiveness of working in a walkable downtown with plenty of open spaces and places to grab a cup of coffee, lunch or a beverage after work. For Developers and investors, it is the appeal of an affluent population in an urban setting to build upon the success of recent developments. We will work with you on a process that captures those sometimes competing interests into a well-vetted plan to guide you over the next 10 years.

In the past two decades, the City has focused its Master Planning efforts on areas that need the most guidance – the Downtown, Eaton Street Rail District and Triangle District. Woodward Avenue’s corridor has been examined through a South Gateway Study, and separate Complete Street and rapid transit studies. In addition, a city-wide Non-Motorized Plan was prepared. Many of the recommendations of those prior plans have been implemented. Others are still valid for consideration. Our impression is that one objective of this Master Plan Update is a light refresher for those plans and to integrate them into a City-Wide Plan. A second goal of the Master Plan is to cover the other, largely residential districts that were not covered in those plans. This will include some consistent elements as well as policies that reflect the distinct characteristics of the City’s varied neighborhoods.

While Birmingham is an incredibly successful city – from its residential neighborhoods to commercial districts – the City still needs a Master Plan to help maintain its success. Specifically, a Master Plan can help with the following:

- Engage stakeholders and the public in taking a broader view of the city and the future.
- Take a fresh look at the City overall - with an eye on future trends such as the implications of e-commerce, housing needs, and mobility.
- Identify enhancements that may be needed in the stable neighborhoods to help them retain their appeal.
- Evaluate how to better link land use, design and the transportation system to increase the number of people who walk, bike and use transit.
- Address some of the consequences of densification, such as stress on the parking system. Parking pressures that extend onto some residential streets.
- Discuss policies to align the City’s various Boards, Committees, City Commission and Staff.
- Determine if a wider array of housing types is needed (the “Missing Middle”). If so, where should it be located and how can it fit into the character of the area?
- Provide a foundation for the zoning ordinance and identify potential amendments.
- Meet the State requirements that a Master Plan be adopted every five years. Along with including State-required Plan elements that are missing in Birmingham’s various plans, in particular, a Zoning Plan.
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN - APPROACH & ASSUMPTIONS

Our approach is to build upon the prior district plans and fill in the gaps, both content and geographic, to create a city-wide Master Plan. This will be done through an extensive community engagement process. Our definition of the community to engage is not just residents. It also includes key stakeholders (property owners, advocacy groups, organizations), agencies, city officials and staff. Our engagement process includes a variety of tactics and sessions with city staff, city officials, stakeholders and the public. Our featured event will be a four-day charrette process. As with our past projects and charrettes in Birmingham, we look for a collaborative process working with city staff. Our budget assumes city staff will handle logistics including the notices required by the Michigan Planning Act, invitations, e-blasts, event locations, publicity, media kits and other coordination.

At the project outset, we will develop a draft Community Engagement Plan. This plan will be discussed and refined at the kickoff meetings. This guidebook will include detailed information on how we will communicate with different groups and the timing of various elements. The tactics and events are described in the Work Plan below at the time they would occur. In summary the Engagement Activities include the following:

- A website to be hosted by the city, to announce the project and schedule. We will develop language and illustrations for the city to update the website before and after public events.
- We will prepare e-newsletters for the city to blast out to residents, business owners and key stakeholders. We will prepare these three times 1) announce the project 2) before the charrette and 3) to summarize the draft plan before the open house and public hearing.
- Five meetings with City staff
- Five meetings with the Planning Board plus meetings during the adoption process
- Two meetings with the City Commission plus the Public Hearing
- Suggested optional meetings with city staff, the Multi-Modal Board and parking committee
- A two-day session of roundtable or focus group discussions with key stakeholders plus Visioning or Listening sessions with the public
- A meeting with agencies and representatives of adjacent communities
- A four-day design charrette led by UDA
- A public open house during the public review period before the Public Hearing
- Summary brochure
WORK PLAN

Our proposed Work Plan is organized by Plan Phases. For each Phase we have noted the meetings and deliverables. For ease of understanding, the work plan for parking related topics has been included in one location, under the Exploration Phase. But that effort will span throughout the Phases.

We have included the meetings requested in the RFP, noted at the times we would expect them to occur. But we believe addition meetings will be needed. Those are noted as “Optional” and would be billed hourly in addition to our stated fee.

The sequence would follow the project schedule below.

**PHASE 1: PROJECT LAUNCH**

MONTHS 1-2

This first phase is intended to review the work plan and schedule to agree on any adjustments. We will also use this period to set the course for engagement activities, understand the previous plans and data available. We also suggest some early discussions on the eventual plan format.

The tasks in this phase will include the following:

- Kickoff meeting with City staff to review the work plan, to have staff provide an overview of active planning efforts, development projects, capital improvements, etc. Also clarifications of the integration and extent of update to the Downtown, Triangle and Rail District Plans. This should include representatives of Planning, Engineering, Administration, Communications Director, and the Police Chief.
- A kickoff meeting with the Planning Board
- Project start-up briefings with the Multi-Modal Board and City Commission
- Based on the above, a second meeting with city staff to agree on any refinements to the Work Plan and Schedule
- Initiate community engagement including a page on the City's website, calendar of events, lists of key stakeholders to invite to focus group meetings

**Meetings:**

2 with City staff (1 is Optional)
1 with the Planning Board
1 briefing for the Multi-Modal Board at our regular meeting (not charged to the Master Plan)

**Deliverables:**

Materials for those meetings including summaries of discussions
A draft Notice of Intent to Proceed with a Master Plan update to be refined and distributed by the City
A Community Engagement Plan and calendar of events
PHASE 2: DISCOVERY  (DATA COLLECTION & ANALYSIS, INCLUDING PARKING & INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS)

MONTHS 2-4

During this phase, we will work with city staff and other organizations to collect available data. This information will be evaluated for its influence on the Master Plan. We will also tour the City to begin to identify focus areas. This Discovery Phase will include the following tasks.

Review of past plans. We are already familiar with most of the previous plans in the City that will be a foundation for this plan. We will review and summarize those plans including those listed in the RFP: the Downtown 2016 Plan, Eton Road (Rail District), Triangle District, Alley and Passages, Multi-Modal Transportation and Parks and Recreation Plan. Since one purpose of the Master Plan is to support the zoning ordinance, we also want to discuss the South Woodward Plan, recent amendments to the zoning ordinance and map, any key zoning disputes, and other planning and zoning analyses. As part of this process, we will have a meeting with City staff, and perhaps some representatives of the Planning Board to discuss the status of those plans. This will include acknowledgement of recommendations that have been implemented, and a review of those that have not been acted upon. This will help us identify the components on the previous plans to carry forward in this process.

Community Profile – Existing Situation and Trends. We will prepare a community profile that includes important data to consider. This will include population and employment trends/projections, housing statistics such as age of housing stock, demographic characteristics of residents, and similar information. We will use the US Census, American Community Survey, ESRI Business Analyst (home values, commercial spending habits, etc.), and SEMCOG Traffic Analysis Zone data. This information will be supplemented through our conversations with key stakeholders in the real estate and development sectors plus conversations with representatives of the Birmingham School District and private school leadership.

Existing Land Use and Focus Areas. A key element of this process is to agree on how to classify certain uses. This will consider the use, its location and the distinction of uses in the zoning ordinance. The existing land use will be mapped and described to serve as a base for the future land use plan. Unlike older-style plans, this exercise will produce a series of maps and illustrations that will guide development of the Plan. This will include locations where the current land use is non-conforming or where there are major dimensional nonconformities that could influence redevelopment. This exercise will also provide a basis for identifying barriers and impediments to desired land use and development patterns that will be promoted in the future land use plan, to be developed as part of the Master Plan. We will also begin to identify sites that appear to be ripe for redevelopment. This may include vacant lots, obsolete buildings, sites in the vicinity of recent development or sites abutting more intense uses.

Transportation and Infrastructure Analysis. This will include street classifications, traffic volumes and projections, bike facilities, SMART transit ridership and bus stop features, and planned improvements. We will compare the Birmingham network with the latest recommendations from NACTO, ITE and other organizations. MKSK and Nelson\Nygaard will present best practice examples including new Complete Street and Vital Street public realm design manuals for Ann Arbor, Grand Rapids, Lansing, Traverse City plus notable places outside of Michigan. Fleiss & Vandenbrink engineers will also have discussions with the city engineering department construction practices. Best practices used by other communities will be identified in a tech memo for consideration during the process.

Parking Related Data. On the parking side, this will include a projected demand assessment, review of the downtown Parking Assessment district, the current residential permit parking zones, zoning requirements v best practices and other topics described in the section on Parking.
Community Tour/Audit. We will photo-document and qualitatively assess the pattern of lots, streets and home design forms in the various neighborhoods, corridors, and districts.

Meetings:
1 with City staff
1 with the Planning Board

Deliverables:
Existing land use map and description
Summary of Current Plans
Outline for Neighborhood Pattern Book or typologies
Existing transportation and parking assessment including maps
Preparation of Community Meeting, Website & Targeted Outreach
Presentations & Materials for city review and approval to announce events in the upcoming Phase
PHASE 3: VISIONING
MONTHS 3-5

We will facilitate a two-day session of information gathering and listening workshops. This will help build a deeper understanding around the needs of the project and the vision that residents and stakeholders have for the Master Plan. Discussions will involve a vision for the future of Birmingham overall, with specific ideas about certain districts, corridors and places.

The agenda for the two days would include meetings with the City staff, key stakeholder interviews and focus groups. Those invited for an interview or focus group may include key developers, property owners, representatives of neighborhoods and others identified by the City. This will also include an Agency Day meeting with staff or an official from Bloomfield Township, Bloomfield Hills, Royal Oak, Troy, SMART, MDOT and Oakland County.

During the late afternoon or evening of each day, we will host a community input meeting. At these sessions we will exhibit the data evaluation findings. Best practice concepts that similar communities have done well will be described to discuss what could be applied or adapted to the City of Birmingham. Ample opportunities will be provided for attendees to describe what they most value in the City. This discussion will include input on the elements of the City that are most cherished that should be conserved, places that need to be enhanced, and locations where some type of more significant change is desired or feared. Elements for discussion will include specific policy strategies or initiatives and targeted geographic focus areas and redevelopment sites. Ideas discussed will be mapped. These discussions will help form a draft Vision that will be reviewed with and refined by the Planning Board. These sessions will be held at either the downtown library or at another location secured by the city.

Following these initial listening sessions, our team will develop a list of emerging themes and directions to explore for each of the areas of the city (the neighborhoods, Downtown and the Triangle, the Rail District, and South Woodward). This visioning effort will include discussion of initial placemaking, land use, development, and transportation concepts. The critical focus of the visioning effort will be on specific, strategic goals, objectives, and actions that will improve the quality of life and opportunity for citizens, businesses and visitors, both existing and future. The visioning will respond to market opportunities and demand forecasts for new housing and commercial space and coordinated public realm and infrastructure improvements necessary to support and potentially catalyze desired private investments.

Meetings:
1 with City staff
1 with the Planning Board (Optional or could be done by City staff)
1 Briefing with the City Commission
A two-day session of interviews, focus groups, and a community event

Deliverables:
Listening/Visioning Session Materials
List of Emerging Community Themes (Goals and Desired Outcomes)
MONTHS 6-8

There are two main efforts in this Phase. First is the Master Plan and design recommendation that will evolve through a four-day charrette process and then be refined through subsequent meetings. The second is the analysis of the various parking topics outlined in the City’s RFP.

**CHARRETTE**

The Charrette process will consist of a 4-day workshop to develop concepts and to share with the community and elicit input and feedback. Days 1 and 2 would consist of reconvening stakeholders around each of the areas. The team would hold 4 mini-workshops (1 on Monday and 3 on Tuesday) focused on the various residential neighborhoods, Downtown and the Triangle, the Rail District, and South Woodward. Key stakeholders would be invited to participate, discuss best practices, and provide input. Day 3 would focus on development of the ideas, with a client pin-up on Wednesday afternoon/evening. Thursday would be dedicated to final production and a client/elected and appointed officials preview, culminating in a community presentation Thursday evening. This process will allow for extensive community and stakeholder participation, while ensuring the client team is comfortable with the development and direction throughout the week.

These sessions will be used to discuss alternative design concepts, land use strategies, multi-modal options and other topics. The outcome will be a series of maps and illustrations that will be refined following the charrette. These will include typologies for the residential neighborhoods using photos and plan view sketches (lot sizes, shapes, setbacks, streets, sidewalks and street trees. There will be a map that identifies where the different typologies are found or recommended. This will be a concise, fairly simple document, sometimes called a Pattern Book, that could be the basis or Regulating Plan for any zoning changes or a form-based code. UDA offers a more detailed Pattern Book as a separate document as an additional service in the budget.

**PARKING ANALYSIS & STRATEGIES**

There is a daunting (and increasing) level of uncertainty regarding the future of mobility in vibrant, walkable, urban centers, but two components of this future appear relatively certain: per square foot parking demand will decline gradually and the extent of non-driving trips will affect that the velocity of that change. Getting the parking right in such an environment will necessitate a new planning paradigm, one that abandons conventional parking requirements in favor of public/shared investments including funding for non-parking mobility and demand-management initiatives.

NN will lead the development of a parking analysis and a comprehensive set of recommendations. This will include a review of the parking requirements in the zoning ordinance specific to both uses and their district. We will identify supply-based solutions including shared parking strategies, management opportunities, curbside and off-street regulations including residential permit parking approaches, ADA parking needs, and overall funding opportunities. Our analysis will be based on a local understanding of key issues and opportunities, paired with an unparalleled understanding of national best practices and their appropriate application to Birmingham circumstances.

Particular focus areas will include:

- **Projected Demand Assessment** – A study of build-out capacity and its likely impacts on parking supply and demand conditions and perceived parking issues Downtown
  - This assessment will be informed by an analysis of the impact of ride sharing, autonomous vehicles, bikeshare and carshare, and other forms of “emerging mobility”, as well as mass transit, on future parking needs as it pertains to the Metro Detroit area.

- **Review of the Central Business District Parking Assessment District** – To ensure that concerns about constrained public parking supplies do not stifle desired growth
This assessment will focus on restructuring the district program and the assessment framework to ensure stable funding and investment flexibility, and to minimize resistance to otherwise appropriate and desirable development.

A complementary focus will be to assess opportunities to apply a similar approach in new, emerging growth districts.

- Growth District strategies – The potential need for a municipal parking system, and proactive public-parking management, in the Triangle District and the Rail District, with reference to recent analysis and recommendations
- This will also include an analysis of the need for other public parking structures and locations, along with ideas on financing strategies.
- Zoning Standards – A comprehensive review of the Zoning Ordinance parking regulations that apply outside of the Parking Assessment District
- Residential Permit Parking and Alternatives – A review of conditions, concerns, and best-practice-based regulatory strategies for a citywide RPP toolkit
- Adaptive Re-Use Strategies – A comparison of options for creating more resilient infrastructure in the face of increasing uncertainty toward the Future of Parking, including:
  - Design solutions to allow the transition public parking decks to other uses in the future if demand for parking declines.
  - Land-banking alternatives that focus on peripheral surface lots for near-term supply expansions, which can be redeveloped as mixed-use projects should parking needs decline over time.
  - Shifting more development to incorporate shared/public parking solutions for on-site parking needs, allowing this infrastructure to be "re-used" by a larger set of land uses should parking-demand rates decline.
- Review of Downtown Parking Study Findings – Review of findings and recommendations emerging from this study, and their applicability beyond the Downtown, including:
  - The need for demand-based pricing, to maintain consistent availability, both on the street and in the structures.
  - Development of a policy for electric vehicle charging stations.
  - The need for restricted on-street parking between 2am-6am.

Meetings:
- 4-day charrette including a series of meetings and events as described
- Nelson\Nygaard to attend 1 of the scheduled meetings with City staff
- Nelson\Nygaard will be involved in two of the charrette days including a public event
- An Optional meeting with the Planning Board or the Parking Committee or Ad Hoc Parking Committee (or joint meeting)

Deliverables:
- Assessment of Findings and Technical Report, including Best Practices Summary for Inclusion in the Master Plan document

Charrette Deliverables, including:
- Urban Design Analysis (diagrams and photographs)
- Neighborhood typologies (diagrams, drawings, and photographs)
- Birmingham building types (diagrams and models)
- Documentation of architectural character (photography and diagrams)
- 3 illustrative perspectives (eye-level and low aerial)

Community Pattern Book (Additional Deliverable, if authorized), including:
- Community Patterns Description
- Urban Patterns for Infill
- Building Types
- Architectural, Landscape, and Garden Patterns
- Green Building Guidelines
- Home Owners’ Guide
PHASE 5: PREPARATION OF DRAFT PLAN
MONTHS 9-12

The planning process described in the Phases above will culminate with the synthesis of the visioning, plan concepts, future land use plan, multi-modal transportation, parking and other topics into a complete document. The Master Plan will be a graphic-rich, user-friendly document that describes how the community desires to move forward. As requested, the draft plan will be issued in a series of documents – the first at a 50% completion that will be a framework version with options identified for discussion. Following input at a meeting with the Planning Board, we will continue and develop a 75% (or more) complete version. While the RFP states a 75% draft, our experience with dozens of Master Plans that follow Michigan’s adoption requirements suggests that this should instead be a 90% draft that can be endorsed to begin the Official Public Review Period.

It is anticipated the document will include the following chapters.

1. A separate one-page summary brochure with infographics on key goals and recommendations
2. Introduction – the Role of the Master Plan
   - A summary of the community engagement process
   - Acknowledgement of Current Plans and how they are integrated
   - A brief community profile that includes info-graphics and background information on trends that influence the future
3. A review of the existing land use, including its form, for the districts and neighborhoods
4. A neighborhood typology (simple pattern book) to guide development in the neighborhoods
5. The Multi-Modal Transportation Plan, with an updated Map, and description of additional “best practice” design concepts based on NACTO, ITE and other publications
   - General infrastructure assessment including construction protocols
6. A Zoning Plan that compares future land use categories to zoning, and identifies potential zoning ordinance amendments to support Plan recommendations
7. A draft Implementation Section including recommendations for Policies, Programs, Capital Improvements, Regulations and other Topics (priorities and benchmarking/monitoring procedures to be agreed upon in the next Phase)
8. Technical appendices including the parking assessments

Meetings:
- 2 with City staff (one is Optional)
- 2 with the Planning Board
- 1 with the Multi-Modal Board (covered by our separate contract)
A briefing for the City Commission on the 50% draft for input (by city staff, Optional for MKSK)
- 1 Meeting with the City Commission (preferably a joint meeting with the Planning Board)

Deliverables:
- Meeting materials including a briefing presentation for city staff to use with the City Community
- Draft one-page summary
- 1 reproducible PDF and 20 hard copies of a 50% draft plan
- 1 reproducible PDF and 20 hard copies of a 75-90% draft plan (the Public Hearing Draft)
PHASE 6: PRESENTATION & ADOPTION
MONTHS 12-16

Once the Proposed Draft Plan is approved for public review, MKSK will work with City Staff to schedule a series of events to review the draft Master Plan with city officials, agencies, stakeholders and the public. For public review, in addition to comments received during the review process and the required public hearing, we recommend a Public Open House. Summaries of the Master Plan would be displayed and participants will be able to provide input on priorities or elements they feel are missing. This would be an informal, less intimidating opportunity for people to review the draft plan. It also allows discussions with City staff, the consultants and officials who volunteer to assist.

As comments are received on the draft during the review period, we will work in conjunction with city staff to prepare and update a matrix that summarizes suggested changes to the draft Master Plan. This document will note the request, relevant page, and a suggested response. This will be developed in conjunction with city staff, to be used at discussions with the Planning Board and City Commission. Our review and adoption process includes the meetings listed below.

Meetings:
- 2 with City staff
- 1 with the Planning Board to set priorities for the Action Plan (Optional, could be done by City staff)
- 1 with the Planning Board to review and recommend the City Commission initiate the Official Public Review Period (Optional, could be led by City staff)
- 1 with the City Commission to approve distribution of the draft and the commencement of the Official Public Review Period (our team will join City staff if needed)
- 1 day of focus group meetings to present the draft to the same groups involved earlier
- 1 informal public open house on the draft plan and priorities held the same day as the focus groups
- A public hearing conducted by the Planning Board at the conclusion of the 63-day Review Period
- 1 Additional Meeting with the Planning Board (if needed) to review revisions made based on discussion at the public hearing
- 1 Adoption meeting with the City Commission

Deliverables:
- Information to update the City’s project website
- Materials for meetings described above
- A matrix that summarizes suggested changes to the draft Master Plan identified during the public open house and review period.
- A final one-page Master Plan summary
- 1 reproducible PDF and 20 hard copies of the adopted Master Plan including a web-ready version
TIME FRAME
### PHASE 1. PROJECT LAUNCH
**COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN DEVELOPMENT**
- Kickoff meeting with City staff
- Kickoff meeting with the Planning Board
- Project start-up briefings with the Multi-Modal Board and City Commission
- Possible second meeting with city staff to agree on any refinements to the Work Plan and Schedule
- Initiation of community engagement including a page on the City’s website, calendar of events, lists of key stakeholders to invite to focus group meetings

### PHASE 2. DISCOVERY
**DATA COLLECTION & ANALYSIS, INCLUDING PARKING & INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS**
- Review of Past Plans
- Prepare a Community Profile – Existing Situation & Trends
- Exiting Land Use & Focus Areas
- Transportation & Parking Related Data
- Community Tour Audit

### PHASE 3. VISIONING
**LAND USE DESIGN & PARKING**
- Facilitation of a two-day session of information gathering & listening workshops
- Interviews with key developers, property owners, representatives of neighborhoods, and others identified by the City
- Community input meetings
- Emerging themes and directions to explore for each of the areas of the city: Downtown, the Triangle, the Rail District, and South Woodward
- Discussion of initial placemaking, land use, development, and transportation concepts

### PHASE 4. EXPLORATION
**LAND USE DESIGN & PARKING**
- 4-day workshop to develop concepts and to share with the community and elicit input and feedback
- Development of a parking analysis and a comprehensive set of recommendations, including a review of the parking requirements in the zoning ordinance
- Identification of supply-based solutions, including shared parking strategies, management opportunities, curbside and off-street regulations
- Review of Downtown Parking Study findings

### PHASE 5. PREPARATION OF DRAFT PLAN
**TIME FRAME**

- Preparation of draft document to deliver a 50% completion and a 90% completion to the Planning Board

### PHASE 6. PRESENTATION & ADOPTION
**TIME FRAME**

- Review the draft Master Plan with city officials, agencies, stakeholders and the public
- Preparation of a matrix that summarizes suggested changes to the draft Master Plan
- Delivery of the adopted Master Plan including a web-ready version

---

**COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELIVERABLES</th>
<th>MEETINGS</th>
<th>MONTHS 1-2</th>
<th>MONTHS 2-4</th>
<th>MONTHS 3-5</th>
<th>MONTHS 6-8</th>
<th>MONTHS 9-12</th>
<th>MONTHS 13-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials for those meetings including summaries of discussions</td>
<td>2 with City staff (1 is Optional)</td>
<td>1 with City staff</td>
<td>1 with the Planning Board</td>
<td>1 with the Planning Board</td>
<td>1 with City staff (Optional)</td>
<td>2 with City staff</td>
<td>2 with City staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Draft Notice of Intent to Proceed with a Master Plan update to be refined and distributed by the City</td>
<td>1 with the Planning Board</td>
<td>1 with the Planning Board (Optional or could be done by City staff)</td>
<td>1 Briefing with the City Commission</td>
<td>4-day charrette including a series of meetings and events as described</td>
<td>2 with City staff</td>
<td>1 with the Planning Board</td>
<td>1 with the Planning Board (Official Public Review Period Optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Community Engagement Plan and calendar of events</td>
<td>1 briefing for the Multi-Modal Board at our regular meeting (not charged to the Master Plan)</td>
<td>1 Briefing with the City Commission</td>
<td>A two-day session of interviews, focus groups, and a community event</td>
<td>Nelson/Nygaard to attend 1 of the scheduled meetings with City staff</td>
<td>2 with the Planning Board</td>
<td>1 with the Multi-Modal Board (covered by our separate contract)</td>
<td>(with the City Commission (Commission of the Official Public Review Period - team will join City staff if needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nelson/Nygaard will be involved in two of the charrette days including a public event</td>
<td>A briefing for the City Commission on the 50% draft for input by city staff, Optional for MKSK</td>
<td>1 day of focus group meetings</td>
<td>A public hearing conducted by the Planning Board at the conclusion of the 63- day Review Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An Optional meeting with the Planning Board or the Parking Committee or Ad Hoc Parking Committee (or joint meeting)</td>
<td>1 Meeting with the City Commission (preferably a joint meeting with the Planning Board)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(with the Planning Board (if needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Adoption meeting with the City Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREP TASKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kickoff meeting with City staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kickoff meeting with the Planning Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project start-up briefings with the Multi-Modal Board and City Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible second meeting with city staff to agree on any refinements to the Work Plan and Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative of community engagement including a page on the City’s website, calendar of events, lists of key stakeholders to invite to focus group meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENTS
ATTACHMENT B - BIDDER’S AGREEMENT
FOR MASTER PLAN UPDATE

In submitting this proposal, as herein described, the Contractor agrees that:

1. They have carefully examined the specifications, terms and Agreement of the Request for Proposal and all other provisions of this document and understand the meaning, intent, and requirement of it.

2. They will enter into a written contract and furnish the item or items in the time specified in conformance with the specifications and conditions contained therein for the price quoted by the proponent on this proposal.

Chris Hermann 5/31/2018

PREPARED BY DATE
(Print Name) 5/31/2018
AICP, Principal

TITLE DATE

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE E-MAIL ADDRESS
chermann@mkskstudios.com

COMPANY
MSK2, LLC (dba MKSK)

ADDRESS PHONE
4219 Woodward Avenue, Suite 305, Detroit, MI 48201 614.686.0128

NAME OF PARENT COMPANY PHONE

ADDRESS
In order for the bid to be considered valid, this form must be completed in its entirety. The cost for the Scope of Work as stated in the Request for Proposal documents shall be itemized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Elements</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Updated Data Collection and Analysis</td>
<td>$30,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Infrastructure Analysis</td>
<td>$33,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parking Analysis</td>
<td>$35,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attendance at Meetings</td>
<td>$34,600.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Plan Preparation</td>
<td>$29,800.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Finalization and Adoption</td>
<td>$23,000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL AMOUNT**

$289,900.

**Additional Meeting Charge**

$900. per meeting

**Additional Services Recommended (if any):**

Additional Services will be billed hourly at Standard Rates, plus Expenses. Additional Services will be scoped with an estimate provided to the City for approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Name</th>
<th>MSK2, LLC (dba MKSK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorized signature</td>
<td>Chris Hermann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>5/31/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pursuant to Michigan Law and the Iran Economic Sanction Act, 2012 PA 517 ("Act"), prior to the City accepting any bid or proposal, or entering into any contract for goods or services with any prospective Vendor, the Vendor must certify that it is not an “Iran Linked Business”, as defined by the Act.

By completing this form, the Vendor certifies that it is not an “Iran Linked Business”, as defined by the Act and is in full compliance with all provisions of the Act and is legally eligible to submit a bid for consideration by the City.

Chris Hermann 5/31/2018
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May 25th, 2018

City of Birmingham
151 Martin Street
Birmingham MI 48012-3001
Tel: 248 530 1841

FAO: Ms Jana L. Ecker
Planning Director

Dear Ms. Ecker,

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)
CITY OF BIRMINGHAM MASTER PLAN UPDATE

DPZ Partners, LLC (DPZ, DPZ CoDESIGN) are pleased to submit to the City of Birmingham our proposal for providing the above captioned services.

We look forward to assisting the City with its planning, urban design, and development efforts, towards reinforcing the City of Birmingham as a unique, lively, well-connected community; a great place to live, work, visit, and recreate; an important focus of community pride; a model of sustainable growth; and an economic success.

As you may already know, DPZ and its selected sub consultants, Mckenna, Gibbs Planning Group, and Jacobs offer renowned expertise and prowess in the best and latest practices in land use, planning, urban design, and coding; infrastructure planning and engineering; traffic and parking analysis; economic development and market demand analysis; and community engagement for sustainable cities and downtowns. We have the capacity and capability to undertake and complete the contemplated scope in a timely, cost-efficient manner, as demonstrated by the emergent success of our many prior master plans and infrastructure studies. Last but not least, DPZ and its sub consultants have worked for and within the City of Birmingham previously and is highly familiar with the issues at hand. We are excited about the prospect of collaborating with the City again and are committed to providing you with the highest quality of work.

If required, we are willing and able to discuss our proposal with you in greater detail as the procurement process moves forward. Please feel free to contact me at 305 644 1023 x 1012 or at senen@dpz.com for any questions or requests for additional information.

Sincerely,

Senen M. A. Antonio
Partner
DPZ CoDESIGN, LLC
305 644 1023 x 1012
senen@dpz.com
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B. OUTLINE OF QUALIFICATIONS
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Introduction

The DPZ team represents a set of balanced abilities matched to the various aspects of the multi-task scope of this proposal. The professionals identified are deeply experienced in drafting and implementing plans and policies that incorporate Traditional Neighborhood Design principles, together with evidence-based and practical knowledge. They are experts in balancing the economic, social, infrastructural, and sustainability needs of the community and through their local experience well versed in the issues at hand.

The Organizational Chart below illustrates the team’s structure, including key personnel and sub consultants. Team members and sub-consultants will be assigned to accomplish the project task in the most effective manner. DPZ shall be responsible for the preparation of draft and final documents, project coordination, and managing and overseeing the quality of input from sub consultants.
B. OUTLINE OF QUALIFICATIONS - OVERVIEW

Lead Consultant

**DPZ CoDESIGN** will lead the project team under the guidance of Partner Matt Lambert and Founding Partner Andres Duany. Matt is well versed in preparing master plans, land use zoning, and form-based codes including Orange County, FL, Reinvent Phoenix AZ, Windward Pointe Mi, City of Pontiac Mi, and numerous other planning efforts in the United States and abroad. Matt also serves on the board of the CNU Form-Based Codes Institute. Working alongside Matt will be Andres Duany who has extensive experience in preparing plans, guidelines and codes, as well as with politically sensitive planning undertakings. He will provide project direction and oversight. Andres was part of the team that prepared Downtown Birmingham 2016 Plan and recently was invited back to the City to undertake an assessment of the plan’s implementation and make recommendations.

Additional support is provided by senior planners / designers Senen Antonio, Judith Bell, and Mike Huston who are also focused on master planning, form-based codes, municipal projects, and sustainable initiatives.

Sub-consultants

**Gibbs Planning Group (GPG)** are the authority on retail design and regulations in the Traditional Neighborhood Development context. Robert J. Gibbs has completed hundreds of charrettes and workshops and is an expert at preparing proposals for retail and mixed use development and is also a licensed landscape architect. A frequent consultant/advisor for DPZ, including the Birmingham 2016 Plan and recent plan assessment, Roberts wrote the award-winning Principles of Urban Retail Planning and Development. Based in Michigan, the GPG team includes the experienced Andrew Littman, as Research Director and David Magnum, a Planner and Designer. They will lead the demographic, commercial and residential trends analysis, as well as landscape matters.

**Jacobs** are one of the world’s largest and most diverse providers of professional and technical services, including all aspects of community planning and zoning. Adam James and John Wirtz are experts in multi-model transportation and parking analysis and have carried out studies throughout the United States. They are considered to be leaders within their industries, driving innovation towards real-world solutions, drawn from global expertise and local knowledge. Their approach builds strong partnerships with the client and within the team and ensures a thorough analysis and effective solutions.

**Mckenna**s multidisciplinary team places importance on understanding and incorporating the bigger picture into communities at every level. The locally based team, led by John Jackson and Sarah Traxler, have extensive experience in community engagement projects that have helped create consensus and a vision by providing residents with the opportunity to directly impact the physical, social, and economic future of their community. Mckenna has worked on a number of planning and urban design projects for the City of Birmingham, including the Birmingham 2016 Plan and more recently the Parks & Recreation Master Plan. They also prepared the Sustainable Rochester Plan where their approach to sustainability was sensitive to history, size, scale, population, demographics, and diversity of people and place.

---

### REQUIRED SKILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIRED SKILLS</th>
<th>DPZ CoDESIGN</th>
<th>Mckenna</th>
<th>Jacobs</th>
<th>GPG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Management/Coordination</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban design</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal transportation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban planning</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning and form-based code</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical design</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape architecture</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation engineering</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking expertise</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCI certification and/or training</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis and trends</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L Lead ● Contributor
DPZ Firm Profile

DPZ CoDESIGN (DPZ Partners, LLC, DPZ) is a leader in form-based planning, urban design, coding, and architecture, with over 350 projects for new and existing communities in the U.S. and internationally. DPZ’s contributions to planning, design, and regulations have been widely recognized for their excellence and influence on the making of walkable urbanism, complete neighborhoods, and resilient communities – including multiple efforts within the State of Michigan as well as in the surrounding region.

DPZ was founded in 1980 with its main office in Miami, FL, with satellite offices in Gaithersburg, MD and Portland, OR, as well as affiliates in Europe, Asia, and Latin America. A tightly-knit company of 33, DPZ operates as a protean organization; DPZ collaborates with others, retaining the flexibility of a small office, while providing the capacity and expertise of a larger multi-disciplinary firm. DPZ Partners and staff play key roles in the Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU), whose Charter encapsulates the firm's philosophy. DPZ staff are skilled in managing the public process of design, including the deployment of the Charrette, a concentrated working session that assembles professionals and decision-makers to produce informed plans and implementable solutions.

DPZ is distinguished from other firms by its:

- volume of built and implemented work – at the regional, local, lot, block, and building scales – and the lessons learned from these projects;
- ongoing pursuit of innovative solutions, early adoption of technology (including but limited to AutoCAD, GIS, Photoshop, InDesign, SketchUp, etc.), and creation of new planning and design techniques;
- public process, including the DPZ Charrette and rapid prototyping;
- business efficiency, as a small firm that collaborates with others; and
- Partners' renown in the field.

DPZ is the recognized leader in Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) design and our many built examples of authentic TNDs have been used as models throughout the industry to effect change in planning, regulatory, development, marketing, and financing practices in the United States and around the world.

The firm is an active proponent in the movement to replace suburban sprawl with a return to neighborhood-based planning. Its Founding Partners, Andres Duany and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, are founding members of the CNU, a non-profit organization established with the goal of reforming the built environment. The term New Urbanism, was a conscious invention to bring attention to the crisis of ad hoc suburban development and to propose a less wasteful alternative to sprawl.

The basic principles behind the movement are universal. They promote the creation of real communities with pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods, mixed uses and streets shaped by buildings and landscape. The movement, initially called “neo-traditional” planning, has grown to broad application and acceptance, its principles extending to a wide range of development contexts, densities and design. The principles project an ideal of a sustainable quality of life that competes with the
prevalent suburban dream, and also provide a conceptual framework for contemporary development. At the neighborhood level the New Urbanism promotes such compact, mixed-use, mixed-income, pedestrian-friendly increments of community building.

**Sustainable Planning, Design, and Development**

DPZ has long incorporated in its work green development and building practices. In the 1980s, Seaside was designed with light infrastructure, innovative stormwater management techniques, hurricane-resilient construction methods, preserving existing terrain and dunes, and adopting a code-mandated xeriscape. Seaside initiated a "common sense" green approach, which has evolved with subsequent DPZ projects such as Kentlands, Maryland and Middleton Hills, Wisconsin.

A second generation of more comprehensively environmental projects includes regional plans such as those for Northwest Hillsborough County, Florida and Onondaga County, New York; and urban expansions such as Cornell, Ontario, Canada; and redevelopment/retrofit efforts such as Liberty Harbor North, New Jersey and Legacy Town Center, Texas. The proposals for these plans/studies involved more ambitious interventions and mitigation strategies.

The third and current generation of environmental plans include projects offering advanced environmental technologies developed from empirical review of the performance of previous project-generations; these latest include Alys Beach and Sky, Florida; Tornagrain, Scotland; Schooner Bay, the Bahamas; and East Fraserlands and Southlands, Canada, among others. These projects incorporate innovative concepts such as Light Imprint New Urbanism; off-grid development; urban agriculture; and zero energy/waste/stormwater impacts.

The ultimate goal of DPZ projects is to create benevolent urbanism in the form of cities and downtowns, towns and villages, which encourage walking, diversity and complexity. Safe and pedestrian-friendly streets encourage people to walk and interact with the built and natural surroundings. A well-designed public realm, including the “third places” (after home and work), facilitate the creation of social networks and affiliations, in contrast with the alienation propagated by suburban development.

Recent studies correlate the impact of physical environment on human health and well-being; sprawl has been blamed for the erosion of relationships within society and community. The objective for each of DPZ’s projects is to create places that weave a fabric of traditional urbanism to generate the physical framework for a fulfilling human existence. DPZ’s built projects show that, given the choice, people enjoy living in sustainable communities. People seek out our neighborhoods instead of suburban enclaves, to be environmentally responsible, but also because they promote individual well-being within community.

The New Urban principles for planning and urban design underpinning DPZ’s work align with many of the energy and environmental strategies advocated by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC). DPZ’s projects employ sustainable development strategies, including but not limited to, increased development densities; redevelopment and infill; transit oriented development and walkable communities; and the integration of development with open space frameworks.

These are all principles embodied in the USGBC’s Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System. DPZ participated in the de-
development and fine-tuning of the LEED standards for Neighborhood Development (LEED-ND), the first national standard for environmentally sustainable neighborhood design and master planning. In addition, DPZ has also developed the Light Imprint (LI) initiative, a comprehensive development approach for sustainable civil engineering practices calibrated across the rural to urban Transect (see the description following).

**The Transect, Form-Based Design, and Form-Based Coding**

A significant aspect of DPZ’s work is its innovative planning regulations which accompany each design. Tailored to the individual project, the codes, standards and regulations address the manner in which buildings are formed and located to ensure that they create useful and distinctive public spaces. Both broad-based (such as the DPZ’s various form-based codes) and project-specific (such as DPZ’s Urban and Architectural Regulations), these codes are provided to make projects more successful and to ease their implementation.

DPZ pioneered form-based planning, design, and coding, beginning with the very first modern form-based code – for Seaside, Florida – and including the development of the aforementioned SmartCode, which have been adopted by municipalities and developers across the United States and internationally.

Appropriate design of public space such as streets and their interface with private building ensures the comfort and safety of the pedestrian. The varying degrees of density and their corresponding built forms are governed by the Transect - an organizational concept developed by DPZ that proposes detailing (lot sizes, road widths, building form and function, etc.) according to each development’s classification within a continuum from rural to urban context.

A transect of nature is a geographical cross-section of a region that reveals the sequence of environments. It examines the many symbiotic elements that contribute to habitats where certain plants and animals thrive. The transect was first used for biogeographical analysis by naturalist Alexander von Humboldt in the late 18th Century. In the late 20th century, Andres Duany, working with New Urbanist colleagues, identified the rural-to-urban Transect of the built environment, ranging across densities from unbuilt preserve land to the dense urban core.

Human beings thrive in a variety of habitats: some would never choose to live in the urban core and others would wither in a rural place. To provide meaningful choices in living arrangements, the rural-to-urban Transect is divided into six T-zones for use in zoning ordinances. These six habitats vary by the ratio and level of intensity of their natural, built, and social components. The T-zones are coordinated to all scales of planning, from the region, through the community and neighborhood, to
"Third places" in traditional neighborhoods are important elements, such as the central basin, canals, and waterfront promenades in DPZ’s master plan for DownCity Providence, Rhode Island (top left); an active Shain Square, City of Birmingham, discussed during DPZ’s recent review of the Birmingham 2016 Plan (middle left); or a more intimate square at DPZ’s Mashpee Commons (top right). Meanwhile, sustainability strategies are creatively integrated at all scales of planning and design, such as introducing a canal network as a stormwater management tool as well as a public space and community amenity for New Town at St. Charles, Missouri (middle right). Last but not least, sustainability also extends to the use of contextual architectural forms and materials to create meaningful, enduring places, as evidenced in the results from DPZ’s master plan for Norton Commons, Kentucky (bottom left), and the successful implementation of DPZ’s Birmingham 2016 Plan, Michigan (bottom right).
the individual lot and building. The platform of the Transect allows the integration of the design protocols of traffic engineering, public works, town planning, architecture, landscape architecture and ecology. This is the foundation of form-based planning, design, and coding.

DPZ is closely affiliated with the Form-Based Codes Institute (FBCI). Founding Partner Andres Duany is an FBCI Emeritus Board Member and an Instructor. Similarly, Duany, along with DPZ Partners Galina Tachieva, Marina Khoury, and Matthew Lambert are members of the Transect Codes Council, the advisory board to the Center for Applied Transect Studies (CATS).

Relevant Initiatives and Publications

As a progressive, cutting-edge think tank, the firm’s most recognized initiatives, publications, and contributions include, but are not limited to:

Suburban Nation: The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream, the New Urbanism/Smart Growth “bible,” which examines, and offers solutions to, the failures of postwar planning.

The Smart Growth Manual, a handbook of best practices describing and illustrating planning goals and techniques of implementation. With their landmark book Suburban Nation, Andres Duany and Jeff Speck “set forth more clearly than anyone has done in our time the elements of good town planning” (The New Yorker). With this long-awaited companion volume, the authors have organized the latest contributions of new urbanism, green design, and healthy communities into a comprehensive handbook, fully illustrated with the built work of the nation’s leading practitioners. This manual is designed as a quick reference guide, readily accessible as a talking tool to facilitate meetings. Though only recently released, the manual has quickly become a staple item for charrettes, public fora, and other discussions.

Form-Based Development Standards and Guidelines and the SmartCode, an open-source model form-based code. The SmartCode is a model design and development code, as well as the only unified transect-based code available for all scales of planning, from the region to the community to the block and building. As a form-based code, it keeps towns compact and rural lands open, while reforming the destructive sprawl-producing patterns of separated-use zoning.

As an integrated land development ordinance, the SmartCode folds zoning, subdivision regulations, urban design, public works standards and basic architectural controls into one compact document. It is also a unified ordinance, spanning the regional, community, and building scales. The SmartCode also enables the implementation of a community’s vision by coding the specific outcomes desired in particular places. It allows for distinctly different approaches in different areas within the community, unlike a one-size-fits-all conventional code.

The SmartCode is designed to support walkable and mixed-use neighborhoods, transportation options, conservation of open lands, local character, housing diversity, and vibrant downtowns. Because the SmartCode is presented in primarily graphic form, it is increasingly known as a user friendly and transparent alternative to conventional zoning codes, which often confuse the layperson and expert alike. Today, the SmartCode is being used and adopted in a growing number of communities across the United States.
Sprawl Repair Manual, a compendium of techniques and processes for addressing the suburban condition. The Sprawl Repair Manual offers comprehensive guidance for transforming fragmented, isolated and car-dependent development into “complete communities”. Polemical as well as practical, the manual is designed to equip readers - from professional planners, designers and developers to regulators and concerned citizens - with strategies drawn from two decades of successful repair projects. In contrast to sprawl - characterized by an abundance of congested highways, strip development and gated cul-de-sac subdivisions - complete communities are diverse in terms of uses, transportation options and population. They are walkable, with most daily needs close by.

There is a wealth of research and literature explaining the origins and problems of suburban sprawl, as well as the urgent need to repair it. However, the Sprawl Repair Manual is the first book to provide a step-by-step design, regulatory and implementation process. From the scale of the region to the building - turning subdivisions into walkable neighborhoods, shopping centers and malls into town centers and more - today’s sprawl can be saved.

Lifelong Communities: Metropolitan planning organizations are increasingly challenged by the live, work, transport and healthcare challenges of their aging populations. The negative impacts of sprawling development patterns fall disproportionately hard on seniors who wish to remain in their homes as they age.

Consider the market segments labeled “Baby Boomers” (born 1946-1964) and “Millennials” (born 1977-1996) comprise the two largest global generations. Both generations are entering life stages where urban living within pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use, sustainable, light imprint environments, from village center to a reviving downtown core, is increasingly attractive. From a public sector perspective, both age groups can be much more effectively supported when they reside in the healthy and socially supportive context of a vibrant pedestrian oriented neighborhood.

This type of convergence of intergenerational need and opportunity is unprecedented. It is within this framework that DPZ, working with organizations such as the AARP and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, has created age inclusive community models to integrate the interdepartmental age-related concerns of health service delivery, transportation, workforce development and land use planning. Lifelong Communities proactively steers outward sprawl inward towards existing urban and suburban locations adjacent to urban centers, and in doing so, produces healthy and socially engaging communities for people of all ages and abilities. As part of this initiative, DPZ has developed concise and practical guidelines/criteria that help local elected and planning officials evaluate the qualities of specific developments as they come forward for review.

Light Imprint New Urbanism, a comprehensive development approach for the sensitive placement of development via coordinated sustainable engineering practices and New Urbanist design techniques, calibrated across the Transect. Light Imprint planning/engineering techniques balance environmental considerations with design objectives such as connectivity and a well-defined public realm.

While New Urbanist planning, by definition, respects terrain, geographical conditions, topography and public space, Light Imprint provides a toolkit for stormwater management using natural drainage, traditional engineering infrastructure and filtration practices, employed collectively at the scales of the sector, the neighborhood and the block. This toolkit offers a set of context-sensitive design solutions that generate a range of environmental benefits combined with an aesthetic approach to green infrastructure, while significantly lowering construction and engineering costs.
Lean Urbanism is an initiative advocating small-scale, incremental community-building that requires fewer resources to incubate and mature. It seeks to lower the barriers to community-building, to make it easier to start businesses, and to provide more attainable housing and development, "making Small Possible". It is open-access, allowing more people to participate in the building of their homes, businesses, and communities. It is open-source, creating tools and techniques for all to use, and is open-ended, focusing on incremental and ongoing improvement.

The Project for Lean Urbanism will restore common sense to the processes of development, building, starting small businesses, community engagement, and acquiring the necessary skills. It includes the development of tools so that community-building takes less time, reduces the resources required for compliance, and frustrates fewer well-intentioned entrepreneurs, by providing ways to work around onerous financial, bureaucratic, and regulatory processes. The tools will be made freely available to governments and organizations seeking to get things done, to entrepreneurs without the knowhow to overcome hurdles, and to small builders or homeowners who could build well in an economical, low-tech way.

Meaningful Stakeholder Engagement

The Charrette approach is the method of planning which DPZ has adopted and developed in our traditional planning practice. A charrette is typically a 7- to 9-day series of meetings, presentations and sessions, during which a design team generates a comprehensive planning and development strategy while soliciting the input of key project decision-makers. Designers and stakeholders gather as a group, typically in a single space on the site of the project, to study, develop, review, and revise proposals in a concentrated period of time.

A primary feature of Charrettes is that they are specifically organized to encourage the participation of all parties who are interested in the project, whether they represent the interests of the regulators, the developers or community stakeholders. The exact level of stakeholder/community engagement shall be determined in close coordination with the client project team; it is preferable that the Charrette be held on or close to the project area, to facilitate the intensive interaction among the DPZ team and the client team, local leadership, and other decision-makers over the duration of the workshop.

A typical DPZ Charrette
The DPZ team sets up a design studio, typically in the neighborhood, and leads a collaborative design process intended to incorporate the contributions of the client project team, and, as appropriate, municipal agencies and leaders, community stakeholders, and other consultants, with the design team committed to the project entirely over the course of the workshop. Through a sequence of meetings, design sessions and presentations, the proposals unfold in real time response to decisions made by the client team, other decision-makers/stakeholders, and the DPZ team.

Charrettes provide a forum for ideas, offer immediate feedback to the planners/designers and give mutual authorship to the Plan by all those who participate. The Charrettes that DPZ orchestrates accomplish the following goals:

1. all those influential to the project develop a vested interest in the design and the shared experience of the Charrette builds broad support for its vision;

2. the various design disciplines work in concert to produce a set of finished documents that address all aspects of design;

3. inputs of all the players are collectively organized at one meeting and thereby eliminates the need for prolonged, sequential discussions that can delay conventional planning projects and lose the momentum of constituents; and

4. a better final product is created through the assimilation of many ideas in a dynamic, collaborative and cost effective process.

DPZ has conducted over 300 such Charrettes with various clients in both the private and public sectors, and is adept at marshalling all the technical information that goes into the design of sustainable streets, neighborhoods and communities, while respecting and incorporating the local planning and cultural context, as well as managing the local development politics.
Specifically, the Charrette scope of services includes:

- **An opening lecture on the first night of the Charrette.** This lecture can be delivered to the immediate participants only, or (as is frequently done) it can be highly publicized and used as the first marketing event for the project.

- **Leadership of the DPZ design team.** DPZ assembles and manages a multi-disciplinary team to prepare all of the graphic planning documents and provide technical information as required. We are typically responsible for paying the sub-consultants that we bring for their time spent at the Charrette. Other sub-consultants that the client brings to the charrette shall be compensated by the client. Should additional reports or studies be required, these can be contracted directly with the pertinent sub-consultant.

- **Organization and coordination of all Charrette meetings and presentations.** The client and DPZ shall coordinate to arrange the necessary meetings with all appropriate decision-making groups, agencies and offices and/or approval bodies. With the DPZ Partner/Director and Project Manager leading the sessions, the charrette participants prepare broad development schemes leading to the recommended development option. The design team’s proposals and strategies are tested with the client project team and other decision-makers over the course of the Charrette, so it is impossible to take an unacceptable scheme too far.

- **A final presentation on the last night of the Charrette.** As with the opening lecture, the media exposure and size of this event is up to the client. The presentation of the plans shapes the perception of the project. All of the work produced during the Charrette is presented and explained at this time.

- **Completion and refinement of the deliverables following the charrette.** We anticipate that minor refinements may need to be made to the documents after the Charrette. Often, new information becomes available that may affect the work. Our fee includes a full generation of post-Charrette revisions to the planning documents, if requested.

The team produces concept alternatives beginning on day one, quickly moving forward to the preferred planning proposals, vetted by the client project team and completed by the end of the charrette, with alternatives feasibility testing; feedback loops with the client and other decision-makers; and planning/design revision inbetween – all within a finite, sequential number of days.

The Charrette is aimed at bringing the stakeholders (i.e. the client team and other participants) into the decision-making-with-design process in real time; as such, most deliverables are integrated and/or correlated. DPZ would seek to have all decision-makers, experts representing the multiple disciplines to be integrated (market/economics, traffic, parks/open space/environment, civil), builders, developers, and if required/requested, public officials and community members, participate and have them decide on the planning proposals as the team presents the various plan alternatives and instantaneously responds to requested changes. The main refinements are actually done at the Charrette in the presence of the decision-makers and with the entire design and planning team intact, through the repeated feedback loops – this is why DPZ’s Charrettes are slightly longer, but highly more effective, than most, and why we typically undertake a single, intensive workshop effort.

More information on DPZ Charrettes – including links to videos of past DPZ Charrettes – is available at http://www.dpz.com/Charrettes/About
B. OUTLINE OF QUALIFICATIONS - DPZ

Selected Awards

2018
• Congress for the New Urbanism Charter Award, Village of Providence, Huntsville, AL
2017
• NAHB Best in American Living Awards (BALA) Hall of Fame Inductee: Andres Duany
2016
• Congress for the New Urbanism Merit Award, East End Transformation, Richmond, VA
2015
• Inaugural Transect Codes Council (TCC) Innovation Award Winner, Saratoga Springs, UT
2014
• Global Human Settlements Award in Planning and Design; Global Forum on Human Settlements, for Miami 21
2013
• Congress for the New Urbanism Charter Award, Honorable Mention, The Scottish Sustainable Communities Initiative Charrette Series Report, Scotland, UK
2012
• John Nolen Medal; Congress for the New Urbanism Florida Chapter
2011
• National Planning Excellence Award for Best Practice for Miami 21, Miami, FL - American Planning Association (APA)
2010
• Charter Award for Southlands: Agricultural Urbanism, Tsawwassen, Canada: Congress for the New Urbanism
• Charter Award for Lifelong Communities, Atlanta, Georgia: Congress for the New Urbanism
• Richard H. Driehaus Charitable Lead Trust Form-Based Code Award to DPZ, for Miami 21, Miami, FL
2009
• Charter Award for the Hertfordshire Guide to Growth - 2021, UK: Congress for the New Urbanism
• Charter Award for the SmartCode: Congress for the New Urbanism
2008
• Richard H. Driehaus Prize for Classical Architecture to Andres Duany and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk
2007
• Neighborhood Planning Excellence Award for East Fraserlands, Vancouver, Canada: Canadian Institute of Planners
2006
• Civitas: Traditional Urbanism in Contemporary Practice, The National Building Museum, Washington, DC
2005
• BALA Platinum Award for Outstanding Community Design for Habersham, Beaufort, SC
2004
• Charter Award for NW Hillsborough County, FL: Congress for the New Urbanism
2003
• Award for Excellence to the Town of Seaside: Urban Land Institute

Other awards for DPZ may be viewed at http://www.dpz.com/Media/Awards

Press

DPZ has been featured in national and international media such as NBC News, ABC News, Time, Newsweek, The New York Times, Washington Post, The Scotsman, The Guardian, and a number of professional publications. A sampling of the firm’s various mentions in the press may be viewed at http://www.dpz.com/Media/Press.
Work Load, Availability, and Capacity

DPZ has sufficient capacity to perform the work as contemplated in the RFP, and are committed to the City of Birmingham in providing quality master planning and design services under the anticipated contract. Our confidence in this regard stems from our experience with other similar projects and from an office methodology which is geared to providing a responsive level of service to a limited client base. We have chosen to remain a small office in order to maintain complete control over quality of our work and to be able to respond promptly and thoroughly to client requests and project issues. We consistently receive more offers of employment that our firm can handle, and we have responded by selecting only those projects that best exemplify our professional objectives. DPZ has built an extensive network of consultants that can be utilized when required and that share our philosophy and approach. This is the case for this proposal where the team of consultants complement DPZ’s national expertise by providing the best blend of professional skills and local knowledge.

We only respond to RFQs/Ps when we believe that there exists and opportunity for us to make a significant contribution. When we are selected to work on a specific project, we dedicate the majority of our resources to that project in anticipation of finishing it quickly. Most of the significant work is progressed during the Charrette process, which – as described in the previous section – is a significant factor in the timely provision of our services.
Matthew Lambert, CNU - Partner and Project Manager

Matthew Lambert is an architectural and urban designer and planner with more than a decade of experience that covers a broad range of project types, from multi-county regional plans, to new community and redevelopment plans and regulations, to affordable and modular housing design. Since he joined DPZ in 2000, he has managed projects for campus master plans and hospital strategic master plans (including program distribution); form-based codes; resort towns; new towns and urban infill; and disaster recovery plans, throughout the U.S. He has worked with communities in the Caribbean, Europe and the Middle East.

Lambert is active in the Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU); he is an early leader of the CNU Next-Gen. As a member of the Transect Codes Council, he is contributing to the evolution of the Smart Code. He contributes to Form-based Code education by co-organizing and lecturing at CNU 202 education sessions. He served as DPZ's Project Manager for our work with Hendrix College, among other various campus master planning efforts.

Selected Projects

- Windward Pointe, MI Master Plan
- City of Pontiac, MI - CNU Legacy Charrette, Downtown Revitalization Master Plan
- City of Bay City, MI
- Hot Springs Village, AR Master Plan
- Central Avenue TOD Plan, Albuquerque, NM
- Tigard Lean Code, Tigard, OR
- Doña Ana County Comprehensive Plan, NM
- Reinvent Phoenix TOD Form Based Codes and Master Plans, AZ
- Vista Field Airport Redevelopment Plan, Kennewick, WA
- Albuquerque, NM - Economic Development-based Infill and Zoning Analysis with Zoning Update Recommendations
- Doña Ana County, NM - Regional Scenario Planning and Comprehensive Plan
- Downtown Mobile, AL - Downtown Master Plan and Form-based Code
- Hendrix College/The Village at Hendrix, Conway, AK - Campus & College Town Master Plan
- Palmer Trinity School Master Plan, Miami, FL Campus Master Plan
- Edinburgh Garden District, Edinburgh, Scotland - Greenfield New Town/Airport and Rail TOD Buckeye Lake, OH
- Green Tree Master Plan and Code, Vacaville, CA
- Little Rock Towers, Little Rock, AR
- Project Trek, Philippines
- Ignite High Point, NC - Downtown Master Plan, Urban Infill, Mall Retrofit
- Uptown Dardenne Prairie, MO - Inner City Retrofit and Form-Based Code
- East End, Richmond, VA: APA VA Award, 2011 - Medical-initiated Infill Development
- St. Mary's Hospital, Richmond, VA - Medical Campus Redevelopment
- Federal City, New Orleans, LA - Military Base/Campus Redevelopment

Academic

- 2005 Bachelor of Architecture in Architecture and Computer Science, Magna Cum Laude, University of Miami, Miami, FL

Affiliations and Service

- 2001-Present Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU)
- 2003-2012 Next Generation of the New Urbanism (CNU), Steering Committee
- 2006-Present Transect Codes Council, Board Member
- 2012-Present CNU Form-based Codes 202, Co-organizer and Lecturer
- 2015-Present Codes Study, Contributor
Andrés Duany, FAIA CNU Founding Partner and Project Advisor

Andrés Duany, architect, urban designer, planner and author, has dedicated over three decades to pioneering a vision for sustainable urban development and its implementation. He has influenced planners and designers worldwide, redirected government policies in the U.S. and abroad, and produced plans for hundreds of new and renewed communities of enduring value.

Duany’s leadership can be credited with the plan and code for Seaside, the first new traditional community; the Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) zoning ordinance; the development of the SmartCode, a form-based zoning code, adopted by numerous municipalities seeking to encourage compact, mixed-use, walkable communities; the definition of the rural to urban Transect and Agrarian Urbanism; as well as inventive affordable housing designs, including Carpet Cottages and Cabanons.

Duany is the author of many essay and articles, and co-author of several books, including Suburban Nation: the Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream. The SmartCode, The Smart Growth Manual, Garden Cities: Agricultural Urbanism, and The New Civic Art. Duany’s work has been recognized with numerous awards, including the Richard Driehaus Award, the Jefferson Medal, The Vincent Scully Prize and several honorary doctorates.

Selected Projects

- Downtown Birmingham Master Plan 2016 and Birmingham 2016 Plan Assessment, MI
- High Point, NC
- Downtown West Palm Beach, FL
- Downtown Mobile, AL
- Al Ain Central Business District Plan and Code, Abu Dhabi, UAE
- Bon Secours St. Mary’s Hospital Campus Extension, Richmond, VA
- DownCity Providence, Downtown Revitalization Plan and Code, Providence RI
- Study of Westminster, Washington and Thayer Streets, Providence RI
- Markham Master Plan and Code, Ontario, Canada
- The Village at Hendrix, Conway, AR
- Historic Gateway, Roswell, GA
- Seaside, Walton Co., FL: National AIA Award, Progressive Architecture Award
- Fifth Avenue South, Naples, FL
- Downtown Sarasota Master Plan, FL: CNU Charter Award
- Downtown Fort Myers Master Plan, FL
- Downtown Stuart, FL: Florida Governor’s Award for Urban Design
- Hannibal Square, Winter Park, FL
- Plan Baton Rouge, LA: Sierra Club Smart Growth Award
- Mississippi Renewal Forum
- Louisiana Speaks (multiple municipal master plans and codes)
- NW Hillsborough Plan, FL: CNU Charter Award
- Legacy Town Center, Plano, TX

Academic

- 1974 Master of Architecture, Yale School of Architecture
- 1972 Ecole de Beaux Arts, Paris, Ancien Eleve

Affiliations and Service

- 1996 Elected, American Institute of Architecture, College of Fellows
- 1993-2004 Congress for the New Urbanism, Co-Founder and Board Member
- Registered Architect, NCARB # 33870
- Design awards juror for many organizations
Senen Antonio, Partner and Senior Planner/Designer

Senen M. A. Antonio possesses over twenty years of international experience in sustainable design and planning, including plans for regions, downtowns, transit-oriented development, disaster recovery, urban revitalization and infill, resorts, and new towns, in the Americas, Europe, Africa, and Asia. A major part of his firm-wide responsibility is to help define the future of the practice, working with fellow Partners in projecting industry trends and seeking project opportunities for breaking new areas of knowledge and technique in the New Urbanism. He remains involved in several key project assignments, managing projects across all phases from conceptual design through construction. He lectures widely across the United States, in the Middle East, and throughout Asia, and contributes articles to professional journals. He is co-writing, with Andres Duany, a book on sustainable communities. He is a member of the Congress for the New Urbanism and is a LEED-accredited professional.

Selected Projects

Windward Pointe, MI Master Plan
ABQ Central Corridor TOD Planning Study, TOD/Urban Infill Planning and Coding Analysis, Albuquerque, NM
Vista Field Redevelopment, Urban Infill/Brownfield Redevelopment, Kennewick, WA
Downtown Monroe Master Plan, Urban Infill, Monroe, LA
Uptown Dardenne Prairie, Urban Infill & Form-Based Code, Dardenne Prairie, MO
Newburgh Waterfront, Urban Revitalization Plan & Form-Based Code, Newburgh, NY
Scottish Sustainable Communities Initiative, Regional Plan & Pilot Projects, Scotland, UK
Hertfordshire Guide to Growth Study, Regional Plan & Pilot Projects, Hertfordshire, UK
ARC Lifelong Communities, Regional Plan and Code, Atlanta, GA,
Green Tree Master Plan, Urban Infill/New Town Plan & Form-Based Code, Vacaville, CA
Glenridge/Aria Master Plan, Urban Infill/New Village Plan & Form-Based Code, Atlanta, GA
Stanboroughbury/Symondshyde, Urban Infill/New Village Plan, Hertfordshire Co., UK
The Hills of Depoe Bay, Urban Infill/New Village Plan & Form-Based Code, Depoe Bay, OR
Wittenbeck, Urban Infill/New Village, Heiligendamm, Germany
Melana Village Centers, Incremental Village Development, Pretoria, South Africa
Southlands, Agrarian Urbanism, Tsawwassen, Canada

Publications (Selected)

Green By Design: The Four Communities of Florida’s EcoCoast (with Andres Duany and Christian Wagley), to be published in 2018

Seminars and Lectures

2015 Featured Speaker - United Nations Environmental Programme - Sustainable Buildings and Climate Initiative (UNEP-SBCI), the Global Forum on Human Settlements (GFHS), and China Railways Group (CRG), Shanghai
2013 Featured Speaker - Philippine Green Building Council (PhilGBC), Manila
2012 Featured Speaker - Municipality of Makkah Smart Growth Workshop, Jeddah
Featured Speaker - US Speaker and Specialist Grant, Bureau of International Information Programs, US Department of State/US Embassy - Laos
Featured Speaker, New Urbanism and SmartCode Workshop, Ministry of Public Works, Indonesia
Key Speaker and Seminar Presenter, "Sustainable Cities Dialogues 2012", Cebu
2011 Invited Speaker, 3rd League of Cities of the Philippines Global Convention, Manila
Keynote Speaker, 2011 Indonesia World Town Planning Day, Jakarta, Indonesia

Affiliations and Academic

2010 - Present Congress for the New Urbanism Accredited Professional (CNU-A)
2004 - Present USGBC LEED Accredited Professional
2001 - Present The Congress for the New Urbanism, member
1992 - Present Registered Architect, Philippines, No. 11026
1995 Master of Urban Design, With Honors, The University of Hong Kong
1990 B.Sc. Architecture, magna cum laude, The University of the Philippines
Michael Huston is a licensed architect, urban designer and planner, with over twenty years of professional experience. His background includes a decade of designing educational facilities, a number of years devoted to downtown revitalization in Louisville, KY, working first with city government and subsequently in partnership with a developer, and many years in private practice.

Huston’s experience in all phases of development and design has been an important contribution to his work at DPZ on master plans for transit oriented development and sprawl repair, as well as on building type studies for those plans.

Selected Projects

"Bayside" Retail Town Center for Skipjack Properties, South Padre Island, TX
Syosset Park Town Center for Simon Property Group, Oyster Bay, New York
Town Madison, Retail Town Center, Madison, AL
City Sao Paolo, Pirituba, Brazil
Midtown 2050, Omaha, NE
Alys Beach "Main Street" Plan Update, Alys Beach, FL
Bethel TOD, Bethel CT
Wild Cherry Canyon Master Plan, San Luis Obispo, CA
West Haven TOD, West Haven CT
South Point Master Plan, Ribeirao Preto, Brazil
Itahye Master Plan, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Westside Master Plan, Houston, TX
The Hills of Depoe Bay, Depoe Bay, OR
Renn Farm Master Plan, Frederick, MD
Ignite High Point Master Plan, NC
Reinvent Phoenix TOD Master Plan, AZ
Coconut Grove BID Plan, Miami, FL
Westview South Park, Urban Infill, Frederick, MD
Bon Secours DePaul Medical Center, Norfolk, VA
Bon Secours Memorial Regional Medical Center, Hanover County, VA
The Land, Tulsa, OK
Economic Development Strategic Plan, Orem, UT
University Mall Urban Infill Plan, Provo, UT

Academic

University of Kentucky, Bachelor of Architecture
University of Florida, Bachelor of Arts

Affiliations and Service

Affiliations and Service: Registered Architect, Kentucky (#4170), Florida (AR# 94985)
Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU)
U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), LEED Accredited Professional
Judith I. Bell, CNU-A LEED AP - Senior Planner/Designer

Judith I. Bell is a planner and urban and architectural designer with twelve years of experience in a variety of project types, from regional plans and new community master plans, urban revitalization and infill plans, and design guidelines and zoning codes. She has participated in projects in North and South America, the Caribbean, Europe and China, and she has lectured on the New Urbanism and the SmartCode. She also contributes to the firm’s publications and marketing process by improving and streamlining reports, book layouts and presentation graphics. Judith is fluent in both English and Spanish, received her Bachelors and Masters degrees in Architecture from the University of Miami and is a LEED-accredited professional.

Selected Projects

Windward Pointe, MI Master Plan  
City of Pontiac, MI - CNU Legacy Charrette, Downtown Revitalization Master Plan  
Miami 21, Vision Plan and Form-Based Code, Miami, FL  
Reinvent Phoenix, Multiple Transit District Master Plans and SmartCode, Phoenix, AZ  
City of Charleston, The B.A.R Process, Charleston, SC  
Bull Street, Campus Redevelopment, Community Master Plan, Form-Based Code, Columbia, SC  
New Town St. Charles, Community Master Plan and Urban Regulations, St. Charles, MO  
Scottish Sustainable Communities Initiative Charrette Series, Regional Visioning, Scotland, UK: CNU Charter Award, 2013  
Chapelton of Elsick, Community Master Plan & Urban Regs., Aberdeen, Scotland, UK  
Grandhome, Community Master Plan, Aberdeen, Scotland, UK  
City of Charleston, The B.A.R Process, Charleston, SC  
Ave Maria School of Law, Campus Master Plan Exploration, Naples, FL  
Olowalu, Community Master Plan and Urban Regulations, Maui, HI  
Alys Beach, Community Master Plan, Walton County, FL  
Beachtown New Village, Community Master Plan, Galveston, TX  
The Land Urban Infill Master Plan, Tulsa, OK  
River District (East Fraserlands), Urban Infill Master Plan and Code, Vancouver, Canada  
Southlands Master Plan, Tsawwassen, British Columbia, Canada  
Village at Niagara on the Lake, Community Master Plan & Urban Regs., Toronto, Canada  
Big Bay Point Resort, Village Master Plan and Urban Regulations, Inisfll, Ontario, Canada  
Porta Norte, Community Master Plan and Code, City of Panama, Panama  
Schooner Bay, Prototypical Houses, Great Abaco Island, The Bahamas  
Xi Shui Dong, Urban Infill, Wuxi, China  
Marina Rio Lujan, Infill Village Plan, Tigre, Argentina

Academic

2004  M. Architecture in Urban Design, University of Miami, FL  
2003  B. Architecture, cum laude, Minor in Business Administration, University of Miami, FL

Affiliations and Service

Registered Architect, Florida State Board of Architecture and Interior Design AR 99161  
CNU-Accredited Professional, Congress for New Urbanism  
LEED Accredited Professional, US Green Building Council

Selected Publications and Lectures

2014 - Present  Guest Juror, University of Miami School of Architecture  
2012  Graphics Editor, Garden Cities: Theory & Practice of Agrarian Urbanism, (The Prince’s Foundation)  
2011  Lecturer, Smartcode Calibration 202, Congress of New Urbanism (CNU 19), Madison, WI  
2010  Lecturer, "Principles of New Urbanism", Universidad Americana de Asunción, Paraguay  
Team Leader Reference - Matt Lambert, Partner and Project Manager

City of Phoenix, Arizona
Scope: Reinvent PHX; Urban Infill, Transit-Oriented Development, Form-Based Code; Planning, Urban Design, Coding, Green Infrastructure Planning and Design; Community Engagement
Date: 2012-2015
Contact: Katherine Coles, Planner
Telephone: 602-534-9938
Email: katherine.coles@phoenix.gov

DPZ CoDESIGN References

City of Pontiac, Michigan
Scope: Downtown Visioning and Master Plan, with Community Outreach
Date: 2017
Contact: Jane Bais DiSessa, Deputy Mayor, City of Pontiac
Email: jbais-disessa@pontiac.mi.us
Telephone: 248-758-3322

City of Kirkwood, Missouri
Scope: Master Plan and Parking Study, with Community Outreach
Date: 2017
Contact: Jonathan D. Raiche, AICP, City Planner
Telephone: 314-984-5926
Email: raichejd@kirkwoodmo.org

City of Derby, Connecticut
Scope: Revitalization Plan, Community Outreach and Zoning Code Adjustments.
Date: 2016
Contact: Lynn DiGiovanni, Previous Project Manager and Mayor’s Advisor
Telephone: 203-650-5599
Email: digiovannil@luchs.com

City of Miami, Florida
Scope: City-wide Zoning Code Overhaul; Planning and Land Use, Urban Design, Zoning/Coding, Transportation/Infrastructure, Community Engagement
Date: 2004 - 2010
Contact: Manny Diaz former Mayor of Miami
Telephone: 305 416 3180
Email: manny@lydeckerdiaz.com
Firm Profile

Gibbs Planning Group (GPG) is a Michigan corporation, founded in 1988. GPG offers urban planning, landscape architectural and real estate market research services for hotels, office, residential and retail developments. GPG’s expertise allows us to formulate and refine a proven and focused approach to accomplish the market research. GPG is dedicated to providing practical, actionable results, which reflect economic development realities and not just theoretical research.

GPG has a broad range of both private and public-sector experience across North America. Public urban retail consulting clients include: Alexandria, Bay City, Birmingham, MI, Cambridge, Charleston, Chicago, Fargo, Kalamazoo, Grand Rapids, Houston, Knoxville, Madison, Mackinac Island, Marquette, Miami, Palm Desert, Petoskey, Portland, Troy, Traverse City and Seattle.

GPG’s private sector clients include EDS, Pulte Homes, Rosemary Beach, Steiner Associates, The St. Joe Company, The Taubman Company, Simon Property Group and the Walt Disney Company. GPG has also conducted market research for Brown University and the Universities of Pennsylvania and Miami. GPG has provided consulting services for over 500 town centers and communities across the United States, Central America, Europe and the Pacific Rim.
Robert Gibbs serves as GPG’s president and managing director. Gibbs is considered one of the foremost urban retail planners in America. For more than two decades, his expertise has been sought by some of the most respected mayors, renowned architects, and successful real-estate developers in the country. Profiled in The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, and Urban Land, Gibbs has, writes The Atlantic Monthly, “a commercial sensibility unlike anything possessed by the urban planners who usually design downtown-renewal efforts.” He is also a recognized leader in the New Urbanism, having pioneered the implementation of its environmentally sustainable principles of Traditional Town Planning and Smart Growth.

For the past 30 years, Gibbs has been active in developing innovative yet practical methods for applying modern trends in commercial development to more than 400 town centers and historic cities here and abroad. He also planned Michigan’s first ten New Urban communities and Form Based Codes. A speaker at the First Congress of the New Urbanism in 1992 and twenty subsequent CNUs, Gibbs lectures frequently throughout the country. He is the author of Principles of Urban Retail Planning and Development and the Retail Module of the SmartCode and has contributed articles to numerous books and publications. For the past 22 years, he has taught “Urban Retail Planning” in the Executive Education Program at the Harvard Graduate School of Design. In 2012, Gibbs was honored by the Clinton Presidential Library for his life’s contributions to urban planning and development, and by the City of Auckland, New Zealand for his planning innovations.

Gibbs serves as president, supervising all operations, planning, and research.
B. OUTLINE OF QUALIFICATIONS - GIBBS PLANNING GROUP

Andrew L. Littman, J.D., CNU-A
Director of Research

Email: andrew@gibbsplanning.com

Andrew Littman serves as Director of Research at GPG where he oversees its hotel, office, residential and retail market research for cities and new town centers across the country. Prior to joining GPG in 2016, Andrew practiced law (initially in private practice and later as a staff attorney at the Wayne County Circuit Court) and then worked as a broker at Marcus & Millichap.

Andrew is a graduate of Skidmore College, the Moritz College of Law at The Ohio State University and obtained a graduate certificate in real estate development from the University of Michigan. He is a member of the State Bar of Michigan and the Congress for the New Urbanism, as well as being a licensed real estate salesperson.

Gibbs Planning Group
May 2016 – Present

Relevant Training
Completed Harvard University Graduate School of Design class “Urban Retail: Essential Planning, Design, and Management Practices”.

Education
University of Michigan – Ann Arbor
Taubman College of Architecture & Urban Planning Graduate Certificate in Real Estate Development

The Ohio State University
Moritz College of Law
Juris Doctor Skidmore College
Bachelor of Arts in Government

Memberships
State Bar of Michigan
Congress for the New Urbanism graduate
B. OUTLINE OF QUALIFICATIONS - GIBBS PLANNING GROUP

David N. Mangum, CNU-A, LEED APND
Director Urban Planning & Design

Email: david@gibbsplanning.com

David Mangum serves as GPG’s Director of Urban Design and Planning and has been intricately involved in GPG’s urban design and town planning efforts, research and charrette leadership. David was recently project manager and head planner for GPG’s Troy Town Center master plan, a 100-acre mixed-use walkable community planned for the city’s existing civic center.

Recent projects include Boyne Resorts, Detroit Fairgrounds, Farmington, Frankenmuth, Grosse Pointe, Highland Park, Holland and new mixed-use town centers for the cities of Troy, Warren and Wixom, MI; David has also consulted for Nob Hill District of Albuquerque, NM; Cuyahoga Falls OH; Hot Springs, AR; Midtown Omaha, NE; Panama Pacifico in Panama, Central America; Sarasota, FL; Uptown Normal, IL; and South Bend, IN. He spearheaded alternative master plan projects for city clients Fort Wayne, IN; Three Rivers, Troy and Wixom, MI; and Longwood, FL, and has helped organize and lead charrettes for East Lansing, Marquette, Oak Park, Palmer Park (Detroit), and Woodward Avenue, MI.

David has given extensive public lectures and workshops and has also presented and participated in panel discussions at the "1st Moscow International Forum- Culture: A Look into the Future" on the contemporary integration of urban retail formats in modern cities.

Gibbs Planning Group
May 2013 - Present

Presentations
CNU 22 - The Resilient Community: “Retail Success: Rebuilding Cities & Towns” 2014
CNU 26 - Surviving the Retail Apocalypse

Relevant Training
NCI Charrette System Training, December 2013
Form-Based Code Institute, November 2013 (Courses 101e & 301)
MI Place Initiative, October 2013
Placemaking Strategy Development Trainer

Education
Wayne State University
Department of Urban Studies & Planning
Master of Urban Planning
University of Michigan - Ann Arbor
Taubman College of Architecture & Urban Planning
Bachelor of Science in Architecture

Memberships
American Planning Association (Michigan Chapter)
U.S. Green Building Council (Detroit Regional Chapter)
Congress for New Urbanism

Publications & Awards
MIASLA Award of Merit: Palmer Park Master Plan
Michigan Association of Planning Award of Excellence: Marquette Third Street Master Plan
Crain's Detroit Business
Detroit Free Press
SITES

Planning and Urban Design
Alternative & Interim Master Plans, S. Fort Wayne, IN
Chandler Crossings Master Plan, Lansing, MI
Eddington Farms Master Plan, Rochester Hills, MI
Fallen Timbers Master Plan, Marietta, OH
Frankenmuth, Michigan Gateway Innovation District, Lansing, MI
Historic Hospital Master Plan, Three Rivers, MI
Palmer Park Master Plan, Detroit, MI
Retail Implementation Strategy: Longwood, FL
Shelby Town Center, Shelby Twp., MI
Troy Town Center, Troy, MI
Warren, MI Streetscape Plan
Wixom, MI Town Center
Woodward-1696 Complete Streets Analysis, R.O., MI

Representative Market Analysis Experience
Boyne Resort, MI
Cuyahoga Falls, OH
Downtown Des Moines, IA
Downtown Hartford, CT
Farmington, MI
Florida Hosp., Orlando, FL
Freshfields Village, SC
Grosse Pointe, MI
High Street, Atlanta, GA
Historic Richmond Town, Staten Island, NY
Holland, MI
Indian School Rd. Transit District, Phoenix, AZ
Kennesaw, GA
Marquette Third Street Corridor, Marquette, MI
Niagara-on-the-Lake, ON
Palm Beach Gardens, FL
Panama Pacifico, Panama, Central America
Patrick Sq., Clemson, SC
Sarasota, FL
Seabrook, WA
South Memphis, TN
Stonecrest Mall, GA
South Bend, IN
S. Fort Wayne, IN
B. OUTLINE OF QUALIFICATIONS - JACOBS

Firm Profile

Jacobs is a multidisciplinary firm offering a comprehensive range of master planning, engineering, environmental, civil/site, and other professional services extending from the initial analysis phase of a project through design, bidding and construction. Founded in 1947, we serve clients in both private and public sectors, including municipalities, corporations, and government agencies. Our Midwest offices include Detroit, Columbus, Chicago and St. Louis.

Our Infrastructure Planners and Engineers provide an array of services including:

- Parking analysis and design
- Roadway and traffic signage
- Bridges/Structural Design
- Streetscapes
- Site development
- Recreational trails and bicycle paths
- Utilities
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)
- Traffic studies and modeling
- Interchanges
- Drainage and flood protection
- Transit

Jacobs is working with clients to evaluate the changing impacts of new forms of transportation. These new forms of transportation are reshaping how we think about infrastructure planning, design, and construction to accommodate technologies like ride sharing, connected and autonomous vehicles, and automated transportation systems.
Adam James Garms, AICP Transportation Planner

Adam Garms’ transportation experience includes traffic control plans, data collection, travel demand and traffic simulation modeling, construction staging alternatives, and parking studies. He has been involved in the planning and design of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) He also has experience with traffic signal design and sign design. He has worked extensively with ArcGIS, ArcPad, TransCAD, Cube, VISUM, Microscopic Transportation Simulation Model (MITSIM), VISSIM, SimTraffic, SYNCHRO, Highway Capacity Software (HCS), aSIDRA, Turbo Architecture, MicroStation, AutoCAD, and GuidSign

Selected Projects

Kirkwood Downtown Master Plan, Kirkwood – Kirkwood, MO. Transportation Planner conducted an analysis of the current and future parking supply and demand to determine the sufficiency of the parking system through an inventory of the existing system, the identification of deficiencies, and the identification of possible improvement solutions. Adjustments to the zoning codes and modifications to the parking systems where included as part of the recommendations. (2017-2018)

Doniphan Drive Corridor Study, TxDOT – El Paso, TX. Transportation Planner using the El Paso MPO’s travel demand model to forecast traffic volumes along the Doniphan Drive corridor from Racetrack Drive to the New Mexico border. The demographics in the travel demand model were modified for a redevelopment scenario and the roadway network was expanded to include additional intersections. The forecasted traffic volumes were used as part of the process to develop future traffic volumes for the project corridor. (2016 – present)

Master Plan Update, Webster University – St. Louis, MO. Transportation Planner evaluating vehicular circulation, pedestrian circulation, and parking for existing conditions and proposed future conditions. Proposed several traffic calming methods for campus streets and travel demand management techniques. Developed parking forecasts for proposed future conditions. ArcGIS was used to produce maps of the vehicular/pedestrian circulation and existing parking conditions. (2011-2012)

Traffic Operations Study, Missouri DOT – Troy and Moscow Mills, MO. Transportation Planner developing a SYNCHRO model used for operational analysis roadway network, including eight miles of divided highway and ten miles of arterial/collector roads in east central Missouri. The model was used to determine capacity issues and to test various mitigation alternatives. (2005)

Technical Papers/Publications

“Data on the Fly” article published in Roads and Bridges magazine, April 2007
“Comprehensive Use of Semipermanent Dynamic Message Signs for Regionwide ATIS Programs” at Transportation Research Board 86th Annual Meeting (January 2007)
“Access Management Plan and Program for Des Moines, Iowa, Metropolitan Area” at Transportation Research Board 85th Annual Meeting (January 2006)
“Development and Calibration of a Large-Scale Microscopic Traffic Simulation Model” at Transportation Research Board 83rd Annual Meeting. Published in Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board 1876, December 2004 (January 2004)

Academic B.S., Community and Regional Planning, Iowa State University (Ames), 2002

Affiliations and Service

American Institute of Certified Planners, 2005 (#136126)
Indiana DOT NEPA and CE Certified, 2014
TxDOT Pre-Certification Categories: 1.3.1 and 1.4.1
American Planning Association (APA)
Transportation Engineering Association of Metropolitan St. Louis (TEAM STL) Board Member
Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE)
John Wirtz, PE, PTOE Transportation Engineer

John is a project manager with over 13 years of traffic engineering and transportation planning experience. He is passionate about multi-modal transportation, complete streets, and traffic safety; and has served as a guest lecturer for a graduate level Complete Streets courses at the University of Illinois at Chicago and the Illinois Institute of Technology. John has a deep understanding of traffic engineering for urban streets due to his four-year tenure as an on-site consultant for the Chicago Department of Transportation. He has also worked on various NEPA studies, including environmental impact statements (EIS) for major freight and transit projects. As Project Manager, John has led the design of over 35 miles of protected bike lanes and buffered bike lanes as part of CDOT’s Streets for Cycling Phase I/II project. John’s strengths include data analysis, creative engineering solutions, and technical writing.

Areas of Expertise
- Complete Streets Planning and Design
- Traffic Operations Analysis
- Crash and Safety Analysis
- On-Street Bicycle Facility Design
- Streetscape Design
- Synchro Traffic Modeling
- Project Prioritization
- NEPA/Environmental Analysis
- Technical Writing

Selected Projects
Milwaukee Avenue / Logan Square Phase I and II – Chicago, IL  
Title/Role: Project Manager 04/2017 to Present,  
Scope: Preliminary engineering and final design services for a 1.3-mile segment of Milwaukee Avenue, including the roadways surrounding historic Logan Square. The scope includes reevaluating a previous study to incorporate complete streets elements, and a once-in-a-generation opportunity to redesign Logan Square.

Western Avenue Streetscape Master Plan – Chicago, IL  
Title/Role: Project Engineer 04/2010 to 05/2013  
Scope: This project included a 3.5-mile segment of Western Avenue in Chicago’s Beverly and Morgan Park neighborhood. The primary goal of the study was to recommend streetscape improvements to improve the walkability of the area and create a more vibrant local business district in an area that is currently largely auto-oriented.

Chicago Streets for Cycling Phase I and II – Chicago, IL  
Title/Role: Project Manager 02/2013 to 11/2017  
Scope/Description: The City’s goal was to create 100 miles of improved bike lanes. Jacobs has helped CDOT meet that goal through the design of 35.3 miles of buffered and protected bike lanes in 29 separate corridors.

Red Line Extension Project Environmental Impact Statement – Chicago, IL  
Title/Role: Transportation Planner 04/2012 to 12/2013  
Scope/Description: A joint venture team to complete an Environmental Impact Statement for several alternatives to extend public transit service south from the existing 95th Street Red Line Terminal to the far south side of Chicago, including two heavy rail transit (HRT) corridors and one bus rapid transit (BRT) corridor.
McKenna’s downtown Northville, Michigan headquarters – a repurposed Ford Motor Company plant designed by Albert Kahn, built in the 1930s. Our work spaces reflect McKenna’s commitment to our people, our communities, sustainable design and the rich technology heritage of the Midwest.

McKenna’s team of talented planning, design and building professionals help municipal leaders develop and maintain communities for real life. From street festivals, neighborhood parks, and storefronts, to parking spots, coffee shops, and farmers’ markets, we want your community to thrive. Headquartered in Northville with offices in Detroit and Kalamazoo, Michigan, McKenna provides planning, zoning, landscape architecture, community and economic development and urban design assistance to cities, villages, townships, counties, and regional agencies, as well as select private clients. Our success can be measured by the physical improvements to hundreds of McKenna client communities, and by our 40-year record of client satisfaction and on-time, on-budget delivery.

McKenna currently provides project services to more than 85 communities and private land investors in Michigan, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois. Anticipating and responding to change is a major distinction of McKenna’s practice. McKenna’s innovation and depth of experience is a resource for public and private decision-makers; we are a corporation of roughly 20 planners, urban designers, and landscape architects formed under the laws of Michigan on May 2, 1978.
Areas of Service

Community Planning
- Master Plans (Cities, Villages, Townships, Counties and Regions)
- Neighborhood Preservation Plans
- Redevelopment Plans
- Corridor Plans
- Downtown Plans
- Growth Management Plans
- Park and Recreation Plans
- Capital Improvements Programs
- Community and Fiscal Impact Analysis
- Waterfront Planning
- Open Space Planning
- Historic Preservation Plans
- Transportation and Parking Plans
- GIS Analysis and Alternative Testing
- Access Management

Economic Development
- Public/Private Partnerships
- Brownfield Redevelopment Planning
- Downtown Redevelopment Action Plans
- Corridor Redevelopment
- Tax Increment Finance Plans
- Grant Applications
- Redevelopment Project Management
- Market Studies: Retail, Commercial, Residential, Industrial, Institutional
- Redevelopment Financing Assistance
- Land Assembly/Eminent Domain Assistance

Building Department Administration
- Zoning Administration
- Building Code and Zoning Enforcement
- Building Inspection
- Electrical, Mechanical and Plumbing Inspections
- Property Maintenance and Housing Inspection
- Landscape Construction Observation
- Code Enforcement
- Compliance with State
- Department Management Plans

Parks and Recreation
- Parks and Recreation Master Plans
- Park Design (neighborhood, community, regional)
- Ball Field Planning and Design
- Park and Recreation Facilities Design
- Bikeway and Trail Planning and Design
- Grant Applications
- Public Participation
- Universal and ADA Accessibility
- Park and Recreation Furnishings

On-Site Management Services
- Zoning and Planning Administration
- Tax Increment Finance Authority Management
- Downtown Development Authority Administration
- CDBG Administration
- Housing Rehabilitation
- Project Management – Capital Improvement Projects
- Redevelopment Project Administration
- Community Development Administration
- Economic Development Administration

Development Codes
- Zoning Ordinance
- Zoning Ordinance and Resolution Review and Preparation
- Continuing Advisory Services to Elected and Appointed Officials, Planning and Zoning Commissions, and Boards of Appeal
- Subdivision and Condominium Regulations
- Form-Based Codes
- Environmental Regulations – Wetlands, Woodlands
- Expert Witnessing and Court Testimony on Zoning
- Sign Regulations
- Annexation Advisory Assistance
- Sex-Oriented Business Regulations and GIS Testing
- Open Space Regulations
- Planning and Zoning Code Training Seminars
- On-Site Zoning Administration
Complete Streets and Transportation Planning

- Complete Streets Policy Development
- Complete Streets Design Guidelines
- Complete Streets Procedure and Implementation
- Corridor Plans
- Streetscape Plans
- Bicycle & Pedestrian Plans
- Bicycle Parking Plans
- Bicycle Sign Plans
- Bike Share Feasibility Studies
- Intersection Design & Crossing Plans
- Zoning and Regulatory Review
- User Maps and Wayfinding Studies
- Transportation Master Plans
- Site Plan Review of Transportation Facilities
- Circulation Studies Vehicles and Pedestrian
- TOD Studies
- Education and Training
- Transportation and Parking Plans
- Access Management
- Parking Studies

Public Participation (NCI Certified)

- Charrettes
- Hands-on Workshops
- Focus Groups
- Roundtable Discussions
- Surveys (telephone, online, direct mail)
- Public Hearings
- Open Houses
- Interactive Citizen Advisory Committees
- Youth Outreach
- Community Walks and Bike Rides
- Pop-Up / Storefront Workshops
- Consensus Building
- Participatory Decision-Making
- Interviews (one-on-one, intercept)
- Community Preference Surveys

Community Development

- HUD CDBG Administration
- Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing
- Environmental Review Records
- Consolidated Plans
- Elderly Housing Assistance
- Five Year and Annual Action Plans
- CDBG Program Planning and Applications
- Housing Rehabilitation Administration
- Market Studies – Market Rate, Elderly and Assisted Housing
- Housing Market Studies (MSHDA approved)

Urban Design

- Community Design Plans
- Placemaking Strategies
- Parks, Greens, Commons and Plaza Design
- Streetscape Design
- Site Planning
- Community Character Planning
- Historic Park Design
- Computer Visualization (before/after)
- Design Review
- Site Evaluation and Selection
- Design Manuals
- Neo-Traditional Design (TND)
- Urban Form Pattern Books
- Mixed Use (residential, retail, office, public, institutional) Design
- Public Art

Sustainability Plans

- Sustainability Indicators Analysis, Evaluation Criteria, and Program Improvements
- Develop Neighborhood Stabilization Plans
- Green Infrastructure Plan for Community’s Public Property
- Walkable/Bikeable Audits and Implementation Plans
- Community Master Plan, Strategic Plan, or Capital Improvement Plan
- Plan for Low Impact Development (LID) Components
- Local Planning and Zoning
- Access Management Plans for Transportation Corridors

Landscape Architecture

- Residential Development Plans (single family detached/attached; multi-family, elderly, mixed use, townhouses) Conventional & Cluster
- Site Analysis and Design
- Site Layout and Planning
- Construction Drawings and Construction Observation
- Landscape Architecture (MSHDA-approved)
- Arborist Services (tree surveys and maintenance plans)
- Greenways and Trail Planning and Design
- Native Plant Landscapes
- Wayfinding, Signs, and Interpretive Stations
- Environmental Performance Standards
- Public Art Development
- Public Space Design – Greenways, Bikeways, Streetscapes
- Wetlands, Woodlands, Groundwater, Aesthetic, and Vista Protection Regulations
- Sustainable Landscape Design
Awards and Accolades

McKenna has been honored by its peers and public with planning and design awards. We take pride in consistently delivering exceptional planning and personal service to public officials across the Midwest.


2010 Site Design/Parks Award, Michigan Recreation and Park Association. Van Buren Charter Township (Wayne County), MI – Riggs Heritage Park.


2007 Planner of Year Award, Michigan Association of Planning. Phillip C. McKenna, AICP, PCP.

2007 Interactive Mapping Tool GIS for Everyone Award, Improving Michigan’s Access to Geographic Information Networks (IMAGIN). River Rouge, MI.

2005 CAM Magazine Year End Special Issue, Construction Association of Michigan in recognition of outstanding facility planning and design. Flat Rock, MI – Community Center Site Design and Boardwalk.


2004 Outstanding Small Business Award, Crain’s Detroit Business. McKenna.

2002 MRPA Master Plan Award, Michigan Recreation and Park Association. Oakland County, MI, Orion Oaks County – Park Site (1,000 acre) Master Plan.


*McKenna and its planners and designers have also been selected for other awards including Crain’s Detroit Business 20-in-their-20’s; Crain’s Detroit Business “Coolest Places to Work”; and the Michigan Business and Professional Association’s The 101 Best and Brightest Places to Work in Southeast and West Michigan.*
John R. Jackson, AICP, CNU, NCI

**PRESIDENT**

**EDUCATION**

- Master of Urban Planning
  - Taubman College
  - University of Michigan

- Bachelor of Environmental Design
  - Miami University, Oxford, OH

**HONORS**

- Planning Excellence Award for Implementation of “Downtown Grosse Pointe Revitalization Program”
  - City of Grosse Pointe, MI, Michigan Association of Planning.

- Outstanding Planning Project Award for Open Space Development
  - Hamburg Township (Livingston County), MI, Michigan Association of Planning and Michigan Society of Planning Officials.

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

- Comprehensive Planning
  - Prepared comprehensive plans for rural and urban communities based upon community goals and land capability. Prepared zoning ordinances, capital improvement programs and regulatory mechanisms for communities from 4,000 to 60,000 populations.

- Community Planning and Zoning
  - Directed preparation of the master plans, urban design plans, and updated zoning ordinances. Provided day-to-day advisory services on comprehensive planning, zoning, site design and subdivision regulations for municipal, legal and real estate clients.

- Zoning
  - Prepared complete zoning ordinances, overlay districts, form-based standards, and comprehensive text and map amendments for cities, villages, and townships in Michigan. Advised legislative bodies, Planning Commissions, and Zoning Boards of Appeals on land use regulation and proposed development and redevelopment in a number of communities of various sizes and character. Prepared form-based and hybrid zoning ordinances for municipalities to promote quality predictable development.

- Urban Design
  - Prepared and implemented regulatory instruments addressing architectural design, form-based standards, aesthetic character, historic preservation, site plan review, and streetscape design.

- Economic Development Planning and Management
  - Provided planning and execution assistance in all phases of economic and community development and tax increment financing including planning, acquisition, rehabilitation, public improvements, citizen participation, financing and administration for redevelopment projects using DDA, TIFA, LDFA, and Brownfield mechanisms.

- Real Estate Development
  - Created redevelopment strategies for single and multiple sites in Michigan communities. Tasks included performing economic and political/social feasibility studies, researching and developing appropriate use concepts for the site, and guiding the design process to complement the surrounding areas.

- Central Business District Planning
  - Directed major urban design efforts for downtowns of cities, including retail, office, institutional, tourism, redevelopment, placemaking, circulation and parking planning and redevelopment financing.

- Commercial Corridor Redevelopment
  - Directed preparation of corridor plans to revitalize older commercial strips and to accommodate public and private improvements through merchant and citizen involvement in the economic development process.

**MEMBERSHIPS**

- American Institute of Certified Planners
- American Planning Association
- Michigan Association of Planning
- Congress for the New Urbanism
- Michigan Downtown Association
- Michigan Farmland and Community Alliance
- American Institute of Architects, Affiliate Member
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Sarah Traxler, AICP, NCI
VICE PRESIDENT

EDUCATION

Master of Urban Planning
Taubman College
University of Michigan

Bachelor of Arts (with honors)
Sociology
University of California at Santa Cruz

HONORS

Excellence Award for Implementation of the “Downtown Marketing and Strategic Plan”
Buena Vista Charter Township, Michigan Association of Planning

Outstanding Student Project Award for “New Directions for Vehicle City: a Framework for Brownfield Reuse”
Michigan Association of Planning

Raoul K. Wallenberg Scholarship Recipient
University of Michigan, Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Comprehensive and Master Planning
Managed numerous master and comprehensive planning efforts for diverse Midwestern communities, including thoughtful public engagement, sustainable future land use analyses, corridor re-imagining, and housing typologies and planning, all with a focus on effective and easy-to-administer implementation strategies. Managed and prepared parks and recreation plans for diverse communities, focusing on the future of play, inclusive / universal design, and equity planning for the provision of parks and recreation in a contextualized manner.

Redevelopment Planning and Management
Managed urban and suburban redevelopment projects including project planning, land acquisition, relocation, citizen participation, budgeting and finance, grantsmanship, public improvements, site design, zoning, strategic planning, land disposition, and scheduling. Successfully functions as project manager for municipality acquiring vacant, blighted 380,000 sq. ft. shopping mall using eminent domain. Prepared a brownfield reuse strategy for a Brownfield Redevelopment Authority. Created an inventory of probable brownfields, crafted reuse goals, developed criteria to target areas where brownfield redevelopment could best fulfill reuse goals; and created frameworks for reuse in areas with the highest redevelopment potential. Reuse strategy recipient of a state planning award.

Zoning
Prepared complete zoning ordinances, overlay districts, form-based standards, and comprehensive text and map amendments for cities, villages, and townships in Michigan. Advised legislative bodies, Planning Commissions, and Zoning Boards of Appeals on land use regulation and proposed development and redevelopment in a number of communities of various sizes and character. Provided on-site administration of zoning and other land use and building regulations for a community of 25,000.

Real Estate Development
Created redevelopment strategies for single and multiple sites in Michigan communities. Tasks included performing economic and political/social feasibility studies, researching and developing appropriate use concepts for the site, and guiding the design process to complement the surrounding areas.

Neighborhood Planning
Managed and prepared Neighborhood Plans for Michigan and Indiana communities. Plan elements include housing and commercial market analyses, placemaking strategies, capital improvement prioritization, funding recommendations and implementation matrices.

Community Development
Managed annual Community Development Block Grant programs for three inner-ring suburbs (two entitlement communities and one Urban County program sub-recipient). Responsibilities included preparation of annual Action Plans, Environmental Review Records (ERRs), Consolidated Action Plan Evaluation Reports (CAPERs), applications to County for funding, and administration of projects, including Housing Rehabilitation. Administered Neighborhood Stabilization Program with $1.65 M budget, including preparation of ERR, program and policy design, managing other consultants and project implementation.

MEMBERSHIPS

American Institute of Certified Planners
American Planning Association
Michigan Association of Planning

International Council of Shopping Centers

RFP The City of Birmingham - Master Plan Update
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M. Paul Lippens, AICP, NCI
DIRECTOR OF TRANSPORTATION AND URBAN DESIGN

EDUCATION

Master of Urban Planning  Bachelor of Arts
Taubman College  Hampshire College
University of Michigan

HONORS

Award for Excellence in Transportation Planning for “Realize Cedar: Urban Design Framework”
Delhi Charter Township (Ingham County), MI, Michigan Association of Planning

Award for Excellence in Transportation Planning for “Bike/Walk Livonia: A Future Transportation Plan”
City of Livonia, MI, Michigan Association of Planning

Implementation Award, 2013
Illinois American Planning Association

Best Practices Award, 2012
Illinois American Planning Association

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Urban Design
Led the Indianapolis East 10th Street Urban Design and Gateway Plan to improve the pedestrian environment and promote walkable access and crossing areas. The plan defines parking and parking management for businesses and residences, as well as the creation of bicycle facilities. Plan recommends improved bus shelters and bus pull-offs and intersection traffic management and improved vehicular traffic flow. Developed design alternatives for balanced multimodal transportation, and corridor/district placemaking, as well as destination functions; district identity elements; and public open space with design recommendations, construction budgets and implementation strategies.

Complete Streets Policy and Implementation
Award winning author of the Complete Streets, Complete Networks Design Manual, which combines the physical planning of infrastructure with an institutional understanding of project management, funding and prioritization. The manual provides guidance on the implementation of complete streets policy and presents a structure for evaluating street design, mode prioritization, network optimization and placemaking. Also coauthored the Complete Streets Chicago: Design Guide - Chicago’s, Complete Streets v2.0.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans and Safety
Led award winning bicycle and pedestrian planning in Livonia, Delhi Township, Frenchtown Township, and Paw Paw (Michigan) Evanston, Midlothian, Palos Heights and Winfield (Illinois) and Lowell (Indiana), as well as sub regional bike plans in Chicago suburbs. Studied sidewalk gaps, and recommended bike lanes, sharrows, trails, and protected bikeways. Improved crossing safety and intersection design for people walking, biking, and taking transit. Made network recommendations which considered traffic vehicular volume, roadway configuration, MMLOS, destinations, delay, directness, and public perception.

Trail Planning and Access Studies
Lead planner and designer for the Fort Wayne Downtown/South Central Area Connectivity Plan. Planned a network of non-motorized transportation options to support neighborhood residential development, equity, and accessibility to regional amenities. The network is highlighted by an urban greenway linear park loop. A greenway extends the current Rivergreenway system as an armature linking neighborhoods with shared recreational, cultural and commercial resources. Additionally, led design and access studies on the Des Plaines River Trail, the Illinois Prairie Path, and Chicago’s world famous Lakefront Trail.

Multi-Modal Transportation System Planning and Design
Led multi-modal planning projects in Indianapolis and Carmel, Indiana, which initiated transportation systems to integrate bicycle, pedestrian and transit modes in a network of streets that form typology-specific corridors. Designed system to encourage development of a place-based transportation, principally pulling land use analysis, housing and neighborhood planning, economic development potential, and green infrastructure into the plan to assure a comprehensive approach to add value to residents.

MEMBERSHIPS

American Institute of Certified Planners
American Planning Association

CERTIFICATIONS

National Charrette Institute
Charrette Systems and Management and Facilitation
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C. OUTLINE OF CONTRACTORS' EXPERIENCE
DPZ, Jacobs, Gibbs Planning Group, and Mckenna have strong track records of collaborating and providing master planning, urban design, zoning and coding services for various successful cities and downtowns; towns and town centers; and villages throughout the United States and internationally. These include multiple projects for the City of Birmingham and a number more in the surrounding region. The team possesses unparalleled experience working with various authorities, agencies, and municipalities, including, where required, in venues with a great degree of community engagement. In carrying public sector projects forward, we intensively coordinate stakeholders, agencies, and levels of municipal governments from work order through the approval processes.

The DPZ projects on the following pages comprise several recent planning efforts which are consistent with the goals of traditional pedestrian-oriented place making; sensitive, sustainable development; responsible economic growth; and integration/coordination with the local municipal framework. These include master plans projects that emphasized the importance of effective community engagement and information dissemination – a method that is critical with the interrelated planning, design, transportation, economic, and sociocultural issues typically associated with municipal development/redevelopment.

Similarly, our sub consultants project samples included herein highlight each firm’s experience in similar municipal planning work and technical studies to that identified in this RFP. They include projects for the City of Birmingham as well as others in the region.

The DPZ Team has been involved over the past several decades in the planning and revitalization efforts for the City of Birmingham, MI.
### Downtown Birmingham 2016

**Location:** City of Birmingham, Michigan  
**Type:** Master Plan  
**Year Design:** 1996  
**Status:** Adopted

During a week long charrette DPZ, together with local consultants Robert Gibbs and McKenna Associates, collaborated with the City of Birmingham to plan Downtown Birmingham to 2016. Benefitting from effective community engagement during the process the adopted plan served as a strategic guide through the next two decades of the City’s development. It was designed to be broad and visionary, with tactical studies, designs, and partnerships to follow.

The Master Plan recommendations included:

- Downtown as a regional traffic destination, but not a traffic conduit.
- Birmingham to evolve gracefully into a small city, and not be held to the standards of a village.
- Decisions lead to mixed-use public spaces uncontaminated by suburban traffic & parking standards.
- Additional plans to safeguard local neighborhoods, with their small town character, from degradation.
- Design reflects Birmingham’s preeminent position as a regional arts center, and not diminished by technocratic standards or economic determinism.

*Illustrations depicting specific policies and interventions*
BIRMINGHAM 2016 PLAN ASSESSMENT

Location: City of Birmingham, Michigan
Type: Implementation Assessment and Proposals
Year: 2014
Status: Complete

At the request of the City Commission and Planning Board, Andrés Duany returned to Birmingham in 2014, to review the Birmingham 2016 Plan’s implementation. Over the course of three days, DPZ and consultant Bob Gibbs held meetings with authorities, stakeholders, developers, and residents. Responding to concerns, DPZ shared observations, made recommendations and emphasized the need to plan for the next generation. Building on the success of the Birmingham Plan a number of untapped opportunities were identified; including:

- Further improvements to the streetscape, infrastructure and civic spaces.
- Review and, when necessary, expand the parking
- Library Plaza Improvements.
- Short and medium interventions activate Shain Park.
- Complete the Booth Park Connector.
- A highway link connecting northeast and northwest.
- Transform 555 Building to create landmark gateway.

The quality of the streetscape was one of the issues assessed.

A walking tour and stakeholder meetings allowed specific topics and locations to be examined and a way forward considered.
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PONTIAC CNU LEGACY PROJECT

Location: City of Pontiac, Michigan
Type: Downtown Revitalization Plan
Year Design: 2016
Status: Implementation in progress
Size: 190 acres
Contact: Jane Bais DiSessa, Deputy Mayor, City of Pontiac

Each year, CNU’s Legacy Charrettes work in the Congress host region to empower local leaders, advocates, and communities to implement New Urbanist principles and build places where people and businesses can thrive and prosper. In 2016, the City of Pontiac was selected as one of four projects commissioned that year.

The early analysis identified much of the urban fabric still intact, pioneering local entrepreneurs, and market demand ready for housing and commercial uses. What was missing was a coherent, continuous, pedestrian-friendly framework for businesses, shops, restaurants and citizens to flourish. During the Charrette the team met with many of the City leaders, local business owners, developers and members of the community. Enthusiasm was built around a shared vision to see Downtown improved, made pedestrian-friendly, opened up to investment opportunities and a broad mix of housing and other uses accommodated.

The Vision encompassed practical steps to revitalize Downtown Pontiac in a rational, phased process. The re-striping of streets to double the number of on-street parking, and making streets two-way again to help local businesses to be done right away; improving and reusing the Phoenix Center as a sports venue to begin soon after; the transportation recommendations be put in motion concurrently; a public market, pop-up retail and incentives for infill and redevelopment can come soon after.

Focus areas include short and medium term actions that underpins the overall Master Plan vision.
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FORT MEYERS DOWNTOWN PLAN

Location: Fort Myers, Florida
Type: Downtown Plans
Year Design: 2001, 1986
Status: Under Construction
Size: 540 Acres
Contact: Don Paight, Executive Director
Downtown Redevelopment Agency

DPZ worked with Genesis Group to complete a master plan for this 540-acre study area in downtown Fort Myers. While the previous master plan, prepared in 1986, had succeeded in spurring reinvestment in the downtown area, the following years saw dramatic changes in the local politics and demographics. To address this new reality more effectively, the City retained DPZ to prepare a fresh and cohesive development program that could be implemented through public and private partnerships.

The DPZ master plan reflects a new way of approaching urban planning and development, one that views the collaboration of public and private actions as a continuous and evolving process that begins months before the design team’s efforts and continues for years afterwards. The plan aims to identify general initiatives and specific projects that will maximize private investment while enhancing the public realm of downtown.

The master plan is to be used in conjunction with three separate documents: the SmartCode, the Fort Myers Retail Analysis, and the Downtown Fort Myers Streetscape Plan. The SmartCode is an alternative zoning ordinance that can be implemented as either a replacement to existing ordinances or as an optional alternative to function in parallel with existing ordinances.

The plan reflects 17 specific interventions. These are pilot projects that highlight areas the City should encourage in its efforts to improve the downtown.

Visualizations of streetscapes proposed by the Downtown Master Plan.
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MIAMI21

Location: Miami, Florida
Scope and Services: City-wide Zoning Code Overhaul; Planning and Land Use, Urban Design, Zoning/Coding, Transportation/Infrastructure, Community Engagement
Date: 2004 - 2010
Size: 35 Sq. Miles
Client Contact: Manny Diaz
Former Mayor of Miami
Lydecker Diaz

Responding to Miami’s rapid growth, the City’s Planning Department commissioned DPZ to embark on an unprecedented mission: a complete overhaul of the City’s zoning code with the largest known application of a form based code.

The project name “Miami21” represents the “Miami of the 21st Century” and entails a holistic approach to land use and urban planning, broadening the scope of a traditional zoning code to become a truly comprehensive plan. Miami21 will provide a clear vision for the City that will be supported by specific guidelines and regulations to: address the public and private realm, create a more efficient permitting process, and provide a stable environment for investment.

Miami21 proposes dual yet distinct goals of conservation and development. Conservation goals are intended to preserve neighborhoods and historic site, create sustainable development through green building incentives, conserve energy through green initiatives, improve connectedness for walkability, increase access to natural environments and improve quality of life for residents. Development goals are intended to develop corridors to function as transit-oriented centers, ensure predictable environment for growth and appropriate development, incentivize LEED and maintain future growth capacity of downtown.

Six elements, in particular, serve as the linchpins in the development of the blueprint: a Form-based Code, Economic Development, Transportation, Parks and Open Spaces, Arts and Culture, and Historic Preservation.

The project was a huge cooperative venture with many public meetings and meetings with the Office of Mayor Manuel A. Diaz, the Office of City Manager Pedro G. Hernandez, the Offices of City Commissioners, the Planning Department, the Office of Zoning, the Department of Economic Development, the Department of Capital Improvements and Transportation, the Office of the City Attorney, the Neighborhood Enhancement Team (NET), CitiStat, the Office of Communications, the Department of Public Works, the Department of Parks and Recreation, and the Department of Code Enforcement.

Miami21 was fully adopted – as DPZ had submitted it – in May 2010.

Awards

2014 Global Human Settlements Award in Planning and Design, Global Forum on Human Settlements
2014 AIA Institute Honor Award for Regional and Urban Design; The American Institute of Architects
2011 APA National Planning Excellence Award for Best Practice
2010 Driehaus Form-Based Code Award
2010 Paul Crawford Distinction for a Ground-Breaking Code
APA FL 2010 Award of Excellence, Best Practices Category
An inactive street can be transformed by removing large blank walls and creating walkable, active streets by bringing buildings closer to the sidewalk with active sidewalk storefronts and frequent entrances.

Mixed-use neighborhood corridors with medium densities provide jobs, neighborhood services, live-work options, and transit opportunities—all within walking distance of one another. In this example the transportation corridor goes from just being a way to get to a destination—to a destination in-and-of itself.
Beginning in early 2013, DPZ began the design, coding, and implementation plan for five TOD districts located along the existing Metro light rail corridor in the City of Phoenix.

As the prime consultant, DPZ lead a team with over a dozen national and local consultants; the DPZ Team also worked closely with the Gateway Steering Committee representing the local community, the City of Phoenix Planning and Development Department and other departments, agencies and organizations, as well as the City’s partners, Arizona State University (ASU), and St. Luke Health Initiative.

The City of Phoenix started the process of defining a new vision for a more livable and equitable development future. The DPZ Team was privileged to be a part of this process and work with the City and its partners to create long-term, sustainable vision and plans for the five TOD Districts, and to help stimulate growth within them while also positively influencing the larger city.

The six main components of this vision include:

- Diverse and Affordable Housing
- Thriving Economic Development
- Green Infrastructure
- Balanced Land Use
- Connected Mobility
- Health and Vitality

The multi-year process included large scale planning, envisioning potential futures and best-use scenarios addressing land-use, transportation, utilities, affordability, and development regulations. The primary goal of DPZ’s engagement was a new zoning code addressing land within 1/2 mile of light-rail stations.

Reinvent Phoenix has resulted in a number of small-scale interventions continuing to transform the city, as well as commitment to major thoroughfare reconfigurations now secured through CIP. The TOD code was adopted in July 2015.
DPZ was commissioned by the City of Kirkwood, Missouri to do a downtown Master Plan and Parking Study. A full study of existing conditions, zoning regulations, potential development sites, demographics, and a complete market potential analysis was undertaken. These studies informed a week-long public charrette held in October 2017 in which a consensus downtown master plan was drafted. The Master Plan recommendations and proposed changes to the Zoning Code were approved in 2018.

Following a recent Comprehensive Plan and based on a series of analyses looking at the zoning code, parking, and market helped shape the overall master plan. The master plan identified strategic locations for redevelopment opportunities and proposed methods for stitching the downtown fabric back together again.

Rebuilding the historic block structure, defining pedestrian priority streets, identifying parking strategies were key in the implementation of the downtown master plan for Kirkwood. Additionally, new building types were proposed that were missing from the region, due to constraints in zoning. These building types along with small revisions to the zoning code will allow residents to remain in the city as they age.

The master plan, while designed over private property, provided a unified vision forward for the city which residents and the city can utilize as they move forward in the redevelopment of their downtown.
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MIDTOWN OMAHA 2050

Location: Omaha, Nebraska
Scope and Services: Midtown Development Vision and Master Plan; Planning, Urban Design, Preliminary Coding, Community Engagement
Date: 2016
Size: ~5 Square Miles
Client Contact: D.J. Thayer, Executive Director, International & Domestic Business Affairs

Midtown Vision 2050 – comprising 5 square miles of Omaha that stretch from downtown to Dundee, generally extending from 20th Street on the east to 48th Street on the west, and from Center Street on the south to Cuming Street on the north – serves as a framework for Midtown Omaha’s growth, as shepherded by a new nonprofit group led by some of the city’s largest employers in collaboration with DPZ. The planning proposals are aimed towards maximizing Midtown’s potential by connecting its existing corporate and university campuses and neighborhoods, and filling in the gaps between them with new development designed to complement each other and support an urban lifestyle.

A main component of the plan is the introduction of a modern streetcar line down Farnam Street that would connect midtown, downtown and the riverfront. The plan envisions the establishment of neighborhood nodes with shops, restaurants, and offices sensitively transitioning to residential areas. Proposals also include the conversion of many one-way streets in the area to two-way traffic, as well as the narrowing of other overly-wide streets and the addition of bike lanes and wider, pedestrian-friendly sidewalks. Last but not least, the plan also recommends revisions to city zoning regulations to create better design standards and more cohesive neighborhoods.

“Midtown Vision 2050 is a visionary plan that guides growth and redevelopment in midtown Omaha for the next several decades,” said Ken Cook, chairman of Midtown 2050’s board. Midtown 2050 is backed by Mutual of Omaha, the University of Nebraska Medical Center, Nebraska Medicine, Kiewit Corp., Creighton University, the philanthropic nonprofit Heritage Services, and the Midtown Neighborhood Alliance.

Midtown 2050 considers a more robust redevelopment of midtown as crucial to metropolitan Omaha’s economic progress. Not only would it generate more activity and tax revenue in a half-empty part of the city’s urban core, but it would be vital to attracting talented young employees and entrepreneurs.
This revitalization plan for the 700-acre area of downtown West Palm Beach was a collaborative process and involved twenty-two improvement initiatives that were underway before the April 1993 charrette began. The goal of the initial effort was to bring these disparate projects together and place them within a coherent context. The resulting master plan reinforces the unique character of each of the downtown neighborhoods, districts, and corridors; supports the improvements underway; describes additional improvements required to fight deterioration; and provides strategies to inspire confidence in a healthy urban fixture. Each action proposed by the plan is related to the following six strategies, produced during the planning process:

1. reinforce the identity of each neighborhood, district, and corridor,
2. balance vehicular and pedestrian comfort on downtown streets,
3. focus retail growth by area and type,
4. provide a regulatory framework for physical predictability,
5. encourage housing downtown,
6. identify sites for future civic buildings

The new code is simple and succinct. It promotes small-scale, incremental growth. The coding of buildings is based on building type rather than on an abstract floor-area ratio. In conjunction with the regulating plan, the height and physical configuration of a building is described in advance. The code and master plan have been adopted and are in the process of implementation. Immediate successes have been the rebirth of Clematis Street and the development of City Place. Both projects hinged on zoning ordinance changes introduced by the master plan. New projects based on the DPZ plan include a performing arts center and a library.
Downtown Albuquerque and EDo comprise downtown Albuquerque but are divided due to a rail line splitting the two down the middle. A master plan was done to bridge the two neighborhoods and allow them to support one another rather than compete against each other.

Central Avenue, the main east west spine, has several opportunities for development including activating the ground floors to provide a consistent, comfortable pedestrian experience. Development on the west is primarily revitalization opportunities around future transit stations while the east side (East Downtown) has become the tech hub of Albuquerque. This has increased interest in some of the surrounding underutilized parcels as potential infill opportunities.

The rail line which runs north/south and is the physical divide between the Downtown on the west and East Downtown has numerous underutilized parcels along it and with Innovate ABQ reinvigorating the neighborhood there are unique opportunities for small-scale development along some of the vacant sites, facing the rail line. Some of this development would otherwise be unrealistic, by virtue of the size and scale. The rail line is an amenity to be capitalized on with development fronting it. Envisioned to be an arts district with restaurants and outdoor seating along the promenade with the potential to include a BRT within the underutilized right-of-way, tying Downtown to Old Town through a transit loop. The rail line provides the opportunity to stitch the core of the city back together.

During the workshop, all of the in-progress development projects and many of those parcels highly likely to develop were analyzed and illustrated with the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) metrics. Innovate ABQ alone projects approximately 600,000 square feet of new development across office, research, institutional, retail, hospitality, and residential uses, including nearly 400 student units. Outside of Innovate, approximately 800 residential units and 800,000 square feet of new non-residential development is possible.
The Downtown Sarasota Master Plan was prepared by DPZ in conjunction with Cardinal Carlson + Parks, Hall Planning & Engineering and James Moore, in collaboration with the Sarasota CRA.

The Master Plan draws upon earlier plans for the downtown, including those of 1986, 1983 and John Nolen’s plan of 1925.

This version’s main contribution is an increase in precision, the assignment of priorities and the provision of tools for implementation - specifically a new form-based code. Since Sarasota is a relatively young city, the Master Plan and code will provide the guidance and discipline needed to bring the city into a period of graceful maturity.

Major themes in the new plan included:

- Connecting the downtown to the bay front
- A system of walkable streets
- A balanced transportation system
- Walk-to-town neighborhoods
- Civic improvements
- Strategic, pragmatic implementation

To realize the city’s motto, “A city of urban amenities with a small town feeling,” it is necessary to create an urban downtown proper surrounded by small town neighborhoods. The study area of this plan includes the three inner-city neighborhoods, Rosemary, Gillespie Park and Park East, recognizing that together with the downtown proper they form an integral part of the pedestrian experience and must be conceived of as a single sector.

By designating each of the city’s streets either ‘A,’ pedestrian-oriented, or ‘B,’ auto-oriented, based on what currently exists, the Master Plan provides a guide for future growth.

Sarasota will be able to fulfill the potential of its existing street network, creating a cohesive and functional system that facilitates vehicular movement and at the same time creates a viable and pleasant system for pedestrians and bicyclists.
By revamping an out-of-date office park into a high-density, mixed-use development, the Downtown Doral project will provide the City of Doral with a central business and civic district. The City, which was independently incorporated in 2003, initially grew as a series of disparate parcels that included a world renowned golf club, isolated subdivisions, shopping centers, and a warehouse district. It never had a pedestrian-oriented core.

Responding to the City's growing population and need for an identifiable center, Armando Codina, now with Flagler Development Group, hired Cooper-Carry's Atlanta office to initiate a design for the conversion of a former industrial and office zone into a mixed-use downtown neighborhood. In August of 2005, DPZ was brought on board to conduct a charrette to refine the plan and draft the code documents.

Downtown Doral will replace one million square feet of office space with 2,840 residential units, over 1 million square feet of commercial space—including 180,000 sf of retail and 400,000 sf of new class “A” office space -- and civic features such as an elementary school, a library and a new City Hall. The current municipal center is housed in one of the existing office buildings. The master plan preserves the existing public rights-of-way and underground infrastructure, yet introduces new structures, thoroughfares and public spaces. All of the streets will be scaled for the pedestrian, with high-density condominium towers rising above a steady podium of residential and retail uses that screen mid-block parking structures. All the main thoroughfares shall be lined with ground floor shops and/or townhouses.

A main feature in the Cooper-Carry design, a broad linear park called the Paseo Doral was reinforced in DPZ’s charrette plan. The Paseo’s greenway is on a cross-axis with Downtown Doral’s new Main Street and is framed by townhouses in a manner reminiscent of Boston’s Commonwealth Avenue. The plan also features a 4-acre City Park overlooked by the site for the new library. DPZ’s regulating plan, urban regulations and thoroughfare standards were approved by the City in 2006 as part of a special downtown district zone. Together, these documents will dictate the size and placement of Downtown Doral’s buildings. Construction is underway for the first residential tower by Perkins + Will.
With the completion of a massive regional mall in the near vicinity, downtown Birmingham, Michigan was feeling the pressure of changing retail/shopping trends. The City decided to commission a planning study in an effort to nurture and enhance future downtown growth.

GPG, with McKenna Associates and Duany Plater-Zyberk, was hired to develop a downtown master plan. The team held a week-long Charrette in downtown Birmingham and conducted a series of public meetings and presentations while designing the City’s future in public. From viable retail expansion quantities to proposals for mixed-use “liner buildings” to conceal parking decks, the planning study was comprehensive. The plan was approved by the City, and many of the recommendations, such as a renovated central city park and traffic calming measures in the North Woodward gateway are continually in the process of being implemented.

Principal: Robert Gibbs
Client: City of Birmingham, Michigan
Contact: Jana Ecker, Planning Director
PO BOX 3001
Birmingham, MI 48012-3001
Tel: (248) 530-1090           Email: jeckerplanner@mainlink.net
The Grosse Pointe Chamber of Commerce, with the cooperation of the five municipalities that make up Grosse Pointe, commissioned Gibbs Planning Group (GPG) to do a study of the community from a commercial, retail and restaurant perspective.

GPG conducted market studies for the four major commercial areas servicing the Grosse Pointes: Mack Avenue from Alter Road on the west to just past 8 Mile Rd./Vernier Rd., and three primary shopping areas along Kercheval Rd. commonly referred to as “The Park, The Village and The Hill.” Exceptional public services, schools and parks, combined with several private clubs and four unique commercial areas, amount to a high quality of life enigmatic of the Grosse Pointes’ metropolitan reputation.

GPG found that adding to the critical mass of retailers and restaurants in the four study areas could increase vibrancy in the commercial districts and further economic development within each study area as they evolve into desirable, mixed-use, urban places. The trade area demographics represent a pent up market for traditional main street commerce, furthering the potential for sustainable retail development. Leading categories of supportable retail growth are grocery stores, restaurants, pharmacy and department store merchandise.

The four study areas could presently support up to 563,200 additional sf of retail and restaurant development, generating as much as $164.1 million in new sales. By 2021, household income growth could increase the total captured sales to $172.4 million. Demand could partially be absorbed by existing businesses and/or with the opening of 165 to 225 new restaurants and
2014
GPG conducted a retail analysis for the City of Holland’s Downtown. While historic charm, stable employment and exceptional infrastructure make downtown Holland a desirable location for local, regional and national retailers, the study proposed that just beyond some densely developed blocks, several advantageously located sites are suitable for infill or redevelopment.

A steadily increasing population in a fast-growing region, coupled with strong tourism and events, positions Holland for new commercial development to complement the existing supply of successful retailers and restaurants. GPG’s market study identified and quantified the retail demand generated by residents, workers, students and a year-round supply of tourists, ultimately discovering opportunities for existing retailers to expand their presence or for new retailers to enter the market. Adding to the critical mass of retailers and restaurants downtown can further the broad appeal to tourists and contribute to increased expenditure within the downtown development district. Leading categories of supportable retail growth are restaurants, department store merchandise, apparel, furniture and jewelry.

GPG offered guidance in marketing and distributing the study, as well as equipping the DDA with a list of potential tenants to fill the retail gaps, and consequently, property owners have fully embraced the study.
GPG first teamed with Duany Plater-Zyberk Architects (DPZ) in 1995 to develop a master plan that would turn downtown Naples into a more vibrant mixed-use city center. GPG discovered a significant pent-up demand for upscale residential, office, shopping and dining in the region. The demand was being suppressed by a lack of parking, local zoning codes and little incentive for property owners to redevelop. Naples elected to increase downtown density, building heights and its commercial area, and to attract more diverse retail and restaurants into the downtown areas.

Another market analysis was conducted in 2010, which made the following recommendations to enhance Fifth Avenue’s commercial sustainability:

- Implement a Business Improvement District or similar for improved business retention, new business recruitment, expanded marketing and central management.
- Improve landscape lighting, parking design, and streetscape amenities.
- Expand marketing to include all local and national businesses (the website and publications list only association members).
- Conduct parking meter beta test to measure effectiveness of improved shopper parking in relation to retail sales.
- Encourage more outside dining areas and live entertainment for restaurants.
- Encourage business employees to park in parking garages by increasing the rate of on-street parking, by implementing a progressive parking ticket policy.
- Temporary pop-up stores in key locations/ vacant storefronts.

Principal: Robert Gibbs  
Client: Fifth Avenue South Business Association  
Contact: Lou Vlasho, Property Owners’ Steering Committee  
700 Fifth Avenue South, Naples, Florida 34102  
Tel: (239) 659-0040  
Email: louvlasho1@comcast.net
Butler Township, OH
Butler Township Miller Lane and North Dixie Drive Plan

Butler Township, Montgomery County, OH

Owner:
Erica Vogel
Township Administrator
evogel@butlertownship.com

Butler Township, OH
8524 North Dixie Drive
Dayton, OH 45414
937.898.6735

Brief Description:
Land Use Planning

- Data Collection and Analysis
- Wayfinding
- Transportation Planning
- Zoning
- Redevelopment Strategies
- Streetscapes
- Access Management

Project Duration:
2013 - 14 Months

Butler Township retained Jacobs to prepare a comprehensive plan and land use strategies for the primary retail area bordered by I-75 to the east, Little York Road to the north, North Dixie Drive to the west and Benchwood Road to the south. The need for this plan was driven by several factors including: the closure of an interchange on I-75 at Little York (north), the opening of a new interchange at Benchwood Lane (south) and decades of piecemeal, uncoordinated development resulting in severe disinvestment in the northern portion of the study area.

This plan analyzed existing conditions including land use, utilities, transportation linkages, gaps in goods and services and established a detailed vision and goals for the preservation, development and redevelopment of this important commercial shopping destination in the greater Dayton region.

The study area was divided into 10 policy areas, each exhibiting unique characteristics for which future policies and implementation strategies were established. Key to this effort was the establishment of sustainable land use patterns, a wayfinding, streetscape and gateway signage program to cohesively identify and tie together the individual policy areas.

Recommendations ranged from maintaining and protecting certain policy areas and structures to a complete revised vision for other areas which included the establishment of a mixed use, high density, Town Center main street concept to attract new residents and smaller service and retail types businesses – a niche missing in this region.

Deliverables include a comprehensive plan including recommendations for land use, zoning, streetscapes, transportation and wayfinding signage.

The plan was unanimously adopted by the Township Planning and Zoning Commission and the Township Trustees in April, 2013. Construction of wayfinding signage began in early 2014.
In order to make ensure that downtown’s future parking needs and concerns are fully identified, Jacobs was hired by Downtown Amarillo, Inc (DAI) to conduct a parking study encompassing a 45 block area in Amarillo Texas. The study entailed a four step process including:

1. Assembling existing conditions information including GIS data and base mapping, identification of public and private parking facility players, summarizing previous parking studies, identification of public and private parking facility locations (both on and off street), identification of public transit routes and stop locations, and a summary of zoning regulations that affect downtown development;

2. Conducting an analysis of existing on and off-street parking areas and layouts including the identification of the number of parking spaces and determining parking occupancy/utilization counts as it relates to existing land use patterns;

3. Establishing strategies and alternatives for identified parking needs as it relates to current and future land uses which included, but were not limited to: identifying deficiencies that may exist in the current parking system, evaluating opportunities to better utilize parking through reconfiguration, offsetting demand through various parking demand strategies, investigating joint or shared parking opportunities, the potential establishment of new parking areas and identifying changes that are recommended to be made in the zoning code with respect to required parking.

4. Preparing a final study and recommendations which will enable DAI to: understand current and future parking conditions in the downtown area; determine if and where parking issues currently exist and identify methods for minimizing them, understand the impact of expected future development on downtown parking, understand if additional parking capacity is needed and where it may be needed, and understand alternative ways to better utilize existing parking systems downtown.
Chicago Streets Cycling Plan 2020
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Chicago's Streets for Cycling 2020 Plan recommends a 645-mile network of bike facilities for innovative treatments with the goal of making all Chicagoans feel safe bicycling on the city's streets.

Jacobs teamed with Sam Schwartz Engineering to plan the future bikeway network by identifying gaps in the existing bicycle system, opportunities for improvement, and implementation challenges. The network was divided into three types of routes:

- Spoke Routes (60 miles) – Seven bicycle corridors radiating in all directions from downtown, with protected bike lanes and buffered bike lanes as the preferred design treatment, colorized pavement, and extra branding effort.
- Crosstown Bike Routes (275 miles) – Major through streets with protected bike lanes and buffered bike lanes as the preferred design treatment.
- Neighborhood Bike Routes (310 miles) – Local streets with neighborhood greenways as the preferred treatment. Neighborhood greenways would prioritize traffic control for the bike route and use traffic calming to reduce automobile speeds and volumes.

Jacobs is responsible for the route planning in three of the nine city sub-regions, including the central business district. We developed a methodology to rate and prioritize individual corridors based on factors such as existing bike commute mode share, population density, proximity to destinations (transit, schools, parks), and network connectivity. We also performed design review of concept geometry and traffic analysis for the West Side Boulevards corridor, and assisted with Community Advisory Group and public meetings. Jacobs is currently working on design and implementation of the project through a separate contract.

Webster University, MO Parking Analysis and Projection Strategy

Owner:
Webster University
470 East Lockwood Ave.
Webster Groves, MO
314.961.9801

Brief Description:
Parking Usage and Master Planning

Project Duration:
2010

As part of the Webster University Master Plan Update, Jacobs collected data on existing parking usage across the campus and anticipated future parking needs for the campus. This included parking in a garage, multiple lots, and on street parking. Parking lot counts were used to determine the usage of the parking lots and recommend a program to manage the parking needs across the campus. Recommendations were also provided for future parking locations and options to accommodate anticipated future growth on the campus.
CDOT previously completed a Phase I Project Development Report (PDR) for eight miles of Milwaukee Avenue from Grand Avenue to Jefferson Park in 2003, an Addendum to the PDR in 2006, and has since reconstructed four segments of Milwaukee Avenue moving from northwest to southeast. However, in the time since the PDR and its Addendum were approved, CDOT has adopted a more concentrated focus on developing complete streets design solutions that consider the needs of all roadway users.

Simultaneously, in 2012, a group of Logan Square neighborhood residents began reimagining the design of the streets surrounding the Square, including rerouting Milwaukee Avenue around the Square to create a single park space, and realigning Kedzie Avenue to the west of an existing transit terminal to create a large new public plaza adjacent to businesses and restaurants on the east side of Kedzie Avenue. This group referred to their concept as the Bicentennial Improvements Plan.

CDOT selected Jacobs to reevaluate the previous Phase I study for a 1.3-mile segment of Milwaukee Avenue between Logan Boulevard and Belmont Avenue, including a once-in-a-generation opportunity to redesign the roadways surrounding Logan Square. We began by meeting with local elected officials, assembling a project study group comprised of key local stakeholders, collecting data, and hosting a public meeting to discuss existing conditions in the study area. The data collection effort included a unique origin-destination study using data from mobile devices provided by Streetlight, and multiple parking observations on different days and times to analyze utilization.

Jacobs developed four concepts for the design of Logan Square and two for Milwaukee Avenue that were presented at a second PSG and Public Meeting.

- The Logan Square design concepts included a minor change option, a “traffic oval” option similar to the design proposed by the resident-generated Bicentennial Improvement Plan, a two-way option that keeps Milwaukee Avenue through the Square and Kedzie Avenue in its existing location, and a two-way option that “bends” Milwaukee Avenue around the north and east sides of the square instead of going through the Square.

- The Milwaukee Avenue design concepts included one option for additional complete streets improvements such as dashed bike lanes and curb extensions to improve pedestrian crossings, and one option that would narrow the roadway and remove parking to provide fully separated bike lanes.

All concepts were compared for impacts on public spaces, historic integrity, pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, traffic operations, parking supply, and constructability.
The City of Birmingham is one of Michigan’s premier communities, and part of its reputation and tradition of excellence is its longstanding commitment to world-class parks design and recreation provision. The City engaged McKenna to prepare a rewrite of its Parks and Recreation Master Plan, which—in Michigan—is the basis for access to State and other grants and loans for acquisition, design, and development of parks. Additionally, the Parks and Recreation Board wished to reexamine its overall planning priorities, as well as specific plans for each of its 26 parks, which cover more than 230 acres or 10% of the City’s total acreage.

McKenna designed a robust public engagement program; City leaders had desired to extensively engage residents, who are extremely passionate about Birmingham parks. Throughout the multi-pronged engagement process, which included a “Field Day” at the Fall Harvest Farmer’s Market, a comprehensive online and paper survey, key stakeholder roundtable discussions, and public presentations, a significant number of residents indicated that the parks and recreation programs were key to their choosing to invest and stay in Birmingham.

McKenna’s beautifully-designed, easy to interpret Parks and Recreation Master Plan document included all information required by the State, as well as best practice and strategic recommendations on features that the City wished to investigate for future development, including restrooms in public parks, green stormwater handling, and other special planning topics.

City leaders are highly satisfied with the process and resulting document, and are incorporating the plan features into their other robust planning and design priorities city-wide for a comprehensive, coordinated program of community planning and design excellence.
Rochester, one of Michigan’s premier medium-sized cities located north of Detroit, is surrounded by fast-growing communities—and thus has been subject to extreme development pressure. Rochester’s walkability, vibrant downtown, and traditional neighborhoods have made it the center of this highly attractive suburban area in metro Detroit.

The City’s recently updated Master Plan identified a number of “potential intensity change areas”—sites likely to redevelop in the near future. Rochester experienced a building boom of mixed-use and residential development in its downtown consistent with the Master Plan. However, City leaders saw the need to gain a thorough understanding of the impact each of these projects would have on the character of the community, as well as impacts on the community’s natural, historic, and man-made systems.

Rochester engaged McKenna to develop a sustainability tool that would establish key measurable indicators. McKenna analyzed and developed 20 Rochester-specific indicators including tree coverage, traffic, parking, stormwater, and financial impact. McKenna’s analysis included a determination of the baseline for each indicator, then, working closely with the Interdisciplinary Working Committee through a robust public process, McKenna developed optimal levels for each indicator based on the objectives of the Master Plan. The McKenna team developed a scoring system, on which each new development is scored—ensuring that future development is sustainable and consistent with the established and envisioned character of the community. In addition, the City appointed McKenna to its Sustainability Directorship.

Rochester leaders are highly satisfied with the Sustainable Rochester process and resulting sustainability tool, and have directed McKenna to incorporate the program into the development review process for a comprehensive, coordinated approach to community planning and design excellence.
Eton Road Corridor Plan
BIRMINGHAM, MICHIGAN

The City of Birmingham was confronted by redevelopment proposals for an area of the City located along Eton Road between Maple and Lincoln which was perceived by the private market to be underdeveloped. The area contained a variety of uses, most commonly older industrial. The City judged redevelopment proposals to be premature without a land use and transportation plan first in place and retained McKenna to create a master plan to guide the transformation.

As part of the process, McKenna developed a master plan amendment to set the vision for the area and a zoning ordinance amendment to implement the recommendations of the plan. The plan resulted in a vision for a mixed use corridor with a range of commercial, service, light industrial and residential uses. The plan called for high quality, cohesive development, compatible with existing uses in the corridor and adjacent single-family neighborhoods.

The area has since redeveloped according to the Eton Road Corridor Plan, which included detailed implementation, marketing, and design guidelines. Major features of the process included community input, a visioning workshop which employed a development potential map, and a land use and transportation evaluation matrix.

As a result of the plan, more than 300 residential dwelling units were built and five industrial buildings revitalized for a variety of uses in the Eton Road corridor. The area transformed from a first-generation industrial area to a vibrant, mixed use area in the decade following the adoption of the plan.
D. SCOPE OF WORK
Our team has long standing relationships and a history of highly collaborative project execution. This is key to keep in mind while reviewing the work plan. Tasks specified are highly dependent upon each other and touch many hands within the team. No one team member has all of the answers; we gain insight through collaborative cross-over, engagement with stakeholders, and consultation with area experts. In order to facilitate this relationship, we will ensure close coordination between DPZ, GPG, McKenna, and Jacobs during the collaborative charrette and for the duration of the full project cycle.

The following approach is prepared prior to direct discussion with the City of Birmingham. Therefore it makes assumptions based on our understanding of the scope and may be refined as the project moves forward in order to meet the City’s expectations. We envision execution of specific tasks to occur within bursts of overlapping activity, as identified in the project time frame (Section E). Our team will be available according to the proposed time frame. The majority of tasks outlined below are related to others and cross boundaries of team members. We have found over decades of working on projects similar to this one that huddling cross-disciplinary expertise and immediate analysis and feedback on proposals is the best path to success. Organizing our work with a focus on the Charrette is key to achieving this.
D. SCOPE OF WORK - (I) COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Community Engagement Understanding

The DPZ Team is experienced in all forms of public outreach and engagement techniques. Our blend of national and local experts will ensure the community engagement plan not only encompasses appropriate and innovative techniques but also is manageable, properly resourced, and accounts for any regional sensitivities.

Our team has proven success in appropriately and comprehensively engaging Birmingham residents - both in the prior Birmingham 2016 Plan preparation and more recently during the Parks and Recreation Master Plan process. For this initiative we understand that Birmingham is again desirous of an inclusive, comprehensive community engagement approach for the master planning effort and that Birmingham residents are engaged, highly educated, and passionate about local opportunities and constraints.

The type and extent of consultation must be tailored to the scope of the project and proper planning ensures the agreed approach will be strategic, targeted and fully effective at each stage of the project. The Project Initiation meeting (Task 1) will confirm with the City the proposed approach and timings of initiatives and make any necessary refinements. This includes agreeing a schedule of meetings, presentations and workshops, publicity strategy, and the deployment of online communication tools such as a website and social media strategy.

Framework for Engagement

Our team will be considerate of how residents and other stakeholders wish to be engaged. Thus, our team will:

- Be respectful of residents’ and other stakeholders’ time and attitudes.
- Provide multiple opportunities for input.
- Be straightforward and forthcoming in establishing the role their participation will play in decision-making, whether they are empowered (most powerful role) or advised (least powerful role) – though most engagement processes fall somewhere in between those two poles.
- Fashion the approach around the role the City wishes to grant its stakeholders.
- Proactively engage all age groups and account for all knowledge levels.
- Conduct community activities with friendly yet professional demeanors.
- Follow through on any and every promise made to the community.

Community engagement during the Birmingham Parks and Recreation Plan process
Baseline Engagement Acknowledged

The RFP identified a number of events and meetings that together comprise the baseline for community engagement, from a multi-day Charrette to working sessions with the Planning Board. Our proposal includes all of the base meetings as identified in the RFP and the significant engagement elements are described in more detail below.

Communication / Publicity Tools

A communication strategy will be agreed as an early task (Task 1). We will work with the City to utilize existing and/or set up and manage new communication tools to enable extensive publicity of the project, key events and dates, and provide further engagement opportunities as reports and documents are prepared and published. This will include both a website, (see screenshots on the following page of websites previously set up by McKenna), and the use of the City’s Social Media Applications, as appropriate.

Interactive Workshop / Charrette

As mentioned, DPZ utilizes short focused workshops (Charrettes) as our preferred method to intensively engage stakeholders and communities in our traditional planning practice and this will be a principle part of this project’s scope (Tasks 6 & 7). Our team comprise expert Charrette facilitators and includes personnel certified by the National Charrette Institute in both its NCI Charrette System program and the NCI Charrette Management and Facilitation program. The Charrette will assemble key decision-makers to collaborate with the DPZ team in information sharing, creating iterative proposals, listening to feedback, and agreeing revisions. A sample Charrette schedule is shown below.

Community engagement is an important aspect of the proposed Charrette and will encourage input and produce valuable political and audience feedback. Professionals and stakeholders will identify options that will be rapidly prototyped and judged in public sessions, enabling informed decisions and save months of sequential coordination. The dynamic and inclusive process, with frequent presentations, is a fast method of identifying and overcoming obstacles and objections. The shared experience will vest interest in the proposals and build support for the vision.
Online Surveys

Two (2) Online Surveys – Online surveys can be effective methods of engaging large numbers of residents and stakeholders during a planning process. Additionally, many communities prefer online surveys to other online engagement methods - online fora, for example - so that the chance for inappropriate discussions in moderated comments sections or forums is effectively eliminated. The McKenna team employed in-person and online methods to engage nearly 2,000 residents and stakeholders during the 2017 Birmingham Parks and Recreation Master Plan process; the online surveys were taken by nearly 1,000 participants, proving that online engagement is effective in Birmingham. We developed the communications plan, language for posting on social media and the City’s website, and a detailed approach that was convenient and straightforward for the City to administer using its communications and IT teams.

Thus, having recent proven success in gathering online survey responses and “getting the word out” effectively and efficiently to people who are engaged in social media, we propose administering two online surveys during the planning process (Provisionally proposed during Tasks 3 & 9). We will work with City staff to develop the questions, which will be focused on strategic issues that Birmingham leaders are currently wrestling with and will deploy the surveys towards the beginning and middle of the project schedule for maximum effect. Together with the Charrette, the online survey will inform the strategies and future land uses represented in the adopted Master Plan, as determined and agreed upon by the City’s project team when the Community Engagement Plan is prepared and finalized.

Please note that if there is a specific desire to NOT administer online surveys as part of this planning effort we will work with the City to develop an alternative online engagement method, if desired.

Telephone Interviews

Unlimited Telephone Interviews + 10 In-Person Interviews – Our team will conduct an unlimited number of telephone interviews and up to 10 in-person interviews with key stakeholders who are not able or willing to attend the multi-day Charrette (Provisionally proposed during tasks 6 -7). This is critical to project success, as there will undoubtedly be a handful of important property owners or tenants that will not participate otherwise. Additionally, as necessary and as desired / approved by the City, we will work with local, County, regional and State stakeholders through voice and electronic communications.
D. SCOPE OF WORK - (II) DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Data Collection and Analysis Understanding

The following key activities are proposed as part of the data collection and analysis work-stream to be led by Gibbs Planning Group. The information gathered will provide an important basis to determine the City of Birmingham’s current demographic profile and allow informed consideration be given to the likely trends and future opportunities for commercial and residential policy.

A significant proportion of this work will be carried out as early tasks in the project timeline (Tasks 2-4) with opportunities for consultation with the City and other stakeholders. The early assessment will allow a baseline of information to be available for further analysis at the beginning of the Charrette (Tasks 6 & 7). The policies and proposals developed during the Charrette will respond to an interactive analysis of the information available with input from stakeholders and the community. This intuitive process and respected techniques applied by Gibbs Planning Group will result in a relevant, authoritative and effective updated plan.

Specific activities include:

- **Update Birmingham and Oakland County population data** to include current demographic data, future projections and analysis of each demographic group including: families, seniors and all other population segments. This data shall be based on city, county, SEMCOG, US Census, and private research resources.

- **Update Birmingham, Oakland County, and Southeast Michigan demographic and employment data** to include current and projected demographic data (residential, retail, office, mix of land uses) and analysis of the region, regional and downtown development trends, and regional collaboration efforts.

- **Update of City of Birmingham Residential Housing section** to include neighborhood vision in residential areas, analysis of changes in residential patterns and residential areas from 1980 to now, typology and character of neighborhoods, development trends, future projections, and future direction. Future housing demand shall also estimated for the City of Birmingham.

- **Prepare a retail market study** for downtown Birmingham and each surrounding neighborhood and commercial district.

- **Analyze the physical characteristics** of Birmingham’s neighborhoods and commercial districts. This analysis shall include historic attributes, landscape conditions, parks and open space, housing types, commercial characteristics and the period of construction of each land use pattern.
Parking and Infrastructure Analysis Understanding

Birmingham’s network of walkable tree-lined streets is a key infrastructure asset of the community, helping to differentiate it from other nearby suburbs and make it one of the most desirable places to live in Metro Detroit. In recent years, Birmingham has taken steps to improve upon its transportation system by implementing many of the recommendations of DPZ’s Downtown Birmingham 2016 Plan, passing a resolution of support for Complete Streets in 2011, and developing a vision for a more walkable and bikeable city in the City’s 2013 Multi-Modal Transportation Plan.

Parking is also a key infrastructure asset, and ensuring that adequate and appropriate parking is available is part of a successful plan. Birmingham has evaluated parking as part of recent individual plans and the Master Plan Update will review these plans and bring them together into one cohesive parking plan for the community.

This Master Plan Update will build upon Birmingham’s previously completed plans to analyze infrastructure and parking needs and develop recommendations that support the goals of the community. Stakeholder input will play a key role in the planning process, from developing goals related to transportation and parking infrastructure, to identifying existing issues and concerns, to soliciting ideas for improvements.

Identification of Goals

Through coordination with City staff, key stakeholders, and the general public, various transportation and parking goals will be identified to help guide the infrastructure recommendations (Tasks 1 & 2). Goals could be related to physical infrastructure, such as closing gaps in the sidewalk network, creating low stress bike routes to every school, or ensuring that traffic signals are equipped for a future with connected vehicles. Or the goals could be performance-based, such as reducing the number of traffic crashes, increasing transit mode share, or developing green infrastructure to reduce stormwater runoff. Parking goals could relate to the number and type of parking spaces provided, desired parking utilization, or related to requirements on how parking is to be provided as part of developments. All goals should be measurable and have an associated time frame for implementation.

Infrastructure Analysis

We will review existing data, supplemented by field data collection as necessary, to create maps of the existing transportation network, including street classifications, traffic volumes, sidewalks, bicycle facilities, and tran-
D. SCOPE OF WORK - (III) PARKING AND INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS

sit routes (Tasks 2-4). We recommend moving away from the classifications of “regional, major, and secondary thoroughfares” used in the 1980 Birmingham Plan, and towards a system that identifies roadways as boulevards, avenues, or streets based on the functional definitions in the Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares manual produced by the Institute of Transportation Engineers and the Congress for the New Urbanism. Additionally, “hot spots” showing the community’s main concerns (e.g., congestion, speeding, safety, cut-through traffic, difficult pedestrian crossings, etc.) will be developed through public coordination and stakeholder involvement.

Parking Analysis

The existing conditions for parking will include an inventory of existing parking spaces in the Central Business District, the Triangle District, and the Rail District. The analysis will also evaluate the parking demand for these locations and evaluate the need for or adjustments to the municipal parking systems (Tasks 2-4). Items to be evaluated would include capacity, pricing (possibly demand-related), type (i.e., handicap, electric vehicle, etc.), permitting and restrictions (residential, business), impact of other modes (i.e., walking, biking, ride sharing, transit), need for additional parking structures and future uses of parking structures, and a review of the Zoning Ordinance parking regulations.

Recommendation of Solutions

Many transportation and parking infrastructure projects have already been recommended by other plans or are currently budgeted and programmed. This Master Plan Update will supplement those projects with additional recommendations based on a combination of stakeholder input, the community’s goals, existing conditions analysis, and our understanding of best practices (Tasks 4-7). Our specialty is identifying creative engineering solutions. For example, on the Milwaukee Avenue / Logan Square design project in Chicago, we developed a range of alternatives that address the public’s goals to increase open space, improve pedestrian safety, provide dedicated off-street bicycle facilities, and still maintain acceptable traffic operations. We will apply the same approach to the most pressing issues in Birmingham to recommend solutions that improve conditions for all roadway users.

It is also important to understand the supply and demand for the parking and we will provide recommendations based on the actual, not perceived, demand. For example, in our recent Downtown Kirkwood Master Plan update we found that there was adequate parking to meet the demand within the study area, which allowed the city to prioritize other needs instead of building additional parking.

Prioritization of Recommendations

Recommendations will be prioritized into short-term, medium-term, and long-term projects based on multiple factors. We applied a similar approach to a recent multi-modal plan in Chicago’s northwest suburbs, where we prioritized 167 bicycle and pedestrian facility recommendations based on factors such as crash history, proximity to key destinations, connections to existing facilities or across barriers, and constructability. The constructability criteria will include a planning-level cost estimate for each recommendation. The results of the infrastructure and parking analysis will be incorporated into the draft and final plans (Tasks 6-10).
D. SCOPe OF WORK - (IV & V) PREPARATION OF DRAFT PLAN AND PRESENTATION & ADOPTION

Project Understanding

Birmingham has been on an excellent trajectory since before the City-wide Master Plan was adopted in 1980, subsequent to the Plan until today, and will continue into the future. Birmingham is a world-class city whose residents and property owners enjoy strong returns on investment and excellent quality of space because of the planned, deliberate, and appropriately-scaled public investments implemented by City leaders over many decades.

The City has remained proactive in planning for future success and continued excellence of place by undertaking and adopting several sub-area plans, which now require a comprehensive synthesis and integration into the City-wide master plan. Sub Area Plans include:

- Downtown 2016 Plan (1996);
- Eton Road Corridor Plan (1999);
- Triangle District Plan (2007);
- Alleys and Passages Plan (2012); and
- Multi-modal Transportation Plan (2013);
- Parks and Recreation Master Plan (TBD)

Several further untapped opportunities were detailed during DPZ’s Plan Assessment carried out in 2014 and provide good insight into the issues at hand. Much of the recent focus has been on Downtown revitalization and the City’s Commercial Areas. This success needs to be institutionalized, reflected in an updated plan, and spread further with an emphasis placed on a number of key opportunity areas and the residential neighborhoods.

Tough questions will be asked and addressed during the process, such as:

- How might the Triangle and Rail Districts relate to one another and provide nodes of interest and connection to residents of surrounding neighborhoods?
- Are there neighborhoods with small lots and buildings that should remain smaller in stature and protected from infill rebuild to continue to provide entry points into the market?
- Can Birmingham’s aging residents expect to remain in the community they love?
- What downtown retail environment should be molded given the current proliferation of professional service provider tenants?
- Should green infrastructure play a significant role in the way the community develops in the future?

Rural-to-Urban Transect of typical Miami conditions
Overview of Approach

To complete the above project four phases are proposed over a period of 16 months. The work begins with initiation and analysis, followed by preparation of the draft plan with subsequent refinements, and lastly through to the successful adoption of the finalized plan.

**PROPOSED PHASES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One: Initiation, Assessment and Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two: Preparation of Draft Master Plan Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three: Refinement of Draft Master Plan Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four: Finalization and Adoption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The phases comprise a total of 11 distinct tasks and embed effective community and stakeholder engagement throughout the process. Our proposal also includes all the necessary work sessions with City Staff and meetings with the Planning Board and Planning Commission as set out in the RFP. The operation and timing of these meetings is crucial to making progress as scheduled, maintaining open communication channels, delivering to the scope, and the overall success of the project. Strategic meetings that relate to the key stages and presentations led by DPZ, including the project initiation tasks and the Charrette, with routine / topic specific meetings will be led by our qualified sub consultants. Meetings will be a combination of in-person meetings and, when more efficient, via conference call, particularly for short focused discussions with City staff. This approach will be refined and agreed during project initiation and/or in advance of the meeting.

This description of Services below corresponds with the proposed Project Time Frame (see Section E).

**PHASE ONE – INITIATION, ASSESSMENT, AND ANALYSIS**

**Task 1: Project Initiation**

A project start-up meeting will be conducted to establish the process and procedures of the project; the Project Schedule of work, production, meetings and presentations; the Work Plan Services and Deliverables; project governance; community engagement plan and methods of communication of proposals and progress. Regular coordination meetings are a common fixture of municipal work and will be an important component of this project. This task also includes a tour of the City and potentially an early visioning workshop with City staff.

Deliverable: Project Initiation Document/Powerpoint

Meetings: 1 work session with City Staff and 1 meeting with Planning Board.

**Task 2: Analysis of Background Materials and Existing Conditions**

An analysis of background materials will be undertaken; demographic, commercial and residential data will be updated; an assessment of parking and infrastructure conditions will be undertaken; key elements of current plans and policy documents will be identified (including the City-wide Plan and the aforementioned sub area plans). Existing conditions will thus be documented and an outline of the goals and potential areas of adjustment will be developed. Includes work described in D.(II) & (III) of this section.

Deliverable: Successive Powerpoint presentations outlining ‘draft assessment and analysis findings’

Meetings: Meetings with Staff and Stakeholders, as needed.

**Task 3: Public Review of Analysis Findings**

This task comprises a public, staff, and stakeholders review of the draft findings from the Task 2 Analysis. This includes an outline of the goals and key concerns to be addressed in the updated plan. This represents the first opportunity for the public and other stakeholders to formally input into the plan content and their ongoing engagement will be crucial from this point.

Deliverables: Powerpoint or booklet, media communication materials

Meetings: Online Consultation / Surveys / Telephone Interviews, 1 work session with City Staff, 1 work session with the Planning Board to discuss key segments of the Plan, other meetings with Staff as needed

**Task 4: Finalize Analysis Findings**

The finalization of the analysis incorporates all the responses to prior presentations and public review. The Finalized Analysis will provide a good foundation for the most intensive period of work to be carried out during the Charrette (Tasks 6 & 7). The finalized documentation, may also include an executive summary and other maps and graphics for public audience.
D. SCOPE OF WORK - (IV & V) PREPARATION OF DRAFT PLAN AND PRESENTATION & ADOPTION

Deliverable: Powerpoint or booklet, and electronically for web documentation or other media communication. As specified, one reproducible PDF digital file and twenty hard copies of the latest version of the updated plan.

Meetings: Online Communication, as appropriate, to present the Findings and follow-up meeting with City Staff, as needed

Task 5: Phase End Progress Review (50% Project Completion)

The progress review allows for revisions to the schedule, processes and other adjustments following the work of this phase and the public response to the work, confirming or revising the work plan as needed.

Deliverables: Progress Report (representing 50% of project completion) and media communication materials, as needed

Meetings: 1 meeting with City Staff and 1 progress report meeting with the City Commission

PHASE TWO – PREPARATION OF DRAFT MASTER PLAN UPDATE

For Tasks 6 and 7, a multi-day Charrette is proposed to engage specific topics and to enable a condensed and iterative process. This represents the most intensive period of work.

Task 6: Prepare Draft Master Plan Update - Charrette

Following a tour of the City, the task begins by determining the overall organization and specific techniques of the new plan; the identification of which portions of the existing plan require changes in content, and whether any portions of the existing plan are to be retained. An outline of document sections and content will be confirmed. Following initial a visioning session(s), specific topic focused meetings will be held with key stakeholders and staff. Issues will be discussed, relevant data further analyzed, and solutions presented. Drafting of key elements of the text, plans, and graphics may also be prepared or proposed, as appropriate. An appropriate draft Equivalency Chart is initiated to track significant themes throughout the process, and to facilitate comparisons between existing and proposed as they evolve. A closing public presentation will bring together the key themes, recommendations, and next steps.

Deliverable: Outline of plan including drafts of key text, graphics and illustrative materials, Powerpoint presentation, web and media communication materials

Meetings: The Charrette will comprise of multiple topic focused meetings, visioning exercises, and interactive works sessions and presentations with staff, the public, and stakeholders, as needed. A sample Charrette schedule is included in the Community Engagement Plan Section D (I)

Sample existing conditions study completed for Reinvent Phoenix project. The diagram depicts vacant and city-owned properties, transit sheds, and building heights.
Task 7: Examine and/or Update Specific Areas of Intervention - Charrette

The examination considers a number of master plan, urban design, and building development interventions, and/or locations identified during development of the Draft Updated Plan as potential concerns for stakeholders or staff. As suggested by the RFP these include specific consideration of residential areas, the downtown and commercial areas, and the transitional areas that connect these zones.

Deliverables: Powerpoint presentation, graphics and plans, web and media communication as needed

Meetings: Combined with Task 6 above. Includes 1 work session with the Planning Board to discuss key segments of the Plan.

Task 8: Finalize Draft Master Plan Update - Post-Charrette (75% Project Completion)

Following the conclusion of the Charrette, the Project Team will gather all the information and findings and prepare a full draft of the updated plan. This will include a draft of the updated text, maps, and graphics as agreed during Phase One and Two and specified in the RFP. The Draft will be made available to City Staff along with a Progress Report representing 75% completion of the project.

Deliverables: One reproducible PDF digital file and twenty hard copies of the draft Plan; Progress Report

Meetings: 1 City staff working session and 1 meeting with City Commission to consider Progress Report

PHASE THREE – REFINEMENT OF DRAFT MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Task 9: Revise the Draft Master Plan Update

The Draft will be presented to City Staff for feedback, including specific Departments to review pertinent sections. The documents will also be made available for public presentation and response. This may be facilitated by working sessions with members of specific stakeholder or community groups, or through online surveys / electronic communication, to be determined in the course of prior tasks.

Deliverables: Electronic and paper of refined plan, maps and graphics, Equivalency Chart, Powerpoint presentation, web and media communication materials.

Meetings: 1 Staff working session or series of stakeholder workshops and other meetings with Staff as needed. 1 work session with the Planning Board to discuss key segments of the Plan.

PHASE FOUR – FINALIZATION AND ADOPTION

Task 10: Finalization of Updated Plan

Documents are finalized in response to the suggested refinements following the staff, public and stakeholder input.

Deliverables: One reproducible PDF digital file and twenty hard color copies of the completed plan; One reproducible PDF digital file of the final Plan for publication on the web and social media; and One page infographic outlining vision, goals and recommendations of the Plan.

Meetings: Meetings with City Staff, as needed
**Task 11: Final Presentations and Adoption**

On finalization of Updated Plan the City can progress into the adoption phase. The final presentations to the City include a public hearing at the Planning Board and a further public hearing at the City Commission. Technical support of Staff will be available during the Adoption Process.

**Deliverables:** Responses to on-going questions and comments, advice on potential adjustments.

**Meetings:** 1 Planning Commission meeting, Staff meetings and support as needed to respond to questions and incorporate revisions.
E. PROPOSED TIME FRAME
# City of Birmingham Master Plan Update

## Proposed Time Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase One</th>
<th>Iniation, Assessment and Analysis (Months 1 - 4)</th>
<th>Team Involvement</th>
<th>Project Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>Project Initiation</td>
<td>DPZ</td>
<td>Gibbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Analysis of Background Materials and Existing Conditions</td>
<td>DPZ</td>
<td>Gibbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>Public Review of Analysis Findings</td>
<td>DPZ</td>
<td>Gibbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>Finalize Analysis Findings</td>
<td>DPZ</td>
<td>Gibbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>Phase End Progress Review (50% Project Completion)</td>
<td>DPZ</td>
<td>Gibbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Two</th>
<th>Preparation of Draft Master Plan Update (Months 5 - 10)</th>
<th>Team Involvement</th>
<th>Project Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>Prepare Draft Master Plan Update</td>
<td>DPZ</td>
<td>Gibbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7</td>
<td>Examine and/or update specific areas of intervention</td>
<td>DPZ</td>
<td>Gibbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8</td>
<td>Finalize Draft Master Plan Update (75% Project Completion)</td>
<td>DPZ</td>
<td>Gibbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Three</th>
<th>Refinement of Draft Master Plan Update (Months 10 - 12)</th>
<th>Team Involvement</th>
<th>Project Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 9</td>
<td>Revise the Draft Master Plan Update</td>
<td>DPZ</td>
<td>Gibbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Four</th>
<th>Finalization and Adoption (Months 13 - 15)</th>
<th>Team Involvement</th>
<th>Project Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 10</td>
<td>Finalization of Updated Plan</td>
<td>DPZ</td>
<td>Gibbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 11</td>
<td>Final Presentations and Adoption</td>
<td>DPZ</td>
<td>Gibbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team will be available according to the proposed time frame.
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F. ADDITIONAL SERVICES
No additional services beyond those already included and described in Sections D & E of this proposal are proposed in order to complete the project.
G. ATTACHMENTS
ATTACHMENT B - BIDDER’S AGREEMENT
FOR MASTER PLAN UPDATE

In submitting this proposal, as herein described, the Contractor agrees that:

1. They have carefully examined the specifications, terms and Agreement of the Request for Proposal and all other provisions of this document and understand the meaning, intent, and requirement of it.

2. They will enter into a written contract and furnish the item or items in the time specified in conformance with the specifications and conditions contained therein for the price quoted by the proponent on this proposal.

SENEN ANTONIO

PREPARED BY
(Print Name)
PARTNER

TITLE

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

E-MAIL ADDRESS

DPZ CODESIGN

COMPANY

ADDRESS

PHONE

NAME OF PARENT COMPANY

ADDRESS

I FURTHER ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF ADDENDUM NO.1 OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM RFP MASTER PLANNING UPDATE ISSUED ON MAY 23, 2018.
In order for the bid to be considered valid, this form must be completed in its entirety. The cost for the Scope of Work as stated in the Request for Proposal documents shall be itemized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Elements</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Comprehensive Community Engagement Plan</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Updated Data Collection and Analysis</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Infrastructure Analysis</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parking Analysis</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attendance at Meetings</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Plan Preparation</td>
<td>$ 118,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Finalization and Adoption</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMOUNT</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 298,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Meeting Charge

- Depending on personnel required
- $1,000-4,000 per meeting

### Additional Services Recommended (if any):

Additional services beyond the scope of this RFP are not proposed. For the purposes of completeness please find herein DPZ’s hourly rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>$ 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>$ 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Project Manager</td>
<td>$ 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>$ 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer / Illustrator</td>
<td>$ 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draftsperson</td>
<td>$ 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>$ 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firm Name: DPZ CODESIGN

Authorized signature: ___________________________  Date: MAY 25TH, 2018
# ATTACHMENT D - IRAN SANCTIONS ACT VENDOR CERTIFICATION FORM

FOR MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Pursuant to Michigan Law and the Iran Economic Sanction Act, 2012 PA 517 ("Act"), prior to the City accepting any bid or proposal, or entering into any contract for goods or services with any prospective Vendor, the Vendor must certify that it is not an “Iran Linked Business”, as defined by the Act.

By completing this form, the Vendor certifies that it is not an “Iran Linked Business”, as defined by the Act and is in full compliance with all provisions of the Act and is legally eligible to submit a bid for consideration by the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepared By</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Print Name)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>May 25, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:SENEN@DPZ.COM">SENEN@DPZ.COM</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorized Signature</th>
<th>E-mail Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DPZ CODESIGN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1023 SW 25TH AVENUE</td>
<td>305-644-1023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Parent Company</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxpayer I.D.#</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-2563570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 7, 2018

DPZ CoDesign
1023 SW 25th Avenue
Miami, FL 33135

Attention: Senen M. A. Antonio

Re: City of Birmingham Master Plan Update – Consultant Selection

We confirm receipt of your firm’s proposal in response to the above-captioned Request for Proposal and thank you for same. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank you for the time and effort that your firm put into preparing your proposal to conduct a comprehensive master planning effort for the City, and for your continued interest in working with the City of Birmingham.

Please be advised that the Ad Hoc Master Plan Selection Committee (“the Committee”) has completed an evaluation of all of the proposals received to determine which firms the City would like to interview to complete our consultant selection process.

I am pleased to inform you that the Committee selected two (2) firms to advance to the second round of our evaluation process, and your firm was one of the two selected to proceed. As a result, we would like to invite your team to come to Birmingham for an interview before the Committee on August 29, 2018 at 9:00am. The Committee is comprised of members of the Planning Board, Multi-Modal Transportation Board, Ad Hoc Parking Committee, Parks and Recreation Board, Design Review Board / Historic District Commission and includes a former City Commissioner, as well as a resident at large member. You will have 20 – 30 minutes to conduct a presentation to the Committee, and another 30 – 45 minutes for a question and answer session. The Committee has asked for your team to provide additional information during the interview to clarify your approach to the following:

- The study of residential neighborhoods;
- The provision of future projections;
- Market conditions affecting the City;
- Density considerations and recommendations;
- Who will provide project leadership for your team; and
- Possibilities for tightening up of project time frame and cost reduction.

Given the time it took for us to convene the Committee to evaluate proposals during the summer vacation season, we are requesting a 45 day extension on the term of your proposal to the City to allow us to complete the selection process. Your original proposal is valid for 90 days, which ends on September 1, 2018. If you agree to this extension, please sign and date below and return the signed copy to our office to confirm the term extension to your proposal. Receipt of this letter
signed by DPZ below will confirm both the term extension and DPZ’s interview time slot on August 29, 2018 at 9:00am.

Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience at 248-530-1841.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

Jana L. Ecker
Director of Planning

DPZ agrees to extend the term of the proposal for the City of Birmingham – Master Plan Update dated June 1, 2018 to a total of 135 days, with such term ending on October 15, 2018.

[Signature] Aug. 8, 2018
Signature Date

Matthew Lambert, Partner

Printed Name & Title
August 7, 2018

MKS
4219 Woodward Ave, Suite 305
Detroit, MI 48201

Attention: Chris Hermann

Re: City of Birmingham Master Plan Update – Consultant Selection

We confirm receipt of your firm’s proposal in response to the above-captioned Request for Proposal and thank you for same. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank you for the time and effort that your firm put into preparing your proposal to conduct a comprehensive master planning effort for the City, and for your continued interest in working with the City of Birmingham.

Please be advised that the Ad Hoc Master Plan Selection Committee ("the Committee") has completed an evaluation of all of the proposals received to determine which firms the City would like to interview to complete our consultant selection process.

I am pleased to inform you that the Committee selected two (2) firms to advance to the second round of our evaluation process, and your firm was one of the two selected to proceed. As a result, we would like to invite your team to come to Birmingham for an interview before the Committee on August 29, 2018 at 10:30am. The Committee is comprised of members of the Planning Board, Multi-Modal Transportation Board, Ad Hoc Parking Committee, Parks and Recreation Board, Design Review Board / Historic District Commission and includes a former City Commissioner, as well as a resident at large member. You will have 20 – 30 minutes to conduct a presentation to the Committee, and another 30 – 45 minutes for a question and answer session. The Committee has asked for your team to provide additional information during the interview to clarify your approach to the following:

- The study of residential neighborhoods;
- The provision of future projections;
- Market conditions affecting the City;
- Density considerations and recommendations;
- Who will provide project leadership for your team; and
- Possibilities for tightening up of project time frame and cost reduction.

Given the time it took for us to convene the Committee to evaluate proposals during the summer vacation season, we are requesting a 45 day extension on the term of your proposal to the City to allow us to complete the selection process. Your original proposal is valid for 90 days, which ends on September 1, 2018. If you agree to this extension, please sign and date below and return the signed copy to our office to confirm the term extension to your proposal. Receipt of this letter
signed by MKSK below will confirm both the term extension and MKSK’s interview time slot on August 29, 2018 at 10:30am.

Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience at 248-530-1841.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

Jana L. Ecker
Director of Planning

MKSK agrees to extend the term of the proposal for the City of Birmingham – Master Plan Update dated June 1, 2018 to a total of 135 days, with such term ending on October 15, 2018.

[Signature] [Date]

Chris Hermann, Principal
Printed Name & Title
AGREEMENT FOR MASTER PLAN UPDATE

This AGREEMENT, made this 17th day of September, 2018, by and between CITY OF BIRMINGHAM, having its principal municipal office at 151 Martin Street, Birmingham, MI (hereinafter sometimes called "City"), and DPZ Partners, LLC, having its principal office at 1023 SW 25th Ave, Miami, FL (hereinafter called "Contractor"), provides as follows:

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the City has heretofore advertised for bids for the procurement and performance of services required to complete an update to the City-wide comprehensive master plan, and in connection therewith has prepared a request for sealed proposals ("RFP"), which includes certain instructions to bidders, specifications, terms and conditions.

WHEREAS, the Contractor has professional qualifications that meet the project requirements and has made a bid in accordance with such request for cost proposals to complete an update to the City-wide comprehensive master plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, for and in consideration of the respective agreements and undertakings herein contained, the parties agree as follows:

1. It is mutually agreed by and between the parties that the documents consisting of the Request for Proposal to complete an update to the City-wide comprehensive master plan and the Contractor's cost proposal dated May 25, 2018 shall be incorporated herein by reference and shall become a part of this Agreement, and shall be binding upon both parties hereto. If any of the documents are in conflict with one another, this Agreement shall take precedence, then the RFP.

2. The City shall pay the Contractor for the performance of this Agreement in an amount not to exceed $298,000.00, as set forth in the Contractor's May 25, 2018 cost proposal.

3. This Agreement shall commence upon execution by both parties, unless the City exercises its option to terminate the Agreement in accordance with the Request for Proposals.

4. The Contractor shall employ personnel of good moral character and fitness in performing all services under this Agreement.

5. The Contractor and the City agree that the Contractor is acting as an independent contractor with respect to the Contractor's role in providing services to the City pursuant to this Agreement, and as such, shall be liable for its own actions and neither the Contractor nor its employees shall be construed as employees of the
City. Nothing contained in this Agreement shall be construed to imply a joint venture or partnership and neither party, by virtue of this Agreement, shall have any right, power or authority to act or create any obligation, express or implied, on behalf of the other party, except as specifically outlined herein. Neither the City nor the Contractor shall be considered or construed to be the agent of the other, nor shall either have the right to bind the other in any manner whatsoever, except as specifically provided in this Agreement, and this Agreement shall not be construed as a contract of agency. The Contractor shall not be entitled or eligible to participate in any benefits or privileges given or extended by the City, or be deemed an employee of the City for purposes of federal or state withholding taxes, FICA taxes, unemployment, workers' compensation or any other employer contributions on behalf of the City.

6. The Contractor acknowledges that in performing services pursuant to this Agreement, certain confidential and/or proprietary information (including, but not limited to, internal organization, methodology, personnel and financial information, etc.) may become involved. The Contractor recognizes that unauthorized exposure of such confidential or proprietary information could irreparably damage the City. Therefore, the Contractor agrees to use reasonable care to safeguard the confidential and proprietary information and to prevent the unauthorized use or disclosure thereof. The Contractor shall inform its employees of the confidential or proprietary nature of such information and shall limit access thereto to employees rendering services pursuant to this Agreement. The Contractor further agrees to use such confidential or proprietary information only for the purpose of performing services pursuant to this Agreement. The Contractor agrees that it will require all subcontractors to sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement satisfactory to the City Attorney.

7. This Agreement shall be governed by and performed, interpreted and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of Michigan. The Contractor agrees to perform all services provided for in this Agreement in accordance with and in full compliance with all local, state and federal laws and regulations.

8. If any provision of this Agreement is declared invalid, illegal or unenforceable, such provision shall be severed from this Agreement and all other provisions shall remain in full force and effect.

9. This Agreement shall be binding upon the successors and assigns of the parties hereto, but no such assignment shall be made by the Contractor without the prior written consent of the City. Any attempt at assignment without prior written consent shall be void and of no effect.

10. The Contractor agrees that neither it nor its subcontractors will discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment with respect to hire, tenure, terms, conditions or privileges of employment, or a matter directly or indirectly related to
employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, height, weight or marital status. The Contractor shall inform the City of all claims or suits asserted against it by the Contractor’s employees who work pursuant to this Agreement. The Contractor shall provide the City with periodic status reports concerning all such claims or suits, at intervals established by the City.

11. The Contractor shall not commence work under this Agreement until it has, at its sole expense, obtained the insurance required under this paragraph. All coverages shall be with insurance companies licensed and admitted to do business in the State of Michigan. All coverages shall be with carriers acceptable to the City of Birmingham.

12. The Contractor shall maintain during the life of this Agreement the types of insurance coverage and minimum limits as set forth below:

   A. Workers’ Compensation Insurance: Contractor shall procure and maintain during the life of this Agreement, Workers’ Compensation Insurance, including Employers Liability Coverage, in accordance with all applicable statutes of the State of Michigan.

   B. Commercial General Liability Insurance: Contractor shall procure and maintain during the life of this Agreement, Commercial General Liability Insurance on an "Occurrence Basis" with limits of liability not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence combined single limit, Personal Injury, Bodily Injury and Property Damage. Coverage shall include the following extensions: (A) Contractual Liability; (B) Products and Completed Operations; (C) Independent Contractors Coverage; (D) Broad Form General Liability Extensions or equivalent; (E) Deletion of all Explosion, Collapse and Underground (XCU) Exclusions, if applicable.

   C. Motor Vehicle Liability: Contractor shall procure and maintain during the life of this Agreement Motor Vehicle Liability Insurance, including all applicable no-fault coverages, with limits of liability of not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence combined single limit Bodily Injury and Property Damage. Coverage shall include all owned vehicles, all non-owned vehicles, and all hired vehicles.

   D. Additional Insured: Commercial General Liability and Motor Vehicle Liability Insurance, as described above, shall include an endorsement stating the following shall be Additional Insureds: The City of Birmingham, including all elected and appointed officials, all employee and volunteers, all boards, commissions and/or authorities and board members, including employees and volunteers thereof. This coverage shall be primary to any other coverage that may be available to the additional insured, whether any other available coverage by primary, contributing or excess.
E. Cancellation Notice: Workers' Compensation Insurance, Commercial General Liability Insurance and Motor Vehicle Liability Insurance (and Professional Liability Insurance, if applicable), as described above, shall include an endorsement stating the following: "Thirty (30) days Advance Written Notice of Cancellation or Non-Renewal, shall be sent to: Finance Director, City of Birmingham, PO Box 3001, 151 Martin Street, Birmingham, MI 48012-3001.

F. Proof of Insurance Coverage: Contractor shall provide the City of Birmingham, at the time the Agreement is returned for execution, Certificates of Insurance and/or policies, acceptable to the City of Birmingham, as listed below.

1) Two (2) copies of Certificate of Insurance for Workers' Compensation Insurance;
2) Two (2) copies of Certificate of Insurance for Commercial General Liability Insurance;
3) Two (2) copies of Certificate of Insurance for Vehicle Liability Insurance;
4) Two (2) copies of Certificate of Insurance for Professional Liability Insurance;
5) If so requested, Certified Copies of all policies mentioned above will be furnished.

G. Coverage Expiration: If any of the above coverages expire during the term of this Agreement, Contractor shall deliver renewal certificates and/or policies to the City of Birmingham at least (10) days prior to the expiration date.

H. Maintaining Insurance: Upon failure of the Contractor to obtain or maintain such insurance coverage for the term of the Agreement, the City of Birmingham may, at its option, purchase such coverage and subtract the cost of obtaining such coverage from the Agreement amount. In obtaining such coverage, the City of Birmingham shall have no obligation to procure the most cost-effective coverage but may contract with any insurer for such coverage.

13. To the fullest extent permitted by law, the Contractor and any entity or person for whom the Contractor is legally liable, agrees to be responsible for any liability, defend, pay on behalf of, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Birmingham, its elected and appointed officials, employees and volunteers and others working on behalf of the City of Birmingham against any and all claims, demands, suits, or loss, including all costs and reasonable attorney fees connected therewith, and for any damages which may be asserted, claimed or recovered against or from and the City of Birmingham, its elected and appointed officials, employees, volunteers or others working on behalf of the City of Birmingham, by reason of personal injury, including bodily injury and death and/or property damage, including loss of use thereof, which arises out of or is in any way connected or associated with this Agreement. Such responsibility shall
not be construed as liability for damage caused by or resulting from the sole act or omission of its elected or appointed officials, employees, volunteers or others working on behalf of the City of Birmingham.

14. If, after the effective date of this Agreement, any official of the City, or spouse, child, parent or in-law of such official or employee shall become directly or indirectly interested in this Agreement or the affairs of the Contractor, the City shall have the right to terminate this Agreement without further liability to the Contractor if the disqualification has not been removed within thirty (30) days after the City has given the Contractor notice of the disqualifying interest. Ownership of less than one percent (1%) of the stock or other equity interest in a corporation or partnership shall not be a disqualifying interest. Employment shall be a disqualifying interest.

15. If Contractor fails to perform its obligations hereunder, the City may take any and all remedial actions provided by the general specifications or otherwise permitted by law.

16. All notices required to be sent pursuant to this Agreement shall be mailed to the following addresses:

   City of Birmingham                         CONTRACTOR
   Attn: Jana L. Ecker                       DPZ Partners, LLC
   151 Martin Street                         1023 SW 25th Avenue
   Birmingham, MI 48009                      Miami, FL 33135
   248-530-1841                              305-644-1023

17. Any controversy or claim arising out of or relating to this Agreement, or the breach thereof, shall be settled either by commencement of a suit in Oakland County Circuit Court, the 48th District Court or by arbitration. If both parties elect to have the dispute resolved by arbitration, it shall be settled pursuant to Chapter 50 of the Revised Judicature Act for the State of Michigan and administered by the American Arbitration Association with one arbitrator being used, or three arbitrators in the event any party’s claim exceeds $1,000,000. Each party shall bear its own costs and expenses and an equal share of the arbitrator’s and administrative fees of arbitration. Such arbitration shall qualify as statutory arbitration pursuant to MCL§600.5001 et. seq., and the Oakland County Circuit Court or any court having jurisdiction shall render judgment upon the award of the arbitrator made pursuant to this Agreement. The laws of the State of Michigan shall govern this Agreement, and the arbitration shall take place in Oakland County, Michigan. In the event that the parties elect not to have the matter in dispute arbitrated, any dispute between the parties may be resolved by the filing of a suit in the Oakland County Circuit Court or the 48th District Court.

18. FAIR PROCUREMENT OPPORTUNITY: Procurement for the City of Birmingham will be handled in a manner providing fair opportunity for all businesses. This
will be accomplished without abrogation or sacrifice of quality and as determined to be in the best interest of the City of Birmingham.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said parties have caused this Agreement to be executed as of the date and year above written.

WITNESSES:

_______________________________  
Matthew J. Lambert
By: ___________________________
Its: Partner

_______________________________  
Andrew Harris
By: ___________________________
Its: Mayor

_______________________________  
Cherilynn Mynsberge
By: ___________________________
Its: City Clerk

Approved:

_______________________________  
Jana L. Ecker, Planning Director
(Approved as to substance)

_______________________________  
Joseph A. Valentine City Manager
(Approved as to substance)

_______________________________  
Timothy J. Currier, City Attorney
(Approved as to form)

_______________________________  
Mark Gerber, Director of Finance
(Approved as to financial obligation)
**CERTIFICATE OF LIABILITY INSURANCE**

This certificate is issued as a matter of information only and confers no rights upon the certificate holder. This certificate does not affirmatively or negatively amend, extend or alter the coverage afforded by the policies below. This certificate of insurance does not constitute a contract between the issuing insurer(s), authorized representative or producer, and the certificate holder.

**IMPORTANT:** If the certificate holder is an ADDITIONAL INSURED, the policy(ies) must have ADDITIONAL INSURED provisions or be endorsed. If SUBROGATION IS WAIVED, subject to the terms and conditions of the policy, certain policies may require an endorsement. A statement on this certificate does not confer rights to the certificate holder in lieu of such endorsement(s).

**PRODUCER**

Acrisure, LLC d/b/a InSource
9500 South Dadeland Boulevard
4th Floor
Miami, FL 33156-2867

**CONTACT NAME:**

**PHONE:** (A/C, No, Ext.): (305) 670-6111

**FAX:** (A/C, No, Ext): (305) 670-9699

**E-MAIL ADDRESS:** email@insourse-inc.com

**INSURER(S) AFFORDING COVERAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSURER A:</th>
<th>Hartford Casualty Insurance Co</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAIC #:</td>
<td>29424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSURED**

DPZ Partners, LLC
1023 SW 25 Avenue
Miami, FL 33135

**INSURER B:** Hartford Underwriters Ins. Co.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSURER C:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSURER D:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSURER E:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSURER F:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**COVERAGES**

**CERTIFICATE NUMBER:**

**REVISION NUMBER:**

This is to certify that the policies of insurance listed below have been issued to the insured named above for the policy period indicated. Notwithstanding any requirement, term or condition of any contract or other document with respect to which this certificate may be issued or may pertain, the insurance afforded by the policies described herein is subject to all the terms, exclusions and conditions of such policies. Limits shown may have been reduced by paid claims.

**INSURER** | **TYPE OF INSURANCE** | **ADD ON SUBR** | **W/VD** | **POLICY NUMBER** | **POLICY EFF (MM/DD/YYYY)** | **POLICY EXP (MM/DD/YYYY)** | **LIMITS** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL GENERAL LIABILITY</td>
<td>CLAIMS-MADE</td>
<td>OCCUR</td>
<td>21SBABY0640</td>
<td>12/18/2017</td>
<td>12/18/2018</td>
<td>EACH OCCURRENCE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DAMAGE TO RENTED PREMISES (EA occurrence):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MED EXP (Any one person):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PERSONAL &amp; ADV INJURY:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL AGGREGATE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRODUCTS - COMP/OP AGG:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B | AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY | | | 21UECTE1819 | 12/18/2017 | 12/18/2018 | COMBINED SINGLE LIMIT (EA accident): |
| | | | | | | | BODILY INJURY (Per person): |
| | | | | | | | BODILY INJURY (Per accident): |
| | | | | | | | PROPERTY DAMAGE (Per accident): |

| A | UMBRELLA LIABILITY | OCCUR | CLAIMS-MADE | 21SBABY0640 | 12/18/2017 | 12/18/2018 | EACH OCCURRENCE: |
| | | | | | | | AGGREGATE: |

| B | WORKERS COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY | | | 21WECAJ3690 | 10/01/2017 | 10/01/2018 | E.L. EACH ACCIDENT: |
| | | | | | | | E.L. DISEASE - EA EMPLOYEE: |
| | | | | | | | E.L. DISEASE - POLICY LIMIT: |

**DESCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS / LOCATIONS / VEHICLES** (ACORD 101, Additional Remarks Schedule, may be attached if more space is required)

**CERTIFICATE HOLDER**

**CANCELLATION**

Should any of the above described policies be cancelled before the expiration date thereof, notice will be delivered in accordance with the policy provisions.

**AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE**

© 1988-2015 ACORD CORPORATION. All rights reserved.

The ACORD name and logo are registered marks of ACORD.
**CERTIFICATE OF LIABILITY INSURANCE**

**PRODUCER**
Collinsworth Ins & Risk Mgmt Services Inc
P.O. Box 661628
Miami Springs FL 33266

**INSURED**
DPZ Partners, LLC
1023 S.W. 25th Ave.
Miami FL 33135

**COVERAGES**

**CERTIFICATE NUMBER:** Cert ID 1925  
**revision number:**

**THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE POLICIES OF INSURANCE LISTED BELOW HAVE BEEN ISSUED TO THE INSURED NAMED ABOVE FOR THE POLICY PERIOD INDICATED. NOTWITHSTANDING ANY REQUIREMENT, TERM OR CONDITION OF ANY CONTRACT OR OTHER DOCUMENT WITH RESPECT TO WHICH THIS CERTIFICATE MAY BE ISSUED OR MAY PERTAIN, THE INSURANCE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES DESCRIBED HEREIN IS SUBJECT TO ALL THE TERMS, EXCLUSIONS AND CONDITIONS OF SUCH POLICIES. LIMITS SHOWN MAY HAVE BEEN REDUCED BY PAID CLAIMS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSURER (A/C, NO):</th>
<th>NAME:</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>FAX</th>
<th>E-MAIL ADDRESS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INSURER A:</td>
<td>Beazley Insurance Company Inc.</td>
<td>Erinn E Collinsworth</td>
<td>(786) 930-4795</td>
<td>(786) 930-4794</td>
<td><a href="mailto:erinn@collinsworthinsurance.com">erinn@collinsworthinsurance.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURER B:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURER C:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURER D:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURER E:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURER F:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CERTIFICATE HOLDER**

**CANCELATION**

**SPECIMEN**

**ACORD 25 (2016/03)**  
The ACORD name and logo are registered marks of ACORD

© 1988-2015 ACORD CORPORATION. All rights reserved.
PROJECT LEADERSHIP

Leaders in the planning, development and placemaking field who are known for creating vibrant and livable communities.

CHRIS HERMANN, AICP
Principal
MKSK
Principal in Charge
Principal Planner

JUSTIN GOODWIN, AICP
Associate
MKSK
Project Manager
Urban Planner

MEGAN O’HARA LEED AP
Principal
UDA
Urban Design
Community Design
Charette Lead

TOM BROWN
Principal
Nelson/Nygaard
Parking

BRAD STRADER, AICP, PTP
Principal
MKSK
Transportation Planner
Community Engagement

JULIE KROLL, PE, PTOE
Sr. Project Manager
Fleis & VandenBrink
Traffic Engineer
Who We Are:

27+ Year Practice

90 Design Professionals:
Planners | Urban Designers
Landscape Architects

Primary Office: Columbus, OH
Louisville, KY | Covington, KY
Indianapolis, IN | West Lafayette, IN
Detroit, MI | Greenville, SC

Professional Planning Services:
Comprehensive Master Planning
Land Use Planning
Focus Area/Neighborhood Planning
Transportation Planning
Strategic Planning
‘Town Center’ Planning
Trail, Greenways & Park Planning/Design
Streetscape & Public Space Design
Placemaking
Zoning & Form Based Codes
Community & Stakeholder Engagement
Visualization & Graphics
Economic Development & Funding Strategies
Capital Improvement Planning
OUR TEAM

A team of national experts, and local knowledge to lead the city through this Master Plan process.

- **MKS**: Lead Community & Development Planning
  - Placemaking
  - Community Engagement

- **UDA**: Urban Design
  - Neighborhood Typologies
  - Charette Lead

- **F&V**: Infrastructure Analysis
  - Multi-Modal Transportation Engineering

- **NYG**: Parking
  - Analysis & Recommendations
OUR TEAM BRINGS AN UNPARALLELED KNOWLEDGE OF BIRMINGHAM

- Triangle District Form Based Code
- Southern Gateway
- Downtown Plan
- Parking Study
- Woodward Transit and Complete Streets Plans
- Zoning Evaluations
- Maple/Old Woodward Redesign
- Many Street and Pedestrian Realm Design Projects
- Multi-Modal Board Advising

BIRMINGHAM MASTER PLAN UPDATE
BIRMINGHAM “ONE OF THE BEST PLACES TO LIVE IN MICHIGAN”

DYNAMIC BUSINESS DISTRICT

LIVEABLE NEIGHBORHOODS

THRIVING ECONOMY
BIRMINGHAM ISSUES + OPPORTUNITIES

- **INFILL/REDEVELOPMENT** | Architecture, Building Scale/Height
- **RESIDENTIAL** | Missing Middle, Market Demand
- **PARKING** | Demand, Location, Type, Disruption
- **STREETS** | Widths, Streetscape, Complete Streets, Bike Lanes
- **PROJECTS** | Cost, Schedules, Public-Private Partnerships
- **RETAIL** | Quality, Mix, Flexibility, Resiliency, Location
- **NEIGHBORHOODS + DISTRICTS** | Protect Value, Grow Economy, Transitions Between, Character
NATIONAL TRENDS + PATTERNS: 
THINGS ARE CHANGING RAPIDLY

- The aging of America and rise of the creative millennials
- Urban developments and e-commerce replacing shopping centers
- The retail economy is focusing on experience and “place”
- Housing types are changing & rental rates will rise
- Automation and disruption will change mobility
- Municipalities and public-private partnerships must take a stronger role in encouraging successful growth
OUR APPROACH: ENGAGING THE CLIENT & STAKEHOLDERS IN DIVERSE WAYS

COMMUNITY KNOWLEDGE

WHAT DO YOU WANT TO ACHIEVE?

FROM PLAN TO IMPLEMENTATION

PLANNING & DESIGN TEAM KNOWLEDGE

WHAT CAN WE ACHIEVE?

DIALOGUE

OWNERSHIP & BUY-IN
SUSTAINS THE EFFORT

BIRMINGHAM MASTER PLAN UPDATE
BRINGING PLANNING TO LIFE: QUALITY OF IDEAS & QUALITY OF COMMUNICATION
PROCESS MILESTONES

**MONTHS 1-2**
- Kickoff Meetings with Key Stakeholders
- Community Engagement Kick-Off

**MONTHS 2-4**
- Data Collection
- Inventory of Existing Conditions
- Review of Past Plans

**MONTHS 3-5**
- Best Practices Summit
- Charrettes to Identify Aspirations & Alternatives

**MONTHS 6-8**
- Evaluation of Options
- Selection of Preferred Alternatives & Scenarios

**MONTHS 9-12**
- Plan Documentation
- Development of An Action Plan with Priorities & Implementation Steps

**MONTHS 12-16**
- State Required 63-Day Public Review Period
- Public Hearings
- Revisions
- Adoption

---

**PHASE 1**
**PROJECT LAUNCH**
- Kickoff Meetings with Key Stakeholders
- Community Engagement Kick-Off

**PHASE 2**
**DISCOVERY**
- Data Collection
- Inventory of Existing Conditions
- Review of Past Plans

**PHASE 3**
**VISIONING**
- Best Practices Summit
- Charrettes to Identify Aspirations & Alternatives

**PHASE 4**
**EXPLORATION**
- Evaluation of Options
- Selection of Preferred Alternatives & Scenarios

**PHASE 5**
**DRAFT MASTER PLAN**
- Plan Documentation
- Development of An Action Plan with Priorities & Implementation Steps

**PHASE 6**
**ADOPTION**
- State Required 63-Day Public Review Period
- Public Hearings
- Revisions
- Adoption
PROCESS MILESTONES: ORIGINALLY PROPOSED SCHEDULE

MILESTONES BY MONTHS

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16

PROJECT LAUNCH

DISCOVERY

VISIONING

EXPLORATION

DRAFT MASTER PLAN

ADOPTION

PHASE 1

PROJECT LAUNCH

+ Kickoff Meetings with Key Stakeholders
+ Community Engagement Kick-Off

DISCOVERY

+ Data Collection
+ Inventory of Existing Conditions
+ Review of Past Plans

VISIONING

+ Best Practices Summit
+ Charrettes to Identify Aspirations & Alternatives

EXPLORATION

+ Evaluation of Options
+ Selection of Preferred Alternatives & Scenarios

DRAFT MASTER PLAN

+ Plan Documentation
+ Development of An Action Plan with Priorities & Implementation Steps

ADOPTION

+ State Required 63-Day Public Review Period
+ Public Hearings
+ Revisions
+ Adoption
**Process Milestones: Revised Schedule**

**Milestones by Months**

1. **Project Launch**
   - Kickoff Meetings with Key Stakeholders
   - Community Engagement Kick-Off

2. **Discovery**
   - Data Collection
   - Inventory of Existing Conditions
   - Review of Past Plans

3. **Visioning**
   - Best Practices Summit
   - Charrettes to Identify Aspirations & Alternatives

4. **Exploration**
   - Evaluation of Options
   - Selection of Preferred Alternatives & Scenarios

5. **Draft Master Plan**
   - Plan Documentation
   - Development of An Action Plan with Priorities & Implementation Steps

6. **Adoption**
   - State Required 63-Day Public Review Period
   - Public Hearings
   - Revisions
   - Adoption

*We can reduce the schedule by 3 months with same milestones*
PROJECT DELIVERABLES

- An aspirational community-built consensus on direction for the city.
- A guiding plan for the city, community, agencies, & private investors to follow
- With foundational components:

  DEMOGRAPHIC & MARKET CONDITIONS
  LAND USE + ZONING PLAN
  MOBILITY + PARKING RECOMMENDATIONS
  PARKS + OPEN SPACE

  HOUSING + ECONOMIC DEV. STRATEGIES
  DISTRICT PLANNING INITIATIVES
  NEIGHBORHOOD DNA
  IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY
EXPERIENCE | APPROACH: MASTER PLANNING, LIVABILITY & QUALITY OF PLACE

CHRIS HERMANN, AICP, Principal, MKSK

JUSTIN GOODWIN, AICP, Project Manager, MKSK
NEW ALBANY: VOTED #1 SUBURB IN OHIO
FRANKLIN & LICKING COUNTIES, OHIO
NEW ALBANY: 20 YEARS OF PLANNING, DESIGN & DEVELOPMENT ADVISING

PLAN – LONG-TERM RELATIONSHIP:
Nearly two decades of planning services transformed a small village into a vibrant city

- 1998-2014: Strategic Plan & Updates
- 2006: Village Center Plan & Strategy
- 2009: Form-Based Code
- 2007: Leisure Trails Master Plan
- 2012: Health New Albany
- 2014: Bike New Albany
- 2016: Rose Run Greenway

RESULTS:
- Over 200,000 SF of mixed-use infill
- Over 300 residential infill units
- 10.3 M SF development
- Connection to 27 miles of bike trails
- Library/ Post Office/ Village Hall
- International Business Park
- McCoy Community Center for the Arts
- Philip Heit Center for Healthy New Albany
- Civic greenspace
- School campus

#1 SUBURB IN AMERICA
- BUSINESS INSIDER (2015)

SINCE 1998 ATTRACTED
$2.4 B INVESTMENT

SINCE 1998
14,500 JOBS
100 M TAX REVENUE
NEW ALBANY IMPLEMENTATION: GUIDING DEVELOPMENT FROM VISION TO REALIZATION
DUBLIN: COLUMBUS METRO “MOST LIVEABLE COMMUNITY”
FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO

POP 43,224
MEDIAN HOME VALUE $350,000
Bridge Street + Bridge Park
EXPERIENCE | APPROACH: CHARRETTE FACILITATION - LISTENING, TESTING, AND DECIDING

MEGAN O‘HARA LEED AP, Principal, UDA
URBAN DESIGN ASSOCIATES (UDA)

- Formed in 1964
- Based in Pittsburgh
- We brought public process into practice.
- We learned that listening can create better outcomes & places.
- Innovation and collaboration is at our core.
PHASE 3 - VISIONING

- Two-day listening session
- Meetings with the City staff, elected officials, committees, and key stakeholders
- Documentation of neighborhood DNA
- Community engagement to listen to people’s vision
- Distill what we learned through the analysis
- Develop a list of emerging themes and directions to explore for each of the city’s neighborhoods and districts
- Briefing with the City Commission
PHASE 4 - EXPLORATION

4-day charrette to develop concepts for the Master Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| + Set-up Studio  
+ Kick-Off Meeting  
+ Mini-Workshop #1 | + Mini-Workshops #2, #3, and #4  
+ Key stakeholder meetings  
+ Workshops will focus on the neighborhoods and districts | + Develop ideas explored on Days 1 & 2  
+ Afternoon/evening pin-up with core client group | + Final production  
+ Core group preview  
+ Community presentation and discussion | + Download/briefing phone call or meeting to follow up |

BIRMINGHAM MASTER PLAN UPDATE
CHARRETTE – LIVE THEATRE ROOTED IN LISTENING
What activities would you participate in Cypress Village?

...For health and wellness? For different ages? For escaping? For connecting with others etc.?
CHATTANOOGA ARTS DISTRICT/PROMENADE, TN
EXPERIENCE - SUMMERS CORNER, SUMMERVILLE, SC
EXPERIENCE - SEWICKLEY HEIGHTS

(ADDITIONS AND RENOVATIONS, PATTERN BOOK)
EXPERIENCE - A PATTERN BOOK FOR NORFOLK NEIGHBORHOODS, GHENT
NEIGHBORHOOD DNA

Precedent Places Visited
Basildon
Noak’s Bridge
Billericay
Ingatestone
Chelmsford
Writtle
Maldon
Southend-on-Sea
Leigh-on-Sea
Colchester

Town Patterns
Cities
Market Towns
Resort Towns
Fishing and Working Towns
Agricultural Villages and Hamlets
Residential Developments

Urban Spatial Patterns
High Streets
Market Squares
Retail Courts and Plazas
Neighborhood Streets
Neighborhood Parks
Regional Parks
Mews, Courts, and Alleys
Waterfronts
Edge Conditions
(Open Space and Agricultural Land)

Building and Lot Typologies
Flat Building
Mansion-Style Flats
Terrace Row
Semi-Detached Duplex
Detached Cottage
Detached Mansion

Architectural Patterns
Victorian
Arts + Crafts
Georgian
Romantic / Vernacular

Urban Design Associates
Craylands | Basildon, Essex August 2009

© 2009 Urban Design Associates
DRAFT AUGUST 2009

Craylands Tool Kit
Essex Building Types

Craylands Regeneration | Basildon, Essex
28 July 2009

Birmingham Master Plan Update
OPTIONAL ADD-ON: PATTERN BOOK

BIRMINGHAM MASTER PLAN UPDATE
EXPERIENCE | APPROACH: PARKING

TOM BROWN Principal, NELSON/NYGAARD
PARKING ANALYSIS - DOWNTOWN PARKING
PARKING ANALYSIS - GROWTH STRATEGIES

- How Much Growth, Where?
- How much Parking Demand, When?
- How to get the parking right?
Parking Analysis - Role of City to Ensure Future-Forward Approach

- Get the Zoning/Parking Requirements Right
- Assessment District Options
- Curbside Management
PARKING ANALYSIS - PREPARING FOR UNCERTAINTY

- Off-Street Parking Demand will go Down: When and by how much will vary significantly.
- Curbside competition will increase dramatically, requiring smart, active management.
IMPLEMENTATION

CHRIS HERMANN, AICP, Principal, MKSK
THE ULTIMATE PRODUCT OF A MASTER PLANNING PROCESS IS NOT A DOCUMENT, IT IS A VIBRANT COMMUNITY.
TRACK RECORD OF IMPLEMENTATION: GUIDING COMMUNITIES FROM VISION TO REALIZATION

CIVIC INFRASTRUCTURE
- Scioto Greenway
- Long Street Bridge & Cultural Wall
- Scioto Mile & Bicentennial Park

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT
- Columbus Commons
- Bexley Main Street Design Guidelines
- Lexington Great Public Spaces Plan

STREETSCAPES
- South Fourth Street Corridor Study
- Livingston Avenue Streetscape Master Plan
- Downtown Columbus Public Realm Enhancement Study
BIRMINGHAM
WE ARE YOUR TEAM!

THE COMBINED TALENTS OF THIS TEAM WILL PROVIDE BIRMINGHAM WITH:

- Leaders in the planning and placemaking creating VIBRANT AND LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

- EXPERTS IN ENGAGEMENT facilitation with diverse stakeholders and the public

- National leaders in DESIGN CHARRETTEs

- National leaders in LINKING LAND USE WITH MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION

- Award-winning plans: EXCELLENCE IN COMMUNICATION - Narratives and Graphics
  - Visionary action plans - Roadmap to the future
  - Successful implementation

- KNOWLEDGE OF BIRMINGHAM: Three of our four firms have been entrusted with many previous projects in Birmingham
DISCUSSION
TRACK RECORD OF IMPLEMENTATION: GUIDING COMMUNITIES FROM VISION TO REALIZATION

MASTER PLANNING
Conceptual Design | Policy Guidance | Economic Analysis | Land Use Planning
Infrastructure Planning | Community Engagement

- Pro formas, development agreements, financial modeling & entitlements, tax and legal structures
- Development planning, capacity studies and site design
- Code, ordinance, policy & programs
- Funding, financing and public-private partnerships
- Regulatory compliance

- Detailed design & Engineering
- Estimating & Constructability
- Solicitation, negotiation/bidding and procurement
- Construction Administration
- Stewardship models, capital planning, operating cost analysis and revenue strategies
- Data collection, survey, research and training

VIBRANT COMMUNITY
CENTRAL BIRMINGHAM
OVER 38 YEARS OF MAKING HAPPY PLACES
“We believe great places add to the sum of human happiness. DPZ designs economically and environmentally resilient communities that foster physical and social well-being.”

OVER 38 YEARS OF MAKING HAPPY PLACES
BUILT SUCCESS WITH NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL
Planning, Urban Design, Zoning and Coding, Architecture, and Community Development

OUR TEAM

**MCKENNA**
Community Engagement; Sustainability; Local Support for Planning, Zoning, and Coding

**Gibbs Planning Group**
Economics, Demographics, Market Analysis, and Landscape Design

**JACOBS**
Transportation, Parking, and Infrastructure
• Built Success with National and International Renown
• Familiarity with Issues Unique to Birmingham
• Expertise with Creative Community Visioning, Neighborhood Enhancement, and Implementation
• Placemaking and Value Creation via Good Design
• Bringing the Community to the Table
Andres Duany
Project Principal
and Advisor

Matt Lambert
Partner and
Project Manager
INNOVATION AND RESEARCH

VANGUARDS OF URBANISM

The Smart Growth Manual
From the authors of Suburban Nation
Andres Duany and Jeff Speck with Mike Lydon

Livable Communities for Aging Populations
Urban Design for Longevity
M. Scott Ball

Public Works Manual
For the Design of Contextual Thoroughfares

Suburban Nation
The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream

Sprawl Repair Manual
Gailina Tacheva
Miami 21, FL
City of Birmingham, MI
Kentlands, MD
Middleton Hills, WI

EXPERTS IN URBAN REVITALIZATION AND
FAMILIARITY WITH ISSUES UNIQUE TO BIRMINGHAM
The United States Housing Corporation was created during World War I to build housing for workers near war-related industries and shipyards. USHC employed many of the first city planners and landscape architects who later became the leading town planners throughout the country.
BIRMINGHAM ORIGINAL PLAN 1929

FRAMEWORK FOR NEIGHBORHOOD NODES
BIRMINGHAM ORIGINAL PLAN 1929

PLAN FOR NEW STREETS & NEIGHBORHOOD
BIRMINGHAM PLAN 1980 – FUTURE LAND USE PLAN

FUTURE LAND-USE PLAN
The City of Birmingham, Michigan 1980

- Single-Family Residential
- Low-Density Multi-family Residential
- Medium-Density Multi-family Residential
- Intensive Commercial/Office/Residential
  (within Birmingham Parking Assessment District)
- Intensive Commercial/Office/Residential
  (outside Birmingham Parking Assessment District)
- General Commercial
- Office and Low-Intensity Commercial
- Neighborhood Commercial
- Institutional
- Open Space and Recreation
- Industrial
- Conditional Permit Parking
- Municipal Parking

BIRMINGHAM PLAN PROVIDES THE GENERAL
DOWNTOWN BIRMINGHAM 2016 MASTER PLAN

A Master Plan for the City of Birmingham, Michigan

1 November, 1996
FINAL REPORT
REVISED

RECOMMENDATIONS,
APPENDICES
& IMPLEMENTATION

Andrei Dressy and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk
Architects and Town Planners

Gilbert Planning Group, Inc.
Town Planning, Landscape Architecture, Retail Consulting

Glattke Jackson Kercher Anslim Lopez Ruchart
Community Planning and Traffic Engineering

The Green Group, Inc.
Market Research

Mellanby Associates, Inc.
Community Planning and Urban Design

FOCUS ON THE DOWNTOWN
DOWNTOWN BIRMINGHAM 2016 MASTER PLAN

DOWNTOWN PLAN AREA OF FOCUS

Maple Road
Quarton Lake
Woodward
Adams Rd.
DOWNTOWN BIRMINGHAM 2016 MASTER PLAN

Downtown Birmingham 2016 Regulating Plan

REGULATING PLAN SUPPORTS THE VISION
GREAT RESULTS
REVIEW OF PROGRESS AND THE WAY FORWARD
GENERAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE CITY

BIRMINGHAM CITY WIDE MASTER PLAN (1980)
DOWNTOWN PLAN 2016 (1996)

FOCUS ON THE DOWNTOWN
Eton Road Corridor Plan (1999)

Maximize the Corridor’s Benefits and
MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (2013)

IMPROVING CONNECTIVITY, CHOICE, AND SAFTEY
IDENTIFYING UNTAPPED OPPORTUNITIES
ENHANCING THE AVAILABILITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF
NEIGHBORHOODS REMAIN IN THEIR HISTORICAL LOCATION

- Quarton Lake
- Midvale
- Pierce Shepherd Lutheran
- Downtown
- Poppleton
- Pembroke
- Holy Name
BIRMINGHAM NEIGHBORHOODS

SCALE AND MIX OF HOUSING

Quarton Lake
EXPERTISE WITH CREATIVE COMMUNITY VISIONING, NEIGHBORHOOD
THE THEORY: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES ARE...

1. Connected | Walkable | Bikeable | Transit-Ready | Permeable | Proximate
2. Compact | Structured on a pattern of 5 & 10 minute walks
3. Complete | Balance of Jobs | Housing | Retail | Schools | Programmed open space
4. Complex | Housing for a diversity of Age | Income | Transect preference
5. Convivial | Public spaces that are Safe | Engaging | Accessible | Comfortable
6. Conserving | Buildings that are Resource-Efficient | Healthy | Durable | Flexible
7. Cost-effective | Structures that are Appropriate-Tech | Conventional | Repairable
8. Coordinated | Protocols of Subsidiarity | Sequence of Coded Principles | Appeal

WHAT MAKES A GOOD NEIGHBORHOOD
Community amenities are a focus of complete neighborhoods.

- **New Town St. Charles, MO**
- **Rosemary Beach, FL**
- **Kentlands, MD**

Types of amenities:

- **Neighborhood Centers**
- **Public Spaces**
- **Civic Buildings**
Neighborhood: The fundamental human habitat, a community housing a full range of everyday human needs. Its ideal form is a compact, walkable, urbanization whose environment provides a balanced range of fabricated living, working, shopping, and recreational and educational uses.

There exists a variety of modes, some old and some of relatively recent derivation, that incorporate the amenities of the neighborhood.

### NEIGHBORHOOD UNIT 1927

**Local Institutions** are located within the neighborhood. Regional institutions are placed at the edges with their traffic does not enter the neighborhood.

There is a civic open space at the center of the neighborhood, and several smaller playgrounds, one in close proximity to every household.

**A network of small thoroughfares within the neighborhood, disperses local traffic.**

**Recall is confined to the junction, leaving the main traffic, accepting the register of the automobile.**

### TRADITIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT 1977

**Each throughfare and civic Open Space must conclude or be part of an interior environment.** Such environments are marked by buildings surrounding them, and are organized by Transit Zones. Transit Zones ensure that the portions of the public work is complete.

**The thoroughfare network requires that they move in a linear fashion.**

The thoroughfare network is connected to those outside the neighborhood, and are interconnected by an attached Main Street for circulation and low-work roads.

**The thoroughfare system is oriented from exoskeletons attached edge to edge.**

The traffic along the highways at the edges is more prevalent than in the town. There is an increased possibility of accidents.

### NEIGHBORHOOD STRUCTURE: NEIGHBORHOOD SCALE

DPZ REVIVED THE TRADITIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD
The neighborhood or TND is an urban planning block of the regional plan. While the neighborhood model may be structured by a variety of criteria, many are similar, allowing significant overlap in the composition of the pedestrian area, the location of the neighborhood, and the TND. These similarities manifest second-order consequences regarding the density of the residential and the social quality of the center.

The TND model reflects on the American Neighborhood Unit of 1967 and the European Quarter. It is a comprehensive regional design. Taking the neighborhood as a comparative model, the shaded area represents the neighborhood model. Because a neighborhood's proportions differ from those of the TND model, taking the neighborhood as a comparative model is essential.

Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) is similar to the American Neighborhood Unit of 1967 and the European Quarter. It is a comprehensive regional design. Taking the neighborhood as a comparative model, the shaded area represents the neighborhood model. Because a neighborhood's proportions differ from those of the TND model, taking the neighborhood as a comparative model is essential.

The Livable Neighborhood Pattern can also be seen as a combination of the TND and the TOD. It was conceptualized as a correction to the Modern City Model, primarily as it was applied at Milltown, a community designed to house families as the core element of a city, despite housing the population at a lower density than that of the TND.

The Livable Neighborhood Pattern combines aspects of the TND and the TOD. It was conceptualized as a correction to the Modern City Model, primarily as it was applied at Milltown, a community designed to house families as the core element of a city, despite housing the population at a lower density than that of the TND.

Taking the neighborhood as a comparative model is essential. The shaded area illustrates the neighborhood model. Due to the overlap in the composition of the pedestrian area, the location of the neighborhood, and the TND, these similarities manifest second-order consequences regarding the density of the residential and the social quality of the center. As with the TND and the TOD, the Livable Neighborhood Pattern combines the urban design of the TND and the TOD. It was conceptualized as a correction to the Modern City Model, primarily as it was applied at Milltown, a community designed to house families as the core element of a city, despite housing the population at a lower density than that of the TND.
MIDTOWN OMAHA

GIFFORD PARK
This opportunity area could be said to be in transition, as new development is already having an impact. The intersection of California and 33rd Streets is home to new small businesses, and with a little help it could see the type of success that has occurred at other neighborhood nodes like Dundee.

The existing Creighton Medical Center building has been sold and is proposed to be converted into a large multi-family complex. In addition, Omaha Public Schools is in the planning stages for a new elementary school.

The plan reinforces connections between these areas and integrates them into the neighborhood context.

PLAN ANNOTATIONS
1. The existing neighborhood node, located at the intersection of California and 33rd Streets, is already home to several new small restaurants and businesses. The area could see even more success with the addition of much needed streetscape improvements, including wider sidewalks with shade trees.
2. The former Creighton University Medical Center is being re-purposed as a multi-family complex. The residents will help support local businesses at 33rd and California, as well as new development in the vicinity.
3. A new elementary school is being planned for this block by Omaha Public Schools.
4. New infill development can fill the gaps in the urban fabric, where existing surface parking lots occur.
5. Omaha Public Schools Administration Building.
6. Large parcels may be subdivided into smaller lots to promote small-scale infill development that is compatible with the neighborhood context.
ANALYZE OPPORTUNITIES TO PRESERVE AND ENHANCE MIDTOWN OMAHA

KEY IMPLEMENTATION STEPS:
Develop and implement a form-based code as a tool to unify existing areas of development and promote walkable urbanism.

Promote the creation of a TIF or BID for the neighborhood node at 33rd and California Streets. Use to help fund streetscape improvements to improve walkability.

The illustration above shows the intersection of 33rd and California with much needed streetscape and facade improvements. Local businesses thrive in this type of environment.

The image to the left shows the same intersection today.

MIDTOWN OMAHA
5. Slow Zones

A slow zone is an area dedicated to less than 20 mph vehicle speeds and shown below. This zone will be dedicated to reduced posted speed streets to accommodate non-motorized users and envelope the slow streets shown.
DOWNTOWN PARKING RATIOS

- Jobs / housing balance
- Operations
- Future demand trends and technologies
- Optimizing use of existing facilities
- Additional future facilities

Statistically under-parked
2.75 Ideal (Cars/ Thousand sq. ft. Commercial)

- Birmingham: 1.42
- Ann Arbor: 1.91
- Holland: 2.26
- Traverse City: 2.75

ASSESS INVENTORY REQUIREMENTS

Copyright 2018 Gibbs Planning Group, Inc.
(Source – Traverse City DDA 2014)
PROVIDE THE MISSING MIDDLE
OPPORTUNITIES – INNOVATIVE HOUSING

- LIVE / WORKS
  - Atlanta, GA

- APARTMENT VILLAS
  - Rosemary Beach, FL

- BUNGALOW COURTS
  - New Town St. Charles, MO

- OTHERS
  - Townhouses and ADUs
TO: City Commission  
City of Birmingham  
151 Martin Street  
Birmingham, MI  48009  
Attention: Mr. Joe Valentine, City Manager (via email and post)

CC: Ms. Jana Ecker, Planning Director (via email)

FROM: Andres Duany, DPZ CoDESIGN  
Matthew Lambert, DPZ CoDESIGN  
Phillip McKenna, McKenna  
Robert Gibbs, Gibbs Planning Group

DATE: September 19, 2018

RE: Master Plan Update Consultant Team  
Commission Evaluation

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you again for the opportunity to partner with Birmingham leaders to prepare a generationally significant comprehensive plan for your premier community. In anticipation of a full presentation by our team of our proposal to the City Commission, we consider several points to be important.

1. **Fairness in The Next Steps:** The DPZ team believes we complied with the procurement rules and the competitive egalitarian process outlined in the RFP comprising 1) Proposal; 2) Presentation; 3) Committee selection and recommendation; and 4) City Commission approval of selection.
We carefully invested our time and money, confident that if selected by the Committee, we would gain Commission approval. By those rules, our team garnered the Committee’s preference by a substantial 7-to-1 margin.

At the City Commission meeting on Monday, September 13, the rules were altered, and a new process confronts us out of which we expect to once again emerge successful; however, to do so, we must be permitted at least a fair chance to succeed. We respect the Commission’s desire to have MKSK appear before you for a question-and-answer session similar to that with our team earlier this week. This being said, MKSK possesses the advantage of having access to the video of the September 13 hearing and the Commission’s concerns, allowing them to position their interview with the Commission anticipating said concerns. To maintain fairness in this process, we respectfully request for the opportunity of a proper (but abridged) presentation to the Commission by both DPZ and MKSK.

As part of the above, we also respectfully request that a report or presentation from and by the selection committee on their 7-to-1 conclusion be provided to, and reviewed by, the Commission, as part of providing the Commission with all pertinent information.

2. **The DPZ Team’s Expertise in Public Engagement:** In addition to a community engagement program (website, surveys, interviews) that will run throughout the course of the master planning process, a key element in our proposed work plan towards ensuring meaningful community engagement that feeds directly into the master plan preparation is our Charrette methodology.

In the late 1980’s DPZ pioneered the Charrette methodology integrating planning/design and stakeholder consultation in an interactive, dynamic workshop format. By definition, our proposed Charrette process is an intense series of highly visible public engagements, specifically structured over multiple sequential days (typically 7 to 8 days) to elicit and impart relevant information to the community as well as to extract, process, illustrate, and test all possible ideas, options, concerns, and input of the affected stakeholder (e.g. individual residents, neighborhood groups, youth, seniors, and other interest groups; businesses,
investors, builders, and developers; local institutions; city leaders and city departments; etc.). The DPZ team would seek to have all such decision-makers participate at the Charrette have them directly influence the planning and design process as the team presents various plan alternatives and instantaneously responds to requested changes. The main refinements are actually done at the Charrette in the presence of the decision-makers through repeated feedback loops – this is how the DPZ team embeds the community’s vision into the master plan; in the manner described above, by the conclusion of the Charrette, the resulting plan proposals – prepared and organized by skilled professionals – are widely understood and lead to broad support and implementation.

Our proposal allocates the public engagement budget as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Est. Amt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 7-day Charrette public engagement and design process</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 7-month non-Charrette public engagement</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Project Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Surveys (hard copy) (online)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Interviews (unlimited)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, DPZ has committed to having Founding Partner Andres Duany available for meetings with each of the City’s neighborhoods as part of his leadership role at the Charrette. This targeted approach with neighborhood stakeholder groups will yield great returns for City leaders.

3. **The DPZ Team’s Expertise in Planning for Neighborhoods:** Since 1980, DPZ has been creating benevolent and successful human places in the form of neighborhoods, villages, towns, and cities, all of which encourage walking, diversity, and complexity. Specifically, some 20 years ago, DPZ resurrected and re-invented pre-World War II neighborhood design, along with principles now used in common planning practice, such as the 5-minute walk/pedestrian shed, the connected grid, Complete Streets, civic spaces, front porch security, attainable housing types, etc.
As we had discussed with the selection committee at our interview on August 29, we anticipate an approach to planning for the various Birmingham neighborhoods that is two-fold: (1) identifying and strengthening the unique character and core of each neighborhood, along with (2) examining the transitions and interfaces between neighborhoods (including downtown as well as considering prior/ongoing redevelopment plans) at their edges, ensuring a cohesive urban fabric, optimizing opportunities for strategic infill, and facilitating connectivity between areas and throughout the city overall.

Our team has researched the historical establishment of the City’s neighborhoods, past plans related to the connections and interrelationship between neighborhoods, and has recent success engaging Birmingham residents during the Parks and Recreation Master Plan process. In short, we are intimately familiar with the neighborhoods, their centers and history, and have recently interfaced with neighborhood representatives.

We appreciate the complexities of the Commission’s responsibilities, and we very much believe our team has the most demonstrably successful record of planning in the City of Birmingham, as well as in other places of various sizes, types, and priorities – signifying our capacity to align with each community’s unique vision and goals. Ultimately, we do “get” Birmingham; therefore please let us know the date and time of the new presentation so we might make the necessary preparations.

Thank you for considering our perspective; we look forward to working with you again.

Sincerely,

Andres Duany     Phillip McKenna

Matthew Lambert    Robert Gibbs
September 26, 2018

Mr. Andreas Duany, Mr. Matthew Lambert, Mr. Phillip McKenna and Mr. Robert Gibbs
DPZ CoDesign
1023 SW 25th Avenue
Miami, FL 33135

Dear Mr. Duany, Mr. Lambert, Mr. McKenna and Mr. Gibbs,

I am in receipt of your September 19th letter to the City Commission outlining your request for how the Master Plan Selection Consultant selection should proceed. It is important to note the selection for the consultant is governed by the Request for Proposals (RFP) that was issued for this project. As such, the Terms and Conditions outlined in the RFP provide the City (thereby the City Commission as its governing body) the right to reject any or all proposals received, waive informalities, or accept any proposal, in whole or in part, it deems best. Keep in mind no decision has been made at this time as the Commission has only requested further clarification from one of the other contractors which is also provided for in the RFP. It must be made clear no rules were altered and no new processes were conducted. Rather, the City Commission is conducting their due diligence in ensuring the Scope of Work they developed will be administered as prescribed by the RFP.

Consequently, your requests to introduce additional presentations cannot be granted. However, the other contractor will be at the October 8th Commission meeting to provide clarification on their proposal and you and your team are also welcome to attend.

Sincerely,

Joseph A. Valentine
City Manager

cc: City Commission
On September 12, 2018, the Planning Board conducted a public hearing to consider amendments to Chapter 126, Zoning, of the City Code to add a definition for the term religious institutions and to remove all references to Church or Churches throughout Chapter 126, Zoning, and to replace with religious institution(s) and set a public hearing for September 12, 2018. The use of the term religious institution to replace the word church throughout the Zoning Ordinance will ensure that all religions are addressed consistently and included as permitted uses in the appropriate zone district(s). The Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend approval of these ordinance amendments to the City Commission.

On September 17, 2018, the City Commission set a public hearing date of October 8, 2018 to consider these amendments as recommended by the Planning Board. Please see attached report and Planning Board minutes for your review.

SUGGESTED ACTION:

To APPROVE the following amendments to Chapter 126, Zoning, of the City Code to remove all references to Church or Churches and replace the terms with religious institution(s) and provide a definition for same:

1. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.03, R1A (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
2. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.05, R1 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
3. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.07, R2 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
4. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.09, R3 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

5. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.11, R4 (TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

6. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.13, R5 (MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

7. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.15, R6 (MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

8. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.17, R7 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

9. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.21, O1 (OFFICE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

10. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.25, P (PARKING) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

11. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.27, B1 (NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

12. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.29, B2 (GENERAL BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

13. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.31, B2B (GENERAL BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

14. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.33, B2C (GENERAL BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

15. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.37, B4 (BUSINESS-RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
16. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.39, MX (MIXED USE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
17. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.43, TZ2 (TRANSITION ZONE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
18. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.45, TZ3 (TRANSITION ZONE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
19. TO AMEND ARTICLE 3, SECTION 3.07 – PERMITTED USES AND SPECIAL USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH;
20. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.45 (G)(5)(a)(ii) and (iii) – PK-01 GENERAL PARKING STANDARDS – TO AMEND THE METHODS OF PROVIDING PARKING FACILITIES, TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
21. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, TO AMEND TABLE A – REQUIRED OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES, TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
22. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.66 (A)(1)(STORAGE AND DISPLAY STANDARDS), TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
23. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.84 TU-01 (A)(2)(TEMPORARY USE STANDARDS), TO REPLACE CHURCH OR OTHER RELIGIOUS FACILITY WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
24. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.86 TU-03 (A)(1)(TEMPORARY USE STANDARDS), TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
25. TO AMEND ARTICLE 7, SECTION 7.21 (A)(1) – REQUIREMENTS, TO REPLACE CHURCHES WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS;
26. TO AMEND ARTICLE 9, SECTION 9.02 – DEFINITIONS, TO ADD A DEFINITION OF RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
27. TO AMEND APPENDIX A, LAND USE MATRIX, TO MERGE CHURCH AND CHURCH AND RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION ROWS INTO ONE ROW UNDER RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION; AND
28. TO AMEND APPENDIX B, INDEX, TO ELIMINATE INDEXED PAGES WHERE CHURCH NO LONGER EXISTS, ADD RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION AND CORRESPONDING PAGE NUMBERS.
The City of Birmingham has allowed churches and religious institutions across the city for many years. Churches are permitted in the B1, B2, B2B, B2C, and B4 zones, while also being permitted under a Special Land Use Permit in the R1A, R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, O1, P, MX, TZ2 and TZ3 zones. Religious institutions are only permitted under a Special Land Use Permit in the MX, TZ2 and TZ3 zones. As it stands, the City of Birmingham Zoning Ordinance does not define churches or religious institutions.

Some recent examples of church or religious institution activity in the City have to do with the Holy Name Church (630 Harmon), Grace Baptist Church (280 E. Lincoln), First Presbyterian (1669 W. Maple), and a home at 1578 Lakeside where a synagogue was proposed but never came to fruition. Many of the amendments to the Special Land Use Permits of these churches/religious institutions were for signage, but also for the purchase of other property for the development of other church related buildings or parking lots. Thus far, the City has considered “church” to be an overarching categorical term in the decision making process.

However, Black’s Law Dictionary defines a church as follows:

In its most general sense, the religious society founded and established by Jesus Christ, to receive, preserve, and propagate his doctrines and ordinances. A body or community of Christians united under one form of government by the profession of the same faith, and the observance of the same ritual and ceremonies. The term may denote either a society of persons who, professing Christianity, hold certain doctrines or observances which differentiate them from other like groups, and who use a common discipline, or the building in which such persons habitually assemble for public worship.

Oxford dictionary defines a church as a building used for public Christian worship, and Webster’s dictionary defines church as a building for public and especially Christian worship. Thus, use of the word church in the City Code implies the inclusion of only Christian religions, and potentially excludes all other religions or belief systems.

Thus, it may be more inclusive to use the term religious institution to replace the word church throughout the Zoning Ordinance to ensure that all religions are included as permitted uses.
There is no common definition for a religious institution, but an *institution* is defined as an organization founded for a religious, educational, professional, or social purpose, or, a significant practice, relationship, or organization in a society or culture by the Oxford and Webster’s dictionaries, respectively.

The Planning Division recommends that the word “church” be replaced with “religious institution” in all instances across the Zoning Ordinance. This would make religious institutions permitted in the B1, B2, B2B, B2C, and B4 zones, while also being permitted under a Special Land Use Permit in the R1A, R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, O1, P, MX, TZ2 and TZ3 zones.

Religious institution should also be added as a defined term in Article 9, section 9.02. A suggested definition:

**Religious Institution:** A building housing worship by an organization founded on an established religion, such as a church, synagogue, mosque, temple, or other house of worship.

The use of the term religious institution as defined above to replace the word church throughout the Zoning Ordinance will ensure that all religions are addressed consistently and included as permitted uses in the appropriate zone district(s).

On August 8, 2018, the Planning Board discussed the proposed amendments to Chapter 126, Zoning, of the City Code to add a definition for the term religious institutions and to remove all references to Church or Churches throughout Chapter 126, Zoning, and to replace with religious institution(s) and set a public hearing for September 12, 2018.

**Suggested Action:**

To recommend approval to the City Commission of the following amendments to Chapter 126, Zoning, of the City Code to remove all references to Church or Churches and replace the terms with religious institution(s) and provide a definition for same:

29. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.03, R1A (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
30. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.05, R1 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
31. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.07, R2 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
32. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.09, R3 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

33. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.11, R4 (TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

34. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.13, R5 (MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

35. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.15, R6 (MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

36. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.17, R7 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

37. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.21, O1 (OFFICE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

38. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.25, P (PARKING) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

39. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.27, B1 (NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

40. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.29, B2 (GENERAL BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

41. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.31, B2B (GENERAL BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

42. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.33, B2C (GENERAL BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;

43. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.37, B4 (BUSINESS-RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
44. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.39, MX (MIXED USE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
45. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.43, TZ2 (TRANSITION ZONE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
46. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.45, TZ3 (TRANSITION ZONE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
47. TO AMEND ARTICLE 3, SECTION 3.07 – PERMITTED USES AND SPECIAL USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH;
48. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.45 (G)(5)(a)(ii) and (iii) – PK-01 GENERAL PARKING STANDARDS – TO AMEND THE METHODS OF PROVIDING PARKING FACILITIES, TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
49. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, TO AMEND TABLE A – REQUIRED OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES, TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
50. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.66 (A)(1)(STORAGE AND DISPLAY STANDARDS), TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
51. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.84 TU-01 (A)(2)(TEMPORARY USE STANDARDS), TO REPLACE CHURCH OR OTHER RELIGIOUS FACILITY WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
52. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.86 TU-03 (A)(1)(TEMPORARY USE STANDARDS), TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
53. TO AMEND ARTICLE 7, SECTION 7.21 (A)(1) – REQUIREMENTS, TO REPLACE CHURCHES WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
54. TO AMEND ARTICLE 9, SECTION 9.02 – DEFINITIONS, TO ADD A DEFINITION OF RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
55. TO AMEND APPENDIX A, LAND USE MATRIX, TO MERGE CHURCH AND CHURCH AND RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION ROWS INTO ONE ROW UNDER RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION; AND
56. TO AMEND APPENDIX B, INDEX, TO ELIMINATE INDEXED PAGES WHERE CHURCH NO LONGER EXISTS, ADD RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION AND CORRESPONDING PAGE NUMBERS.
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.03, R1A (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.03 R1A (Single-Family Residential) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT

- Assisted living
- Church
- Continued care retirement community
- Independent hospice facility
- Independent senior living
- Medical rehabilitation facility
- Parking (accessory) – public, off-street
- Philanthropic use
- Public utility building
- Publicly owned building
- Religious institution
- School – private
- Skilled nursing facility

ORDAINED this _____ day of __________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, City Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.05, R1 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.05 R1 (Single-Family Residential) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT

- Assisted living
- Church
- Continued care retirement community
- Independent hospice facility
- Independent senior living
- Medical rehabilitation facility
- Parking (accessory) – public, off-street
- Philanthropic use
- Public utility building
- Publicly owned building
- **Religious institution**
- School – private
- Skilled nursing facility

ORDAINED this _____ day of __________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

________________________________________

Andrew Harris, Mayor

________________________________________

Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.07, R2 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.07 R2 (Single-Family Residential) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT

• Assisted living
  • Church
• Continued care retirement community
• Independent hospice facility
• Independent senior living
• Medical rehabilitation facility
• Parking (accessory) – public, off-street
• Philanthropic use
• Public utility building
• Publicly owned building
  • Religious institution
• School – private
• Skilled nursing facility

ORDAINED this _____ day of _________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.09, R3 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.09 R3 (Single-Family Residential) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT

- Assisted living
- Church
- Continued care retirement community
- Independent hospice facility
- Independent senior living
- Medical rehabilitation facility
- Parking (accessory) – public, off-street
- Philanthropic use
- Public utility building
- Publicly owned building
- Religious institution
- School – private
- Skilled nursing facility

ORDAINED this ______ day of _________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.11, R4 (TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.11 R4 (Two-Family Residential) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT

- Assisted living
- Church
- Continued care retirement community
- Independent hospice facility
- Independent senior living
- Parking (accessory) – public, off-street
- Public utility building
- Publicly owned building
- Religious institution
- School – private
- Skilled nursing facility

ORDAINED this ______ day of __________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

________________________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

________________________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.13, R5 (MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.13 R5 (Multiple-Family Residential) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT

- Assisted living
- Church
- Continued care retirement community
- Independent hospice facility
- Independent senior living
- Parking (accessory) – public, off-street
- Public utility building
- Publicly owned building
- Religious institution
- School – private
- Skilled nursing facility

ORDAINED this ______ day of _________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO._______

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.15, R6 (MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.15 R6 (Multiple-Family Residential) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT

- Assisted living
- Church
- Community center
- Continued care retirement community
- Independent hospice facility
- Independent senior living
- Public utility building
- Publicly owned building
- Recreational club
- Religious institution
- School – private
- Skilled nursing facility
- Social club

ORDAINED this _____ day of _________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.17, R7 (MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.17 R7 (Multiple-Family Residential) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT

- Assisted living
- Church
- Community center
- Continued care retirement community
- Independent hospice facility
- Independent senior living
- Parking – off-street
- Public utility building
- Publicly owned building
- Recreational club
- Religious institution
- School – private
- Skilled nursing facility
- Social club
- Special-purpose housing*

ORDAINED this ______ day of __________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.21, O1 (OFFICE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.21 O1 (Office) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT

- Assisted living
- Bistro (only permitted in the Triangle District)*
- Church
- Continued care retirement community
- Independent hospice facility
- Independent senior living
- Religious institution
- Skilled nursing facility

ORDAINED this _____ day of __________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.25, P (PARKING) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.25 P (Parking) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT

- Assisted living
- Bistro (only permitted in the Triangle District)*
- Church
- Community center
- Continued care retirement community
- Independent hospice facility
- Independent senior living
- Parking – off-street
- Publicly owned building
- Public utility building
- Recreational club
- Religious institution
- School - private
- Skilled nursing facility
- Social club

ORDAINED this ______ day of ________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.27, B1 (NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.27 B1 (Neighborhood Business) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

INSTITUTIONAL PERMITTED USES

- Church
- Community center
- Government office
- Government use
- Religious institution
- School – private
- School – public
- Social club

ORDAINED this _____ day of _________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.29, B2 (GENERAL BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.29 B2 (General Business) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

INSTITUTIONAL PERMITTED USES

- Church
- Community center
- Garage - public
- Government office
- Government use
- Loading facility – off-street
- Parking facility – off-street
- Religious institution
- School – private
- School – public
- Social club

ORDAINED this ______ day of __________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.31, B2B (GENERAL BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.31 B2B (General Business) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

INSTITUTIONAL PERMITTED USES

- Church
- Community center
- Garage – public
- Government office
- Government use
- Loading facility – off-street
- Parking facility – off-street
- Religious institution
- School – private
- School – public
- Social club

ORDAINED this _____ day of __________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.33, B2C (GENERAL BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.33 B2C (General Business) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

INSTITUTIONAL PERMITTED USES

- Church
- Community center
- Garage – public
- Government office
- Government use
- Loading facility – off-street
- Parking facility – off-street
- Religious institution
- School – private
- School – public
- Social club

ORDAINED this _____ day of __________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO._______

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.37, B4 (BUSINESS-RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.37 B4 (Business-Residential) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

INSTITUTIONAL PERMITTED USES

- Church
- Community center
- Garage – public
- Government office
- Government use
- Loading facility – off-street
- Parking facility – off-street
- Religious institution
- School – private
- School – public
- Social club

ORDAINED this _____ day of __________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

__________________________________________

Andrew Harris, Mayor

__________________________________________

Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.39, MX (MIXED USE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.39 MX (Mixed Use) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT

- Church
- Community center
- Garage – public
- Government office
- Government use
- Loading facility – off-street
- Parking facility – off-street
- **Religious institution**
- School – private
- School – public
- Social club

ORDAINED this ______ day of _________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.43, TZ2 (TRANSITION ZONE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.43 TZ2 (Transition Zone) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT

- Any permitted commercial use with interior floor area over 3,000 sq. ft. per tenant
- Assisted living
- Bakery
- Bank/credit union with drive-thru
- Church and religious institution
- Coffee shop
- Delicatessen
- Dry cleaner
- Essential services
- Food and drink establishment
- Government office/use
- Grocery store
- Independent hospice facility
- Independent senior living
- Parking structure
- **Religious institution**
- School – private and public
- Skilled nursing facility
- Specialty food shop

ORDAINED this ______ day of __________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 2.45, TZ3 (TRANSITION ZONE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 2.45 TZ3 (Transition Zone) District Intent, Permitted Uses, and Special Uses

USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT

- Any permitted commercial use with interior floor area over 3,000 sq. ft. per tenant
- Assisted living
- Bakery
- Bank/credit union with drive-thru
- Church and religious institution
- Coffee shop
- Delicatessen
- Dry cleaning
- Essential services
- Food and drink establishment
- Government office/use
- Grocery store
- Independent hospice facility
- Independent senior living
- Parking structure
- Religious institution
- School – private and public
- Skilled nursing facility
- Specialty food shop

ORDAINED this ______ day of __________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF
BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND SECTION 3.07, PERMITTED USES AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND TABLE
3.07 - TRIANGLE OVERLAY DISTRICT LAND USE MATRIX, TO REMOVE CHURCH IN
THE LAND USE MATRIX

Section 3.07, Permitted Uses and Special Uses, Table 3.07 – Triangle Overlay District
Land Use Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ASF3</th>
<th>MU3</th>
<th>MU5</th>
<th>MU7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government office</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government use</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking – off-street</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking structure</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious institution</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School – private</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School – public</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social club</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORDAINED this ______ day of ________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, City Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.45 – PK-01 GENERAL PARKING STANDARDS, SECTION G(5)(a)(ii) and (iii) TO AMEND THE METHODS OF PROVIDING PARKING FACILITIES, TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 4.45 – PK-01 General Parking Standards

G. METHODS OF PROVIDING PARKING FACILITIES

5.(a)

i. The maximum allowable floor area ratio (FAR) in the parking assessment districts shall not exceed 100%, except that the maximum usable floor area may be increased up to 200% by providing 1 parking space for every 300 square feet over the maximum 100% FAR.

ii. Churches Religious institutions in the parking assessment district are exempt from this maximum FAR provision.

iii. In the case of churches religious institutions and buildings occupied by nonprofit organizations providing services to the general public, by securing permission to use the parking facilities of other buildings within 500 feet of the church religious institution or community center building when such other building is not normally open, in use, or in operation during the principal hours of use of such church religious institution or community center building. Permission to use such other parking facilities shall be evidenced in writing for a period of not less than 1 year. In the case of nonprofit organizations, the parking to be shared must be in a parking or commercial district

ORDAINED this _____ day of __________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

__________________________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

__________________________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.46, TO AMEND TABLE A – REQUIRED OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES, TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 4.46 – PK-02 Off-Street Parking Spaces Required, Table A – Required Off-Street Parking Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church, Religious institution, school and other place of public assembly with fixed seats</strong></td>
<td>1 space for each 6 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church, Religious Institution, school and other place of public assembly without fixed seats</strong></td>
<td>1 space for each six person of capacity as determined by the Fire Marshal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>1 space for each 3 seats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORDAINED this ______ day of _________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.66, SD-01, STORAGE AND DISPLAY STANDARDS, TO REPLACE CHURCHES WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS

Section 4.66, SD-01, Storage and Display Standards

A. SALE OF CHRISTMAS TREES
   1. Other provisions of this ordinance notwithstanding, Christmas trees may be stored, displayed and sold without the use of a building or other structure by churches religious institutions, schools or other nonprofit, organizations on property owned by such institution or organization.

ORDAINED this _____ day of _________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.84, TU-01 - TEMPORARY USE STANDARDS, TO REPLACE CHURCH OR OTHER RELIGIOUS FACILITY WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 4.84, TU-01

A. PERMITTED TEMPORARY USES: Subject to the specific regulations that follow and to the other applicable regulations of the district in which the use is permitted, the following temporary uses are permitted:

1. Temporary office buildings: Such buildings are allowed for the purpose of conducting business for a permitted use in association with a development project under building permit or granted preliminary Site Plan Approval subject to conformance with Chapter 22 of the Birmingham City Code.

2. Ecclesiastical Homeless Shelter Programs: Such use is permitted when it is a temporary accessory use to a church or other religious facility with the following requirements:

   a. Such a use shall be wholly accommodated inside a church or other religious institution.

   b. Such a use shall be permitted for a period not to exceed 7 consecutive days upon inspection by the Fire Marshal and Building Official.

   c. No more than 1 such event is permitted from the same facility in any 12-month period.

   d. No more than 30 overnight guests may be accommodated on any 1 night within the approved weeklong program.

ORDAINED this _____ day of __________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

______________________________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

______________________________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.86, TU-03 - TEMPORARY USE STANDARDS, TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 4.86, TU-03

A. PERMITTED TEMPORARY USES: Subject to the specific regulations that follow and to the other applicable regulations of the district in which the use is permitted, the following temporary use is permitted:

1. Seasonal plant sales: Any religious institution, school or other nonprofit organization may conduct seasonal plant sales on property owned by such institution or organization.
   a. Such sales shall be limited to a period not to exceed 30 days.
   b. Plant displays need not comply with the setback requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. The displays shall meet the requirements of Section 4.87.
   c. All refuse or debris resulting from such sales shall be wholly contained on the premises and removed from the premises after the end of the sale.
   d. Christmas tree sales require a license as defined in Section 26-88 of the Birmingham City Code.

ORDAINED this ____ day of ________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND ARTICLE 7, SECTION 7.21 – REQUIREMENTS, TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 7.21, Requirements

A. The City Commission shall approve a request for a regulated use if it determines that all of the following standards are met:
   1. The use will be compatible with adjacent uses of land, considering the proximity of dwellings, churches religious institutions, schools, public structures, and other places of public gatherings.
   2. The use will not adversely impact the capabilities of public services and facilities including sewers, water, schools, transportation, and the ability of the City to supply such services.
   3. The use will not adversely impact any cultural or historic landmarks.
   4. The use is in compliance with all other requirements of this Zoning Ordinance.
   5. The use is in compliance with federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

ORDAINED this ______ day of __________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

________________________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

________________________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND ARTICLE 9, SECTION 9.02 – DEFINITIONS, TO ADD A DEFINITION OF RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Section 9.02, Definitions

Religious Institution: A building housing an organization founded on an established religion, such as a church, synagogue, mosque, temple, or other house of worship.

ORDAINED this ______ day of _________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO._______

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND APPENDIX A, LAND USE MATRIX, TO MERGE CHURCH AND CHURCH AND RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION ROWS INTO ONE ROW UNDER RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

| Institutional                                    | PP | R1A | R1 | R2 | R3 | R4 | R5 | R6 | R7 | R8 | O1 | O2 | P | B1 | B2 | B2B | B2C | B3 | B4 | MX | TZ1 | TZ2 | TZ3 |
|-------------------------------------------------|----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| Auditorium                                      | P  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | - | -  | -  | -   | -   | -  | -   | -   | -  | -   | -   | -   |
| Bus/trail passenger station and waiting area    | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | - | S  | S  | S   | P   | -  | P   | -   | -  | -   | -   | -   |
| Cemetery                                        | P  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | - | -  | -  | -   | -   | -  | -   | -   | -  | -   | -   | -   |
| Church                                          | -  | S   | S  | S  | S  | S  | S  | S  | S  | S  | S  | S  | S | P  | P  | P   | P   | -  | P   | S   | S  | S   | S   | S   |
| Church and religious institution                 | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | - | -  | -  | -   | -   | -  | -   | -   | -  | -   | -   | -   |
| College                                         | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | - | -  | -  | -   | -   | -  | -   | -   | -  | -   | -   | -   |
| Community center                                | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | S  | S  | S | P  | P  | P   | P   | -  | P   | -   | -  | -   | -   | -   |
| Religious institution                           | -  | S   | S  | S  | S  | S  | S  | S  | S  | S  | S  | S  | S | S  | S  | S   | P   | P  | P   | P   | P  | S   | S   | S   |

ORDAINED this ______ day of _________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

______________________________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

______________________________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM ORDAINS:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM:

TO AMEND APPENDIX B, INDEX, TO ELIMINATE INDEXED PAGES WHERE CHURCH NO LONGER EXISTS, ADD RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION AND CORRESPONDING PAGE NUMBERS

Appendix B, Index

C:

Church: 2-4; 2-6; 2-8; 2-10; 2-12; 2-14; 2-16; 2-18; 2-22; 2-26; 2-28; 2-30; 2-32; 2-34; 2-38; 2-40; 3-10; 4-12; 4-32; 4-35; 4-42; 4-50; 4-51; 7-10; A-4.

R:

Religious institution: 2-4; 2-6; 2-8; 2-10; 2-12; 2-14; 2-16; 2-18; 2-22; 2-26; 2-28; 2-30; 2-32; 2-34; 2-38; 2-40; 3-10; 4-12; 4-32; 4-35; 4-42; 4-50; 4-51; 7-10; A-4.

ORDAINED this ______ day of __________, 2018 to become effective 7 days after publication.

____________________________
Andrew Harris, Mayor

____________________________
Cherilynn Mynsberge, Clerk
2. Church/Religious Institutions

Ms. Ecker advised that the City of Birmingham has allowed churches and religious institutions across the City for many years. Thus far, the City has considered "church" to be an overarching categorical term in the decision making process. However, use of the word "church" implies the inclusion of only Christian religions, and potentially excludes all other religions or belief systems based on standard dictionary definitions. Neither church nor religious institution is defined in the Zoning Ordinance.

Thus, it may be more inclusive to use the term "religious institution" to replace the word "church" throughout the Zoning Ordinance to ensure that all religions are included as permitted uses.

There is no common definition for a religious institution, but an institution is defined as an organization founded for a religious, educational, professional, or social purpose, or, a significant practice, relationship, or organization in a society or culture by the Oxford and Webster’s dictionaries, respectively.

The Planning Division recommends that the word “church” be replaced with “religious institution” in all instances across the Zoning Ordinance. This would make religious institutions permitted in the B-1, B-2, B-2B, B-2C, and B-4 zones, while also being permitted under a Special Land Use Permit in the R-1A, R-1, R-2, R3, R-4, R-5, R-6, R-7, O1, P, MX, TZ-2 and TZ-3 zones. Religious institution should also be added as a defined term in Article 9, section 9.02. A suggested definition:

Religious Institution: A building housing an organization founded on an established religion, such as a church, synagogue, mosque, temple, or other house of worship.

The use of the term "religious institution" as defined above to replace the word "church" throughout the Zoning Ordinance will ensure that all religions are addressed consistently and included as permitted uses in the appropriate zone district(s).

Mr. Williams thought this seems quite simple; all they need to do is expand the definition of "church." It was agreed to change the Religious Institution definition to read "A building housing worship by an organization . . . "

Motion by Mr. Williams
Seconded by Mr. Boyle that the Planning Board schedule a public hearing for September 12, 2018 utilizing the revised definition and the 28 amendments to Chapter 126, Zoning of the City Code that are set forth in the materials.
Motion carried, 7-0.

VOICE VOTE
Yeas: Williams, Boyle, Clein, Emerine, Jeffares, Koseck, Ramine
Nays: None
Absent: Share, Whipple-Boyce
Chairman Clein opened the public hearing at 7:40 p.m.

2. **CHURCHES/RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 126, ZONING, OF THE CITY CODE AS FOLLOWS:**

1. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.03, R1A (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
2. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.05, R1 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
3. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.07, R2 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
4. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.09, R3 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
5. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.11, R4 (TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
6. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.13, R5 (MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
7. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.15, R6 (MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
8. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.17, R7 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
9. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.21, O1 (OFFICE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
10. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.25, P (PARKING) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
11. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.27, B1 (NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
12. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.29, B2 (GENERAL BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
13. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.31, B2B (GENERAL BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
14. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.33, B2C (GENERAL BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
15. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.37, B4 (BUSINESS-RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
16. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.39, MX (MIXED USE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
17. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.43, TZ2 (TRANSITION ZONE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
18. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.45, TZ3 (TRANSITION ZONE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
19. TO AMEND ARTICLE 3, SECTION 3.07 – PERMITTED USES AND SPECIAL USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH IN THE LAND USE MATRIX;
20. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.45 (G)(5)(a)(ii) and (iii) – PK-01 GENERAL PARKING STANDARDS – TO AMEND THE METHODS OF PROVIDING PARKING FACILITIES, TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
21. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, TO AMEND TABLE A – REQUIRED OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES, TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
22. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.66 (A)(1)(STORAGE AND DISPLAY STANDARDS), TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
23. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.84 TU-01 (A)(2)(TEMPORARY USE STANDARDS), TO REPLACE CHURCH OR OTHER RELIGIOUS FACILITY WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
24. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.86 TU-03 (A)(1)(TEMPORARY USE STANDARDS), TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
25. TO AMEND ARTICLE 7, SECTION 7.21 (A)(1) – REQUIREMENTS, TO REPLACE CHURCHES WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS;
26. TO AMEND ARTICLE 9, SECTION 9.02 – DEFINITIONS, TO ADD A DEFINITION OF RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
27. TO AMEND APPENDIX A, LAND USE MATRIX, TO MERGE CHURCH AND CHURCH AND RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION ROWS INTO ONE ROW UNDER RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION; AND
28. TO AMEND APPENDIX B, INDEX, TO ELIMINATE INDEXED PAGES WHERE CHURCH NO LONGER EXISTS, ADD RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION AND CORRESPONDING PAGE NUMBERS.
The Chairman opened the public hearing at 7:40 p.m.

Ms. Ecker advised that the City of Birmingham has allowed churches and religious institutions across the city for many years. She explained the City of Birmingham Zoning Ordinance does not define churches or religious institutions. One issue is that the term "church" is meant to only refer to Christian religions and not necessarily others. So the Ordinance may have been eliminating certain religions from being located in certain zone districts. Thus, it may be more inclusive to use the term "religious institution" to replace the word "church" throughout the Zoning Ordinance and also to define "religious institution" to ensure that all religions are included as permitted uses.

Ms. Alice Lezot, 411 S. Old Woodward Ave., Unit 511, came forward. She received clarification that the term "religious institution" will be defined in the ordinance.

**Motion by Mr. Williams**

Seconded by Mr. Boyle to recommend approval to the City Commission of the above 28 amendments to Chapter 126, Zoning, of the City Code to remove all references to Church or Churches and replace the terms with religious institution(s) and provide a definition as follows:

**Religious Institution:** A building housing worship by an organization founded on an established religion, such as a church, synagogue, mosque, temple, or other house of worship.

**Motion carried, 6-0.**

No one from the public stepped up to comment on the motion.

**VOICE VOTE**

Yeas: Williams, Boyle, Clein, Emerine, Jeffares, Koseck

Nays: None

Abstain: Whipple-Boyce, who had just arrived.

Absent: Share

The Chairman closed the public hearing at 7:45 p.m.
MEMORANDUM

Fire Department

DATE: September 28, 2018

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: John M. Connaughton, Fire Chief

SUBJECT: Emergency Response Vehicle Purchases

The Birmingham Fire Department’s emergency responses have continued to increase over the last 10 years. Our medical runs equate to approximately 65% of our run volume. The total number of responses in the year 2007 was 1,852. In the year 2017 our total run volume was 2,477. The fire department responded to All Seasons last year 155 times and the Baldwin House 173 times. The Sheridan, our newest senior living building is open and is expected to increase our run volume an additional 192 runs based on the national average for a facility of this type and size. This increased run volume has also increased our maintenance and repair cost on our apparatus.

As a result of the change in demands on the fire service, the fire department is looking at changing our response profile. Currently, the fire department responds with an engine and rescue (ambulance) for every medical. This allows us to have up to four Advanced Life Support (ALS) personnel on scene (two on the rescue and two on an engine) to perform the necessary triage, treatment and transport procedures for the patient. Then the rescue with two personnel would potentially transport the patient to the hospital and the two on the engine would return to the station. Because of the current response profile, we are utilizing an engine or the ladder truck to back up the ambulance. Since we are now looking to replace vehicles in our fleet we have been assessing the opportunity to integrate a smaller, more efficient apparatus into our operation. The use of a mini-pumper has become a more effective and efficient vehicle for fire service.

*Attached is an article which explains the utilization of this vehicle in the fire service.

Our current back up rescue (Rescue 20), which was put into service in 2001, was scheduled for replacement in the 2016/2017 budget year. The backup engine (Engine 11) was put into service in 1997 and was scheduled for replacement in the 2017/2018 budget year. Neither vehicle has been replaced at this time given the ongoing assessment of our fleet. I believe a change in our response profile is now warranted with the opportunity to integrate a smaller, less expensive and more efficient vehicle that can meet our needs and allow for easier maintenance. A mini-pumper can be serviced at most car dealerships and does not need to be sent to a more expensive specialized service center.

As the Chief of the department, I do not believe we can continue to rely on our 2001 rescue (ambulance) and would recommend purchasing a new rescue as previously planned. The cost of a new rescue (ambulance) is $237,241.00. In addition, I would recommend the City purchase a mini-pumper rather than an engine at this time. The cost of a mini-pumper is half the cost of a full size engine would be. A new mini-pumper would cost $338,431 fully equipped. The mini-
pumper has a fire pump and 250-gallon water tank, so it could certainly be used for smaller fires. The mini-pumper would also be licensed with the State of Michigan as a non-transporting Advanced Life Support vehicle. Instead of an engine responding to all medicals, the mini-pumper would respond with a rescue. This would certainly reduce wear and tear and prevent out of service time for our larger apparatus. In addition, the smaller mini-pumper would be easier to maneuver through most of the City's streets. For these reasons I am recommending we proceed with the replacement of our rescue and purchase of a mini-pumper in lieu of an engine at this time.

It is my recommendation to purchase a 2019 Life Line Type-1 ambulance, mounted on a Ford 4500 series cab and chassis, and to purchase a 2019 Danko mini-pumper mounted on a Ford 5500 series cab and chassis. These vehicles are available for purchase through Houston-Galveston Area Council purchasing program (HGAC) extendable contract pricing from R & R Fire Truck Repair Inc., located in Northville, Mich. This program has been used by Birmingham, Department of Public Services over the last 6 years for purchasing equipment and large commercial vehicles.

Our 2001 rescue was scheduled for replacement in the 2016/2017 budget year at a replacement cost of $240,000. The Life Line 2019 rescue (ambulance) that we have designed to the fire department needs came in under budget at $237,241.00. The purchase order is for $241,841.00 before a $4,600 rebate at the time of completion for the chassis though Ford Motor Company. Some of the highlights of this modern ambulance will be liquid spring suspension for patient comfort transporting on Michigan roads, 4-wheel drive for winter conditions, and a drivetrain that can be serviced locally at any Ford dealership which will reduce operating/maintenance cost.

Our 1997 Pierce Class pumper (Engine) was purchased in 1997 and budgeted to be replaced in the 2017/2018 budget year at a replacement cost of $600,000. The Danko mini-pumper designed to fit our new response model, cost $338,431 fully equipped. The engine and drivetrain warranty is for 3 years vs. a one-year warranty on larger fire apparatus. The mini-pumper can be serviced at a local ford dealership. The cost of the pumper not equipped is around $290,000. The mini-pumper upon delivery will be equipped with additional equipment that will improve our fire and medical services to the community. Some of the items the truck will have are a LifePak 15 heart monitor (defibrillator), a Hurst miniature jaws of life, and a Bullard thermal imaging camera.

The fire department in the near future is looking to upgrade our 2008 Sutphen aerial platform (ladder) truck for an updated design that can navigate the city streets and serve the communities needs more efficiently. We will continue to evaluate the aerial truck and the rest of our fleet as we recommend future replacements.

SUGGESTED ACTION:

To authorize the purchase of a 2019 Life Line Typ-1 ambulance on a Ford F-450 chassis for the cost of $237,241.00 and a 2019 Danko mini-pumper mounted on a Ford F-550 chassis for a cost of $338,431.00; further to authorize this budgeted expenditure from account number 663-338.000-971.0100; further authorizing and directing the mayor to sign the respective agreements on behalf of the City.
John Donohue, Asst. Fire Chief
Birmingham Fire Dept.
572 S. Adams Road
Birmingham, MI 48009

September 24, 2018

Dear Asst. Chief Donohue,

The following quote is offered for your consideration regarding one [1] Danko Emergency Equipment Mini-Pumper, on a 2019 Ford F-550 Super-Duty XL 4x4 Chassis. The scope of work is outlined in the specification package and drawings provided to the department recently.

2019 Ford F-550 Super-Duty XL Crew Cab 4x4, Danko Emergency Equipment Mini-Pumper [Q-0500].

Three Hundred Thirty Eight Thousand, Four Hundred Thirty One Dollars 0/100

$338,431.00

Loose Equipment Provided:
➤ One [1] TFT Blitz-Fire Monitor and Bracket #XXC33
➤ One [1] Bullard Eclipse LDX Thermal Imager
➤ One [1] Blow-Hard BH20 Battery-Powered PPV Fan
➤ One [1] Hurst Edraulic Rescue Tool StrongArm® #273100000
➤ One [1] Physio Controls, LifePak 15 Heart Monitor
➤ Two [2] TFT Ball Valves for Intakes R&L 6.0” x 4” Storz

Pricing is for an HGAC-Buy purchase [EE01] Danko Mini Pumper. The pricing includes the HGAC-Buy Contract Fee, and a $2,000.00 Contingency Fund. Any unused funds will be deducted from the final invoice. The Ford GPC Rebate is factored into the pricing also [-$4,690.00]

Delivery Time-frame: 280-345 Calendar Days
Note: Chassis payment is due upon Chassis arrival at Danko Fire; balance of the build is due in full at the factory upon successful completion of the final inspection/acceptance by Fire Department personnel in attendance.

If you have any questions regarding this proposal or specification package, feel free to contact me at 248-697-8002, or email me at al@rrfiretruck.com.

Best Regards,

Al D'Agostino
Sales & Marketing Mgr.
R&R Fire Truck Repair Inc.

Proposal Accepted on behalf of the City of Birmingham by:

Signed By ______________ Title ______________ Date ______________

Printed Name ___________________________
John Donohue  
Assistant Chief  
Birmingham Fire Dept.  
572 S. Adams Road  
Birmingham, MI 48009  

September 24, 2018  

Dear Asst. Chief Donohue,  

The following quote is offered for your review regarding one [1] 2019 Life Line Type-I Ambulance, purchased under the HGAC Buy program. The build is based off your specifications drafted earlier this year.  

R&R Fire Truck Repair Inc. is the Michigan Dealer for Life Line Emergency Vehicles (LLEV), Sumner, IA. LLEV has been in business building custom high-end Ambulances for the past 33 years.  

One (1) 2019 Life Line Superliner Type-I 171”x 96” Superliner 72” Headroom, on a 2019 Ford F-450 XLT 4x4 Chassis with Liquid Spring Suspension.  

Two Hundred Forty One Thousand, Eight Hundred Forty One Dollars no/100  

$241,841.00  

This quote is based on the NA02 HGAC Contract AM-10-16, with Liquid Spring Suspension installed. This quote also contains the required HGAC Contract Fee, Published Options requested, and Un-Published Options required to complete the delivery. The Chassis will be ordered by Life Line, with availability in late October 2018. The unit should be completed in late February 2019 [Est.].  

Note: The available Ford GPC Rebate on the 2019 Chassis is -$4,600.00. It is your choice to have this amount refunded directly to the City of Birmingham, or deducted from the bid total, signing the rebate amount over to R&R Fire Truck Repair Inc. (paperwork required, see attached form).
Delivery is running approximately 110-calendar days after receipt of the Chassis from Olathe Ford [KS], and a “signed off” Work Order and CAD Drawings.

Thank You for your business, we look forward to providing another state-of-the-art-Ambulance for the City of Birmingham.

Feel free to contact me with any questions you may have at 248-697-8002

Al D'Agostino  
Sales & Marketing Mgr.  
R&R Fire Truck Repair Inc.  
ali@rrfiretruck.com

Proposal Accepted on behalf of the City of Birmingham by:

Signed By __________________________ Title __________________________ Date __________________________

Printed Name __________________________
The Mighty Mini Pumper

KME delivers a mini pumper to the Eagle (PA) Fire Company

Back in the 1970s, known as the dark ages, when I first started in the fire service, the role of the mini pumper was starting to be introduced by some of the fire service manufacturers. The mini pumper was a small agile fire truck with a small 500-to 750-gpm pump and a limited amount, 250-300 gallons, of water onboard. It was a cheap way to get a first-out unit for car fires, dumpster fires, brush fires, and, in some cases, even a first-out attack unit for small structural fires. Even though I wouldn’t advocate it for that scenario, some departments on limited budgets saw a need for this.

The idea lasted a few years but faded away because of the small pumps and limited amount of water for use on the fireground, plus lighter chassis, smaller engines, and not being able to get a four-door crew cab.

Fast forward to the present time. Over the past five years, we have begun to see the mini pumper concept coming alive again. Once again budgets came into play, but this time in some cases you can outfit a mini with a 1,500-gpm pump, a more powerful diesel engine, and a four-door cab. This gives smaller departments with limited resources a viable option for firefighting.

VIABLE OPTIONS

This concept caught the eye of Chief Norm Claybaugh from the Eagle Fire Company in Mount Wolf, Pennsylvania. “We normally replace our vehicles every 15 to 17 years based on maintenance and needs,” Claybaugh says. “We had to replace our 4 x 4 international urban interface unit, which was causing us some maintenance issues. We were putting a great deal of money into this older unit.”

The department began looking into this vehicle about 1½ years ago. Initially, personnel looked into specing a pumper/tanker, but that idea was cost prohibitive. “Looking at our response area, we decided to go with a smaller unit,” Claybaugh continues. “Our area is primarily rural, but we do have some industrial and commercial areas. East Manchester Township, which we also cover, has some farms, large housing developments, as well as some narrow alleyways.”

VEHICLE SELECTION

A smaller mini pumper with a large pump, a four-door cab, a 4 x 4 chassis, a 300-gallon tank, and a 10-gallon Class A foam tank was the way to go for the

Eagle (PA) Fire Company

KME mini pumper specs

- Ford F-550 4 x 4 four-door cab chassis. All aluminum body.
- 6.7-liter Ford Power Stroke diesel engine, automatic transmission.
- Hale single-stage 1,250-gpm pump.
- 300-gallon water tank, 10-gallon Class A foam tank.
- Front-mounted Warn winch.
- FRC MFA 200 foam system.
The vehicle front with Warn winch.

The large four-door cab.

Eagle Fire Company

Eagle Fire Company #1 is in Mount Wolf, Pennsylvania, with 62 volunteers (18 active volunteer firefighters) and one station providing fire suppression, brush fire and tanker services—something we vehemently opposed.

The fire company also had a 2011 KME Class A pumper and was happy with the operation and service with that unit, so it was a no-brainer to go with KME on this purchase. "They listened to all of our ideas," Claybaugh says. "We started with a basic body design and then made some changes to suit our fire company. Our committee was comprised of 12 members. They each had a role. We did a great deal of research, visited other departments that took delivery of similar vehicles, and then wrote our own specs."

"It was a great deal with KME and the local dealer," Claybaugh continues. "We visited the factory three times during the build and made some minor changes along the way. We added some front lights and added grab handles—nothing major—and no changes were made once production started on the vehicle."

VEHICLE SPECS

The committee was originally going to design the truck with a 500-gpm pump but decided on a Hale 1,250-gpm pump. The truck might have to go down some tight alleys and have a long stretch, so the extra gpm pump would come in handy. The truck is built on a four-door Ford F-550 chassis powered by a Ford Power Stroke diesel engine.

The vehicle can carry a great deal of hose: four pre-connects, one having 100 feet of 1½-inch hose, two having 200 feet of 1¾-inch hose, and one 150 feet of 2½-inch hose. Supply lines consist of 500 feet of five-inch and 600 feet of three-inch hose. Also carried are normal engine company fittings, brush tools, axes, halligans, a K-12 saw, a Stokes basket, a basic complement of ropes, and cribbing.

"The basic idea was that it would take some of the burden off our bigger units," Claybaugh says. "It responds to motor vehicle accidents, car fires, dumpster fires, and is a second-deck piece for structural response." Claybaugh adds, "The vehicle is working "out well for us, and we are using the mini to our advantage."

Who says you can't go back to the future. An old idea with a modern approach is serving the Eagle Fire Company. The members didn't want to take no for an answer when they turned down building just another cookie cutter truck. They worked together to design a vehicle that would work for their response area and take the burden off their larger pumps. The result was a custom-designed mini pumper that not only saved their budget but provided them with a viable firefighting apparatus.

Bob Vaccaro has more than 40 years of fire service experience. He is a former chief of the Deer Park (NY) Fire Department. Vaccaro has also worked for the Insurance Services Office, the New York Fire Patrol, and several major commercial insurance companies as a senior loss-control consultant. He is a life member of the IAFC.
DATE: October 2, 2018

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: Jana Ecker, Planning Director
Scott Grewe, Police Commander
Paul T. O'Meara, City Engineer

SUBJECT: Maple Rd. Paving Project
Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave.

Recently, questions have been raised relative to whether it is appropriate to proceed to the reconstruction of Maple Rd. in 2020, in light of the pending reconstruction of the N. Old Woodward Ave. Parking Structure reconstruction. A separate report relative to that topic explains the benefits of proceeding with the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan as currently laid out. Based on that assumption, construction of the Maple Rd. downtown segment is currently planned to begin in March of 2020. Unlike Phase 1, Phase 2 will include federal funding in the form of two federal grants totaling a value of approximately $600,000. As a result, the bidding documents will be bid through the MI Dept. of Transportation (MDOT). The additional lead time required to meet the State’s bidding timetable to achieve the City’s preferred construction schedule requires that final engineering design begin in December of this year. As a result, the MKSK/F&V consulting team that regularly works with the Multi-Modal Transportation Board (MMTB) presented options to the Board at their regular meetings of July 12 & August 2, 2018. After taking input from the MMTB, the following represents their recommendations of the design’s highlights through the entire corridor. Input from the City Commission is desired at this time so that a finalized version can be returned at a future meeting for final approval.

PROJECT SUMMARY

As outlined on the attached map, the 2020 Maple Rd. project will consist of three separate sections:

1. At the west end of the job, the Southfield Rd. approach to Maple Rd. will be relocated to the west to allow for true 90° turns to and from Southfield Rd. The more conventional intersection design is expected to reduce crashes, which allows this work to qualify for a grant valued at 80% of the construction cost, or approximately $250,000.

2. Between Southfield Rd. and Chester St., no changes are proposed to the traffic pattern or street, which was modified in 2016 as a part of the Maple Rd. 3-lane conversion completed that year. The asphalt pavement is in marginal condition, therefore, an asphalt milling and resurfacing is proposed.
3. Starting at Chester St. and extending to Woodward Ave., the Maple Rd. corridor will be completely reconstructed, including new water and sewer improvements, new concrete street, new sidewalk streetscape, new traffic signals, and new fiber optic system conduit. The Maple Rd./Old Woodward Ave. intersection completed in 2018 will be left as is.

DESIGN DETAILS

The following summarizes the design details that have been reviewed and endorsed by the MMTB. These design features will be presented in detail at the meeting:

1. Parking Space Design

Birmingham has traditionally marked parallel parking spaces with alternating “x” areas that allow for easier maneuvering of vehicles into and out of parallel parking spaces. The consultant reviewed this question, and determined that MDOT allows both options. The consultant found that the design with the “x” areas is not very popular in most congested Michigan downtowns. After review, the MMTB recommended that the “x” parking space design be eliminated if this would add parking spaces in the project area. After further study, the consultant has determined that removal of the “x” areas would not create additional parking spaces, therefore, the final recommendation is to construct the street with them being a part of the design.

Once that was decided, staff and the consulting team met with local representatives of MDOT to determine a design that could be approved relative to the important questions of lane widths, parking space dimensions, and distance between crosswalks and parking spaces. Since this is not a state highway, MDOT offered the following design parameters:

- Through traffic lanes and left turn lanes must be a minimum of 11 ft. wide.
- Parallel parking spaces must be a minimum of 8 ft. wide, and 22 ft. long.
- The distance from a crosswalk to an adjacent parking space can be reduced from the traditional MDOT standard of 50 ft. down to a minimum of 20 ft.

We were pleased with these concessions from MDOT. Implementing these standards, the new design will have the following features:

- Standard 38 ft. street width in areas where parking is provided (down from the current 44 ft. width).
- City sidewalks gaining three feet of width in areas where parking spaces are present (plus, in areas where double steps currently exist, all steps will be removed, improving the sidewalks even more so from current conditions).
- Landscape and seating feature areas at Henrietta St. and at the mid-block crossing east of Old Woodward Ave.
- Counting three new parking spaces being introduced on Park St., a final tally showing all but 7 parallel parking spaces remaining, even with the introduction of the mid-block crossing.

The Commission is also advised that as a part of the street reconstruction, the accessible parking spaces that are within the project area will require enhancements, in accordance with revisions made in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Widened parking spaces with
handicap ramp access are now required for parallel parking spaces on newly constructed streets, similar to the sketch included in this report. It is anticipated that a total of four accessible spaces will have to be constructed along the project length to meet the requirements of the ADA.

2. **Landscaping Design**

The design theme used from the Old Woodward Ave. project will be continued. Design features will include:

- Raised planter beds at each tree.
- Large areas of structural organic soil around each tree.
- Landscaped seating areas at Henrietta St. and at mid-block crossing.

Unlike the rest of the project, due to the required street width between Park St. and Woodward Ave., the proposed sidewalks will remain similar to what they are today. MKSK provided multiple options on how to provide landscaping features in this area. The MMTB recommended the installation of columnar trees that have innovative concrete removal panels placed between the tree and the right-of-way line, for maximum usable walking space. Photos are attached.

3. **Southfield Rd. Intersection**

As shown on the attached drawing, the south leg of the Southfield Rd. intersection will be moved about 50 ft. to the west. While still remaining in the right-of-way, the plan is anticipated to reduce traffic crashes at this location. The more conventional design will reduce speeds for northbound Southfield Rd. traffic, which will in turn improve safety for pedestrians crossing at the east leg of the intersection. The safety grant awarded to the City will cover 80% of the construction cost for this part of the project, including relocation of the existing “span wire” style traffic signal. Since this intersection is on the edge of the Central Business District, the City Commission may wish to consider approving the installation of a new “mast arm” style traffic signal at the intersection. It is anticipated that the additional cost of the mast arm style signal would be approximately $100,000.

When considering this design element, note that the Bates St. and Henrietta St. traffic signals are already planned and budgeted for complete replacement, and they will feature the mast arm design. Further, in 2019, MDOT will be replacing the traffic signal at Maple Rd. & Woodward Ave. The City has already agreed in concept to reimburse MDOT the additional funds required to upgrade that signal to the mast arm style, instead of the standard span wire style. The MMTB did not make a recommendation on this item, since the decision does not impact the function of the streets.

4. **Bates St. Intersection**

The current configuration of the intersection is unconventional in that the pavement markings provide for a left turn lane on the west side of the intersection, where the current street is 48 ft. wide, vs. the east side of the intersection, which has no left turn lane, and is 44 ft. wide. Based on current standards, if a left turn lane is provided, it must line up with equally sized lanes on both sides of the intersection. Traffic counts were taken, and it was determined that
left turn demand is currently low in both directions, even during the peak hour. Allowing any left turns can be a serious detriment to the flow of through traffic if there is no left turn lane. Further, given the narrow right-of-way, if left turn lanes are provided, either parking must be eliminated, or sidewalks must be constructed at a narrow, undesirable width.

For several decades, left turns have been banned daily at the Henrietta St. intersection from 7 AM to 7 PM. The turn restriction allows Maple Rd. to function well during the day without left turn lanes. The design team and the MMTB recommend that a similar turn restriction be introduced at the Bates St. intersection, thereby requiring motorists to turn at Chester St. instead. Implementing this restriction provides several design benefits:

- Parking spaces can be constructed for the full length of the block to the east, improving accessibility for the multiple retail destinations in the immediate area.
- Vehicle turning movements can be moved to Chester St., where retail activity is reduced.
- Enhanced, wider sidewalks can be constructed on both blocks.
- The transition from a three lane cross-section at Chester St. to a two-lane cross-section closer to Bates St. can be designed to mimic the design concept previously approved for the Maple Rd. segment east of Old Woodward Ave.

Bumpouts are proposed at the intersection to reduce pedestrian crosswalk lengths. Reviewing the plan with truck turning movements, the handicap ramps areas will be designed to accommodate encroachments from trucks turning at this intersection.

5. Henrietta St. Intersection

The traffic configuration at Henrietta St. will match the current street. A larger landscaped sidewalk area will be developed, similar to that done at the three-way intersections on the Old Woodward Ave. project. Crosswalk lengths will be reduced.

Reviewing the truck turning movements, given the narrow width of the existing Henrietta St. pavement, turning trucks at this intersection will have to encroach on to the handicap ramps as designed. Provisions will be incorporated into the final design to accommodate this.

6. E. Maple Rd. Mid-Block Crossing

As requested by the City Commission, a mid-block crossing is provided on the block east of Old Woodward Ave. The crossing is designed to line up with the existing via that extends south into the Central Park Properties complex. Enhanced landscaping and public seating areas similar to what was done on Old Woodward Ave. will be provided.

7. Park St./Peabody St. Intersection

In accordance with the 2016 Downtown Birmingham Master Plan, the plan proposes modifying the north leg of this intersection to accommodate two-way traffic on Park St. Several alternatives were studied. Please refer to the attached memo from Fleis & Vandendbrink (F&V) for more details.
This detailed traffic analysis was just finalized by F&V, and was not fully presented to the MMTB. It was not known at that time whether Alternate 4 would be a viable option. Now that we know that it is, and since it improves the pedestrian environment the best, the consultant and staff team recommend the implementation of Option 4. Option 4 provides the safest pedestrian crossing for the north leg, as described in the attached memo.

Focusing on Option 4, it should be clarified that the drawings show three different options for a traffic island on the north leg, including no island, a small island, or a large island. The drawback of having no island is that some north and southbound motorists may be tempted to violate the turn restriction signs and drive straight through the intersection. We see this as being a relatively minor problem, however.

Removing the island allows for a larger sidewalk streetscape and development opportunity on the northeast corner, adjacent to the currently vacant property. The enhanced pedestrian environment that could result at that corner causes the team to recommend that no island be installed at this intersection.

SUMMARY

Summarizing the above, the design team is requesting specific input on the direction of the design in the following areas:

1. Landscaping design concepts will follow that used on the Old Woodward Ave. project. On the narrow sidewalk section between Park St. and Woodward Ave., columnar trees with removable concrete panels will be implemented to provide maximum sidewalk space.
2. Approval of the funding required for the installation of a new mast arm traffic signal at the Southfield Rd. intersection.
3. Banning left turns from 7 AM to 7 PM at the Bates St. intersection.
4. Reconfiguration of the Park St./Peabody St. intersection, modifying Park St. to the north to allow for two-way traffic with on-street parking, and signalizing the north leg of the intersection for improved pedestrian safety.

A detailed resolution follows.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:

To direct the MKSK/F&V design team to proceed to final plans for the Maple Rd. project from Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave., as follows:

1. Designing Maple Rd. with 11 ft. wide travel lanes and 8 ft. wide parking spaces for a new standard road width of 38 ft. between curbs, and continuing to provide the “x” maneuvering areas between parallel parking spaces
2. Landscaping design concepts will follow those used on the 2018 Old Woodward Ave. project. On the narrow sidewalk section between Park St. and Woodward Ave., columnar trees with removable concrete panels will be implemented to provide maximum sidewalk space.
3. Inclusion of a new mast arm traffic signal at the Southfield Rd. intersection, at an estimated additional cost of $100,000.
4. The Bates St. intersection shall be designed without left turn lanes, and left turns shall be banned from 7 AM to 7 PM.
5. The Henrietta St. intersection will be complemented with additional landscaping and seating areas, similar to that done on Old Woodward Ave.
6. A mid-block pedestrian crossing will be provided on E. Maple Rd., aligning with the existing pedestrian via to the south currently located between 288 & 300 E. Maple Rd.
7. Option 4 shall be implemented for the Park St./Peabody St. intersection, which will convert Park St. to the north to two-way traffic with parking for northbound traffic, and signalization of the north leg of the intersection for improved pedestrian safety.
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September 28, 2018

VIA EMAIL

Mr. Paul O'Meara  
City Engineer  
City of Birmingham  
151 Martin Street  
Birmingham, MI 48012

RE: Maple Road & Park Street Intersection Alternatives Analysis

Dear Mr. O'Meara,

The purpose of this letter is to provide a summary of the alternatives analysis performed at the Maple Road and Park Street intersection. The following alternatives were considered for the intersection operations and design. Each of the alternatives features are summarized herein.

- Alternative 1: Channelized Right-Turn with Bump-out
- Alternative 2: Full Intersection Operations
- Alternative 3: Channelized Right-Turn with Center Island
- Alternative 4: NB and SB Right-turn Only-Signalized E/W Ped Crossings

**ALTERNATIVE 1: CHANNELIZED RIGHT-TURN WITH BUMP-OUT**

The intersection operations with this alternative are similar to the existing conditions, with the following notable changes.

- A single WB right-turn lane is provided (currently a dual right-turn).
- A small island is provided to prevent SB vehicles from making left-turn or through movements and prevents NB vehicles from making through movements.
- A bump-out is provided on the northeast corner of the intersection.

Items of note associated with this alternative:

- The NB, EB and WB approaches will operate with traffic signal control. No changes from the existing signal operations is proposed.
- The SB approach is STOP control and the WB right-turn operating as a free-flow movement. With the WB right-turn operating as a free-flow movement, there is no concern with these vehicles impacting the adjacent intersection operations at Woodward Ave.
• Pedestrians on the west and south legs of the intersection will have pedestrian signal heads. The north leg of the intersection will operate as an unsignalized crossing and vehicles will need to yield to pedestrians in the crosswalk. This the existing pedestrian operations at this intersection.

Overall, this alternative will operate in a manner similar to existing conditions, with the addition of southbound traffic on Park Street.

**ALTERNATIVE 2: FULL INTERSECTION OPERATIONS**

The intersection operations with this alternative provide a typical intersection. This alternative considers the following features:

- Full movements for all approaches.
- Signalized control for all approaches, including signalized pedestrian crossings.

Items of note associated with this alternative:

- All approaches will operate with traffic signal control.
- Pedestrians will have pedestrian signal heads on the north, south and west legs of the intersection.

Overall, this alternative will operate with significant delay for vehicles on all approaches. It is expected that vehicles will back-up on all legs of the intersection, and of particular concern are vehicles on the WB approach impacting the operations of the Woodward Ave. intersection. Therefore, full access at this intersection is not recommended due to the proximity to the Woodward Ave. intersection and the poor intersection operations.

**ALTERNATIVE 3: CHANNELIZED RIGHT-TURN WITH CENTER ISLAND**

The intersection operations with this alternative are similar to the existing conditions and alternative 1, with the following notable changes.

- A single WB right-turn lane is provided (currently a dual right-turn).
- A large island is provided to prevent SB vehicles from making left-turn or through movement and NB vehicles from making through movements.

Items of note associated with this alternative:

- The large island provides a 2-stage pedestrian crossing with a pedestrian refuge in the island.
- The NB, EB and WB approaches will operate with traffic signal control. No changes from the existing signal operations is proposed. The SB approach is STOP control and the WB right-turn is a free flow movement. With the WB right-turn operating as a free-flow movement, there is not concern with these vehicles impacting the adjacent intersection operations at Woodward Ave.
• Pedestrians on the west and south legs of the intersection will have pedestrian signal heads. The north leg of the intersection will operate as an unsignalized crossing and vehicles will need to yield to pedestrians in the crosswalk. This the existing pedestrian operations at this intersection.

Overall, this alternative will operate in a manner similar to existing conditions, with the addition of southbound traffic on Park Street.

**ALTERNATIVE 4: NB AND SB RIGHT-TURN ONLY-SIGNALIZED E/W PED CROSSINGS**

The intersection operations with this alternative are similar to the existing conditions, with the following notable changes.

• A single WB right-turn lane is provided (currently a dual right-turn).
• Signalized control will be provided for all approaches, including signalized pedestrian crossings.

Items of note associated with this alternative:

• All approaches will operate with traffic signal control.
• Pedestrians will have pedestrian signal heads on the north, south and west legs of the intersection.
• There is no room for an island on the north leg with the larger bumpout on the northeast corner.

Overall, this alternative will operate in a manner similar to existing conditions, with the addition of southbound traffic on Park Street. One notable improvement for this intersection is that there is signalized pedestrian control for pedestrians crossing the north leg of the intersection.

This leg of the intersection currently does not have any traffic control for pedestrians. There is no proposed median island with this alternative due to facilitating truck turning movements with the proposed bump-out. Without an island on the north and south legs of the intersection there is nothing preventing vehicles from driving through or making a left-turn.

**SUMMARY**

**Alternative 1: Channelized Right-Turn with Bump-out**

• This alternative will operate in a manner similar to existing conditions, with the addition of southbound traffic on Park Street. This alternative provides both a bump-out and a small island on the north leg of the intersection.

**Alternative 2: Full Intersection Operations**

• This alternative will operate with significant delay for vehicles on all approaches. It is expected that vehicles will back-up on all legs of the intersection, and of particular concern is vehicles on the westbound approach impacting the operations of the Woodward Ave. intersection. Therefore, this alternative is not recommended due to the proximity to the Woodward Ave. intersection and poor intersection operations.

**Alternative 3: Channelized Right-Turn with Center Island**

• This alternative will operate in a manner similar to existing conditions, with the addition of southbound traffic on Park Street. This alternative provides no bump-out, but does provide a large channelizing island on the north leg of the intersection.
Alternative 4: NB and SB Right-turn Only-Signalized E/W Ped Crossings

- This alternative will operate in a manner similar to existing conditions, with the addition of southbound traffic on Park Street.

- Overall, this alternative will operate in a manner similar to existing conditions, with the addition of southbound traffic on Park Street. One notable improvement for this intersection is that there is signalized pedestrian control for pedestrians crossing the north leg of the intersection. This leg of the intersection currently does not have any traffic control for pedestrians. There is no proposed median island with this alternative due to facilitating truck turning movements with the proposed bump-out. Without an island on the north and south legs of the intersection there is nothing preventing vehicles from driving through or making a left-turn.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on a holistic analysis of the intersection, considering all factors including vehicular and pedestrian safety, maneuverability and accessibility, F&V recommends that the City of Birmingham move forward with the design and construction of Alternative 4. The Multi-Modal Transportation Board has stressed pedestrian safety as their highest concern at this intersection, and Alternative 4 grants this. While this option is the most expensive, it provides the greatest benefit to all users.

Alternatives 2 and 3 were not found to be acceptable alternatives from both a safety, operational and fiscal standpoint.

If Alternative 4 is not fiscally viable, F&V recommends that the City of Birmingham move forward with the design and construction of Alternative 1. While not as optimal as Alternative 4, Alternative 1 provides benefits to motorists while not diminishing the level of service or level of safety that pedestrians currently have.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact our office.

Sincerely,

FLEIS & VANDENBRINK

Julie M. Kroll, PE, PTOE
Sr. Project Manager

Justin Rose, PE
Project Manager

JPR: jmk

Attachments: Alternatives 1-4
DATE: July 3, 2018

TO: Multi-Modal Transportation Board

FROM: Paul T. O’Meara, City Engineer

SUBJECT: Maple Rd. Reconstruction – Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave.

As you know, the City of Birmingham has committed to a three-phased program to reconstruct its major corridors in the Central Business District. Phase I construction, focusing on the central part of Old Woodward Ave., is currently nearing completion, with an expected completion in early August. The remaining two phases will consist of:

Phase 2 – Maple Rd. – Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave. (Construction planned in 2020)
Phase 3 – S. Old Woodward Ave. – Brown St. to Landon Ave. (Construction planned in 2022)

While the Multi-Modal Transportation Board (MMTB) assisted with the initial street designs used in Phase 1, the City Commission assisted at a high level in the final design package. Per their direction, a planning consultant (MKSK) was hired and assisted the City in the conceptual design package now being constructed. Since there is a desire to be consistent and follow the design theme started in Phase 1 into the remaining projects, MKSK has been retained to assist again to develop the conceptual plans for Phase 2. This is a particularly smooth transition, given that MKSK has now been retained and is teamed with the City’s traffic engineering firm F&V. Together, they have prepared the attached conceptual plans as a first review for the MMTB to assist the MMTB with all of its planning needs. It is expected that the initial MMTB comments will be taken at this meeting, and then initial comments will be taken from the City Commission. A final review by the MMTB is expected later this summer.

As plans are prepared for Phase 2, it is important to note that the City was fortunate to be awarded two federal grants to assist in covering the cost of this project. Grants include:

- A grant for $352,000, awarded by the Oakland Co. Federal Aid Committee, to assist the City in the cost of reconstructing this major road. As a street with high traffic counts, combined with the need for general safety improvements, this segment of Maple Rd. qualified for a grant estimated at covering 80% of the cost of resurfacing this street.
- A grant for $249,700, awarded under the Highway Safety Improvement Program, covering 80% of the cost of reconstructing the Southfield Rd. at Maple Rd. intersection.

Together, these two grants will cover about $600,000 of the City’s costs in reconstructing Maple Rd. As a result, the project will be bid and paid for through the Michigan Dept. of Transportation (MDOT). The final construction plans will have to be reviewed and approved through MDOT, meaning that MDOT standards will have to be followed as a part of the design process. The following is a summary of the project highlights, from west to east:
1. **Southfield Rd. Intersection** - The skewed angle in which Southfield Rd. meets Maple Rd. has created a high crash environment. It is also considered unfavorable for pedestrians attempting to cross Maple Rd. at this signal, as right turns from Southfield Rd. to eastbound Maple Rd. can be executed at higher than normal speeds. F&V studied crash histories for the City. They determined that moving the intersection to the west (as shown on the attached plans), therein making all turning movements to be executed at a 90° angle, would have a measurable impact on reducing crashes.

Maple Rd. pavement is in marginal condition in this area, and the widths as constructed do not need to be changed. A concrete approach is planned for Southfield Rd., otherwise, Maple Rd. will be asphalt resurfaced. The traffic signal will have to be relocated as a part of this improvement. Being that the City is installing mast arm traffic signals at all of its intersections within the Central Business District, and since this intersection is at the outside edge of the district, the City Commission will be asked to consider whether a mast arm traffic signal design is appropriate here or not. MKSK and F&V have been asked to provide two pieces of information to assist in this decision:

   a. Estimated cost difference between the standard span wire signals (matching the current design) and installing mast arm signals. (The cost differential will not be covered by the federal grant.)  
   b. Photo renderings of the appearance of the two signal designs, as viewed for northbound traffic, and the visual impact they will have on the Birmingham Museum located at this intersection.

2. **Southfield Rd. to Chester St.** - This block serves as a transition into the business district. The traffic lane design was modified in 2016 in conjunction with the three lane road conversion to the west, now providing sufficient storage for the large numbers of left turns being made in both directions. Since the pavement is in marginal condition, and no changes are proposed, milling and resurfacing of the asphalt surface is proposed here. Traffic volumes are inherently higher here as vehicles turn on and off of Chester St. to bypass the congestion in the center of downtown.

3. **Chester St. to West of Pierce St.** - Complete reconstruction, including water and sewer improvements, fiber optic, street lights, and landscaping (where possible) is proposed. A safety improvement encompassing aligned left turn lanes at Bates St. will likely be required as a part of the design, as will be explained by the consultant. While bumpouts and reduced crosswalk lengths are desired, the smaller road width on Maple Rd. will require that truck turning movements be considered in the design. Historically, left turns have been banned to Henrietta St. from 7 AM to 7 PM. That restriction is proposed to continue with this new design, in order to allow for a reduced road width in this area. MKSK will provide lane and sidewalk width options, as well as conceptual sidewalk design concepts for the Board to review.

4. **East of Old Woodward Ave. to Park St./Peabody St.** - Similar to paragraph 3 above, complete reconstruction is planned. During discussions on Phase 1, the City Commission clarified the desire for a mid-block pedestrian crossing on this block, to be located at the pedestrian via currently located just west of Café Via (300 E. Maple Rd.). The mid-block crossing has been included in this design. Also, in accordance with the
Downtown 2016 Master Plan, Park St. will be modified to operate as a two-way street, allowing for better circulation of vehicles in the northeast section of the CBD. Due to the short distance from Woodward Ave., the existing traffic signal function must remain as is. Southbound Park St. traffic will be required to turn right, after following a STOP sign. Some form of traffic island is recommended to reinforce this right turn movement. Large and small island options are presented for the Board’s review.

5. **Park St. / Peabody St. to Woodward Ave.** Similar to the section west of Chester St. above, this block acts as a transition out of the Central Business District. Traffic volumes are higher as vehicles turn on and off of Park St. and Peabody St. Given traffic levels, coupled with the short distance available for queues, no changes are suggested. Due to the age of the pavement, complete reconstruction is proposed. MKSK will provide suggested sidewalk conceptual design given the limitation of space.

**Parking Options**

A design concept that the MM TB will be asked to discuss is how to design the pavement markings. Options include:

A. **Parking Space Size**

1. 20 ft. long parking spaces adjacent to 8 ft. maneuvering boxes (similar to the current parallel parking concept provided on all downtown Birmingham streets)
2. 22 ft. long parking spaces, with no maneuvering boxes.

Note that the total count of parking that can be provided does not change based on which one is selected.

B. **Lane Width**

1. 11 ft. wide travel lanes with 8 ft. wide parking spaces.
2. 11 ft. wide travel lanes, a 1 ft. wide parking buffer, and 7 ft. wide parking spaces.

The positives and negatives of both options will be reviewed.

A suggested recommendation to the City Commission is provided below:

**SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION:**

To recommend to the City Commission conceptual design plans for the reconstruction of Maple Rd. from Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave., with the following design features:

1. Parking spaces sized at __________, and lane widths designed at ______________.
2. Option ____ for the design of Maple Rd. between Chester St. and Henrietta St.
3. Option ____ for the design of the Park St. intersection.
Maple Road Project (and extension of current project)

- Full reconstruction
  Chester to Pierce and E of Old Woodward to Woodward
- Resurfacing from Southfield to Chester St.
- Realignment and signal upgrade at the Southfield intersection

Timeline: Bid Package by December
Project Goals: to the Degree Practical

- Consistency with the Phase 1 project
- Improve the pedestrian environment
- Ease pedestrian crossings
- Provide reasonable traffic operations
- Maximize the number of on-street parking spaces
- Consider maintenance costs
- Meet MDOT design standards (MDOT funded)
Recommended Street Tree Pattern: Parking Zones

In Parking Zones:

• Street trees line with center of every other parking space (top right)
• Street lights line the middle of other parking spaces (top right)
• Use of narrow, columnar trees instead of large canopy trees (bottom right)

Trees with columnar branching habit (left) preferred over large canopy trees (right).
Recommended Street Tree Pattern: Widened Sidewalk Option

In Options where Parking Removed (Maple & Bates):

- Street trees reflect pattern of Woodward Ave
- Larger sidewalks allow for larger trees and planters
Phase 1 Study
Maple Road: Existing Conditions
Maple & Southfield Proposed Geometrics: New Signal Options

- Safety Funding for Intersection redesign
  - Includes eliminating the angled intersection approach
  - Signal modifications

- Signal Options:
  - Modify existing signal-included in safety grant
  - Upgrade to mast arms- Additional $80k-$120k
Maple & Bates
Existing Conditions

• Options
  • WB left-turns prohibited
  • Provide left-turn lane

• Left-turn Volumes
  • WB (33 AM/32PM) – No existing Left-turn lane
  • EB (6 AM/14 PM) – Existing Left-turn lane
Maple & Bates
Option A: Left-turn Lane with Narrower Sidewalk

- Left-turn Volumes
  - WB (33 AM/32PM) – No existing Left-turn lane
  - EB (6 AM/14 PM) – Existing Left-turn lane
- Improve sight distance
- Reduce rear-end crashes
- Reduce vehicle queues on Maple Road
Maple & Bates Option B: Left-turn Lane with Parking Removed

- Left-turn Volumes
  - WB (33 AM/32PM) – No existing Left-turn lane
  - EB (6 AM/14 PM) – Existing Left-turn lane
- Improve sight distance
- Reduce rear-end crashes
- Reduce vehicle queues on Maple Road
Maple & Bates: Which is Preferred?

Option A: Left-turn Lane with Narrower Sidewalk

Option B: Left-turn Lane with Parking Removed
Maple & Park
Option A:
Channelized Right-turn Lane

- Two stage pedestrian crossing
- Free-flow right-turns onto NB Park Street
- No queueing from right-turns onto Woodward
Maple & Park
Option B: Reduced Traffic Island

- Typical pedestrian crossing
- Signal Control right-turns onto NB Park Street
- No queuing from right-turns onto Woodward
Maple & Park: Which is Preferred?

Option A: Channelized Right-turn Lane

OR

Option B: Reduced Traffic Island
Parking Options
Option A-1: 20 ft Parking with 8 ft Boxes

- No Extra space at end of Blocks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERSECTION TYPE</th>
<th>&quot;z&quot;(FT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO TRAFFIC CONTROL NO CROSSWALK</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO TRAFFIC CONTROL WITH CROSSWALK</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC CONTROL PRESENT</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE SECTION 257.674 OF THE MICHIGAN VEHICLE CODE FOR MORE INFORMATION.
Parking Options
Option A-2: 22 ft Parking

- Extra space at end of block
  - Bike Parking
  - Larger Bump-outs
  - Pedestrian Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERSECTION TYPE</th>
<th>&quot;Z&quot; (FT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO TRAFFIC CONTROL NO CROSSWALK</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO TRAFFIC CONTROL WITH CROSSWALK</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC CONTROL PRESENT</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE SECTION 257.674 OF THE MICHIGAN VEHICLE CODE FOR MORE INFORMATION.
Parking Options
Option B-1: 11ft lanes with 8 ft wide Parking
Parking Options
Option B-2:
11ft lanes with 7 ft wide Parking with 1 ft buffer
Parking Options: Which is Preferred?

Option A-1:
20 ft Parking with 8 ft Boxes

Option B-1:
11 ft lanes with 8 ft wide Parking

Option A-2:
22 ft Parking

Option B-2:
11 ft lanes with 7 ft wide Parking with 1 ft buffer
Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Multi-Modal Transportation Board held Thursday, July 12, 2018.

Chairperson Slanga convened the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

Present: Chairperson Johanna Slanga; Board Members Vice-Chairperson Lara Edwards, Amy Folberg, Daniel Rontal, Katie Schafer, Doug White

Absent: Alternate Board Member Daniel Isaksen

Administration: Lauren Chapman, Asst. City Planner
Jana Ecker, Planning Director
Austin Fletcher, Asst. City Engineer
Scott Grewe, Police Dept. Commander
Paul O‘Meara, City Engineer
Carole Salutes, Recording Secretary

Fleis & Vanderbrink ("F&V"): Julie Kroll
MKSK: Brad Strader

2. INTRODUCTIONS (none)

3. REVIEW AGENDA (no change)

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, MMTB MEETING OF JUNE 7, 2018

Page 2 - Add in that Lara Edwards was nominated as Vice-Chair.

Motion by Ms. Folberg
Seconded by Ms. Edwards to approve the MMTB Minutes of June 7, 2018 with the addition.

Motion carried,

VOICE VOTE
Yeas: Folberg, Edwards, Rontal, Slanga, Schafer, White
Abstain: None
5. RESIDENTIAL STREET WIDTH STANDARDS

Ms. Ecker recalled that on January 22, 2018, the City Commission considered future street widths for Bennaville, Chapin and Ruffner. Several residents appeared on behalf of Bennaville Ave., and additional residents appeared on behalf of the one block of Chapin Ave. After much discussion, the City Commission endorsed the recommendations of the Multi-Modal Transportation Board (“MMTB”) with regards to the future street width. However, during the discussion, the Commission expressed confusion as to what the City’s policy is for determining the width of a new street. As a result, the MMTB was asked to study the issue in further detail, and send information and policy direction back to the Commission.

Accordingly, the MMTB discussed revising street widths standards over several months and on May 18, 2018, the revised Residential Street Widths Standards were presented to the City Commission. The Commission concluded that the document should be returned to the MMTB for suggested edits to the document. An updated draft with the changes that the Commission requested shows the changes noted in red.

Ms. Folberg commented that on street design standards (1), it looks like for new and existing unimproved residential streets that are being improved that there is no variance from the 26 ft. except when the right-of-way is less than 50 ft. She did not think that was the Board’s intent. That is not in agreement with the flow chart, which extends to both newly improved streets and existing but reconstructed streets that if any of the items in 4 are present, a different width for the street may be considered.

Mr. O’Meara and Ms. Ecker agreed that the intent was that a slightly wider width may be considered for new and existing unimproved residential streets that are being improved.

Ms. Ecker concluded the language for (1) should read, “When streets are improved or newly constructed, the standards below shall generally be applied. Exceptions may be considered when factors such as those described in Section 4 are evident.” Also, in INTRODUCTION a T is missing.

Mr. Rontal thought the City Commission wants a standard and a means of identifying when the standard can be breached.

Ms. Ecker noted all of this will be together from start to finish in the City Commission Agenda packet when it goes back to the Commission. If approved, the new City Standard will be on the City’s website.

Motion by Ms. Edwards
Seconded by Mr. Rontal to recommend approval to the City Commission of the revised Residential Street Width Standards with the changes that were discussed.

Motion carried, 6-0.

VOICE VOTE
Yea: Edwards, Rontal, Folberg, Slanga, Schafer, White
Nay: None
Absent: Isaksen

6. BIKE SHARE PROGRAM

Ms. Chapman described the different bike share types. Most common is the docked or station based. There is also dockless where people need not return the bike to a kiosk. Additionally, there is another dockless service where the bike is locked to a City rack or a station.

Grant opportunities are available. MoGo (Detroit's bike share) was awarded two grants. SEMCOG awarded a Transportation Alternatives Program grant for $495,380 to the cities of Berkley, Detroit, Ferndale, Huntington Woods, Oak Park, and Royal Oak for a multi-community bike share. In addition to that grant, MoGo also received a grant from Build a Better Bike Share for $400,000 to support adaptable bikes that are for users who struggle to use two-wheel bikes.

There are different ways to fund bike shares:
- The entity partnering with the bike share puts up money;
- Through a third party operation;
- Through various partnerships;
- Small business sponsors.

Anyone can use a bike share for any reason, at any time. The City has several miles of trails. Several people have expressed that they would like a bike rental in the City. Ms. Chapman noted 21 potential station locations in Birmingham.

There were several questions that Ms. Chapman asked the board to consider:

If bike share is favored:
What kind would the board prefer?
- Recommendation: The City pursues docked (station based) bike share or dockless (kiosk optional). For dockless: Users would be required to lock bikes to public racks or company provided racks.

Is there interest in multi-community connections?
Recommendation: The City link with other communities in order to increase the effectiveness for Birmingham and other communities.

What company?
- Recommendation: If linking with other communities the City would have to contract with the same systems MoGo (Shift Transit) or Southfield (Zagster) use. If not, City staff has no specific recommendation.

Should we provide accessible bikes now or withhold opinion until later? - City staff recommends that the MMTB consider accessible bikes after a bike share has been operational for at least a year.

Ms. Ecker noted there is no information that suggests you cannot have a successful bike share program without infrastructure. Or, that you cannot have successful infrastructure without a bike share program. One is not needed before the other.

Mr. Rontal had a hard time seeing people use a bike share program to get around the City of Birmingham. He could see it being useful to get to surrounding communities. In terms of intra-city bike share, he favored something more along the lines of the Lime Electric Scooter Share they have in San Francisco as being more convenient.

Ms. Ecker said with respect to locating the stations the board would lead and public input would be encouraged. Offsite parking locations would be good places to put a station so that commuters can get to Downtown. Mr. Rontal said he has a hard time visualizing people biking down Maple Rd. from some of the outlying churches, wearing their work clothes.

Discussion turned to usage and Ms. Chapman said with both Zagster and MoGo their usage data is proprietary to their participating cities.

With regard to safe bike routes to surrounding communities, Eton, and Pierce were noted.

Ms. Schafer wondered whether if other cities are using bike share and Birmingham is not, is Birmingham shutting itself out of that potential draw of people because they can't leave their bike in Birmingham.

Ms. Ecker stated there is a whole generation of folks that don't want to drive and might want to ride bike share. To Ms. Schafer's point, if surrounding cities have bike share and Birmingham doesn't, is Birmingham left out?

Ms. Chapman said in response to Mr. Rontal that the cost to go with either Zagster or MoGo depends on the number of stations and how many bikes at each station.
Ms. Slanga noted the Zagster pilot is paid for by Zagster. However, it is much more on the community with MoGo; but then there is the connectivity with surrounding cities. Ms. Chapman said the cities can bring in different sponsors. Advertising can be applied to the bikes or to the kiosks. Mr. Rontal suggested they should look at going to large businesses for sponsorship as well as small businesses. Maybe Ford, GM, and Chrysler would be interested in stepping in. Ms. Ecker advised that in the past the Sunow Group has been interested in sponsorship.

Ms. Ecker thought it would be a mistake to start something and not try to connect with surrounding communities.

Ms. Chapman asked the board members whether they feel bike share is a favorable possibility.

Ms. Folberg said to her the question is whether it is worth $100,000 to do a feasibility study. Ms. Chapman said that other communities have not done a feasibility study and are basically signing up for bike share a year at a time to see how it goes. MoGo is planning to hold community meetings for them to consider possible station locations.

Ms. Ecker said that opportunities for grants come up every year. She added surrounding municipalities are generally more than happy to share information back and forth with Birmingham. It was discussed that being a year behind may provide Birmingham a lot of information about what might or might not work.

Board members asked staff to come back with:
- A round number of locations with an accessibility map;
- If Birmingham were to go with MoGo in order to connect with surrounding communities it would be around $______. If it were $100,000 to implement, then the $100,000 feasibility study seems like a waste of money;
- What is the City's perspective on how it would be managed;
- With MoGo the City would have to do more of the heavy lifting than with Zagster. Is there enough resources and staff to do that;
- Provide information from surrounding cities that are starting this up;
- Some thoughts and opinions from the business community on bringing in bike share.

Ms. Ecker predicted that once a bike station is in place people will be surprised how much they might use it. Ms. Chapman said the key for locations are to place bike stations somewhere people can get to and somewhere that people want to be.
7. MAPLE RD. IMPROVEMENTS (Phase 2 of Old Woodward Ave. Project)

Mr. O'Meara noted that the City of Birmingham has committed to a three-phased program to reconstruct its major corridors in the Central Business District. Phase I construction, focusing on the central part of Old Woodward Ave., is currently nearing completion, with an expected completion in early August. The remaining two phases will consist of:

- Phase 2, Maple Rd. – Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave. (Construction planned in 2020)
- Phase 3, S. Old Woodward Ave. – Brown St. to Landon Ave. (Construction planned in 2022)

While the Multi-Modal Transportation Board ("MMTB") assisted with the initial street designs used in Phase 1, the City Commission assisted at a high level in the final design package. Per their direction, a planning consultant (MKSK) was hired and assisted the City in the conceptual design package now being constructed. Since there is a desire to be consistent and follow the design theme started in Phase 1 into the remaining projects, MKSK has been retained to assist again in developing the conceptual plans for Phase 2. This is a particularly smooth transition, given that MKSK has now been retained and is teamed with the City’s traffic engineering firm F&V. Together, they have prepared conceptual plans to assist the MMTB with all of its planning needs. It is expected that the initial MMTB comments will be taken at this meeting, and then initial comments will be taken from the City Commission. A final review by the MMTB is expected later this summer.

As plans are prepared for Phase 2, it is important to note that the City was fortunate to be awarded two federal grants to assist in covering the cost of this project. Grants include:

- A grant for $352,000, awarded by the Oakland Co. Federal Aid Committee, to assist the City in the cost of reconstructing this major road. As a street with high traffic counts, combined with the need for general safety improvements, this segment of Maple Rd. qualified for a grant estimated at covering 80% of the cost of resurfacing this street.
- A grant for $249,700, awarded under the Highway Safety Improvement Program, covering 80% of the cost of reconstructing the Southfield Rd. at Maple Rd. intersection.

Mr. Strader spelled out the goals of the Phase 2 project:

- Be consistent with Phase 1;
- Improve the pedestrian and bike environment using recommended design options from the MMTB and the City Commission;
- Provide reasonable traffic operations;
- Consider on-street parking options that maximize the number of spaces;
- Consider maintenance costs;
- Meet the MDOT standards;
Consider placement of street trees and ornamental street lights;
- A tree every other parking space interspersed with a street light every other space;
- Trees to be columnar in nature.

Mr. Strader and Ms. Kroll covered options for the various sections of the road.

1. Southfield Rd. Intersection - The City received a safety grant to improve the geometrics. The skewed angle in which Southfield Rd. meets Maple Rd. has created a high crash environment. It is also considered unfavorable for pedestrians attempting to cross Maple Rd. at this signal. F&V studied crash histories for the City. They determined that moving the intersection to the west, therein making all turning movements to be executed at a 90° angle, would have a measurable impact on reducing crashes. The traffic signal will have to be relocated as a part of this improvement. The MMTB and City Commission will be asked to consider whether a mast arm traffic signal design is appropriate here or not. To upgrade the signal from span wire to a mast arm would be an additional $80 to $120 thousand, depending upon the design. The standard for Downtown is a mast arm; outside of Downtown it is not. MKSK and F&V will provide photo renderings of the appearance of the two signal designs as viewed for northbound traffic, and the visual impact they will have on the Birmingham Museum located at this intersection.

Mr. Rontal suggested that if the mast arm is used and it is decided this is Downtown, they should locate signage or public artwork on the SE corner of the intersection so people are notified that they are coming into Downtown. He hoped the options for street trees would include those with fall color.

Mr. Strader assured they will draw the schematics to ensure the intersection is designed for trucks to be able to make the turn onto Southfield Rd.

2. Maple Rd. Between Chester St. and Bates - The consultants looked at a median option but it did not work out because after using the MDOT and Federal funding standards the island became too small.

3. Maple Rd. and Bates - The options are to leave the intersection as it is with left turns prohibited, or to provide a left-turn lane with:
   - **Option A** - Left turn lane with narrower sidewalk
     - Improves site distance;
     - Reduces rear-end crashes;
     - Reduces vehicle queues on Maple Rd.
   - **Option B** - Left turn lane with eight parking spaces removed
     - Improves site distance;
     - Reduces rear-end crashes;
     - Reduces vehicle queues on Maple Rd.
In this case Ms. Kroll opined that the low volume of left turns probably does not warrant a left turn lane.

Mr. Strader said they have a little room to move the street trees out into the road and restore the sidewalk width at the east and west side of Bates. The priority is to either keep the sidewalk as wide as possible even if they sacrifice on-street parking, or is keeping the on-street parking a critical priority and then doing the best they can with the sidewalk and street trees. Option A, allowing on-street parking, benefits the businesses and street life and it buffers the pedestrian from the travel lanes on the positive side. On the downside it adds to congestion because of parallel parking maneuvers. Option B makes it much better for pedestrians and it helps the traffic flow as well. The downside is the loss of parking.

Right now Maple Rd. lanes are 12 ft. wide and they are proposed to be narrowed to 11 ft. which are the least they can be with all of the constraints of high volume of traffic, busses, and heavy vehicles.

Discussion concluded there could be an Option C that would take out both sides of left turn lanes. That may cause backups. Option D would be no left turns at Bates.

Board members leaned towards Option B.

4. Maple Rd. and Park St.

- **Option A** - Channelized right-turn lane
  - A center median with a two-stage pedestrian crossing;
  - Allows free-flow right turns onto NB Park St.;
  - No queuing from right turns onto Woodward Ave.

- **Option B** - Reduced traffic island;
  - Typical pedestrian crossing;
  - Signal Control right turns onto NB Park St. (free-flow);
  - No queuing from right turns onto Woodward Ave.

Ms. Ecker noticed that with Option A the whole pork chop space is wasted. Whereas in Option B usable sidewalk space is being added. Mr. Strader pointed out that a diverter will be needed so that people will not continue SB from Park St. onto Peabody, and they would have to turn right.

Ms. Ecker said to keep in mind that the NE corner of Park St. and Maple Rd. is likely to be redeveloped in the near future. Pretty much everyone who is interested talks about wanting Park St. to be two-way for ease of access to that property.

Chairperson Slanga expressed the opinion that nuggets and pork chops just don't work.

It was agreed that the board needs to think a little more about this intersection.
5. Maple Rd. East of Peabody and Park St. - There is a narrow sidewalk with not a lot of room for street trees. They could do something to keep the small trees but the thought is maybe no street trees and replace them with a low ground cover or some other kind of plant material. Board members agreed.

6. Parking
   • Option A-1 - 20 ft. parking with 8 ft. boxes
     - No extra space at end of blocks.
   • Option A-2 - 22 ft. parking
     - Bike parking;
     - Larger bumpouts;
     - Pedestrian areas.
   • Option B-1 - 11 ft. lanes with 8 ft. wide parking
   • Option B-2 - 11 ft. lanes with 7 ft. wide parking with 1 ft. buffer

Board members were split on these options.

8. MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA (no public was present)

9. MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS (none)

10. NEXT MEETING AUGUST 2, 2018 at 6 p.m.

11. ADJOURNMENT

No further business being evident, the board members adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

______________________________
Jana Ecker, Planning Director

______________________________
Paul O'Meara, City Engineer
At the last meeting of the Multi-Modal Transportation Board (MMTB), the Board discussed initial design concepts for the planned reconstruction of the downtown section of Maple Rd., scheduled for 2020. As you know, our consulting team presented initial design concepts and questions. The meeting helped to provide feedback to further develop the concepts. A revised presentation has been assembled, and will be reviewed by the Board. The summary of topics include:

1. Parking space layout and total count.
2. Tree selection.
3. Planter design options.
4. Park St. intersection design.
5. Bates St. intersection design.
6. Southfield Rd. intersection design.

The design team would like to get additional feedback on these topics before finalizing a presentation to the City Commission. The design elements will then be presented to the City Commission later in August. A suggested recommendation can be found below:

**SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION:**

To recommend to the City Commission the conceptual design plans for the reconstruction of Maple Rd. from Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave., with the following design features:

1. Parking spaces sized at 22 ft. wide per MDOT requirements, and lane widths at 11 ft. wide.
2. Option _____ for the design of Maple Rd. between Chester St. and Henrietta St.
3. Option _____ for the design of the Park St. intersection.
Maple Road Project (and extension of current project)

- Full reconstruction
  Chester to Pierce and E of Old Woodward to Woodward
- Repaving from Southfield to Chester St.
- Potential realignment and signal upgrade at the Southfield intersection

Timeline: Bid Package by December
Updates:

1. Parking layout options
2. More information on street tree selection
3. Landscape options for narrow segments
4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
5. Additional options at Maple & Bates
6. Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta
7. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
Parking Study Findings:

- 43 On-street parking spaces west of Old Woodward. Use of narrow, columnar trees instead of large canopy trees (bottom right) **95% full**
- 29 On-Street east of Old Woodward
- **Total=72 existing spaces**
- Image: Weekday from 12-2pm
Maple Rd. On-Street Parking Options

Existing - 72 Total spaces

MDOT Recommendation - 54 Total spaces
On-Street Parking Existing

- 43 On-street parking spaces west of Old Woodward
- 29 On-Street east of Old Woodward
- Total=72 existing spaces
• City may seek a design exception from MDOT
• Spaces reduced at corner per MDOT specifications
• 36 On-street west of Old Woodward.
• 18 On-Street east of Old Woodward
• **Total= 54 spaces**
  Existing=72 spaces
  (-18 spaces)
Updates:

1. Parking layout options
2. More information on street tree selection
3. Landscape options for narrow segments
4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
5. Additional options at Maple & Bates
6. Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta
7. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
Recommended Street Trees

- Segments of Maple Rd sidewalk are more narrow
- Businesses do not prefer large canopy trees that block frontage
- Need for shade
  - Columnar trees grow to 10-15’ wide and still provide street character with some shade
  - However, some wider sidewalk zones can afford canopy trees (to match those on Old Woodward)
Ginkgo (columnar)

*Ginkgo biloba*

- **Height:** 30-50’
- **Spread:** 10-15’
- **Shape:** Narrow, fastigate
- **Foliage:** Light green
- **Fall color:** Bright yellow
- **Easy to grow, columnar variety of popular urban street tree. Extremely adaptable, can fit into narrow spaces, air pollutant tolerant.**
Recommended Columnar Street Tree: Option 2

Armstrong Maple
*Acer Rubrum ‘Armstrong’*

- **Height:** 45’
- **Spread:** 15’
- **Shape:** Narrow, fastigate
- **Foliage:** Light green
- **Fall color:** Yellow, orange-red
- Fast growing, columnar tree used in streetscapes with narrow clearances
Recommended Street Tree for Wider Sidewalk Zones

Thornless Honey Locust
Gleditsia triacanthos f. inermis

• **Height:** 30-70’
• **Spread:** 25-40’
• **Shape:** Round, spreading
• **Foliage:** Dark green
• **Fall color:** Bright yellow
• Thornless and seedless variety recommended for tree lawns and streets.
• Already specified on Woodward Ave
Updates:

1. Parking layout options

2. More information on street tree selection

3. Landscape options for narrow segments

4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody

5. Additional options at Maple & Bates

6. Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta

7. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
Landscape Options for Narrow Segments

Existing conditions

- Segments of Maple Rd sidewalk are more narrow
- Streetscape character must continue in these zones
- Most options are alternative to tree plantings

Option 1: Soil cells/structural soils
Option 2: Raised Planter Pots
Option 3: Flush tree grate
Option 4: Linear raised planters
Weight-bearing modules or structural soils lie under street/sidewalks to maximize root growth and prevent stunted growth of trees

- Allow trees to grow in small spaces **without sacrificing walkable area**
- **Recommended for first impression entry zone off Woodward Ave**, if trees are desired
Landscape for Narrow Segments: Option 2
Raised Planter Pots

- Raised pre-cast concrete; planters are highly customizable
- Ideal for narrow spaces with not enough underground root space or width for trees
- Separates pedestrians from road
- Provide opportunity to showcase seasonal/annual plantings
- Specialty irrigation/drainage systems and/or maintenance may be required
Landscape for Narrow Segments: Option 3
Flush Tree Grates

- Tree grate constructed **flush to curb** (does not require the addition 6” redundant tree grate curb)
- Ideal for narrow spaces
- Maximizes walkable pedestrian **hardscape area** around tree
- May be combined with soil cells/stabilized soil to promote sustainable tree health
Landscape for Narrow Segments: Option 4
Linear Raised Planters

- Low, linear raised planters are highly customizable
- Ideal for narrow spaces
- Maximizes walkable pedestrian hardscape area
- Does not require large width or depth for tree plantings
- Separates pedestrians from road

Existing exposed planter

Proposed linear raised planter with seat wall

Shrubs used in place of single tree

Optional seat wall
Updates:

1. Parking layout options
2. More information on street tree selection
3. Landscape options for narrow segments
4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
5. Additional options at Maple & Bates
6. Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta
7. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
F&V asked to evaluate other options...
Park & Peabody SYNCRO Simulations
Updates:

1. Parking layout options
2. More information on street tree selection
3. Landscape options for narrow segments
4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
5. Additional options at Maple & Bates
6. Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta
7. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
Maple & Bates Intersection

Option A - Left turn lanes

Option C1 - No left turn lanes, tapered

Option C2 - No left turn lanes, with parking

Previous:
- **Option B**: Left turn lane, reduce sidewalk width
Maple & Bates Intersection: Option A: Left Turn Lanes
Maple & Bates Intersection: Option C1
No Left Turn Lanes, Tapered
Maple & Bates
Intersection:
Option C2
No Left Turn Lanes, with Parking
Updates:

1. Parking layout options
2. More information on street tree selection
3. Landscape options for narrow segments
4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
5. Additional options at Maple & Bates
6. Additional options at Maple & Chester to Henrietta
7. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
Maple & Chester to Henrietta Crash Analysis
Rear End Crash Summary-Five Year Period (2013-2017)

Total Rear End Crashes (5 Years): 16
Average Rear End Crash Frequency: 3.2 Crashes per year

Crash Summary

Number of Crashes by Location and Cause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Bates</th>
<th>Chester</th>
<th>East of Chester</th>
<th>East of Henrietta</th>
<th>West of Bates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driver error</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to stop at intersection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distracted driving</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distracted driving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Rage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped EB traffic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped EB traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crashes caused by stopped traffic-mid block
Updates:

1. Parking layout options
2. More information on street tree selection
3. Landscape options for narrow segments
4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
5. Additional options at Maple & Bates
6. Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta
7. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
Maple & Southfield Intersection
Proposed Signal Mast Placement

- Two posts required
- Daylight views to museum
- Opportunity for gateway feature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Min Distance</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Max Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>~70’</td>
<td>180’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>~110’</td>
<td>180’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>~90’</td>
<td>180’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Raised pre-cast concrete planters are highly customizable.

Ideal for narrow spaces with not enough underground root space.

Provide opportunity for showcasing seasonal/annual plantings.

Specialty irrigation/drainage systems and/or increased maintenance.
Maple & Southfield Intersection
Proposed Gateway Opportunities

- New configuration allows opportunity for gateway features
- Signage, landscaping, lighting, seating
- Constructed in stages over time
Recommendation on Alternatives to City Commission

1. Parking layout options

2. More information on street tree selection

3. Landscape options for narrow segments

4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody

5. Additional options at Maple & Bates

6. Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta

7. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Multi-Modal Transportation Board held Thursday, August 2, 2018.

Chairperson Slanga convened the meeting at 6:02 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL**

   **Present:** Chairperson Johanna Slanga; Board Members Vice-Chairperson Lara Edwards, Amy Folberg, Doug White, Student Representative Alex Lindstrom

   **Absent:** Board Members Daniel Rontal, Katie Schafer; Alternate Board Member Daniel Isaksen,

   **Administration:** Lauren Chapman, Asst. City Planner  
   Jana Ecker, Planning Director  
   Austin Fletcher, Asst. City Engineer  
   Scott Grewe, Police Dept. Commander  
   Paul O’Meara, City Engineer  
   Carole Salutes, Recording Secretary

   **Fleis & Vanderbrink ("F&V"):** Julie Kroll

   **MKSK:** Brad Strader  
   Haley Wolfe, Landscape Architect

2. **INTRODUCTIONS**

   The new student representative, Alex Lindstrom, introduced himself to the Board. He is a junior at International Academy. Everyone welcomed him.

3. **REVIEW AGENDA** (no change)

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES, MMTB MEETING OF JULY 12, 2018**

   Motion by Ms. Edwards
Seconded by Ms. Folberg to approve the MMTB Minutes of July 12, 2018 as presented.

Motion carried, 4-0.

VOICE VOTE
Yeas: Edwards, Folberg, Slanga, White
Abstain: None
Nays: None
Absent: Rontal, Schaefer, Isaksen

5. MAPLE RD. IMPROVEMENTS (PHASE II OF OLD WOODWARD PROJECT)

Recommendation on alternatives to City Commission:

Mr. Strader said they would like to get additional feedback on several topics before finalizing a presentation to the City Commission later in August. He reminded this project is funded by MDOT and so it must be consistent with MDOT standards.

Key topics for tonight’s discussion are as follows:
1. Parking layout options
2. More information on street tree selection
3. Landscape options for narrow segments
4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
5. Additional options at Maple and Bates
6. Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta
7. Mast arm signal at Maple and Southfield

Parking Layout Options
MDOT recommends 22 ft. long parking spaces and a no parking zone at the corners. The City typically has parking much closer to the corner than MDOT. The City may be able to seek a design exception from MDOT to extend the parking closer to the corners. MKSK’s recommendation to the City Commission based on MMTB input from last month will be to go with this design without the Xs and give up four spaces. Areas at the corners can be used for more landscaping and bumpouts if they can’t extend the parking.

In response to Ms. Slanga, Mr. O’Meara said the positive thing about the Xs is that they allow maneuvering space to get in and out quickly so as not to back up traffic. However, there are less parking spaces. Mr. Strader noted that wherever they can get a bumpout or an amenity for pedestrians they will add it in. He recalled the discussion last month was to recover some of the lost parking if possible. ADA spaces are put at the ends so there is not so much of an impasse throughout the day for turning trucks. Conclusion was to meet with MDOT to see what the flexibility is with the different options.
Street Tree Selections
Ms. Ecker noted the City will try to put in the bigger, broader canopy trees wherever there is room. Ms. Wolfe noted segments of Maple Rd. sidewalk are more narrow and columnar trees still provide street character with some shade. Board members liked the Armstrong Maple for narrow sidewalks because of its orange-red, yellow Fall color. For the wider sidewalk zones, they preferred Thornless Honey Locust.

Landscape Options for Narrow Segments
Board members considered:
- Option 1 - Silva cells and structural soils;
- Option 2 - Raised planter pots;
- Option 3 - Flush tree grates;
- Option 4 - Linear raised planters with seating.

Consensus was to choose Option 3 for the sidewalk treatment, as it is the most narrow option with a tree rather than a planter. It is the best opportunity to provide shade, plus it is ADA compliant by being flush with the sidewalk. Board members also liked Option 4 for wider sidewalks because of the seating.

Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
Ms. Kroll ran Syncro simulations for the board to evaluate. She showed a model of a typical crossing with a push-button activated control to stop right turns. It would be a free-flow movement unless someone pushes the button to stop. Ms. Ecker said with a push-button, pedestrians will be able to cross the first part and the second part will have a stop sign. The members preferred the typical intersection and crossing design that did not include a separate diverter lane for the right hand turn lane.

There was discussion about doing something else with Park other than making it a two-way street. However, there were benefits of keeping it one-way. Ms. Ecker said that generally speaking they try to follow the 2016 Plan which suggests two-way traffic. Further, it will bring value to the vacant site near the Hunter House.

Additional options at Maple and Bates Intersection
- Option A - Left turn lanes, either lose parking or narrow sidewalks;
- Option C-1 - Left turns would be banned at Bates from 7 AM to 7 PM, with the street, tapered towards Chester so there is more sidewalk space between Chester and Bates.
- Option C-2 - No left turn lanes - keep on-street parking all the way to Chester but less room on the sidewalk.

After reviewing the Syncro model, everyone was in favor of Option C-1. Bates will operate the same as Henrietta.
Mr. Strader stated that the left turn volumes are low. EB turns are higher than the WB. When the center turn lane is taken away, the potential for rear-end collisions increases. Ms. Kroll indicated there have been 3.2 crashes/year. Four crashes were caused by stopped traffic, either in the queue or to park. So, no left turns are recommended from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.

*Mast arm signal at Maple and Southfield*
It was shown that the mast arms afford a better view into the Museum from Southfield. The new configuration for the entryway allows the opportunity for gateway features from the west such as signage, landscaping, lighting, seating.

Mr. Strader said they will take this input, repackage it for the City Commission and after the Commission’s direction they will come back with the whole design in an animated model.

6. **2019 LOCAL STREETS PROGRAM - PAVING STREET WIDTHS**

Mr. Fletcher noted one of the projects planned for the 2019 construction season is the Quarton Lake Subdivision reconstruction. The project involves the complete reconstruction of the following streets:
- Raynale St. – N. Glenhurst Dr. to Chesterfield Ave.;
- Brookwood St. – N. Glenhurst Dr. to Raynale St.;
- N. Glenhurst Dr. – Oak Ave. to Raynale St.;
- Kenwood Court – Glenhurst Dr. to 220 ft. to East.

It should be noted that these are the only improved streets in the area that have not been worked on in more than 30 years. The following is a detail of what is proposed. He recalled that the Multi-Modal Transportation Board ("MMTB") recently recommended a written policy on determining the width of new and reconstructed streets in Birmingham. The policy was approved by the City Commission at their meeting of July 23. The finalized version of the policy has been used as a reference in making the following recommendations. A summary of existing conditions is provided below, followed by a recommendation based on the City’s new residential street width standards.

**Raynale St.**: The existing pavement on this block was installed at thirty-two (32) feet wide. The curbs were originally installed in 1929, with an asphalt surface installed at a later date. The road width is wider than the twenty-six (26) ft. width requirement (per the Residential Street Width Standards). The existing right-of-way is sixty (60) ft. wide. A total reconstruction (new concrete pavement and underground utilities) is proposed for this street. A 26 ft. pavement width is recommended that will narrow the pavement, and provide more green space and City trees. The center line will remain the same.

**Brookwood St.**: The existing pavement on this block was installed at twenty-four (24) ft. wide. The curbs were originally installed in 1929, with an asphalt surface installed at a
later date. The existing right-of-way is fifty (50) ft. wide. City trees would be an issue if they try to widen the street to 26 ft. Therefore the recommendation is to keep the road width at 24 ft. A total reconstruction (new pavement and underground utilities) is proposed for this street.

**N. Glenhurst Dr.:** The existing pavement on this block was installed at thirty-two (32) ft. wide. The curbs were originally installed in 1929, with an asphalt surface installed at a later date. The road width is wider than the twenty-six (26) ft. width requirement (per the Residential Street Width Standards). The existing right-of-way is fifty (50) ft. wide. There are no existing City trees in the greenbelt (area between the road and sidewalk), due to the right-of-way and pavement widths. It should be noted that the City recently received a petition to reconstruct N. Glenhurst between Pine St. and Oak Ave. The pavement width of this section of N. Glenhurst is proposed to be constructed at twenty-six (26) ft., in accordance with the Residential Street Width Standards. The center line would remain the same. If the petition is successful, it will likely become a part of this project for logistic purposes as well as to take advantage of economy of scale (better pricing).

**Kenwood Court:** Kenwood Court was originally constructed as a dead end with a length of approximately 220 ft. The existing pavement was installed at twenty-four (24) ft. wide. The curbs were originally installed in 1929, with an asphalt surface installed at a later date. In the early 1990’s Kenwood Court was extended an additional 250 ft. The existing pavement was also installed at twenty-four (24) ft. wide. This street has two (2) right-of-way widths, fifty (50) ft. on the original section (west) and forty (40) ft. on the newer section. Because this street was constructed in two (2) different eras, the rehabilitation needs are different. Because of not wanting to jeopardize the existing large mature trees in the greenbelt, the recommendation is to keep the pavement at 24 ft. wide. A total reconstruction is proposed for the west half of the block (oldest) and resurfacing is proposed for the east half, as it is newer and does not require utility work. The existing curbs will remain in place on the newer section as well.

**Motion by Ms. Folberg**
**Seconded by Ms. Edwards to accept the suggested recommendations changing the typo in (C) to twenty-six (26) ft.:**

A. Reconstructing Raynale St. at twenty-six (26) ft. wide between N. Glenhurst Dr. and Chesterfield Ave.;
B. Reconstructing Brookwood St. at twenty-four (24) ft. wide (matching existing) between N. Glenhurst Dr. and Raynale;
C. Reconstructing N. Glenhurst Dr. at twenty-six (26) ft. wide between Oak Ave. and Raynale St.;
D. Reconstructing the west half of Kenwood Ct. (approximately 250 ft.) at twenty-four (24) ft. matching the existing and resurface the remaining portion of Kenwood Ct.;
E. Schedule a public hearing at the regularly scheduled meeting of the Multi-Modal Transportation Board for September 6, 2018 at 6 p.m.
Motion carried, 4-0.

VOICE VOTE
Yea: Folberg, Edwards, Slanga, White
Nay: None
Absent: Rontal, Schaefer, Isaksen

7. MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Ms. Folberg passed out two articles. One was from the Detroit Free Press that talks about Detroit starting scooter sharing. The second article was from MNPR which mentions bumps along the way for scooter sharing and walking. She noted that in Detroit the pricing for bike share is $8/day, $18/month, and $80/year. She doesn't see bike share as being a casual use at that price.

Dockless scooter share is priced at $1 up front and then $.15/minute. This may be a better option that bike sharing.

Ms. Ecker advised that details on bike share and scooter share will be brought back to the MMTB in September. The scooter share company runs everything. In Detroit the scooters are required to be used in the bike lanes and not on the sidewalk.

Ms. Edwards stated she would like to see a task force from the public working to encourage bike share in Birmingham. They would investigate if there are more bikes how to make biking safe and how to encourage a biking environment.

Discussion followed that the City should consider doing some public relations activities that promote cycling in the City, such as bike events, group rides, public service messages for drivers to stop for cyclists and pedestrians, or drafting an ordinance to require bikes to be on the streets and not sidewalks. Board members thought that a slow roll like group ride for cyclists in Detroit would be fun for the community.

9. MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS (none)

10. NEXT MEETING SEPTEMBER 6, 2018 at 6 p.m.
11. ADJOURNMENT

No further business being evident, the board members adjourned at 7:28 p.m.

________________________________________
Jana Ecker, Planning Director

________________________________________
Paul O'Meara, City Engineer
DATE: September 28, 2018

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: Paul T. O’Meara, City Engineer

SUBJECT: Phase 2 of Downtown Infrastructure Project

At the July 9th City Commission meeting, the Commission had directed staff to evaluate the trade-offs of changing the sequence of the future planned phases for the S. Old Woodward Ave. and Maple Rd. projects in light of prospective plans for the N. Old Woodward and Bates Street project. The following is a compilation of the key considerations that would be affected.

**Project Timing:**

The current schedule for the Phase 2 Maple Road project involves two related projects. First is the reconstruction and infrastructure replacement on Maple Rd. from Chester St. to Woodward Ave. The second is the reconfiguration of the intersection at Southfield Rd. and Maple Rd. The timing for this project includes:

- Detailed design work to begin in December, 2018
- Project Submitted for MDOT approval in August, 2019 (for work in 2020).
- Project start in March/April of 2020 (4 month project)

The alternate option for constructing S. Old Woodward in 2020 would follow this basic same schedule. However, design work has already progressed on the Maple Road phase given the current sequencing of the project phases. A change at this time to prepare designs for S. Old Woodward would pose a delay of about 4 months, but could still be accomplished to bid the project in August of 2019.

The coordination with the N. Old Woodward and Bates Street parking structure project is difficult to assess given the plans are still tentative. Based on current timelines provided in the development team’s proposals and the desire to begin the parking structure replacement as soon as possible, the following tentative timeline is provided:

- Development Agreement finalized in December, 2018
- Preparation of site plan reviews begin the Spring, 2019
- Bond funding proposal submitted for May, 2019
- Project start in October, 2019 thru November, 2022

The following timeline outlines the overlap between the Maple Rd. Project and S. Old Woodward Ave. Project in relation to the proposed N. Old Woodward and Bates Street project based on the above assumptions. The red line represents the N. Old Woodward and Bates
Street project, the green line represents the Maple Rd. Project and the yellow line represents the South Old Woodward Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Old WW &amp; Bates</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Road</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Old WW</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Sept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on Downtown Traffic

To help envision how traffic will be managed, a conceptual detour plan for the Maple Rd. project is attached. The project is expected to be built in two phases, as described below:

1. **Phase 1 - Underground Phase**

Complete pavement removal, followed by all new utilities, is planned between Chester St. and Woodward Ave. To help facilitate this work, we propose to direct all traffic on to the old Ring Road bypass, similar to what was done for the 2018 project. Parking lanes will be removed where feasible to allow for two lanes of through traffic on Willits St., Oakland Blvd., Chester St., and Brown St.

2. **Phase 2 - Paving Phase (including Southfield Rd.)**

During the paving phase, the detour route will remain as described above. To facilitate the work around Southfield Rd., Maple Rd. will be narrowed to two lanes, and Chester St. and Brown St. will be used for a detour of all through traffic on Southfield Rd.

The use of Ring Road worked very well overall during the 2018 project. An important part of its success was the removal of on-street parking to allow more vehicles through at each intersection. While Maple Rd. is closed, it will be important to have two westbound lanes open on Willits St. Assuming the parking structure is the first priority of the N. Old Woodward Ave. & Bates St. project, and given the timing above, it is anticipated that the parking structure would be under construction from approximately October, 2019, to May, 2021. Once the parking structure is done, and work begins on the smaller private building projects, activity on the Willits St. portion of the site will intensify. Construction of a five-story building on the Willits St. frontage of the site (at the northeast corner of Bates St.) will require closure of the sidewalk and the parking lane for safety of the public. If construction of that building begins in 2021, and extends into 2022, this construction will work well if the City is then focusing on Phase 3, the reconstruction of S. Old Woodward Ave. If the Phase 2 and 3 project order was reversed, however, the use of the westbound Willits St. parking lane would conflict with the detour route for Maple Rd.
From a traffic phasing perspective, constructing Maple Rd. first is the preferred option.

**Project Funding**

The funding for the two projects is listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maple Road Project</th>
<th>S. Old Woodward Ave. Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Costs (net of grants)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,710,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
<td>$1,212,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Replacement</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetlights</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$660,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,340,000</td>
<td>$5,560,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Items initially funded by General Fund

$2,955,000 $5,310,000

If the timing for the two projects were switched, the General Fund would see an additional reduction in fund balance of $2,355,000 ($5,310,000 - $2,995,000) in 2019-2020 because the S. Old Woodward Project costs are more heavily weighted towards roads and streetscape (which are initially funded by the General Fund) than the Maple Road Project. There isn’t sufficient time to build up the reserves in the General Fund or to rearrange current capital improvement projects to offset the increased costs to the General Fund.

To summarize, both from a traffic management perspective and from a funding perspective, the current plan of reconstructing Maple Rd. in 2020 and S. Old Woodward Ave. in 2022 (as reflected in the current five-year Capital Improvement Plan) is preferred. It is staff’s recommendation to continue with the phasing previously planned for the reasons stated above.
Maple Road Project (and extension of current project)

- Full reconstruction Chester to Pierce and E of Old Woodward to Woodward
- Repaving from Southfield to Chester St.
- Potential realignment and signal upgrade at the Southfield intersection

Timeline: Bid Package by December
PHASE 1-No work west of Chester Street (March 15 - June 15)
PHASE 2-Work on entire length of Job (June 15 to Finish)

- Begin SB Southfield Detour
- End Detour for WB Maple
- Begin EB Maple Detour
- Continue Detour for SB Southfield
- Detour for WB Maple & SB Southfield
- Peabody Closed to Thru Traffic
- Southfield Closed to Thru Traffic
- EB Maple NB Southfield Detour Route
- Begin EB Maple & NB Southfield Detour
- End Detour for EB Maple & NB Southfield
DATE:          October 8, 2018
TO:            Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager
FROM:          Tiffany J. Gunter, Assistant City Manager
SUBJECT:       Downtown Parking Strategies and Recommendations Report and Presentation

On January 3, 2018, the Advisory Parking Committee (APC) directed staff to release a Request For Proposals (RFP) soliciting Parking Consultant Services to conduct an analysis and provide recommendations to improve the automated parking system in the Central Business District. Nelson Nygaard Consultants were selected in March 2018 to begin the study.

The Downtown Parking Strategies and Recommendation report has been developed in support of our stated goal to ensure the downtown parking system is being operated, managed and developed in accordance with professional and technological best practices. The planning process incorporated input from a variety of community stakeholders, as well City staff. The following outcomes were sought by the City and guided plan development:

- A realistic plan for more effective use of parking and better management of the parking system in Birmingham’s Central Business District.
- Plan findings that are based on credible information that can be communicated to the public and stakeholders.
- Recommendations that will engender a parking system that contributes to a positive image of the City.
- Recommendations that will support a parking system that deploys the latest technology to improve the user experience, while sustaining revenue to cover operations, ongoing capital improvements and system growth.

The report draws upon best practices in parking and demand management to develop proven solutions that work. The consulting team has worked closely with the City and its partners to understand and evaluate the downtown parking system and develop recommendations to achieve the outcomes listed above.

The report is broken into sections that include 1) Existing Conditions, 2) Key Issues and Opportunities, 3) Strategies and Recommendations. The appendices are also full of relevant and timely information. Appendix D: Implementation Guide provides the City with a menu of actionable items that the APC will work to prioritize, implement, and evaluate the performance of each improvement.
On October 3, 2018, the APC met to hear a presentation on the final report from the project team and discuss the findings. The committee was pleased overall with the contents of the report and understood that their role was to determine the applicability and timing for each recommendation as they work to continuously improve the operation and management of the downtown parking system.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:

To accept the Downtown Parking Strategies and Recommendations report, as presented by the Nelson Nygaard Consultants and further to direct the APC to evaluate and prioritize implementation of the recommended strategies in future meetings.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Birmingham has successfully positioned its Central Business District to attract investment in a highly competitive environment. This includes provision and management of a comprehensive public parking system that emphasizes shared-use efficiencies to meet the growing parking needs of its thriving downtown. With recent downtown employment and residential growth and substantial mixed-use development either under construction or near ground-breaking, it is critical that the City continue to effectively allocate resources – including the public parking network – to serve existing and future downtown needs.

The Downtown Parking Plan has been developed in support of the City of Birmingham’s goal to ensure the downtown parking system is being operated, managed and developed in accordance with professional and technological best practices. The planning process incorporated input from a variety of community stakeholders, as well as multiple City departments, and draws upon best practices in parking and demand management to develop proven solutions that work.

The Plan outlines key findings from review of existing conditions and community feedback and outlines opportunities, strategies, and recommendations in support of the City’s goals. Plan recommendations are summarized around a series of priority issues:

- Ensuring commuter access to monthly parking
- Improving visitor access to short-term parking
- Taking advantage of excess on-street capacity
- Capitalizing on data collection and analysis opportunities
- Optimizing management & operations
- Preparing for future growth

Six parking and access management objectives and affiliated strategies were used to guide recommendations and were summarized in full in the Potential Strategies Overview:

- Redistribute Demand
- Reduce Demand
- Expand Capacities
- Expand Supplies
- Deploy Technologies
- Optimize Management

Recommendations focus on “quick wins,” near-term interventions, and long-term considerations. The Plan includes a summary of immediate action steps, as well as a comprehensive Implementation Guide that the City and its partners can use to affect positive change both now and into the future. Appendices to the Plan provide additional detail on existing conditions, best practice strategies, the community engagement process, implementation steps, and peer city documents that respond to specific recommendations.

The Birmingham Parking System is functioning at a high level today. The recommendations and action steps outlined in this plan will help to ensure that it continues to evolve with the growth of the Central Business District, utilizing local expertise and management best practices to meet the needs of the downtown area and its many stakeholders.
PROJECT SUMMARY

OVERVIEW

The Downtown Parking Plan has been developed in support of the City of Birmingham’s goal to ensure the downtown parking system is being operated, managed and developed in accordance with professional and technological best practices. The planning process incorporated input from a variety of community stakeholders, as well as multiple City departments. The following outcomes were sought by the City and guided plan development:

- A realistic plan for more effective use of parking and better management of the parking system in Birmingham’s Central Business District.
- Plan findings that are based on credible information that can be communicated to the public and stakeholders.
- Recommendations that will engender a parking system that contributes to a positive image of the City.
- Recommendations that will support a parking system that deploys the latest technology to improve the user experience, while sustaining revenue to cover operations, ongoing capital improvements and system growth.

The plan draws upon best practices in parking and demand management to develop proven solutions that work. The consulting team has worked closely with the City of Birmingham and its partners to understand and evaluate the downtown parking system and develop recommendations to achieve the outcomes listed above.

SCOPE OF STUDY

The Downtown Parking Plan included several key elements, including an assessment of existing conditions and development of strategies to guide recommendations and action steps. Stakeholder and community outreach efforts were conducted throughout the plan process, which will conclude with the presentation of this plan to the City Commission.

Existing Conditions Assessment

The Existing Conditions Assessment began with a review of the planning context in Birmingham, as well as identification, assembly, and review of all relevant and available data, reports, and studies related to parking and transportation programs in Birmingham. Findings were synthesized in the Existing Conditions Report, providing a clear overview of current conditions in the Central Business District. These included the following key points:

- Parking demand has been steadily increasing, particularly for long-term/monthly parking, and has outpaced the addition of new parking supply.
- At any time of day, at least half of the metered block segments are underutilized (<70%).
- During the peak lunch period, each of the City’s five garages exceeds 90% utilization.
- A significant number of parkers staying longer than 5 hours are not permit-holders.
- The permit wait list is long, but many of these parkers are finding space within the system, sometimes paying more to park and sometimes finding other opportunities.
Community Engagement

Data alone does not tell the whole story of Birmingham’s parking challenges and opportunities. Input from residents, employees, customers, visitors, commuters, and others on day-to-day and seasonal issues provided a more complete understanding of the performance of the parking system, today. In addition to recurring coordination meetings and two meetings with the City’s Advisory Parking Committee, the team conducted a survey of downtown businesses and employees, performed intercept surveys on downtown streets, attended a Birmingham Shopping District merchant meeting, and facilitated a public open house to solicit feedback on existing conditions and preliminary strategies. A Community Engagement Summary memo is included as an appendix to this report.

Strategy Development

Existing conditions, rate structures, regulations and practices, technology deployment, signage & way finding, and service/operations agreements were evaluated to develop a series of strategies informed by best practices in parking system management and operations. The Potential Strategies Overview memo summarized six parking and access management objectives and affiliated strategies designed to achieve them:

- Redistribute Demand
- Reduce Demand
- Expand Capacities
- Expand Supplies
- Deploy Technologies
- Optimize Management

These objectives and strategies provide the framework for the recommendations and action steps for this Final Report.

Presentation of Final Report

This report presents a cohesive set of practicable, proven-effective strategies for the City of Birmingham, in coordination with their partners and key stakeholders, to guide the future performance of the downtown parking system, to address projected parking and travel demand, to enhance downtown mobility. This set of recommendations provides critical tools to address the parking challenges of today, and to respond to emerging and anticipated paradigm shifts in urban parking and mobility dynamics – offering significant resiliency for maintaining optimal downtown access to facilitate downtown’s evident and potential economic vitality.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

DOWNTOWN CONTEXT

The City of Birmingham has successfully positioned its Central Business District to attract investment in a highly competitive environment. The City has prioritized good design, smart land use, and efficient coordination of infrastructure investments to foster a dense, walkable, mixed-use downtown. A major component of this is a comprehensive, self-funded, and strategically-managed public parking system that emphasizes shared-use efficiencies to reduce the amount of parking infrastructure required to keep downtown thriving.
Downtown Birmingham features a dynamic mix of housing, office space, retail, dining, entertainment, and civic attractions and amenities. It has a daytime population of almost 14,000. Approximately 300 unique national and local retail businesses operate among more than 1.5 million square feet of retail space and 2 million square feet of office space. Birmingham’s nightlife and entertainment boasts nearly 50 restaurants and 20 movie screens at two theaters.

This kind of success invariably brings challenges, particularly regarding parking and transportation. With more than 300,000 square feet of mixed-use development either under construction or near ground-breaking, it is critical that the City continue to effectively allocate resources – including the public parking network – to serve existing and future downtown needs.

**PRIOR PLAN REVIEW**

**Birmingham Multi-Modal Transportation Plan (2013)**

Focusing primarily on active transportation measures, the Birmingham Multi-Modal Transportation Plan includes policy and design recommendations intended to reduce automobile dependency in the city. While some recommendations could have a secondary impact on parking, there are no policy, program, or design recommendations in the plan specifically intended to address or impact the downtown parking system.

Network improvement recommendations that could impact the number or design of on-street spaces include the addition of curb extensions at a number of downtown intersections. In addition, the plan includes recommendations for increasing, and improving, the stock of contextually attractive and usable bicycle parking in the downtown. Key recommendations include the following:

- Two bicycle racks should be placed on each proposed curb extension in the downtown
- Bicycle racks should be covered whenever possible
- Seasonal temporary bike racks should be placed in the downtown where appropriate (large curb extensions, adjacent to outdoor dining decks, etc.)
- Provide temporary staffed bike racks during special events to encourage bicycling and provide a secure environment for bikes
- Provide enclosed and secured parking in downtown parking decks
- Provide amenities such as compressed air and basic public bike fix stations at key locations around town

**Downtown Birmingham 2016 Plan (1996)**

Key findings include the following:

- Parking decks are underutilized, and appear to be less desirable than surface parking
- There are opportunities for additional on-street parking within existing pavement widths
- The existing parking decks may be expandable
- The parking deck directional signage system is less than effective

Key parking recommendations include the following:

- Restripe the curb space to maximize potential capacity of existing city-owned space
- Continue 2-hours free parking in parking decks
- Keep meters outside of the CBD at lower rates than those within the CBD
- Expand metered time to 1.5 hours in the CBD, and 3 hours in other shopping areas
- If an observable need arises, pursue the potential for expanding the existing decks
- Implement a signage program to guide parkers to parking decks

THE PARKING SYSTEM

Birmingham’s downtown parking system consists of roughly 4,944 publicly-owned spaces, of which 3,423 are contained in five (5) public parking structures, 1,272 are metered, on-street, and 391 are contained in five (5) surface parking lots. Two private, independently run, parking structures are also located in the CBD and additional private parking lots are used by the City on a temporary basis to expand supply and meet pressing demand from permit parkers.

The parking structures are operated by SP+, with oversight by the City Manager’s Office. On-street parking meters are managed and enforced by the Birmingham Police Department. The overall system is overseen by the City Manager’s Office, while a 9-member Advisory Parking Committee meets regularly to address parking issues and advise the City Commission.

The parking system is financed through an Enterprise Fund, which captures all parking revenue, with the exception of citation revenues, which go to the City’s General Fund. The Enterprise Fund provides for cost recovery for day-to-day expenses, such as maintenance and operations, as well as capital investments that benefit the system on a long-term basis. Recent upgrades to system infrastructure include new traffic control equipment and Smart Meters throughout the CBD, which provide more payment options, real-time information, and operational efficiencies for both users and the City. New gate technology and signage have been added at all City garages to assist with real-time information and ease of ingress/egress.

Parking demand has been steadily increasing, particularly for long-term/monthly parking, largely due to increased demand from downtown employers and employees and a growing number of mixed-use developments that have added more built space to the downtown market. The recent trend in “open office” workspace configurations, which situate more employees in less building space, has accelerated the increase in parking demand at a pace that has exceeded the provision of new places to park. To manage this increased demand, the City has invested in public valet services, leased private facilities to manage a public parking, and initiated a real-time information system to direct drivers to available parking options. The City has also adjusted permit and meter rates and is continually evaluating the technology, operations, and regulations in the parking system to ensure optimal system function and user experience.

The Existing Conditions Report provides a comprehensive review of parking supply and utilization, management, operations, signage, and expected changes.
Figure 1  Downtown Parking Supply
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

The planning process included multiple layers of stakeholder engagement over several months. These included the following:

- Advisory Parking Committee Meetings (2)
- Online Business District Survey
- Face-to-face Intercept Surveys
- Birmingham Shopping District Merchant Meeting
- Public Open House

Through these engagement initiatives, over 450 local business owners, property owners, employees, residents, and visitors were able to provide their input on existing parking conditions challenges and opportunities. Key inputs from this process included:

- Nearly 75% of respondents park in a public parking deck downtown on a daily basis.
- Employers fully cover 54% of respondents' parking costs, either through validation (15%) or providing a permit (39%); around 37% are responsible for their own parking costs.
- 62% of respondents rated Birmingham’s Parking System as either “poor” or “very poor.”
- The free, 2-hour parking in public parking decks is the most popular feature of the downtown parking system; the time/cost of on-street parking received the lowest ratings.
- Parkers can usually find parking within 1-3 blocks of their destination in under 10 minutes; the proximity is favorable, but the search time is not.
- Drivers are aware of parking cost disparities (between permit holders and non-permit holders) and feel that the difference needs to be addressed.
- Additional short-term curbside parking is needed in key locations to serve important pick-up/drop-off functions.

A Community Engagement Summary memo is included as an appendix to this report and provides more detail on the outreach efforts and feedback received.

Figure 2  Sample Survey Results

How Would You Rate the Following Parking Features (1-5 Scale)?

- Free 2 Hour Parking in Parking...
- Design and Circulation Within Parking...
- On-Street Signage
- The Time/Cost of Metered Parking
- The Amount of Turnover of On-Street Parking
- Time It Takes to Find a Parking Space

1 = Very Poor, 3 = Satisfactory, 5 = Very Good
KEY ISSUES & OPPORTUNITIES

COMMUTER ACCESS TO MONTHLY PARKING

Commuter parking demand has risen steeply over the past several years, leading to parking garages that are regularly at or near-capacity during the mid-day peak and a permit wait list of around 3,000 parkers. At the same time, many of these parkers are finding space within the existing system, parking either in garages or on-street while they remain on the wait list. Several measures are already in play in Birmingham and additional recommendations will be highlighted in the following areas:

- Selling more permits in select City garages
- Defining a performance-based pricing approach
- Adjusting parking rates to reflect demand patterns across downtown
- Transitioning monthly permits to a daily pricing structure
- Refining the rooftop and public valet programs
- Expanding employee parking options
- Providing and promoting commuter benefits

VISITOR ACCESS TO SHORT-TERM PARKING

Convenient, consistently available visitor parking is critical to the health of the Birmingham Shopping District. The on-street meters provided throughout the central business district and the short-term parking spaces available in each parking deck constitute ample supply, but availability is still perceived to be an issue. Recommendations in the following areas can help improve real and perceived short-term parking availability in downtown Birmingham:

- Adjust parking rates to reflect demand patterns across downtown
- Ensuring that all drivers know all their options
- Optimizing “Park Once” efficiencies
- Refining the public valet program
- Expanding mobile payment options to the parking structures

EXCESS ON-STREET CAPACITY

A significant number of on-street spaces remains available, even during mid-day and evening peak-demand periods, often in contrast to at-capacity utilization of nearby off-street facilities. This suggests that the current pricing cues – which apply a fee to the on-street spaces, but not to spaces in neighboring garages – are intensifying the supply constraints noted in some key downtown garages. Recommendations that capitalize on the opportunity to reset these cues in the decks and on some on-street blocks to support the City’s goals include:

- Reducing short-term parking set-asides in City garages
- Accommodating short-term parkers with convenient, low cost on-street parking options
DATA COLLECTION & ANALYSIS

A series of recent investments in new gate and meter equipment has positioned the City to collect a robust data set that can be used to monitor parking system utilization and parking behavior. Making the most of these technologies and continually investing in upgrades will help Birmingham capitalize on opportunities to improve parking system function and efficiency, including the following key strategies:

- Utilizing data collection capacity to support performance-based management
- Investing in License Plate Recognition (LPR) equipment
- Upgrading parking transaction & management software

OPERATIONS & MANAGEMENT

Effective operations and management across various City departments and their contractors has yielded a high-performing and revenue-positive parking system that handles a high volume of activity on a daily basis. However, the opportunity exists to further optimize, streamline, and coordinate management, while promoting an efficient and customer-friendly approach to parking system. Recommendations will be outlined in the following areas:

- Soliciting competitive bids for Operator services
- Establishing a Parking Ambassador Program
- Refining the Parking Assessment District

FUTURE GROWTH

Downtown Birmingham is expected see over 300,000 sq. ft. in new development in the near future. These developments include lodging/hospitality, residential, and mixed-use commercial buildings. Additional development in the central business district and other nearby growth districts stands to add more demands on Birmingham’s access and parking network. The City and its partners can address future growth pressures through a series of strategic approaches, including, but not limited to:

- Updating the City’s Zoning Code
- Investing parking revenues in public improvements, beyond parking
- Pursuit of joint development opportunities.
STRATEGIES & RECOMMENDATIONS

STRATEGIES OVERVIEW

The Potential Strategies Overview is provided as an appendix to this report and summarized a series of parking and access management strategies that should be considered for implementation in Birmingham. The following six (6) parking and access management objectives and affiliated strategies provide the framework for the recommendations in the remainder of this section.

Redistribute Demand
- Take a Performance-Based Management approach to ensuring space availability.
- Expand employee parking options.
- Ensure drivers know their options.

Reduce Demand
- Optimize “Park Once” efficiencies.
- Provide circulator and shuttle options.
- Improve pedestrian and bicycle network infrastructure.
- Provide commuter benefits.
- Transition monthly permits to a daily pricing structure.

Expand Capacities
- Continue to refine Public Valet approach for both visitors and commuters.
- Expand Mobile Payment Options to the Parking Structures.
- Vary regulations to balance parking and loading needs at the curb.
- Allocate curbside space for higher-capacity forms of parking.
- Use pay-by-phone options to encourage off-hour shared parking.

Expand Supplies
- Develop “Park Once” zoning strategies.
- Refine the Assessment District Fee Approach.
- Continue to refine Joint-Development approach.

Deploy Technologies
- Utilize License Plate Recognition (LPR) equipment.
- Upgrade parking management and transaction software.
- Support Electric Vehicle Network Infrastructure.

Optimize Management
- Invest parking revenues in public improvements, beyond parking.
- Solicit Competitive Bids for Operator Services.
- Establish a Parking Ambassador Program.
NEAR-TERM PRIORITIES & RECOMMENDATIONS

The following section summarizes a series of near-term priorities that align with the Key Issues & Opportunities outlined in the previous section. Strategies, recommendations, and potential “quick wins” are identified for each priority area to address challenges and opportunities. Longer-term considerations are provided at the end of each priority area.

Ensure Commuter Access to Monthly Parking

Based on the existing permit wait list of approximately 3,000 parkers and utilization rates that consistently exceed 90% during peak mid-day periods, it is clear that adjustments are warranted in how Birmingham addresses commuter parking demand. Further, the significant share of 5+ hour parking activity that is linked to non-permit-holders (roughly 30% at all five garages) confirms that it is common for employees to use validation or pay the full-day rate in lieu of a monthly permit. These conditions also confirm that:

- These parkers (or their employers) are paying a higher daily rate to park than permit-holders, suggesting acceptance of higher permit rates than those currently offered.
- Providing more permits will not likely result in higher utilization levels (or reduced availability) if such permits are provided to commuters who may already using these garages for full day parking.
- These are important factors in determining the appropriate “oversell” rate for permits.

The following strategies and recommendations are designed to address these conditions.

Sell more permits in select City garages.

Permit sales for City garages are restricted when occupancy measures consistently approach capacity, resulting in wait lists for commuters and employers seeking the combination of convenience, cost-savings, and consistency that permits offer when compared to daily parking options. However, as the above summary indicates, parking duration data suggests that a significant portion of parked cars in most City garages on a daily basis are parked by commuters who are either paying the daily rate, or having their daily parking validated by their employer.

Quick Win: Offer permits to the first 10 people on the wait list for the Pierce, and Peabody garages, which have the highest portion of non-permit vehicles staying longer than 5 hours.

The Pierce (44%) and Peabody (39%) garages had the highest portion of non-permit parkers staying between five and twelve hours in the months of October 2017 and January 2018. This was an average of 165 parkers on a daily basis in the Pierce garage and between 90 – 100 per day in the Peabody garage. The City should continue to monitor conditions in these and other City decks and issue more permits every three months, expanding to other garages as conditions warrant.

Define a Performance-Based Pricing approach.

Throughout its on- and off-street parking network, Birmingham can use parking rates to achieve a singular objective: maintaining availability, across the downtown, so that drivers can choose the parking location that best suits their relative cost/ convenience priorities. Space availability, at the block-face level for on-street parking and at the facility level for off-street, becomes the central “key performance indicator” (KPI) that informs rate decisions, as well as most other management and regulatory actions.
For garages, availability for short-term and long-term parkers can be measured and tracked separately, but the primary measure for the facility should be availability among all spaces (which should inform how much inventory is set aside for either group).

The benefits of such an approach go beyond transparency to improve the parking experience by reducing time and energy spent in search of available spaces and reducing perceptions that downtown lacks sufficient parking supply.

**Quick Win: Adopt a policy linking parking rates to demand and establish availability as the Key Performance Indicator (KPI) that will be monitored to inform changes to rates and regulations.**

The City should continue to work with SP+ to monitor parking utilization and permit wait lists for their garages and lots, establishing a solid base of KPI data to inform the policy and decision-making process. Sample utilization ranges, such as those listed below, are based on optimal targets for three types of parking, based distinct user perceptions and expectations for each. Generally, on-street locations need to present more obvious availability, as drivers have fewer options to navigate back toward a missed empty space. Similarly, those seeking long-term parking in off-street facilities generally tend to be more familiar with the facility, and thus more patient in seeking out a space when availability is less obvious.

- On-street parking: 10-20% of spaces are available, or a few spaces on each block-face.
- Off-street, hourly parking: 10-15% of spaces are available
- Off-street, long-term parking: 5-10% of spaces are available, with no permit wait list

These ranges will make clear when KPIs are sufficiently off their target to warrant management changes, such as changes in rates.

**Adjust parking rates to reflect demand patterns across downtown.**

The current situation, with wait lists limiting access to monthly permits, despite demonstrated capacity to accommodate long-term parking well beyond demand generated by current permit holders, results in many downtown employees and employers paying much more for parking than the established permit rate. Data indicates that nearly one-third of non-permit parkers in all garages are paying several times the permit rate to access downtown jobs. Selling more permits for these garages, through the incremental approach outlined above, is a critical first step in addressing this issue. Raising the rates at the most constrained garages is another.

**Quick Win: Raise permit rates at the Chester, Park, and N. Old Woodward garages and monitor results to determine if more permits can be issued, or if further rate increases are warranted.**

These three garages consistently exhibit peak mid-day utilization in excess of 95% and have the highest portion of parkers staying between five and twelve hours who hold parking permits and pay a monthly rate. Raising monthly rates in these garages will reduce the cost disparity between what downtown employees with permits, and those without, must pay for the parking they need to maintain employment in downtown Birmingham.

Increasing permit rates across all garages, gradually approaching a rate that is more reflective of the daily rate currently paid by many commuters or their employers, will help balance future parking supply and demand.

Options that promote reduced parking demand should also be considered as a way of incentivizing non-drive-alone trips and reducing parking demand.
Quick Win: Offer discounted permit rates for carpools and vanpools and “flex” permits that allow for a limited number of uses each month.

These options will communicate to commuters with pricing cues that these are desired behaviors that can be used on a regular or occasional basis. They represent early, “low hanging fruit” options that can lay the foundation for more robust demand management strategies in the future. Another, more progressive, option – daily parking permits – is discussed further in the following section.

In the near-term, the City should continue to monitor utilization and review rates annually to determine if additional adjustments are warranted, raising or lowering rates to address any meaningful gaps between targeted and actual availability. Additional steps (highlighted later in this report) can be taken to improving permit management systems for increased efficiency and accuracy. Ensuring transparency will also be important to public understanding and support and can be achieved by regularly publishing data, findings, and any subsequent management/pricing adjustments in an annual report.

Transition monthly permits to a daily pricing structure.

People are more sensitive to small recurring fees and charges than larger and less-frequent ones. Once an employee purchases a monthly permit, that individual typically ceases to consider driving alternatives because the permit has become a “sunk-cost” investment. Such permits actually create an incentive to drive to work as frequently as possible in order to take advantage of the investment. By contrast, a daily rate can be facilitated through payroll or by issuing a commuter card that can be structured as a “draw-down” account, creating an incentive to use other modes when those are most feasible, thereby saving the daily rate cost. This can reduce commuter parking demand on days when walking, cycling, and transit are most appealing – such as nice-weather days, which can free up garage spaces for additional permit parkers or visitors.

Birmingham’s IN Card and other employer issued validation cards can be used to facilitate this approach, accommodating parkers who are either on the permit waiting list or who would be amenable to a more flexible option that rewards them (through cost savings) for not parking. As monthly-permit rates approach parity with the cumulative cost of paying daily for parking, the flexibility of the daily option can be promoted as an option that provides flexibility for those who work part-time, or who might combine driving with alternative modes throughout the month.

In the near-term, the City should work to establish a Performance-Based Pricing approach with an eye on the daily permit pricing option as a potential “next step” that can be pursued in line with the gradual increase in permit rates. A “pilot” or “trial” period could be explored with a number of interested employers who currently need more permits and are willing to participate in a constructive effort to uncover new solutions. The pilot period can offer insights into fine-tuning the program before it is rolled out more extensively. This approach can be promoted as a way to relieve some of the cost burden of the price increase, coupled with other commuter benefit options, to be discussed in the following section.

---

1 Case Study example: www.seattle.gov/transportation/document-library/reports-and-studies
Provide & Promote Commuter Benefits

Within any given downtown, there are drive-alone commuters who would consider adopting alternative modes, given sufficient incentives or provided means around barriers to options like walking, cycling, transit, and ridesharing.

The City should work with its partners to establish a commuter facing transportation resource portal to inform local businesses and employees about parking and mobility options. The portal would optimally have an online presence, hosted by an existing agency, but could offer a commuter resource “hub” at City Hall where both employers and employees can talk with a resource manager or collect information for personal use or to distribute within their workplace.

*Quick Win: Work with the Birmingham Shopping District and the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG) to create a “welcome” package for new and existing employees that outlines the commuter benefits already available to them.*

The package would include information on existing programs, like transit benefits, guaranteed ride home, and rideshare ride matching services, and make the case for non-drive-alone commutes in both financial, environmental, and quality of life terms. Distribution could start with human resource managers at local workplaces and be available at City offices where parking permits and other transportation resources are available.

**Figure 3** uGO University Circle Resource Portal, Cleveland

[Image: www.uGOinthecircle.com]

**Long-term,** the City, SEMCOG, and individual employers can work together to develop more robust programs and benefits for their employees. Opportunities include subsidized transit passes, a vanpool program, and “cash out” benefits for non-drive-alone trips. A comprehensive program and promotion effort could include a dedicated “transportation manager” who
coordinates and markets program offerings across workplaces, develops and manages new programs with service providers, and monitors program success.

**Continue to refine the Rooftop and Public Valet programs.**

The City's rooftop and public valet programs both address a particular subset of parking demand in the short-term and long-term parking markets. While the rooftop valet program at the parking structures is currently underutilized, it is providing a valuable service by reducing the need for garage closures when at or near capacity. The City should explore options to optimize this service to increase use by commuters, including use of mobile technologies, relocating drop-off locations, or combining efforts with the on-street public valet. In both cases, collecting additional data from valet operators on use of these services will help the City and its partners make continuous improvements to the offerings for both commuters and visitors.

*Quick Win: Work with the current valet operator and existing City vendors, including SP+ and ParkMobile, to add mobile functionality to the valet program and increase data capture on use and program costs.*

Several parking operators offer proprietary applications that can support these types of customer conveniences, which can improve the efficiency of the valet program by allowing valet patrons to schedule their cars' return. ParkMobile, the City's mobile payment vendor, already provides valet features in other markets. If the current vendors cannot meet this objective, the City should consider incorporating this as a part of a future valet or parking operator solicitation.

**In the near-term,** City staff should continue to review the on-street public valet as it relates to use by long-term and permit parkers. While this service was not established with those parkers in mind, there may be an opportunity to meet some of the need for additional capacity in garages by offering a more convenient valet option than is currently provided in the rooftop program.

To further support the rooftop program, the City can look for locations where the valet drop-off and pick-up can happen on the ground floor. By relocating the valet to the lower level of the garage, drivers would be able to more quickly drop off and pick up their vehicle, which addresses one of the main complaints about the existing program.

The pricing should also reflect the increased convenience and cost to the City. In the case of the on-street, public valet being used by long-term parkers, a competitive rate analysis should be conducted quarterly to ensure the valet program is priced at a market rate and that the City is not subsidizing it in a way that is unsustainable or overly burdensome to the public. Structuring the rates for the valet services should—at a minimum—sustain the cost of the operation. These rates should be reviewed quarterly or annually, along with the utilization rates, to ensure that the program is providing adequate benefits and financial gain/loss remains neutral.

**Expand employee parking options.**

Building off of the above section, there are several opportunities to create additional capacity for long-term, employee parking in downtown Birmingham. One area where capacity is limited and utilization consistently exceeds 90% during the mid-day peak is at the north end of Old Woodward, around Lot 6. The City is already planning an expansion of that facility that will add 34 spaces to the lot, but additional capacity is still needed.

One option is to consider in line with the lot expansion is a redesign that would remove the single-space meters from a portion of the lot and demarcate separate areas for permit and short-term parking. In the permit parking areas, a pay station or gate can be installed to limit access, coupled
with a valet assist program that can instituted during peak periods to more efficiently “stack” cars into the limited space.

Nearby, another option is to look for opportunities on adjacent residential parking permit (RPP) streets where selective and strategic monthly permits can be issued. To ensure that residential access is maintained, the City should seek blocks with an average availability of at least 25% during hours when employee permits can be used. Careful monitoring and enforcement of these expansion zones will be critical to successful implementation.

These opportunities, as well as others to expand monthly permit issuance at on-street locations, exist in various zones throughout the downtown area.

In the near-term, the City should look for opportunities to pilot the following approaches to expanding on-street capacity for monthly permit parkers:

- Institute a program in residential permit parking (RPP) blocks, with permits limited to day time parking when resident parking demand is modest.
- Add on-street permits in underutilized metered blocks, such as has been initiated at the south end of Old Woodward.
- Examine on-street permit options on blocks that are not currently metered or included in RPP districts, including those on the southwest edge of downtown.
Additional off-street opportunities have been elusive, but opportunities may arise over time that enable the City to broker shared parking agreements with private property owners who have excess capacity. The temporary lot lease (Lot 12) just east of the study area is a good example of a successful effort to add 156 permit spaces in the near-term. In the case of more remote parking opportunities, which have also been elusive, the City can offer a reduced rate and last-mile connections via commuter shuttle service, which will be discussed further in the following section.
Improve Visitor Access to Short-term Parking

Adjust parking rates to reflect demand patterns across downtown.

The City currently has only two on-street parking rates ($1 and $1.50 per hour), which limits the ability of pricing to influence the distribution of parking demand. Following the methodology described in the previous section, which uses availability as the key performance indicator (KPI), Birmingham should increase the gaps between on-street parking rates, and clearly communicate where the most- and least-expensive parking is located.

*Quick Win: Establish a third pricing tier and create a “premium rate” area where utilization is consistently highest to facilitate a shift in parking activity to areas of consistent availability.*

Pricing in this area may only be modestly higher than in the other two areas, but with three tiers, parkers who are knowledgeable about the pricing scheme and the consistent availability on lower-priced blocks will begin to opt for the ease and cost savings of parking in those areas. This stands to increase availability in the core and reduce the incidence of cars circling for parking in the center of the downtown Birmingham, when parking is available just one or two blocks away.

*Quick Win: Make some currently-metered on-street parking free during hours where capacity is constrained elsewhere in the system, to attract parkers and free up capacity elsewhere.*

In the near-term, in line with the recommendations in the monthly permit section, the City should continue to monitor utilization and review rates annually (at a minimum) to determine if additional adjustments are warranted, raising or lowering rates to address any meaningful gaps between targeted and actual availability. Again, ensuring transparency will also be important to public understanding and support and can be achieved by regularly publishing data, findings, and any subsequent management/pricing adjustments in an annual report.

*Figure 5  Seattle On-Street Parking Occupancy Report*

Image: Seattle Department of Transportation
Ensure that all drivers know all their options.

Visitors are particularly dependent upon information, signage, and wayfinding to understand the full set of parking options available to them, but all users benefit from improvements to delivery and accuracy of information. The City already addresses several aspects of this well, including providing real-time garage availability information (both online and at the facility) and directing parkers to public valet locations. However, there are gaps in the provision of broader parking network information that can be addressed.

**Quick Win:** Implement a comprehensive communications strategy to ensure that drivers know the difference in on-street parking rates and where to find the right-fit combination of convenience and cost for their downtown visit.

The importance of signage and other public outreach in communicating the difference between parking zones and rates will increase with the implementation of performance-based management. This should be addressed as part of a comprehensive approach to increasing driver awareness of options, pricing, and regulations.

Branding with easily discernable information has been used effectively to help visitors understand and find key parking options, including free 2-hour parking in garages and the public valet service put into place while key downtown blocks are closed for construction. Building off these efforts, the City can work to develop a cohesive parking “brand” and information system, accessible online, via mobile device, and in the field, to enhance user understanding of parking options. A successful program will:

- Guide Visitors to “right fit” parking
- Improve predictability, reduce confusion and improve customer experience
- Redistribute demand to underutilized facilities
- Support performance-based management
- Help “brand” downtown Birmingham
- Improve aesthetics and streetscape

**In the near-term,** the City should work to align citywide planning and wayfinding efforts, building upon this work to create a cohesive sign program that creates clear and concise information to parkers. Using a color scheme to clearly mark premium-, base-, and reduced-rate parking locations – both on maps and via on-site signage – can support a performance-based pricing program. Similar efforts could be used to identify spaces in City garages or off-peak access to permit lots.

**Figure 7** Branding + Color Scheme Guide Drivers to Right-Fit Parking

Image: Downtown Sacramento Partnership
Optimize “Park Once” efficiencies.

Birmingham's downtown parking system supports Park Once efficiencies, as most parking options allow drivers to leave their cars in place while they walk around downtown. By allowing drivers to leave their cars in place until they are ready to return home, and promoting area walkability, Park Once can convert potential, excess auto traffic into sidewalk vitality and active public spaces. From a parking demand perspective, it can significantly reduce parking supply needs, as drivers require fewer spaces to get to more downtown destinations.

To further enhance these conditions in downtown Birmingham, the City and its partners should continue to pursue opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian network improvements, as it is doing with the addition of bike parking options and pedestrian safety measures throughout the area. **In the near-term**, the City should also look to add a downtown circulator to further connect various destinations in central business district and beyond. This opportunity was popular during community outreach across all audiences, with multiple employers expressing a willingness to support such a service. A circulator could serve multiple audiences in downtown Birmingham, beginning with visitors and extending to residents and daily commuters, by providing frequent and convenient connections throughout the downtown area. The same vehicles that can be used during mid-day and evening hours to provide local circulation for visitors, shoppers, and residents can be re-purposed during peak commuter hours to fill “first mile/last mile” gaps from remote parking facilities or transit services, making those options more attractive and practical for commuters.

These essential Park Once services can also communicate the downtown brand and make use of emerging electric and autonomous vehicle technologies. Several operators base revenues entirely on sponsorship and advertising sales, enabling them to offer the service free of charge to passengers.

**Figure 8** San Diego’s Free Ride Everywhere Downtown “FRED” Circulator

![Image: Downtown San Diego Partnership](image-url)
Continue to refine Public Valet approach.

The City recently committed to extending two public on-street valet locations beyond the Old Woodward construction period, due to popularity and customer demand. Birmingham staff should continue to review the on-street public valet for usefulness with input from parkers and the Birmingham Shopping District (BSD) and continue to work with the BSD and local merchants to expand marketing and outreach and pursue cost-sharing opportunities.

In the near-term, in addition to the valet recommendations in the commuter parking section, the City should pursue visitor valet opportunities in the Lot 6 areas, where there is a clear desire from merchants to expand the valet service to their district. This could improve parking options for both shoppers and employees in the vicinity. This will continue to be a challenging prospect for immediate implementation, as there is no proximate location for valet car storage, but the options highlighted in the previous section may also yield opportunities to extend valet service to visitors.

Figure 9 Downtown Birmingham Public Valet Locations
Expand Mobile Payment Options to the Parking Structures.

Payment options for short-term parkers in the City’s garages are currently limited to a credit card or IN Card. Community feedback indicated a desire for more options, both to increase payment flexibility and to reduce delays at parking entrance and exit. ParkMobile payments at the City’s smart meters account for approximately 25% of transactions, suggesting that this popular option could be readily adopted by off-street parkers as well.

In the near-term, the City should explore options for either expanding their current ParkMobile contract or soliciting other vendors to allow mobile payment in the garages. Providing parkers with the option to pay for parking using their phone will help mitigate congestion at the exit gates, much of which is the result of delays caused by parkers who are using credit or IN Cards. ParkMobile and other vendors also offer “digital wallets,” which can allow employers to pre-load funds into individual accounts. These mobile options can also enable after-hours payment for visitor use of permit lots, which can offset evening and weekend capacity issues in key areas.

In addition to ParkMobile, there are several Bluetooth mobile solutions that can be adapted to existing SKIDATA PARCS infrastructure for minimal cost that will allow parkers to access the garage or “vend the gate” using a pre-established wallet or account, akin to having a virtual IN Card. Several PARCS vendors are offering Bluetooth solutions. In most cases, the City would need to update the garage technology. However, one company (inugo) has successfully implemented an adaptive solution utilizing existing infrastructure. They install Bluetooth technology ($1,000 per gate set up; $1.00 per space per month for the back office) that allows visitors and permit holders to use their cell phone to access the garage, in most cases, hands-free.

Take Advantage of Excess On-street Capacity

In aggregate, on-street supplies maintain significant excess capacity (<85% occupied) throughout weekday peaks and into the evenings. Much of this underutilized capacity is concentrated in areas around City garages that are, by contrast, at capacity much of the day. Current pricing cues – which apply a fee to the on-street spaces, but offer free 2-hour parking in nearby garages – are intensifying the supply constraints noted in some key downtown facilities, as well as one of the primary parking issues noted in this study – the lack of capacity to accommodate downtown employment growth via permits to City garages.

Figure 10 Peak Weekday Mid-day Parking Utilization
In line with the recommendations in the previous sections to improve access for monthly and daily parkers, there is an opportunity to shift parking from decks that are experiencing capacity constraints to on-street spaces, and within the on-street system to spaces that are currently under-utilized.

**Reduce short-term parking set-asides in City garages.**

*Quick Win: Reduce the number of spaces held for short-term parkers in select garages, shifting a modest amount of short-term parking demand into streets spaces and freeing up spaces for additional permit parkers.*

Two garages – Chester and Pierce – offer opportunities for this transition. Chester is already most heavily used by parkers staying 5 hours or more, with only 15% of parkers staying 2 hours or less. It is also slightly less proximate to downtown’s primary visitor core. That said, there are currently only 42 spaces marked for short-term (<3-hour) parking, so the opportunity is not substantial. These spaces are also frequently used by visitors to the adjacent Baldwin House and Public Library. Coupled with the prior recommendation to expand on-street parking options in the vicinity and promote “right fit” options for visitors, there are multiple options to add capacity in this area to meet the needs of all users.

The Pierce garage, on the other hand, is the only garage with consistent availability (15%-25%) during weekday daytime hours. Pierce is popular with short-term parkers, with more than 40% of current use by parkers staying less than 2 hours. So, a careful strategy – including proactive marketing/outreach to visitors who typically use this deck – should be examined in order to decipher where displaced short-term parkers would be directed, whether alternate garage locations or on-street spaces.

**Continue to provide short-term parkers with convenient, low-cost parking options**

*Quick Win: Make some currently-metered on-street parking free to provide a competitive alternative to free parking in City garages that lack capacity to offer monthly permits.*

To address the priority of accommodating more permit parkers in the City’s garages, steps can be taken to shift a portion of the short-term parkers to existing on-street meters during peak periods, thereby alleviating some of the excess demand on existing decks. Reducing the number of spaces held for short-term parkers in City garages, limiting the free 2-hour parking offering during peak periods (or in select garages), and offering lower-cost on-street parking options to short-term parkers will help facilitate this shift with pricing cues. Promoting free on-street parking in strategic locations will be an important counter-measure to ensure that short-term parkers are still provided with ample opportunities for convenient, low-cost downtown parking.

**Capitalize on Data Collection & Analysis Opportunities**

Data is currently collected through both automated and manual counts in Birmingham’s five public parking garages. The City’s parking Operator, SP+, provides regular reports on system performance to City staff and the Advisory Parking Committee. SKIDATA gate equipment data is continually monitored by SP+ and issues are addressed as they arise. However, the limitations in what this equipment can collect and provide impairs the City’s ability to most effectively evaluate and adjust system operations. On-street, the City’s recent investment in CivicSmart meters has provided new flexibility in payment options for customers, but the data collection opportunities still provided with ample opportunities for convenient, low-cost downtown parking.
Utilize data collection capacity to support performance-based management

The CivicSmart meters collect transaction data, which can be used as a proxy to measure utilization of the City’s on-street parking, but the greater opportunity is to use the vehicle detection sensors to collect and communicate occupancy to both management personnel at the Police Department, and potentially, to communicate space availability to drivers. This functionality can improve time zone enforcement and provide an anti-feed function to facilitate turnover, as well as supplying an ongoing record of utilization throughout downtown. The City should be deliberate about communicating these functions to the public, positioning the changes as improvements to parking space availability and not as opportunities to increase revenues.

Quick Win: Utilize parking meter vehicle detection sensors to begin collecting comprehensive data on parking meter utilization in support of a performance-based management approach to parking pricing and regulations.

If the sensor accuracy is still not meeting expectations, the City should continue to work with their vendor to optimize and test the equipment until it performs at optimal levels. In the meantime, the City can continue to evaluate transaction data or manually count on-street utilization on a regular schedule to begin to establish a more consistent and comprehensive record of capacity and use throughout the entire downtown.

Invest in License Plate Recognition (LPR) equipment.

License Plate Recognition (LPR) technology offers opportunities to improve both parking facility operations and parking regulation enforcement. Fixed mount LPR equipment at garage access points can improve ingress/egress and shorten queuing issues at peak times, while also facilitating programs that monitor “performance,” including tracking utilization during times of peak demand. This equipment could also help prevent parkers from misusing the two-hour free parking period offered in City garages.

In support of a performance-focused enforcement approach, mobile LPR devices can systematically collect “occupancy” data, via plate “reads” in facilities and on blocks where availability is most likely to be constrained. This provides a valuable source of data that can be matched utilization/availability of parking supply.

In the near-term, the City should consider a turnkey solicitation that incorporates operations services and parking technology support that would integrate with their existing SKIDATA equipment, garage security equipment, and provide both mobile and fixed LPR functionality. Ideally, the City would rely upon the same technology provider for both the fixed and mobile LPR solutions, providing the City with a dedicated vendor who would be responsible for the monitoring and upkeep of the equipment. Most importantly, the RFP should require proposers to outline methods for ensuring accurate data delivery and the ability to integrate with all current technologies that the City has deployed, plus future technologies that the City is considering.

Recognizing that there are concerns over the accuracy of mobile LPR technology for use in enforcement activities, it is useful to note that there have been significant improvements with LPR applications in recent years and multiple providers who can be solicited for qualifications and references. Prior to issuance of a formal RFP, the City could consider an RFQ, followed by reference checks with clients who are currently using each vendor’s services.

Upgrade Parking Transaction & Management Software.

Innovations in parking data management solutions can enable detailed, real-time analysis of parking transactions and utilization in support of performance-based management. The data
The services provided by these can provide an in-depth review of historic and current parking demands while predicting future parking occupancies, enabling the City to act on a potential parking demand problem in a specific area before it happens by adjusting rates or regulations both on- and off-street. The City can assume active control of their parking inventory, optimizing their current parking assets and meeting the needs of multiple user groups.

**Quick Win: Upgrade & automate the permit wait list system to ensure efficiency and accuracy.**

The City and their operator should continue working to update the current wait list system to ensure an up-to-date catalog of parkers seeking monthly permits. As the City explores options to adjust rates and issue additional permits, it will be critical to have a dynamic, efficient, and accurate system that relies less on manual checks and direct communication and more on a clearly-defined, automated system of registration, confirmation, and issuance. New transaction and management software can help facilitate these enhancements. A reimbursable fee can be charged to wait list members in order to register and hold a slot, and annual (or semi-annual) updates can ensure that the list is current and permits are being issued to eligible parkers.

**In the near-term,** the City should explore options for contracting services that track parking patterns in real-time across networked on-street meters and off-street payment systems, using algorithms to convert this data into estimates of parking utilization and availability. Such services are relatively new, and often require “spot checks” of actual utilization/availability counts, via manual surveys or through LPR data, to establish and maintain accuracy. Taking the same approach as in the previous section, an initial RFQ for provider services should provide valuable information and references that the City can use to evaluate options leading up to a more formal RFP for a parking data management solution.

Vendors such as Smarking, ParkHub, and Luum offer a variety of services and the City should solicit their existing vendors to identify potential integrated solutions that may be available to them to help support parking data management and broader access and mobility solutions. ParkMobile, for example, has recently established several integrations that may be able to support Birmingham’s efforts, including on- and off-street payments, transit ticketing, pre-paid parking and reservations, valet, fleet vehicle programs, permit management, and charging stations payments. Recent RFQs from the City of Las Vegas and the District of Columbia could also provide insight into Birmingham’s approach to this opportunity.

**Optimize Management & Operations**

Ensure streamlined and coordinated management within the City, while maximizing opportunities related to public and private growth, mobility, and sustainability initiatives.

**Solicit Competitive Bids for Operator Services.**

The City has contracted with SP+ for facility maintenance and operations for its five parking structures since 1991. The service agreement has not been subject to competitive bidding or amendment since the original signing date, while technologies and management needs have changed. Drafting a solicitation for operator services will support new technologies and changing needs of the City and provide an opportunity to build in best practices and needs for current and future initiatives including:

- Customer service benchmarks
- General and specific garage maintenance requirements
- Coordination of parking information with the City and local stakeholders
• Providing advisory services on technology, policy, and parking data
• Collection, invoicing, and depositing of parking revenues
• Ability to monitor and provide service to parking garage equipment
• Permit management tools

In the near-term, City staff should work with the Advisory Parking Committee to evaluate comparable municipal programs that have service and operator agreements for their public facilities to identify best practices and lessons learned. By engaging other municipalities in reviewing their parking operator services, the City will be able to incorporate their own needs in the above key areas with successes and failures from their peers. This will help the City in crafting a comprehensive solicitation which not only incorporates the needs of Birmingham, but also identifies opportunities and services that should be considered, based upon the experiences of similar communities. The comprehensive solicitation should include:

• Support services, including customer service
• Permit management
• PARCS equipment, including integrated counting systems
• Security surveillance systems
• Elevator maintenance
• Preventative and long-term maintenance and cleaning
• LPR – fixed and mobile – including maintenance and warranty
• Data management and reporting solutions
• Valet services
• Way finding & signage
• Real-time information applications for owners and customers

State of the Practice examples of solicitation notices are provided as an appendix to this report.

Establish a Parking Ambassador Program.

Many cities have shifted parking enforcement from police departments to other city or quasi-public agencies whose staff can focus their full attention on improving compliance and customer service. Examples of parking “ambassador” programs in cities like Omaha, NE and Fayetteville, AR place an emphasis on a customer service approach to enforcement. The first priority for these officers is to help visitors find their way and utilize the parking system appropriately, but their authority still allows them to monitor compliance and issue citations.

Quick Win: Rebrand the Birmingham Police Department’s Parking Enforcement Assistant as “Parking Ambassadors” and ensure they have on-going training relative to visitor amenities, parking technologies, policies, and general parking information.

Parking enforcement staff is often the only interaction that visitors have with representatives of the City, so they should be a positive representation for the community. A parking ambassador approach encourages a positive interaction, creating a better image for the City. Parking Ambassadors can be responsible for education and outreach to inform the public about program changes while performing their parking compliance duties.

Long-term, the City should monitor their current approach to parking enforcement, both from a customer service and from a resource/capacity standpoint. Adjustments can be made if Police Department staff would be better utilized on more pressing issues around community safety and well-being, or if repositioning of the parking enforcement “ambassadors” in a different department or partner agency would better align with City and community goals.
Refine the Assessment District Fee Approach.

The current Birmingham Parking Assessment District model relies on periodic fees assessed to property owners in the district to support investments in public parking infrastructure, as needs arise. An alternative model, whereby fees are assessed on a consistent basis, may be more sustainable and politically feasible, while also providing a dependable revenue stream to support these capital investments, as well as potential City partnerships in joint-developments that address downtown’s parking needs.

In the near-term, the City should evaluate the political and economic benefits and drawbacks of a revised approach, featuring a consistently collected assessment that can be set at a modest level. The public relations side of this option cannot be understated, and should focus on the predictability of a normalized assessment as a way to avoid the need for much larger “special” assessments if/when a new parking structure or other significant infrastructure need arises. This may also help reduce resistance to proposed new developments, which may trigger existing property-owner fears of a sudden and significant increase in their assessment liability. It will also make the cost of owning downtown property more predictable, attracting further investment.

Prepare for Future Growth

Develop Park Once zoning strategies.

Birmingham’s zoning code already addresses parking design standards in detail and establishes a progressive set of parking requirements around new development in the downtown area and the Parking Assessment District. A deeper evaluation of the zoning code should be completed in coordination with the City’s upcoming Master Plan process to ensure that parking can be expanded, as needed, to support continued growth in the downtown area, as well as in other mixed-use growth districts.

Focusing on a “Park Once” approach would embrace several of the following objectives and benefits:

- Ensure that public parking supplies can be expanded as needed, to avoid the redundant inefficiencies created by conventional parking requirements.
- Encourage continued growth by offering developers a variety of options to accommodate and/or mitigate the parking demand impacts of their projects.
- Generate mobility improvements and demand-reduction programs to both reduce parking demand and enhance increasingly sought-after multimodal amenities.
- Encourage shared use of existing private parking facilities that were built to meet previous parking requirements.

Elements to include in park-once zoning:

- Incentives to provide shared parking in privately developed parking facilities
- Limits on private, single-use on-site parking
- No limits on shared, on-site parking
- Fee options to exceed limits on private, on-site parking or to waive on-site requirements
- Incentives or requirements to directly provide mobility amenities and/or demand-reduction programs, as appropriate to the scale and use-mix of the project.
A Joint-Development policy that leverages Park Once zoning, and seeks public-private, mixed-use projects as the primary mode of expanding public parking.

In the near-term, the City should evaluate its zoning code to uncover any conflicts between current regulations and the community’s vision for creating walkable, mixed-use districts and should ensure that the Park Once approach to zoning is prioritized in the Master Plan process.

Invest parking revenues in public improvements, beyond parking.

Investing permit and meter revenue in local improvements can reinforce the message that the primary purpose of charging for parking is to manage the system, manage demand, and keep spaces available, not to fill budget gaps. Merchants, in particular, are much more likely to be supportive when they know that increased parking revenues will translate into noticeable public improvements. The primary purpose of the current parking fund – to maintain the parking system and fund expansion as necessary – would remain, while a relatively modest share of revenues would be available for improvements to streetscapes, public spaces, and mobility improvements that can directly reduce future parking expansions.

In the near-term, the City should evaluate potential restrictions on use of Parking System Enterprise Funds for non-parking improvements. If flexibility exists, the City should then pursue the following approach:

- Promote a “benefit district” approach to raise awareness of the local improvements provided by parking revenues.
- Evaluate access and mobility priorities with the Multimodal Transportation Board to determine where investments can address community needs.
- Ensure that benefits include non-driving mobility and commuter-benefit investments that can reduce parking demand (and, thus, performance-based rates).
- Provide annual updates on key investments made with parking revenues within an annual Performance-Based Management Report.

Continue to refine Joint-Development approach.

The pending redevelopment of the N. Old Woodward Garage is a great example of the City pursuing expansion of public parking via joint-development. In cities like Grand Rapids and Ann Arbor, similar approaches have become the default means of expanding parking-system supplies, taking advantage of the cost-sharing and facility-design benefits they offer, as compared to building dedicated parking structures.

As alluded to in the previous section, the City should consider opportunities to invest Parking Assessment revenues in these opportunities as a way of meeting the needs of the public parking supply. Development agreements will need to be explicit about the public improvements and City ownership/control of specific parking assets, in order to ensure that the assessment funds are dispersed as intended and remain invested in a public asset.

In the near-term, the City should continue to pursue the N. Old Woodward & Bates Street redevelopment project with the dual aims of increasing downtown investment and meeting the growing demand for parking within the downtown parking system.

In the long-term, the City should identify additional opportunities for the joint-development approach, including the existing public parking deck locations or public/private properties that are underutilized and could support mixed-use development that incorporates additional public parking supply.
IMMEDIATE ACTION STEPS

The chart on the following page provides a summary of “Immediate Action Steps” that the City and its partners can follow to facilitate direct impacts on the priority areas. They are organized into the following five (5) areas:

- Update Permit System, Rates, & Sales
- Implement Performance-Based On-Street Pricing
- Expand Effective Capacity of Existing Supply
- Improve Parking Experience and Information
- Improve Internal Organization

A comprehensive Implementation Guide is provided as an appendix to this report and summarizes the “Quick Wins” and near-term actions outlined in the previous section.
## IMMEDIATE ACTION STEPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Key Action Steps</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Target Outcomes</th>
<th>Other Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Update Permit System, Rates, & Sales** | • Upgrade and automate the permit wait list system.  
• Solicit contractor service for tracking parking use and integrating with management systems.  
• Offer permits to the first 10 people on the wait list for the Pierce and Peabody garages.  
• Increase the Chester, Park, and N. Old Woodward permit rates by $10.  
• Offer discounted and “flex” permit rates for carpools and vanpools and occasional parkers.  
• Monitor utilization, issue more permits every 3 months, and further adjust rates as needed. | • City of Birmingham  
  - City Manager  
  - City Commission  
  - Advisory Parking Committee  
  - SP+  
  - Employers | • Accurate, real-time permit & utilization data  
• More permits sold / smaller permit wait list  
• Reduced gap between permit and daily parking rates  
• Increased permit revenue  
• Greater non-drive-alone mode share | • Adjustments to pricing should be made in line with issuance of new permits.  
• Consider long-term target rates and phasing plan to approach new rate structure.  
• Communicate and promote objectives and opportunities with a clear communication plan. |
| **Implement Performance-Based On-Street Pricing** | • Adopt a policy linking parking rates to demand and establish availability as the KPI.  
• Establish a third pricing tier and “premium rate” area to shift parking activity.  
• Make some currently-metered spaces free during hours when capacity is constrained.  
• Activate meter sensors to assist with enforcement and data collection efforts.  
• Monitor utilization to establish a solid base of data to inform policies and adjustments. | • City of Birmingham  
  - City Manager  
  - Police Department  
  - City Commission  
  - Advisory Parking Committee  
  - Birmingham Shopping District  
  - CivicSmart | • Consistent, dependable on-street availability  
• More even distribution of peak hour utilization  
• Greater utilization of remote on-street spaces  
• Improved enforcement of on-street regulations  
• Accurate, real-time utilization data | • Communicate and promote objectives and opportunities with a clear sign & communication plan.  
• Monitor equipment accuracy with regular manual checks. |
| **Expand Effective Capacity of Existing Supply** | • Institute an employee permit program in residential permit parking zones.  
• Provide a discrete number of permits for use on under-utilized metered blocks.  
• Examine on-street permit options on blocks that are not currently metered or restricted.  
• Reduce the number of spaces held for short-term parkers in select garages.  
• Optimize the rooftop and on-street valet services with mobile function & improved locations. | • City of Birmingham  
  - City Manager  
  - Police Department  
  - City Commission  
  - Advisory Parking Committee  
  - Birmingham Shopping District  
  - SP+  
  - In-House Valet | • More permits sold / smaller permit wait list  
• Greater utilization of remote on-street spaces  
• Increased permit revenue  
• Greater utilization of commuter valet program  
• Improved valet program customer satisfaction | • Communication with adjacent property owners and permit holders will be key.  
• Enforcement will be critical to success.  
• Valet program costs and revenues should balance for a sustainable program.  
• Valet locations must weigh options for convenience, circulation, and other needs. |
| **Improve Parking Experience and Information** | • Implement a comprehensive communication plan to help drivers find right-fit parking.  
• Develop signage to reflect parking options in support of the performance-based approach.  
• Create a “welcome” package for new and existing employees to outline options & benefits.  
• Focus “Parking Ambassadors” on customer approach to parking and access services.  
• Add mobile functionality to the valet parking service for both customer and operator use.  
• Add mobile payment option to parking garages and expand promotion of E/FN cards. | • City of Birmingham  
  - City Manager  
  - Police Department  
  - City Commission  
  - Advisory Parking Committee  
  - Birmingham Shopping District  
  - SP+  
  - In-House Valet  
  - SKIDATA/Parkmobile | • User-friendly parking system with ample, clear parking options  
• Increased adoption of commuter benefits  
• Better understanding of valet program use and function.  
• Reduced queuing and service calls at garages  
• Improved parking system customer satisfaction | • Collaborate with strategic partners to inform & market parking system changes.  
• Look for opportunities to develop a “suite” of options that address parking & access.  
• Consider shifting parking enforcement to non-Police Department staff. |
| **Improve Internal Organization** | • Develop a comprehensive Operator solicitation that incorporates current City needs and opportunities for new or expanded services that meet City goals.  
• Evaluate the City’s zoning code in line with the upcoming Master Plan update to uncover any conflicts between park once strategies and existing regulations.  
• Begin a discussion of a revised Assessment District approach. | • City of Birmingham  
  - City Manager  
  - Planning Department  
  - City Commission  
  - Advisory Parking Committee | • Clear, current, comprehensive Operator agreement  
• Zoning code aligned with parking, mobility, access and development goals  
• Sustainable, defendable assessment model that provides consistent system revenue  
• Reference comparable municipal parking programs, operator agreements, and RFPs.  
• Weigh options that support continued development and access & parking needs.  
• Consider both economic and community/political benefits of a refined approach. |
LONG-TERM CONSIDERATIONS

While the above recommendations focus on opportunities for near-term implementation, the City and its partners should keep the following considerations in mind as the downtown area and other nearby mixed-use districts continue their growth.

Create a shared parking brokerage.

Recognizing that the opportunities are currently limited, Birmingham and its partners can look for opportunities to develop a shared parking brokerage that includes both public and private facilities. Once pay-by-phone options have been established in downtown parking garages, the brokerage concept can provide opportunities to both expand the effective capacity of the entire downtown parking supply and to increase revenues for owners of parking supplies that are regularly under-utilized. The City, or another coordinating entity, would create a sense of cohesion and authenticity among the shared facilities that does not currently exist, increasing the legibility of the system as a whole and improving the user experience for the general public.

Monitor Emerging Mobility options and impacts on local access issues.

Birmingham should continue to monitor emerging mobility options, including shared ride, electric, and autonomous vehicles, plus services provided by a growing number of transportation network companies (TNCs). As the alternatives to single-occupant-vehicle trips develop or mature, they could offer options that downtown commuters, residents, or visitors would support for some portion of trips. The impacts could include reduced demand for parking spaces (if personal vehicle ownership or use declines) or different kinds of parking spaces (for electric vehicles or for pick-up/drop-off by TNCs) that might warrant a shift in how Birmingham’s downtown parking system is managed.

Develop TDM standards for downtown development.

In line with Birmingham’s effort to evaluate its zoning code and consider modifications to the Assessment District model, the City should evaluate the potential to establish requirements and/or incentives to include transportation demand management (TDM) strategies in downtown development projects. These can address growing concerns about the increasing demand on shared parking resources with lower cost interventions that focus on shifting travel behaviors. Examples include the following:

- Unbundled parking (parking is an optional cost for tenants who store a vehicle on-site)
- Car-share vehicles and/or parking
- Provision of shared bicycles or sponsorship of existing bike share programs
- Contribution to other shared mobility services, such as a downtown circulator
- Showers, lockers, and changing facilities for bicycle commuters (in commercial facilities)
- Transit pass benefits for residents or employees

Continue to improve and promote active transportation options.

As outlined in the Potential Strategies Overview, the City should continue to build on its successful efforts to promote a walkable, bikeable downtown. These include improvements to the pedestrian and bicycle network in line with roadway reconstruction projects and extend to efforts that connect downtown to the surrounding neighborhoods and broader region. The City should continue its work with the Multi-modal Transportation Board and other local and regional agencies to implement the recommendations of the 2013 Multi-modal Transportation Plan.
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1 INTRODUCTION

DOWNTOWN CONTEXT

The City of Birmingham has successfully positioned its Central Business District to attract investment in a highly competitive environment. The City has prioritized good design, smart use of land, and efficient coordination of infrastructure investments to foster a dense, walkable, mixed-use downtown. A major component of this is a comprehensive, self-funded, and strategically-managed public parking system that emphasizes shared-use efficiencies to reduce the amount of parking infrastructure required to keep downtown thriving.

Downtown Birmingham features a dynamic mix of housing, office space, retail, dining, entertainment, and civic attractions and amenities. It has a daytime population of almost 14,000. Approximately 300 unique national and local retail businesses operate among more than 1.5 million square feet of retail space and 2 million square feet of office space. Major employers include Google, McCann World Group, Clark Hill law firm, Munder Capital Management, and numerous other law, financial, architectural, and advertising firms. Birmingham’s nightlife and entertainment boasts nearly 50 restaurants and 20 movie screens at two theaters.

This kind of success invariably brings challenges, particularly regarding parking and transportation. With more than 300,000 square feet of mixed-use development either under construction or near ground-breaking, it is critical that the City continue to effectively allocate resources – including an effective parking network – to serve existing and future downtown stakeholders.

THE PARKING SYSTEM

Birmingham’s downtown parking system consists of roughly 4,944 publicly-owned spaces, of which 3,423 are contained in five (5) public parking structures, 1,272 are metered, on-street, and 391 are contained in five (5) surface parking lots. Two private, independently run, parking structures are also located in the CBD and additional private parking lots are used by the City on a temporary basis to expand supply and meet pressing demand from permit parkers.

The parking structures are operated by SP+, with oversight by the City Manager’s Office. On-street parking meters are managed and enforced by the Birmingham Police Department. The overall system is overseen by the City Manager’s Office, while a 9-member Advisory Parking Committee meets regularly to address parking issues and make recommendations to the City Commission.

The City system is financed through an Enterprise Fund, which captures all parking revenue, with the exception of citation revenues, which go to the City’s General Fund. The Enterprise Fund provides for cost recovery for day-to-day expenses, such as maintenance and operations, as well as capital investments that benefit the system on a long-term basis. Recent upgrades to system infrastructure include new traffic control equipment and Smart Meters throughout the CBD, which provide more payment options, real-time information, and operational efficiencies for both users and the City. New gate technology and signage have been added at all City garages to assist with real-time information and ease of ingress/egress.
Parking demand has been steadily increasing, particularly for long-term/monthly parking, largely due to increased demand from downtown employers and employees and a growing number of mixed-use developments that have added more built space to the downtown market. The recent trend in “open office” workspace configurations, which situate more employees in less building space, has accelerated the increase in parking demand at a pace that has exceeded the provision of new places to park. To manage this increased demand, the City has invested in public valet services, leased private facilities to manage a public parking, and initiated a real-time information system to direct drivers to available parking options. The City has also adjusted permit and meter rates and is continually evaluating the technology, operations, and regulations in the parking system to ensure optimal system function and user experience.
2 EXISTING CONDITIONS

PARKING SUPPLY

Birmingham's downtown parking system consists of roughly 4,944 publicly-owned spaces, of which 3,423 are contained in five (5) public parking structures, 1,272 are metered, on-street, and 391 are contained in five (5) surface parking lots.

Figure 1 Downtown Parking Supply
**On-Street**

On-street parking is the primary function of the curb lane on most downtown streets, and most of this parking is metered. In total, there are more than 1,200 metered on-street spaces downtown, of which nearly half are found along Old Woodward Avenue.

**Regulation and Rates**

Two-thirds of on-street spaces have an hourly fee of $1.50, with the remaining spaces priced at $1/hour. Over 75% all of the spaces have a time limit of one to two hours. Concentrated around the periphery of the CBD, 12% of spaces allow 4-hour parking, and another 12% of spaces allow for 12-hour parking.

![Figure 2: On-Street Spaces by Hourly Fee and Time Limit (non-ADA)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hourly Fee</th>
<th># of Spaces</th>
<th>Share</th>
<th>Time Limit (hours)</th>
<th># of Spaces</th>
<th>Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 3: On-Street Metered Space Hours and Pricing](image)
**Off-Street**

Five parking garages serve downtown Birmingham. At each, nearly half of the available spaces are set aside for hourly/daily parking, and the other half for permit parking. Chester is the largest, with a capacity of 880 spaces, while the Park and Pierce garages each have a capacity in the range of 700-800 spaces. The N. Old Woodward garage has nearly 600 spaces, plus another 156 spaces in an adjacent surface lot. The Peabody garage is the smallest garage in the system, with nearly 450 spaces. Collectively, the downtown garages provide just over 3,400 spaces.

Garage management and regulations generally seek to accommodate permit parkers on the upper levels, allowing for short-term, visitor parking on the lower levels. This is achieved by striping and signing transient parking spaces on the lower levels with white lines and the monthly parking spaces on the upper levels with yellow lines. Prior to a change made in summer 2018, transient spaces were restricted between the hours of 7 – 10 a.m. to discourage all-day parkers from filling the spaces before most retailers open. In line with the adjustments made during the Old Woodward construction project, the transient space restriction has shifted to a time limit of 3 hours, rather than a time of day restriction.

Free, 2-hour parking is promoted heavily through Birmingham Shopping District marketing materials and signage throughout downtown, with a goal of freeing up high-turnover on-street spaces and lowering the perception of a lack of available parking for downtown visitors.

The parking system also includes five surface parking lots, containing roughly 391 spaces, a little over half of which are managed as permit parking. The table on the following page provides a summary of these off-street facilities and their respective parking capacities.
### Figure 4 Capacity of Parking System Garages and Surface Lots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th># of Spaces</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hourly/Daily</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce Garage</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>336</td>
<td></td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Garage</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>463</td>
<td></td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Garage</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Old Woodward Garage</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Garage</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>510</td>
<td></td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Garages</strong></td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lots</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Old Woodward Lot</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 6 Regular &amp; Economy*</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Lots</strong></td>
<td>275</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Off-Street</strong></td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lot 6 is metered and allows for both transient and permit parkers, with 62 spaces reserved for short-term parkers. Lot 6 permit-holders may also park at nearby on-street meters.

### Regulation and Rates

Monthly permits are available for all off-street parking facilities, except the N. Old Woodward Lot. Permit rates were raised by the Advisory Parking Committee in July 2016, as the third in a series of graduated increases, dating to summer 2014, intended to bring rates closer to industry-standard/peer-city norms. An evening-only Monthly Permit is also available at a discounted rate and is targeted toward service-sector employees. These permits are $20 less than the standard rates, allow for parking after 4:00 p.m., and require exit prior to the next regular business day. Approximately 100 permit holders currently take advantage of the discounted rates.

Current permit rates for each are listed in the table on the following page.
Figure 5  Monthly (permit) Parking Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Monthly Permit Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pierce Garage</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Garage</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Garage</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Old Woodward Garage</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Garage</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 6 Regular</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 6 Economy</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot D</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City also provides hourly and daily parking rates at its garages, as follows.

- Less than 2 hours – Free
- Less than 3 hours – $2
- Less than 4 hours – $4
- Less than 5 hours – $6
- Less than 6 hours – $8
- More than 6 hours – $10

Adjustments for Old Woodward Construction Period

To mitigate the impacts of the 4-month Old Woodward Avenue reconstruction project, the City has initiated multiple measures to increase the availability of short-term/transient parking in its garages. By providing a rooftop valet assist for permit parkers and re-signing the lower levels (white-lined spaces) to allow for up to 3 hours of parking, these strategies will lead to additional capacity of up to 250 spaces across the five garages. In addition, the existing offering of free parking on Sundays has been extended to Saturdays as well. The changes will be monitored and evaluated for effectiveness throughout the construction period.

PARKING SYSTEM UTILIZATION

Data Collection

Assessing peak-hour utilization levels and patterns provides a means of determining the capacity of the downtown parking supply, as described above, to meet parking demand throughout a typical week. To this end, parking garage occupancy data was collected from the City’s operator for multiple periods throughout the year. Lacking available data for on-street occupancy, our team conducted field surveys to document occupancy conditions, at the blockface level, across the study area. These counts were conducted on Wednesday, March 21, 2018. Counts were completed every two hours, between Noon and 8 p.m. Key Findings include the following:
On-Street

- At any time of day, at least half of the metered block segments are underutilized (<70%).
- Usage is generally heaviest within a 1-2 block radius of Maple Road’s intersections with Old Woodward Avenue and Pierce Street at all times of the day.
- During the lunch period, many block segments within a 1-2 block radius of Maple Road’s intersections with Old Woodward Avenue and Pierce Street are at or near capacity.
- Utilization is generally consistently high on Old Woodward Avenue, between Vinewood Avenue and Oakland Avenue, though usage on several individual segments along this stretch fluctuate throughout the day.
- South of Maple Street, Old Woodward Avenue is most popular during the evening hours, but most segments are underutilized for most of the day.
- Outside of the most heavily used block segments, the utilization of nearly all of the remaining block segments remains below 70% at all times.
- As a whole, the downtown on-street system peaks at 68% during the lunch period (12pm-2pm) and remains between 57%-62% between 2pm and 8pm.

Off-Street

- During the peak lunch period, each of the City’s five garages exceeds 90% utilization.
- The Park and Chester garages are at or near capacity (over 95% utilization) during the peak lunch period.
- The total number of parkers in the 5 garages skews in favor of non-permitted parkers, at roughly 57% of the total.
- Of these parkers, 26% are staying between 5-12 hours (31% of the total for that duration), hinting at the number of commuters parking in the garages without monthly permits.
- The Chester garage is most heavily used by commuters and monthly permit holders, with the vast majority (73%) of users staying between 5-12 hours.
- Peabody and Pierce are used most heavily by short-term parkers, staying between 1-4 hours, but still have a sizable portion (34%) of parkers staying between 5-12 hours.
- Park and N. Old Woodward experience an even distribution of short stay (1-4 hour) and all-day (5-12 hour) parkers.

Parking system utilization is illustrated and further detailed in the figures on the following pages.
Figure 7  Parking System Utilization – Wednesday, 2pm-4pm

PARKING OCCUPANCY
WEDNESDAY 2PM-4PM

- < 70%
- 70 - 85%
- 85 - 95%
- 95% +
- NO DATA

DATA COLLECTED JANUARY – JULY 2018
DATA SOURCES: CITY OF BIRMINGHAM, SP, FIELD SURVEY
Figure 8  Parking System Utilization – Wednesday, 4pm-6pm

PARKING OCCUPANCY
WEDNESDAY 4PM-6PM

- < 70%
- 70 - 85%
- 85 - 95%
- 95% +
- NO DATA

DATA COLLECTED JANUARY - JULY 2008
DATA SOURCES: CITY OF BIRMINGHAM, SP+ FIELD SURVEY
Figure 9  Parking System Utilization – Wednesday, 6pm-8pm
Garage Utilization by User Type and Duration

The following tables and charts present additional detail on parking activity within the City’s garages, comparing occupancy by user type and duration of stay. This data represents user patterns throughout the entire month of January 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 10</th>
<th>Chester Activity by User Type</th>
<th>Figure 11</th>
<th>Park Activity by User Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 hr</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hrs</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 hrs</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 hrs</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-12 hrs</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13+ hrs</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 12</th>
<th>Peabody Activity by User Type</th>
<th>Figure 13</th>
<th>Pierce Activity by User Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 hr</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hrs</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 hrs</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 hrs</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-12 hrs</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-24 hrs</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 14</th>
<th>N. Old Woodward Activity by User Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 hr</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hrs</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 hrs</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 hrs</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-12 hrs</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-24 hrs</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 15  Duration of Stay at Birmingham Parking Garages
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Key Considerations

The significant share of 5+ hour parking activity that is linked to non-permit-holders (roughly 30% at all five garages) may indicate just how common it is for employees to use validation or pay the full-day rate in lieu of a monthly permit.

- Based on community feedback, this is believed to be very common among downtown employees who are on the permit wait list.
- These parkers (or their employers) are paying a higher daily rate to park than permit-holders, suggesting acceptance of higher permit rates than those currently offered.
- Providing more permits will not likely result in higher utilization levels (or reduced availability) if such permits are provided to commuters who are already using these garages for full day parking.
- These are important factors in determining the appropriate “oversell” rate for permits.

MANAGEMENT, OPERATIONS, & TECHNOLOGIES

Overview

Oversight for the Birmingham Parking System is split between the City Manager’s Office, which is responsible for the off-street decks and lots, and the Police Department, which is responsible for management of the on-street parking system. The City Manager’s Office manages the contract for SP+, who provides day-to-day management and operations services for the City’s garages and off-street lots. These departments and their contractors report to the Advisory Parking Committee, the City Manager’s office, and the City Commission.

The parking system is financed through an Enterprise Fund, which provides for cost recovery of expenses that benefit the system on a long-term basis. These funds are used to pay for day-to-day maintenance & operation of the parking system, as well as capital investments, such as new machinery and equipment.

On-Street Parking

Meters

Smart parking meters are in place for all metered, on-street spaces downtown. In January 2017, the City of Birmingham contracted with CivicSmart for the installation of new Liberty smart meters. The installation of the 1,195 single space meters and 77 dedicated ADA accessible meters was completed at the end of June 2017.

The meters accept payment by US coin, credit/debit card, and are also integrated with a mobile payment option through Parkmobile. Payments made using Parkmobile are displayed on the CivicSmart meters and reflect the paid parking time on the meter display. All meters include a 10-minute grace period that extends the displayed time beyond the expiration time. Payments can be extended
using Parkmobile as long as the posted time limit has not been exceeded. The distribution of
meter payments currently includes 45% coin payments, 30% credit card payments, and 25%
Parkmobile payments. This compares to a 70% coin and 30% Parkmobile split prior to upgrade of
the smart meters to accept credit card payments.

Concurrent with the meter upgrades, rates were increased for the first time in more than 20 years.

**Enforcement**

Each CivicSmart parking meter is equipped with decals indicating the hours of enforcement,
maximum time limit, credit card use instructions, Parkmobile zone information, and meter
feeding restriction. Rates are displayed on the meter screen along with payment instructions. The
ADA-accessible meters are identified with blue domes and housings, plus adjacent signage and
blue pavement parkings to clearly indicate that the space is dedicated for disabled parking.

Parking enforcement is overseen by the Birmingham Police Department, who monitors
compliance with a staff of Parking Enforcement Assistants (PEAs). The PEAs cover the
downtown area, but do not have set routes, while Birmingham Police Officers manage complaint-
response enforcement in the absence of on-duty PEAs. Currently, there are five PEAs – 1 full-time
employee and 4 part-time employees. Enforcement schedules cover Monday through Saturday
between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. PEAs are equipped with handhelds that print
citations on the spot. The handhelds are also integrated, in real-time, to show meter and
Parkmobile payments.

**Figure 17  Parking Enforcement Offenses and Fines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Offenses &amp; Fines</th>
<th>If paid before 10 days</th>
<th>If paid after 10 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expired meter: first seven offenses in calendar year</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expired meter: eight offenses or more in calendar year</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime in non-metered zone</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime in a time zone: less than 2 hours</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime in a time zone: 2 hours or longer</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopping, standing or parking where prohibited</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking over the meter line</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back into parking lot space</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys in ignition or ignition unlocked</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other illegal parking</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No parking here to corner</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap zone</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of snow emergency parking ordinance</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal parking in permit area</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal parking on private property</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PEA daily responsibilities include enforcement of:

- All parking meters
- Metered and non-metered time zones
- Permit parking
- All-day parkers
- Radio calls for parking violation complaints
- Time zones which should be enforced on a regular basis
- Impounding vehicles for unpaid parking tickets

Violators have 10 days to pay or contest a parking citation before the fine escalates. Those wishing to contest a citation can submit the information on the back of the citation to request a court date. Vehicles with 6 unpaid citations and past 10 days due are eligible for towing. The City does not have a booting program. Parking Enforcement Assistants confirm a vehicle’s citation payment status with the Treasury Department before requesting a tow truck. If the vehicle owner provides payment on the outstanding citations before the vehicle is towed, the tow will be cancelled.

**Meter Collections**

Meter collections and enforcement are managed by the Birmingham Police Department – Services Division. PEAs and meter collection staff provide information to the public, ensure compliance of parking regulations, and provide daily maintenance of parking meters to keep them in working order.

**Vehicle Detection Sensors**

Sensors have been installed at all Birmingham single space parking meters but the meter reset or “zero out” feature is not currently active. The meters have the ability to reset back to zero after a vehicle leaves a parking space if time remains on the meter. Until the vendor can prove accuracy, the sensors are collecting data that is compiled and verified by CivicSmart and City staff to ensure 100% accuracy before going “live” with the zero out feature. Sensors can also be used to communicate space availability to drivers, improve time zone enforcement, and provide an anti-feed function to facilitate turnover.

**Public Valet**

Valet options are provided on downtown streets in the shopping district, as well as in the City-owned parking garages. The on-street valet is provided, year-round, by the Birmingham Shopping District and expands to multiple locations during peak holiday periods. During the Old Woodward construction project, the City has installed four valet parking stands around the construction zone to account for the reduced access to downtown businesses. The service provides two hours of free parking, Monday – Saturday, with stations averaging nearly 400 uses per week.

**Residential Permit Parking**

To mitigate against potential “spillover” impacts of CBD parkers on downtown residential streets, the City has developed a residential permit parking (RPP) program. Permits are available to households within a RPP zone for $8.00 per household and expire every two years.

Residential permit parking is enforced through PEA and Police Officer observations, largely led by resident complaints, due to lack of capacity to proactively patrol these zones. From May 2017 – April 2018, the Police Department received 115 complaints of non-permitted vehicles in RPP zones. PEAs and Police Officers issued 601 citations for parking permit violations during this
same period. With parking enforcement priority going to paid parking areas within the Central Business District, compliance in RPP areas can be inconsistent. Anecdotal reports indicate that compliance is a significant issue, however, as the cost of permits and the lengthy permit waiting list have led to regular use of RPP zones by commuters and others who do not have a place to park or who are not willing or able to pay the existing meter or garage rates.

The locations of the RPP zones and areas with high incidence of violations are illustrated in the following figures. Notably, Henrietta Street has nearly as many violations as the others combined.

---

**Figure 18** Residential Permit Parking Zones  
**Figure 19** Streets with Most RPP violations

---

**Off-Street Parking**

The City of Birmingham contracts with SP+ to operate and maintain its five parking garages. SP+ is responsible for managing the SKIDATA parking access and revenue control system (PARCS) equipment and financial reporting, management of the garage permits and waitlists, general garage maintenance and upkeep, and enforcement and monitoring of vehicles parked in the garages. SP+ uses 7 full-time office staff, 2 full-time field supervisors, 1 part-time field supervisor, 7 full-time maintenance staff, 6 part-time maintenance/ambassador staff, 2 full-time enforcement personnel, and 4 part-time valet staff to meet its contracted commitments. The garages are staffed 24 hours a day by SP+ staff, Monday through Saturday, with public office hours between 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Birmingham installed the SKIDATA PARCS equipment in the City’s five garages between 2016-17, allowing for cashless entry and exit. The equipment configuration relies upon use of a permit, credit card, or IN Card – a pre-loaded payment card – upon both entrance and exit. The IN Card can be purchased for $10.00, and then loaded with amounts of $25, $50, $100, or $200. It can
also be purchased with a zero-dollar balance for visitors who typically park within the free 2 hour limit. Permit holders have proximity access cards for entry and exit. There are no tickets printed and no cash is accepted, visitors must use the card in/out feature to utilize the City’s garages.

**Rooftop Valet**

The City, in conjunction with SP+, established a rooftop valet program at the N. Old Woodward Parking Structure to address weekday capacity issues. The valet service operates from about 9:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. and is variably offered in three additional garages. Drivers who cannot find a space on lower levels can turn their cars over to the valet at no additional cost. There is currently low utilization of the valet service. During the Old Woodward construction project, the City has added a more consistent (and mandatory) rooftop valet in four of the five garages to add capacity and accommodate additional demand. Evaluation of that service is ongoing.

**Permit Waitlists**

Demand for downtown employee parking within the Central Business District has exceeded the number of permits available in all five parking structures. Individuals can be on multiple waitlists and, as of February 2018, the number of unique waitlist requests exceeded 3,100. The average wait for a garage permit is over two years.

**Figure 20 Parking Permits and Waitlist Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pierce</th>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Peabody</th>
<th>Woodward</th>
<th>Chester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of Spaces</strong></td>
<td>706</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Monthly Permits Allocated</strong></td>
<td>550</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current # of Active Permits</strong></td>
<td>550</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Vehicles on the Waitlist</strong></td>
<td>946</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average # of weeks on Waitlist</strong></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Validation**

Parking validation has been offered in Birmingham for more than 10 years. The City recently added more validation options, including use of a pre-loaded INCard, validation cards, or through validation accounts set up by employers. The validation cards, which look like a monthly pass, are used for large validation accounts and regularly account for more than 200 parkers per day across the five City garages.

**Compliance & Enforcement**

SP+ is responsible for enforcement in all City garages. Their enforcement staff are equipped with handheld enforcement devices that are used to issue warning notices. When a violation needs to be escalated to a parking citation, SP+ requests a City Parking Enforcement Assistant to write the citation. In cases of repeated permit abuse, SP+ has the ability to revoke a permit.

**Financial Revenues and Reconciliations**

Birmingham’s Parking System revenues include monthly permits, transient parking fees, on-street meter collections, and parking-related charges. Expenses include personnel & operating
costs, supplies, capital costs, and depreciation. Actual budget figures from FY 2015-16 show revenues of $5.42 million with expenses totaling $4.57 million. Projected figures from FY 206-17 were for $6.69 million in revenues and $6.67 million in expenses, due primarily to increased charges for services and increased capital outlays. The approved 2017-18 budget includes $8.11 million in revenues and $5.59 in expenses. Excess revenues are kept within the Parking System Enterprise Fund and are used to pay for system improvements, such as capital investments in technology, equipment, and facilities.

**Garages**

Revenues generated from the City’s 5 parking decks represent 70% of the total budgeted Parking System revenue, or roughly $5.7 million for the budgeted 2017-18 fiscal year. This includes parking permits, validation accounts, and hourly rate revenues from transient parkers.

**Meters**

Surface lots and street meters account for 28% of the total budgeted Parking System revenue, or roughly $2.3 million for the budgeted 2017-18 fiscal year. This includes payments by coin, credit card, and Parkmobile.

**Fines**

Parking citation revenue for the 2016-2017 fiscal year totaled $537,371.93 with an expected increase for 2017-2018 due to a new collections agency contract with Universal Fidelity. In March, approximately $54,000 in unpaid parking citations were billed out by the City’s Treasury office from the 2016 calendar year. Only about 5% of 2017 citations were sent to the City’s collection agency for past due payments. Over 90% of all citations are paid by mail, in-person, by drop box, or online through Certified Payments. Citation revenues go into the City’s General Fund, not the Parking System Enterprise Fund.

**Controls and Processing**

Financial reconciliation with Parkmobile and SKIDATA is completed by the City’s Treasury Department, while the Duncan meter management system access has been provided to the Birmingham Police Department. Credit card processing is provided by Heartland, at a $0.12 flat transaction rate plus interchange. Chargeback requests are rare. SP+ provides the City Treasury with monthly garage revenue and expense reports, including a detailed utilization and revenue report from SKIDATA.

**Financial Outlook**

The Parking System budget for 2017-2018 is estimated based on the current year revenue projections. Parking fee revenue is budgeted to increase approximately 20% over the prior year as a result of increases to monthly parking fees and meter rates. The Parking System’s Enterprise Fund had a net position of $28.6 million at the end of FY 2015-16, which is expected to grow to $35.7 million by the end of FY 2017-18.
SIGNAGE & WAYFINDING

Directional Signage

Birmingham’s parking signage and wayfinding program consists of a series of small, standard signs along the public right of way, extending for 2-3 blocks around each public parking deck. Additional shopping district banners are posted throughout downtown to promote the 2 hours of free parking in the parking decks, as well as seasonal events. The result is a simple system that can help visitors who are familiar with downtown Birmingham find a public garage. While for the most part efficient and effective, the system suffers from a variety of deficiencies, which are outlined below. Opportunities for updates and enhancements will be discussed further during the later stages of the plan process.

Facility Signage

Primary signage at the entrances to Birmingham’s parking decks consists of a large “PARK” sign, followed by the name of the structure. These signs are illuminated at night and are accompanied by additional signs that communicate real-time availability, connected to a parking “widget” available on the City’s website. The exception to this style is the N. Old Woodward Garage, which features more modern exterior signage. Additional free-standing gate signage details parking rates and regulations. Signage on the interior of the garages provides directional information and identification of which spaces are to be used by transient or monthly parkers. Additional signs include downtown maps and “iconic” identification signs near the elevators/stairs.
Curbside Signage

Curbside regulatory signage is uniformly applied throughout downtown Birmingham. Signs demarcate no parking areas, loading zones, and ADA parking spaces and are accompanied by curb and surface striping. Metered space information and regulations are contained on the parking meters themselves. Temporary signage is used to identify valet and construction zones, as appropriate. Around the periphery of the CBD, curbside signs identify non-metered parking zone regulations and residential parking permit zones.

Figure 23  Curbside Signage

Issues/Challenges

Key findings include the following:

- Parking directional signage does not extend more than 2-3 blocks beyond a given structure, leaving unfamiliar visitors without essential clues or “confidence markers” to let them know that they are heading in the right direction.
- Current signage does not identify which garage or destinations it is directing to. This may lead a driver to a garage that is not ideally suited for their destination.
- Parking directional signage lacks visibility due to its muted green colors (see Figure 22). This coloring blends into the surrounding light poles, traffic posts, and trees, instead of standing out for moving drivers to see.
- Existing parking wayfinding signs lack a cohesive, downtown-wide theme (see Figure 23). The fonts, styles, and colors vary between sign types.
Neither sidewalk, nor facility signage include pedestrian-friendly directories or information, which help to guide patrons from parking garages to destinations.

- Facility and interior signs are old, faded, and often contain outdated or inaccurate information.
- Temporary facility and valet signage being used during Old Woodward Ave. reconstruction should be evaluated for use beyond the construction period.
- Curbside signs for loading zones include no information on time-of-day restrictions.
- Signage locations and positioning may change following the construction on Old Woodward Ave. and subsequent planning efforts that look at conditions beyond the CBD.

Figure 24  Signage Blends in with Surroundings

Figure 25  Lack of Sign Family Cohesion
3 ANTICIPATED PARKING CONDITION CHANGES

Following is a summary of expected changes to the parking supply and demand conditions outlined above. It is based on information provided by the City on:

- Expected development
- City plans to expand supplies

EXPECTED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Downtown Birmingham is expected to see over 300,000 sq. ft. in new development in the near future. These developments include lodging/hospitality, residential, and mixed-use commercial buildings. A summary of these known developments is provided below, including a description of uses and parking requirements, which are significantly impacted by location inside or outside of the Parking Assessment District. Developments include the following:

- A 49,625 sq. ft. residential development at 369 N. Old Woodward
- A 106,500 sq. ft. residential development at 856 N. Old Woodward
- A 25,182 sq. ft. hotel development at 298 S. Old Woodward
- A 114,500 sq. ft. office and residential development at 34965 Woodward
- A 27,000 sq. ft. mixed-use development at 277 Pierce Street

369 N. Old Woodward: Brookside
Outside Parking Assessment District

1st Floor: 6,900 sq. ft retail

2nd – 5th Floors: 29 residential units

Parking Requirements:

- Residential: 57 spaces
- Commercial: 23 spaces
- Total Required: 80
- Total Planned: 80 on-site, 6 on-street

---

1 Brookside was added to the Parking Assessment District during the approval process, but is still providing the requisite number of parking spaces.
856 N. Old Woodward: The Pearl
Outside Parking Assessment District
1st Floor: 4,500 sf retail
2nd – 4th Floors: 26 residential units
Parking Requirements:
- Residential: 52 spaces
- Commercial: 12 spaces
- Total Required: 64
- Total Planned: 71 on-site, 6 on-street

298 S. Old Woodward: Daxton Hotel
Inside Parking Assessment District
1st Floor: 15,411 sf commercial & hospitality
2nd – 4th Floors: 126 Hotel rooms
5th Floor: 17 residential units
Parking Requirements:
- Residential: 21 spaces
- Hotel, Restaurant, Banquet: Exempt
- Total Required: 21 spaces
- Total Planned: 74 on-site + valet

34965 Woodward: Peabody Building
Inside Parking Assessment District
1st Floor: 14,855 sf retail/office
2nd – 4th Floors: 62,890 sf office/commercial
5th Floor: 10 residential units
Parking Requirements:
- Residential: 15 spaces
- Retail/Office: Exempt
- Total Required: 15 spaces
- Total Planned: 90 on-site + 11 on-street
277 Pierce Street
Inside Parking Assessment District
1st Floor: 2,867 sf retail
2nd – 4th Floors: 11,400 sf office
5th Floor: 1 residential unit
**Parking Requirements:**
- Residential: 2 spaces
- Retail/Office: Exempt
- Total Required: 2 spaces
- Total Planned: 2 spaces on-site

**Land Use Summary**

In total, these projects are expected to add more than 80 housing units, 37,000 square feet of ground floor retail/commercial space, 126 hotel rooms, and 80,000 square feet of office space.

**Figure 26  Expected Development - Land Use Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Residential Units</th>
<th>Hotel Units</th>
<th>Retail SF</th>
<th>Commercial SF</th>
<th>Food/Bev SF</th>
<th>Office SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>369 N. Old Woodward</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>856 N. Old Woodward</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 S. Old Woodward</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,706</td>
<td>7,706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34965 Woodward</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277 Pierce Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>21,695</td>
<td>7,706</td>
<td>7,706</td>
<td>81,718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projected Parking Demand**

To make a quick, baseline projection of parking demand, we entered these summary measures into our proprietary shared-parking model, which was developed as a refinement of the Urban Land Institute (ULI) industry-standard shared-parking model to reflect impacts of walkable-urban development contexts. Like the ULI model, ours assumes that most to all parking demand generated by the added land uses would be accommodated within a shared parking supply. Our model outputs suggest a parking demand peak of 391 spaces, in aggregate, for all projects. An optimal supply target for this projected demand would be 434 spaces, which would result in a 90% utilization rate during peak periods.
Parking Requirements and Supply Summary

In all, these projects are expected to provide over 300 on-site parking space, despite parking requirements totaling just 182 spaces.

![Figure 27](Expected Development - Parking Requirements and Proposed Supply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Parking Spaces Required</th>
<th>Planned Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>369 N. Old Woodward</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>856 N. Old Woodward</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 S. Old Woodward</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34965 Woodward</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277 Pierce Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
<td><strong>317</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the total planned supply of 317 spaces to the projected peak parking demand of 391 spaces, and the target of 434 added parking spaces, it is reasonable to assume that these projects will need to utilize roughly 117 spaces of additional capacity within the City parking system. These projects expect to find these spaces within the Downtown Parking System. However, if we assume that the current parking system is at capacity and cannot absorb additional demand, the City has begun to address additions to parking supply to meet these and additional needs.

ADDED PARKING SUPPLY

Lot Lease

The City has signed an 18-month lease with the owner of an undeveloped property just outside of the CBD. They are working to make improvements to the new “Lot 12” that will add 156 permit spaces to the downtown inventory. Permits will be distributed to members of the City’s waiting list at a rate of $60/month.

Net Supply Gain: 156 spaces (temporary)

Lot Expansions

The City is also looking at options to expand supply and use at existing lots. At Lot 6, which is located on the north end of downtown, the City is exploring plans to expand the lot to accommodate 34 additional parking spaces, as well as a bioswale to handle surface runoff. The lot is shared by visitors and permit parkers and is regularly at capacity during weekday business hours.

Net Supply Gain: 34 spaces (permanent)
New Garage

Most significantly, the City is working on concepts for the redevelopment of the N. Old Woodward garage, which is the oldest structure in the parking system. Built in 1966, the garage and adjacent surface lot have 745 parking spaces. A joint development agreement is being sought for a 1,150-space garage, with ground floor retail and the potential for development of multiple office and residential buildings, plus the extension of Bates Street into the site. The development will also be expected to provide parking for on-site users, per existing zoning and Parking Assessment District regulations. However, the potential exists for some of the new capacity to be absorbed by new users as part of the adjacent property development. A request for qualifications was issued by the City in early 2017, followed by a request for proposals in September. Two proposals were reviewed by Birmingham’s Ad Hoc Parking Committee in February and March, with addition review forthcoming. The goal is to approve a final development plan by early 2019.

Net Supply Gain: 405 spaces (permanent, though not firm)

Net Supply Change: 595 spaces (439 permanent, 156 temporary)

Considering the projected needs for the expected developments highlighted in this section and the projected net unmet demand for new parking from those projects, the addition of 595 spaces to the Downtown Parking System would more than meet the need. The caveat being that the N. Old Woodward & Bates Street development is not yet firm and final parking supply and demand figures have yet to be determined.

In addition, the City continues to explore ways to expand effective capacities through a variety of approaches, including the rooftop valet, sale of additional on-street permits on lesser used blocks, and in negotiations with private parking facility owners for shared and remote parking opportunities. These, and other strategies, will be explored further in the forthcoming strategies and recommendations document.
APPENDIX B
MEMORANDUM

To: City of Birmingham
From: Nelson Nygaard, MKSK
Date: August 15, 2018
Subject: Birmingham Parking – Community Engagement Summary

Overview

The 2018 Birmingham Downtown Parking Plan featured a community engagement plan that included the following:

1) Online Survey
2) Merchant Meeting
3) Intercept Survey
4) Public Open House

Through these four engagement initiatives, over 450 local business owners, property owners, employees, and residents provided input on existing conditions and future wants and needs.

Online Survey Results

An online survey was developed in coordination with the City and the Birmingham Shopping District. The survey was open for 3 weeks in March 2018. Within this time frame, 418 responses were collected. Over 70% of respondents were employees, while 23% of respondents were business owners and 5% were property owners. The following charts illustrate key survey results:
Does Your Employer Provide Parking As A Benefit?

- **NO, MY PARKING COSTS ARE FULLY MY RESPONSIBILITY**: 94
- **YES, BY PAYING SOME PORTION OF MY DAILY-VALIDATION PARKING COSTS**: 4
- **YES, BY PAYING SOME PORTION OF MY PARKING PERMIT COST**: 3
- **YES, BY PAYING FOR DAILY-VALIDATION PARKING IN A CITY GARAGE**: 39
- **YES, BY PROVIDING A PARKING PERMIT TO A CITY GARAGE**: 99
- **YES, BY PROVIDING FREE PARKING ON-SITE**: 18

---

Do You Provide Parking as a Benefit to Your Employees?

- **NO, THEIR PARKING COSTS ARE THEIR FULL RESPONSIBILITY**: 33
- **YES, BY PAYING SOME PORTION OF THEIR DAILY-VALIDATION PARKING COSTS**: 0
- **YES, BY PAYING SOME PORTION OF THEIR PARKING PERMIT COST**: 6
- **YES, BY PAYING FOR DAILY-VALIDATION PARKING IN A CITY GARAGE**: 7
- **YES, BY PROVIDING A PARKING PERMIT TO A CITY GARAGE**: 23
- **YES, BY PROVIDING FREE PARKING ON-SITE**: 15

---

How Would You Rate Birmingham's Parking System Overall? (1-5 Scale)

- **EXCELLENT**: 0
- **GOOD**: 34
- **SATISFACTORY**: 82
- **POOR**: 107
- **VERY POOR**: 137
While it is important to recognize that the majority of respondents were downtown employees, the survey does shed light on the overall perspective of the business/workforce portion of the community. The results show that a majority of respondents are not satisfied with the current parking system in downtown Birmingham. They find the time and cost of metered parking, low turnover of on-street parking, and the time that it takes to find a parking space as some of the weakest features of the current system. The most popular feature of the parking system is the free 2-hour parking offered in the City’s parking decks.

A majority of respondents shared that their employers pay all or a portion of their parking costs. However, more than 1 in 3 respondents said that parking costs were fully their responsibility. As the findings of some of the subsequent outreach efforts found, the split between employees paying for their own parking versus those whose parking is paid has led to some frustration. Further, the disparity between employers and employees paying standard monthly permit rates and those paying the daily rate is another source of contention.

**Birmingham Shopping District Merchant Meeting**

The consultant team joined the City at the May meeting of the Birmingham Shopping District Merchants to share an update on preliminary findings and strategies. More than 20 participants attended the meeting and provided feedback on existing conditions, concerns, and opportunities. Comments included:

- Concerns were expressed about the number of permits sold in the parking decks, versus the number of spaces available, with multiple merchants citing incidents when they or their employees could not find spaces in the garages.
- Merchants were dissatisfied with the current rooftop valet system, indicating that it is inconvenient and is not an attractive option for permit holders. A suggestion was made that moving the drop-off and pick-up to the lower level would be an improvement.
- A comment was made that there are too many lower level spaces held for short-term (up to 3 hour) parkers, prohibiting longer-term permit parkers from using those spaces.
Backups at the gates (entry and exit) are common and may be a product of the new equipment in the garages. A suggestion was made that problem locations could have a permit lane and the increased promotion and use of the IN card could help.

Commercial loading/unloading at the curb is accommodated in key locations, but more accommodations are needed for personal loading/unloading spaces.

Additional comments were made about perceived issues with enforcement of curbside regulations, including valet zones.

Shuttle or circulator service was seen as a good potential option for accessing remote parking options and moving people throughout downtown during the day. There was a sense that this was something that merchants could see contributing to.

The Lot 6 area is particularly problematic for service industry merchants, who find that the lot and permit spaces are regularly full by the time they arrive (late-morning).

There was a sense that employers would be willing to pay more for permits if they were more confident that the spaces would be available when they or their employees arrived.

Suggestions were made to make the Chester Garage permit-only and continuing the Saturday-Sunday free garage parking beyond the Old Woodward construction period.

Intercept Survey Results

In May 2018, intercept surveys were conducted during the late morning and early afternoon on a weekday. These face-to-face interactions with people on the street in downtown Birmingham allowed for candid conversation about perceptions and issues. There were 24 intercept survey respondents. A majority of respondents were employees who worked in Birmingham, but did not live within City limits. Most respondents said they are usually able to find a parking space under 5 minutes and could park within 1-3 blocks of their destination. The one caveat was that people were much less likely to find a parking space during the lunch hour, or later in the day.

Many employees cited the cost of parking as a challenge. Employees that have been able to secure a parking permit have much lower parking costs than employees who do not hold parking permits. They expressed frustration over parking costs not being equal between employees.
Community Open House

A public Open House was held on June 6th at the Baldwin Public Library. Post cards were mailed by the City in advance and notices were placed online and at other venues throughout downtown. The Open House was lightly attended, but participants were provided with a thorough walk-through of preliminary findings and strategies, along with an opportunity for dialogue and comment.

Paper surveys and comment cards were available to participants. Of the 10 surveys collected at the public workshop, only one respondent had taken the online survey in March. Survey respondents and people who filled out comment cards noted that more parking supply in City decks, more short-term parking on-site and curbside, and more affordable parking options (especially for employers and employees) should be considered in the future.

Participants offered a range of verbal feedback, including insights about additional on-street and shared parking opportunities, interest in additional mobility options (like bike share and shuttles), and willingness to pay for additional permits and services (like valet) if they were made available. There was also a sense expressed that development in downtown Birmingham cannot continue at its current pace without parking being addressed in the short-term in a meaningful way.

Conclusion

Across all stakeholder groups, concern over the cost and availability of parking is consistent. While the public parking decks and on-street meters address much of the parking demand in downtown Birmingham, they are falling short at key times. As development continues at a healthy pace, strategies like those being explored in this planning process should be developed to address these key challenges and the community should be informed as the process moves forward.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This overview summarizes a series of parking and access management strategies that should be considered for implementation in Birmingham. The strategies outlined in this document are the result of the consulting team’s observations and feedback from the City and various community stakeholders. The following six (6) parking and access management objectives are presented alongside a series of strategies that will help to achieve them.

Redistribute Demand
- Take a Performance-Based Management approach to ensuring space availability.
- Expand employee parking options.
- Ensure drivers know their options.

Reduce Demand
- Optimize “Park Once” efficiencies.
- Provide circulator and shuttle options.
- Improve pedestrian and bicycle network infrastructure.
- Provide commuter benefits.
- Transition monthly permits to a daily pricing structure.

Expand Capacities
- Continue to refine Public Valet approach for both visitors and commuters.
- Expand Mobile Payment Options to the Parking Structures.
- Vary regulations to balance parking and loading needs at the curb.
- Allocate curbside space for higher-capacity forms of parking.
- Use pay-by-phone options to encourage off-hour shared parking.

Expand Supplies
- Develop “Park Once” zoning strategies.
- Refine the Assessment District Fee Approach.
- Continue to refine Joint-Development approach.

Deploy Technologies
- Utilize License Plate Recognition (LPR) equipment.
- Upgrade parking management and transaction software.
- Support Electric Vehicle Network Infrastructure.

Optimize Management
- Invest parking revenues in public improvements, beyond parking.
- Solicit Competitive Bids for Operator Services.
- Establish a Parking Ambassador Program.
REDISTRIBUTE DEMAND

Use pricing as a primary means of distributing parking demand more broadly across the downtown parking system, using lower rates to shift some parking activity away from the high-demand core and reduce excess parking-search-related traffic.

The maps below depict patterns of constrained (orange-red) and under-utilized (green and blue) on-street parking, during midday (left) and evening (right) demand peaks. Clear and meaningful pricing cues can help shift enough parking activity toward blocks offering ample availability to ease congestion in the core area(s).

Formalize a Performance-Based Management approach, and define Space Availability as the key performance indicator (KPI) for parking management in downtown Birmingham.

Most drivers have no idea how parking rates are determined, though most likely assume it has something to do with revenue targets. The City of Birmingham can use this study to clarify that parking rates are set in order to achieve a singular objective: maintaining availability, across the downtown, so that drivers can choose the parking location that best suits their relative cost/convenience priorities. Space availability, at the block-face level for on-street parking and at the facility level for off-street, becomes the central “key performance indicator” (KPI) that informs rate decisions, as well as most other management and regulatory actions. For garages, availability for short-term and long-term parkers can be measured and tracked separately, but the primary measure for the facility should be availability among all spaces (which should inform how much inventory is set aside for either group).
The benefits of such an approach go beyond transparency to improve the parking experience by reducing time and energy spent in search of available spaces and reducing perceptions that downtown lacks sufficient parking supply.

**Define targeted KPI ranges.**

The ranges below are based on optimal targets for three types of parking, based distinct user perceptions and expectations for each. Generally, on-street locations need to present more obvious availability, as drivers have fewer options to navigate back toward a missed empty space. Similarly, those seeking long-term parking in off-street facilities generally tend to be more familiar with the facility, and thus more patient in seeking out a space when availability is less obvious.

- On-street parking: 10-20% of spaces are available, or a few spaces on each block-face.
- Off-street, hourly parking: 10-15% of spaces are available
- Off-street, long-term parking: 5-10% of spaces are available, with no wait list for monthly permits.

These ranges are defined to indicate when KPIs are sufficiently off their target to warrant management changes, such as changes in rates.

**Monitor performance.**

One of the primary benefits of this study is the data and documentation generated in previous tasks, which provide a clear indication of where on-street parking options are most consistently constrained (lacking availability), where available spaces can consistently be found, and where spaces are consistently underutilized (less than 70% full). This provides an essential basis upon which to develop a set of three rate tiers, with the express aim of shifting enough drivers away from currently constrained blocks to free up availability for those willing to pay a premium rate for their convenience.

Beyond this study, it will be essential to continue to measure and track occupancy/availability conditions across the Birmingham parking system, using data-tracking technologies, as may be available, complemented by field surveys as necessary.

This should include all off-street facilities, all metered on-street blocks, and residential blocks known to attract significant parking demand (which is likely to change, seasonally).
- Take measures monthly, or more frequently as may be viable.
- Track findings against defined KPI targets
- When KPI measures are consistently below or above a targeted KPI range, rates should be adjusted.
- When KPI target ranges are consistently met, this provides a powerful demonstration of the effectiveness of current rates – effectiveness that translates into easy parking on the street and in garages.

**Increase or decrease rates in response to occupancy/availability measures/patterns.**

Review rates annually, using peak-period KPI measures from across the year, to determine if rate adjustments are warranted. Adjust parking rates to address clear patterns where KPI measures are consistently outside a targeted range. This policy should not be limited to raising rates, but also lowering them where demand is below the targeted KPI range.

**Create tiered hourly rates to redistribute demand.**

**On-Street**

Create premium, base, and reduced on-street parking zones to incentivize more consistent utilization across all metered downtown blocks and reduce congestion in the high-demand core. Initial rates and locations are proposed as indicated in The following map suggests an initial zone concept, based on recently collected utilization data.

**Increase the hourly rate for longer stays.**

Incremental rates incentivize shorter parking stays in high demand on-street locations by adjusting hourly rates based on duration. Digital meters can be used to vary parking rates, applying a base rate to short stays, and applying premium rates to longer stays. This allows pricing to reduce demand among drivers whose parking needs are better accommodated off-street, creating more availability at no added cost to most customers.

**Shift enforcement schedule to start later in the morning.**

Begin enforcing meters at 10am, based on the fact that availability is generally ample until late mornings, to provide a “grace period” of free parking in the mornings.
Provide transparency of any performance-based changes to parking rates.

Release data analysis, findings, and any subsequent management/pricing adjustments in an annual Performance-Based Management report to ensure transparency and communicate both the effectiveness and primary objectives of the program.

As pricing begins to consistently achieve KPI targets, ease up on time limits.

Time limits become an unnecessary regulation/restriction if availability-based KPI targets can be achieved through price alone. Removing time limits can be particularly supportive of “destination districts”, in which many visitors are drawn by a variety of destinations and don’t know how long they will want to stay at the time of parking. By contrast, too-restrictive time limits can render much of an area’s parking supply unsuitable for most customers. Instead of watching the clock, and possibly having to run out and move their cars, customers can be notified by phone that they can add more time to stay longer. This can be a big customer-service win that compensates for higher rates.

The City could begin this strategy by removing time limits for on-street parking after 4pm to encourage longer stays, while relying on pricing to discourage evening-shift employee parking.
Off-Street

Base off-street permit oversell-rates on availability, not fixed standards.

One of the great advantages of regularly tracking availability is that management strategies like “oversell” rates can be set and adjusted based on documented availability or other KPI measures. No oversell rate is too high if space availability can be maintained for all permit holders. Look for opportunities for seasonal adjustments and, in garages where mid-day utilization is consistently below 90%, consider selling additional permits to approach daily utilization in the 90-95% range.

Base off-street permit and visitor parking rates on availability.

In line with the on-street methodology, off-street parking rates can be adjusted to respond to utilization and availability targets. Rates between parking locations should reflect various levels of demand, as measured by utilization levels and permit wait lists, using lower and higher parking costs to redistribute parking activity more evenly across all options. Permit rates are consistent across four of the five City garages, with Chester currently priced at an economy rate, despite having utilization on-par with the other garages. Further, the high incidence of “transient” parkers staying longer than 5 hours and paying an hourly rate suggests that there is an opportunity to increase permit rates to reflect demand and align with the daily rate amount.

Expand employee-parking options.

Expand the number and variety of parking options for downtown employees to ease pressure on monthly parking permits in constrained parking facilities.

- Create on-street permits along strategically selected streets.

- Evaluate options for a select program in residential permit parking (RPP) blocks, with permits limited to daytime parking when resident parking demand is modest.

- Explore options for additional on-street permits in underutilized metered blocks, such as has been initiated at the south end of Old Woodward.

- Examine on-street permit options on blocks that are not currently metered or included in RPP districts, including those on the southwest edge of downtown.

- Broker shared-use agreements with private lot and garage owners with excess capacity at key times. This includes facilities within and outside of the downtown parking district.
Ensure that all drivers know all their options.

Visitors are particularly dependent upon information, signage, and wayfinding to understand the full set of parking options available to them, but all users benefit from improvements to delivery and accuracy of information. The City already addresses several aspects of this well, including providing real-time garage availability information (both online and at the facility) and directing parkers to public valet locations. However, there are gaps in the provision of broader parking network information that can be addressed.

Figure 6  Real-Time Availability Measures Posted to the City’s Home Page

![Real-Time Availability Measures](image)

Figure 7  Real-Time Information is also Available at City Garage Entrances

![Real-Time Information](image)

Develop a parking information and signage brand.

Branding with easily discernable information has been used effectively to help visitors understand and find key parking options, including free 2-hour parking in garages and the public valet service.
put into place while key downtown blocks are closed for construction. Building off these efforts, the City can work to develop a cohesive parking “brand” and information system, accessible online, via mobile device, and in the field, to enhance user understanding of parking options. A successful program will:

- Guide Visitors to “right fit” parking
- Improve predictability, reduce confusion and improve customer experience
- Redistribute demand to underutilized facilities
- Support performance-based management
- Help “brand” downtown Birmingham
- Improve aesthetics and streetscape

Figure 8  Bold Purple Signage has been Effectively Used for Valet Wayfinding

Aligning with citywide planning and wayfinding efforts, the City should build upon this work to create a cohesive sign program that creates clear and concise information to parkers. Using a color scheme to clearly mark premium-, base-, and reduced-rate parking locations – both on maps and via on-site signage – can support a performance-based pricing program. Similar efforts could be used to identify spaces in City garages or off-peak access to permit lots.

Figure 9  Branding + Color Scheme Guide Drivers to Right-Fit Parking

Image: Downtown Sacramento Partnership
The content, placement, and condition of wayfinding and signage in the parking structures is particularly in need of attention. Signage in the City’s five parking structures lacks consistency and many of the signs are in poor condition. Updating entry and exit, level indicator, and interior directional signage in conjunction with minor upgrades, such as painting and lighting updates, can provide an immediate impact and will make the structures feel more welcoming and secure. The City should work with its parking operator to identify outdated and damaged/faded signage for removal and replacement. Maps and other informational signage should be updated in cooperation with broader wayfinding efforts. The City should also weigh its options for investing in the necessary technology to provide accurate space availability information via the current, dynamic-information signage system, or replacing space count signs with “full” / “open” signs to better communicate availability.

REDUCE DEMAND

*Reduce parking supply needs by improving the functionality and cost-effectiveness of non-driving options for getting to and around downtown.*

Optimize “Park Once” efficiencies.

Birmingham’s downtown parking system supports Park Once efficiencies, as most parking options allow drivers to leave their cars in place while they walk around downtown. By allowing drivers to leave their cars in place until they are ready to return home, and promoting area walkability, Park Once can convert potential, excess auto traffic into sidewalk vitality and active public spaces. From a parking demand perspective, it can significantly reduce parking supply needs, as drivers require fewer spaces to get to more downtown destinations.

Figure 10    Parking System in Conventional Development Context

Image: Holly Parker, Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates
Provide circulator and shuttle options.

Circulators and shuttles could serve multiple audiences in downtown Birmingham, including daily commuters, visitors, and residents, by providing frequent and convenient connections throughout the downtown area. Commuter shuttles can fill “first mile/last mile” gaps from remote parking facilities or transit services, making those options more attractive and practical for commuters. These same vehicles can be re-purposed during mid-day and evening hours to provide local circulation for visitors, shoppers, and residents who are moving between destinations. These essential Park Once services can also communicate the downtown brand and make use of emerging electric and autonomous vehicle technologies. Several operators base revenues entirely on sponsorship and advertising sales, enabling them to offer the service free of charge to passengers.
Improve pedestrian infrastructure.

Optimal pedestrian networks are critical to Park Once success, as walking is the primary means by which parkers will connect to their final destination(s). Effective and pleasant walking conditions directly correlate with drivers’ willingness to park further from those destinations, and to connect to more of the overall downtown without requiring a second or third parking space. By contrast, poor walkability will reduce the appeal of otherwise-viable parking facilities, and incentivize more driving trips within the downtown (multiplying the number of parking spaces required for each visitor).

Birmingham’s downtown sidewalk network provides effective pedestrian connections, consistent with the City’s brand as “A Walkable Community.” Improvements planned for Old Woodward will further by adding curb extensions and mid-block crossings in the heart of the Birmingham Shopping District. The Multimodal Transportation Board (MMTB) should continue its efforts to implement the recommendations of the Multimodal Transportation Plan (MMTP), which includes improvements to sidewalks, crosswalks, signals, and wayfinding to support a safer and more comfortable pedestrian network.
The MMTP addresses several key locations where additional improvements can be made, including crossings of Woodward Avenue (M1) where pedestrians must cross up to nine (9) lanes of traffic. As downtown development expands east of Woodward and parking options require visitors and employees to cross the avenue, these recommendations should be prioritized.
Additional improvements that can better support Park Once across all of downtown include the following.

- **Prohibit turns on RED** – Allowing such turns directly and significantly reduces pedestrian safety and comfort at signalized road crossings, as drivers tend to “roll” past stop bars and into and through crosswalks.
- **Establish leading-pedestrian intervals on major streets**, to allow crossing pedestrians a few seconds to establish presence in crosswalks before the coinciding GREEN signal is given to vehicles.
- **Optimize signal timing**, so that pedestrians do not wait excessively long to get a WALK signal, and are provided a WALK cycle of sufficient length to get across the street.
- **Reduce curb turning radii at intersections**, to shorten crossing distances and reduce the speed of turning vehicles.

### Improve bicycle network connections

Making downtown more accessible by bike will tap into growing demand for bike-connected live/work/play environments. It can also reduce parking demand, particularly during warm-weather months when visitor-parking demand can experience seasonal peaks. The MMTP includes comprehensive recommendations for both network expansion and parking, which should be implemented to support bike trips both to and within downtown.

![Bike Corral on N. Old Woodward](image)

**Figure 15** Bike Corral on N. Old Woodward

### Pursue bike share program options.

Bike share is an emerging, rapidly expanding mobility option available in many Michigan cities. Bike share programs bring the convenience and efficiency of biking in an urban setting by
providing users with short-term use of bicycles from a shared fleet distributed across a city. Bike share can be a particularly effective Park Once resource, allowing drivers to reach more of downtown from any particular parking space. It can also make non-driving trips more feasible by providing first-mile/last-mile connections to transit networks.

The emergence of low-cost, “dockless” bike share providers has made bike share more viable in markets like Birmingham, where installing a traditional “docked” or station-based system could be both cost-prohibitive and technically challenging. The City and its MMTB should continue to explore options for implementing a bike share program, engaging peer communities and service providers to understand the costs and technical & organizational needs for a local system.

Provide commuter benefits.

Within any given downtown, there are drive-alone commuters who would consider adopting alternative modes, given sufficient incentives or provided means around barriers to options like walking, cycling, transit, and ridesharing.

Subsidize transit passes.

The concept of the universal transit pass drastically reduces the cost of transit commuting for employees. This can be particularly effective in reducing parking demand among service and low-wage downtown employees. In response to the potential revenue and ridership benefits offered by this demand management strategy, transit agencies have teamed with cities, employers, and others to provide bulk transit passes at steep discounts. Studies have linked universal transit passes to reductions in car mode shares of between 4% and 22%, with an average reduction of 11%. Many of these reductions have occurred even in areas with limited transit service.1

Working with the Birmingham Shopping District the City can explore options for collectively funding a bus-pass program for all downtown employees. This could be modeled on the Ann Arbor DDA go!pass program or a new model in Columbus, Ohio where downtown businesses have agreed to pay an assessment to provide this employee benefit to all downtown employees.2

Market and Promote supportive programs offered by SEMCOG.

Emergency Ride Home

Many would-be transit riders or carpoolers continue to drive to work out of concern that they might not be able to reach a sick child, or go home sick, or that their ride home may have to leave early or work late. An Emergency Ride Home (ERH) benefit can effectively address these concerns, by offering alternative-mode commuters a modest number of free/reimbursed taxi/ride-service rides home throughout the year. Such a program has proven highly effective in reduce common concerns about relying on transit and ridesharing, at a modest cost as the frequency of use tends to be quite low.3

The Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG) offers an ERH program through its Commuter Connect website.

---

3 https://nctr.usf.edu/jpt/pdf/JPT%2010-4%20Menczer.pdf
Rideshare ride matching

One of the most common barriers to ride sharing is the assumption that participants must somehow find a partner with a compatible schedule and commute route, on one’s own. Online platforms and ride-matching algorithms make finding a match much simpler and more effective. SEMCOG provides such a platform on its Commuter Connect website and offers additional options for employers to provide targeted ride matching services to groups of employees.

Figure 16 SEMCOG’s Commuter Connect Platform

Offer ride-share participants the best parking.

Reserve a modest number of high-convenience spaces, including the best spaces within high-demand parking facilities, for registered ride-share vehicles. This can be limited to mornings until 10AM, making any spaces not occupied by then available for general parking.

Transition monthly permits to a daily pricing structure.

People are more sensitive to small recurring fees and charges than larger and less-frequent ones. Once an employee purchases a monthly permit, that individual typically ceases to consider driving alternatives because the permit has become a “sunk-cost” investment. Such permits actually create an incentive to drive to work as frequently as possible in order to take advantage of the investment. By contrast, a daily rate can be facilitated through payroll or by issuing a commuter card that can be structured as a “draw-down” account, creating an incentive to use other modes when those are most feasible, thereby saving the daily rate cost. This can reduce commuter parking demand on days when walking, cycling, and transit are most appealing – such as nice-weather days, which can free up garage spaces for additional permit parkers or visitors.

An example of this is the City of Boulder’s Cash Pass which was instituted to ease payment, reduce backups at garage entrances/exits, and remove the built-in incentive to drive, every day, that a monthly pass can create. Birmingham’s IN Card could be used in much the same way, accommodating parkers who are either on the permit waiting list or who would be amenable to a more flexible option that rewards them (through cost savings) for not parking.

https://bouldercolorado.gov/parking-services/downtown-parking-garages
EXPAND CAPACITIES

*Increase the capacity of existing parking (and curbside loading) supplies by making available options more broadly accessible and functionally viable.*

Continue to refine Public Valet approach.

Birmingham staff should continue to review the on-street public valet for usefulness with input from parkers and the Birmingham Shopping District (BSD). As an example, there is a clear desire from merchants on the north end of Old Woodward to expand the valet service to their district. This could improve parking options for both shoppers and employees in the vicinity of Birmingham’s Lot 6. To better inform new parkers, the City should expand marketing outreach during events where there will be an anticipated increase of visitor parking needs. As additional incentives, the City can also offer a valet merchant validation or partner with the BSD and the Birmingham Bonus Bucks program.

Continue to refine Rooftop Valet approach.

While the rooftop valet program at the parking structures is currently underutilized, it is providing a valuable service by reducing the need for garage closures when at or near capacity. The City should explore options to optimize this service to increase use by commuters, including relocating drop-off locations or combining efforts with the on-street public valet. In both cases, collecting additional data from valet operators on use of these services will help the City and its partners make continuous improvements to the offerings for both commuters and visitors.

Expand Mobile Payment Options to the Parking Structures.

Payment options for non-permit parkers are currently limited to a credit card or IN Card at the City’s parking structures. The City should explore options for either expanding their current ParkMobile contract or soliciting other vendors to allow mobile payment in the garages. ParkMobile payments at the City’s smart meters account for approximately 25% of transactions, suggesting that this popular option would be readily adopted by off-street parkers as well. Providing parkers with the option to pay for parking remotely will also help to address concerns over backups at the entry and exit gates, much of which is the result of delays caused by parkers who are using credit or IN cards. ParkMobile and other vendors also offer “digital wallets,” which can allow employers to pre-load funds into individual accounts.

Vary regulations to balance parking and loading needs at the curb.

Vary regulations to prioritize curbside loading zones during weekday mornings, while minimizing loading zones in favor of more curbside parking during evenings and weekends. This can expand loading capacities when they are most needed, when visitor parking demand tends to be modest, while gaining extra parking capacity when curbside parking is in high demand.
Allocate curbside space for higher-capacity forms of parking.

**Car Share Parking**

Access to car share vehicles has proven effective in reducing resident vehicle ownership in walkable urban centers. Reduced resident parking demand can free up long-term parking spaces for downtown employees. Dedicated on-street parking spaces raise the visibility of car sharing while making these vehicles broadly accessible.

**Create motorcycle/scooter parking zones.**

Convenient parking can encourage increased use of these space-efficient vehicles. This can be a particularly beneficial use of “leftover” curbside areas that are too small for standard vehicle spaces.

**Use pay-by-phone to encourage off-hour shared parking.**

Engage owners of restricted parking facilities about monetizing their parking spaces when they are not in use by coordinating with ParkMobile or another pay-by-phone vendor. The vendor and the facility owner can work out details, such as shared-parking schedules and rates. Typically, the vendor will install its standard signage, consistent with what is used for public parking in the district, and distribute revenue to the facility owner in accordance with their agreement.

**EXPAND SUPPLIES**

*Expand the supply of public parking, while discouraging new private/reserved parking supplies.*

**Develop Park Once zoning strategies.**

Birmingham’s zoning code already addresses parking design standards in detail and establishes a progressive set of parking requirements around new development in the downtown area and the Parking Assessment District. A deeper evaluation of the zoning code can be completed in coordination with the City’s upcoming Master Plan process to ensure that parking can be expanded, as needed, to support continued growth. A Park Once approach would embrace several of the following objectives and benefits:

- Ensure that public parking supplies can be expanded as needed, to avoid the redundant inefficiencies created by conventional parking requirements.
- Encourage continued growth by offering developers a variety of options to accommodate and/or mitigate the parking demand impacts of their projects.
- Generate mobility improvements and demand-reduction programs to both reduce parking demand and enhance increasingly sought-after multimodal amenities.
- Encourage shared use of existing private parking facilities that were built to meet previous parking requirements.

Elements to include in park-once zoning:

- Incentives to provide shared parking in privately developed parking facilities
- Limits on private, single-use on-site parking
- No limits on shared, on-site parking
- Fee options to exceed limits on private, on-site parking or to waive on-site requirements
- Incentives or requirements to directly provide mobility amenities and/or demand-reduction programs, as appropriate to the scale and use-mix of the project.
- A Joint-Development policy that leverages Park Once zoning, and seeks public-private, mixed-use projects as the primary mode of expanding public parking.

Refine the Assessment District Fee Approach.

Provide a more consistent revenue stream to support capital investments in parking infrastructure, including City partnerships in joint-development that combines public parking with private developments. A consistently collected assessment can be set at a modest level, relying on steady collection to avoid the need for much larger “special” assessments if/when a new parking structure is need. This will also help avoid resistance to proposed new developments, by avoiding property-owner fears of project approvals triggering a sudden and significant increase in their assessment liability. It will also make the cost of owning downtown property much more predictable, attracting further investment.

Continue to refine Joint-Development approach.

The pending redevelopment of the N. Old Woodward Garage is a great example of expanding public parking via joint-development. In cities like Grand Rapids and Ann Arbor, similar approaches have become the default means of expanding parking-system supplies, taking advantage of cost-sharing and facility-design benefits they offer compared to building dedicated parking structures.

DEPLOY BEST-PRACTICE TECHNOLOGIES

Utilize License Plate Recognition (LPR) equipment.

License Plate Recognition (LPR) technology offers opportunities to improve both parking facility operations and parking regulation enforcement. Fixed mount LPR equipment at garage access points can improve ingress/egress and shorten queuing issues at peak times, while also facilitating programs that monitor “performance,” including tracking utilization during times of peak demand. This equipment could also help prevent parkers from misusing the two-hour free parking period offered in City garages.

In support of a performance-focused enforcement approach, mobile LPR devices can systematically collect “occupancy” data, via plate “reads” in facilities and on blocks where availability is most likely to be constrained. This provides a valuable source of data that can be matched utilization/availability of parking supply.

LPR data can also be used to help manage parking enforcement activity. Occupancy and compliance data can help map out daily enforcement routes. Digitally “chalking” vehicles while gathering LPR information increases the effectiveness of identifying scofflaws and increases fine collection. In addition, most LPR hardware/software providers integrate with leading mobile payment applications, digital permitting, and parking enforcement software providers. Communication among these systems during data collection and enforcement decreases the time needed to identify illegally parked vehicles.
Upgrade Parking Transaction & Management Software.

Explore options for contracting services that track parking transactions in real-time across networked on-street meters and off-street payment systems, and use algorithms to convert this data into estimates of parking utilization/availability. Such services are relatively new, and often require “spot checks” of actual utilization/availability counts, via manual surveys or through LPR data, to establish and maintain accuracy.

The data provided by these services can provide an in-depth review of historic and current parking demands while predicting future parking occupancies. This can enable the City to act on a potential parking demand problem in a specific area before it happens. The data can support a performance-based management approach by informing decisions on rate-setting and parking duration in specific areas, both on- and off-street.

Parking enforcement routes can be tailored based on the information provided by the software, shifting parking enforcement efforts from being reactive to being more proactive and increasing productivity and parking compliance.

Explore Digital Validation options

Businesses can use validation codes to provide their customers with discounted or free parking. Programs like these can be managed using the City’s mobile payment provider.

Support Electric Vehicle Network Infrastructure

Establishing electric vehicle (EV) infrastructure is a key strategy in supporting the future of clean, sustainable, “smart” cities. Most major car manufacturers have at least one EV model currently at market with new models hitting the market every year. Nationwide, EV sales have climbed steadily since 2011, but still represent only around 1% of total vehicle sales. Michigan is one of the top 10 states in total EV sales, with more than 16,000 purchased since 2011. As projections for EV ownership continue to rise, cities are finding it necessary to adapt and develop infrastructure to keep up with the growing demand.

While electric vehicle ownership is still low in Birmingham, invested parties such as the Michigan Public Service Commission, Consumers Energy Co., DTE Energy Co., Ford Motor Co., and General Motors are working on consumer awareness, grid impact, and charger availability. Many communities, including those as nearby as Auburn Hills and Ann Arbor, have taken proactive steps to support EV network expansion with both city policies and investment of public dollars. These steps can be incremental and should help prepare the city and region for a future with greater EV ownership rates and demand for EV network infrastructure.

Measuring Demand

As a starting point, the City can initiate a survey of user demand to gauge current and prospective EV ownership in the community. This work should be coordinated with regional partners, including public & private agencies, local developers, employers, residents, and others, to inform targets for the number and type of EV charging stations Birmingham and other locales throughout the region should install in the near future.

---

Policy Considerations

Alongside the demand assessment, the City can review their codified ordinances to determine if there are measures that impede installation of EV infrastructure, while also reviewing ordinances from peer communities that have created supportive policies. Auburn Hills, Michigan adopted an EV infrastructure ordinance in 2011 to encourage EV installation in public and private locations throughout the city. The ordinance includes provisions for “roughing in” EV charging infrastructure in residential and workplace settings in order to lower the cost barrier to adding charging stations in the future, as well as signage and enforcement guidance for EV charging spaces. The City now has 8 stations in service. More progressive policies in cities like Aspen, Colorado, and St. Paul, Minnesota, include measures that go beyond encouragement to offer incentives and even requirements for public and private EV network investments.

Public and Workplace Charging Stations

A number of Michigan cities have installed public EV charging stations in municipal parking lots and parking garages, providing highly visible and convenient charging locations for residents and visitors. Private businesses in many locations have installed charging equipment as an amenity for employees or as a way of achieving climate action goals or green building criteria. The U.S. Department of Energy offers resources for employers and municipalities looking to invest in EV network infrastructure through the Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy.6

Integrating EVs into Municipal Fleets

Birmingham can also promote EV network expansion by incorporating vehicles into their city fleet, both as a sign of the City’s commitment to EVs and to carbon emissions goals.

OPTIMIZE MANAGEMENT

Ensure streamlined and coordinated management within the City, while maximizing opportunities related to public and private growth, mobility, and sustainability initiatives.

Invest parking revenues in public improvements, beyond parking.

Investing meter revenue in local improvements can reinforce the message that the primary purpose of charging for parking is to manage demand and keep spaces available, not to fill budget gaps. Merchants, in particular, are much more likely to be supportive when they know that increased parking revenues will translate into noticeable public improvements. The primary purpose of the current parking fund, to maintain the parking system and fund expansion as necessary, would remain, while a relatively modest share of revenues is spent on streetscapes, public spaces, and mobility improvements that can directly reduce future parking expansions.

- Promote this Benefit District approach to raise awareness of the local benefits provided by parking revenues.
- Ensure that benefits include non-driving mobility and commuter-benefit investments that can reduce parking demand (and, thus, performance-based rates).
- Provide annual updates on key investments made with parking revenues within an annual Performance-Based Management report.

6 https://www.afdc.energy.gov/fuels/electricity_charging_workplace.html
Solicit Competitive Bids for Operator Services.

The City has had a contract with SP+ for facility maintenance and operations for the five parking structures since 1991. The service agreement has not been subject to competitive bidding or amendment since the original signing date while technologies and management needs have changed. Drafting a solicitation for operator services will support new technologies and changing needs of the City and provide an opportunity to build in best practices and needs for current and future initiatives including:

- Customer service benchmarks
- General and specific garage maintenance requirements
- Coordination of parking information with the City and local stakeholders
- Providing advisory services on technology, policy, and parking data
- Collection, invoicing, and depositing of parking revenues
- Ability to monitor and provide service to parking garage equipment
- Permit management tools

The City should engage the Advisory Parking Committee to craft an RFP which reflects current parking objectives and best practices.

Establish a Parking Ambassador Program.

The City should consider a compliance-based approach to parking enforcement. Often times parking enforcement staff may be the only interaction that visitors have with the City, so they should be a positive representation for the community. A parking ambassador approach encourages a positive interaction, creating a better image for the City. Parking Ambassadors can be responsible for education and outreach to inform the public about program changes while performing their parking compliance duties. City staff should work with the Birmingham Police department to brand the parking enforcement assistants with “Parking Ambassador” and ensure they have proper and on-going training on parking technologies, policies, and general parking information.
APPENDIX D
## IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

### Priority: Ensure Commuter Access to Monthly Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Key Steps</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Other Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Sell more permits in City garages** | • **Quick Win:** Offer permits to the first 10 people on the wait list for the Pierce and Peabody garages.  
• Monitor parking utilization and permit wait lists in City garages and lots and issue more permits every 3 months, as conditions warrant. | • Parking utilization  
• Permit wait list # | • Consider adjustments to pricing as new permits are issued  
• Continue to address wait list updates and inefficiencies |
| **Define a Performance-Based Pricing approach** | • **Quick Win:** Adopt a policy linking parking rates to demand and establish availability as the Key Performance Indicator (KPI).  
• Monitor parking utilization and permit wait lists in City garages and lots and on-street, establishing a solid base of KPI data to inform the policy and decision-making process. | • Parking utilization  
• Availability by facility  
• Permit wait list # | • Transparency is key: develop and deliver a communications plan to monthly parkers and visitors |
| **Adjust parking rates to reflect demand patterns across downtown** | • **Quick Win:** Increase the Chester, Park, and N. Old Woodward permit rates in 2019 to address heavy demand and reduce the “discount” incentive for buying a permit.  
• **Quick Win:** Offer discounted permit rates for carpools and vanpools and “flex” permits for limited use parkers.  
• Monitor utilization and review rates annually to determine if additional adjustments are warranted, raising or lowering rates to address any meaningful gaps between targeted and actual availability. | • Parking utilization  
• Availability by facility  
• Permit wait list #  
• Permit revenue  
• # of discounted flex and ride share permits | • Transparency is key: develop and deliver a communications plan to monthly parkers  
• Promote discount rates and programs through employers |
| **Transition monthly permits to a daily pricing structure** | • Establish the requisite administrative approach to facilitating daily permit parking, including payment media and back-end management protocols.  
• Engage in dialogue with strategic employers who are seeking additional permits, validating daily employee parking and may be willing to pilot a new approach. | • Parking utilization  
• Permit wait list #  
• Travel mode split  
• Days used/month | • Start small and ramp up once the approach proves feasible  
• Track the highest use days for possible price adjustments |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Key Steps</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Other Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide &amp; Promote Commuter Benefits</strong></td>
<td>▪ <strong>Quick Win:</strong> Work with key partners, like the Birmingham Shopping District, to create a “welcome” package for new and existing employees that outlines commuter options and available benefit programs. ▪ Collaborate with agencies like SMART and SEMCOG to develop more robust programs and benefits for employees.</td>
<td>▪ Parking utilization ▪ Permit wait list # and duration ▪ Benefit options ▪ Benefit utilization ▪ Travel mode split</td>
<td>▪ Combine efforts with others in this section to create and promote a “suite” of options to address parking &amp; access needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continue to refine the Rooftop Valet program</strong></td>
<td>▪ <strong>Quick Win:</strong> Work with operators to add mobile functionality to the valet program and increase data capture on use and program costs. ▪ Explore options to optimize commuter valet service to both improve customer satisfaction and increase utilization. ▪ Identify new options for commuter valet pick-up/drop-off, including use of on-street valet and lower level deck locations.</td>
<td>▪ Parking utilization ▪ Valet utilization ▪ Program cost/revenue ▪ Customer satisfaction</td>
<td>▪ Program costs and revenues should balance for a sustainable program ▪ Valet locations must weigh options for convenience, circulation, and displacement of other uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expand employee parking options</strong></td>
<td>▪ Institute an employee permit program in residential permit parking zones. ▪ Add on-street permits to under-utilized metered blocks. ▪ Examine on-street permit options on blocks that are not currently metered or otherwise restricted. ▪ Look for opportunities to expand existing lots and garages.</td>
<td>▪ Parking utilization ▪ Permit wait list # ▪ Permit revenue ▪ Property owner response ▪ Violations/citations</td>
<td>▪ Communication with adjacent property owners will be key ▪ Look for blocks with &gt;25% availability during target hours ▪ Enforcement will be critical to success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunity: Improve Visitor Access to Short-term Parking</strong></td>
<td>▪ <strong>Quick Win:</strong> Establish a third pricing tier and “premium rate” area to shift parking activity to consistently available areas. ▪ <strong>Quick Win:</strong> Make some currently-metered spaces free during hours when capacity is constrained elsewhere. ▪ Continue to monitor utilization and review rates at least annually.</td>
<td>▪ Parking utilization ▪ Customer satisfaction ▪ Meter revenues</td>
<td>▪ Communications and transparency are key; work with partners, like the Birmingham Shopping District, to ensure parkers are informed (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjust parking rates to reflect demand patterns</strong></td>
<td>▪ <strong>Quick Win:</strong> Implement a comprehensive communication strategy to ensure drivers find right-fit parking. ▪ Align citywide planning and wayfinding efforts to create a cohesive sign program in line with the above.</td>
<td>▪ Parking utilization ▪ Customer satisfaction</td>
<td>▪ Coordination with partner agencies and relevant City advisory committees &amp; planning efforts will be key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure that all drivers know all their options</strong></td>
<td>▪ <strong>Quick Win:</strong> Establish a third pricing tier and “premium rate” area to shift parking activity to consistently available areas. ▪ <strong>Quick Win:</strong> Make some currently-metered spaces free during hours when capacity is constrained elsewhere. ▪ Continue to monitor utilization and review rates at least annually.</td>
<td>▪ Parking utilization ▪ Customer satisfaction</td>
<td>▪ Coordination with partner agencies and relevant City advisory committees &amp; planning efforts will be key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Key Steps</td>
<td>Metrics</td>
<td>Other Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Optimize “Park Once” efficiencies | ▪ Work with partners like the Birmingham Shopping District (BSD) and SMART to explore opportunities for a multi-purpose downtown circulator.  
▪ Continue pursuing opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian network improvements with City and regional agencies like SEMCOG and MDOT. | ▪ Pedestrian and bicycle volumes  
▪ # of multi-destination “park once” trips  
▪ Customer satisfaction | ▪ Promote options in line with the above communication strategy  
▪ Coordinate with the Multimodal Transportation Board |
| Continue to refine the Public Valet approach | ▪ **Quick Win:** Work with operators to add mobile functionality to the valet program and increase data capture on use and program costs.  
▪ Explore options for a valet operation in the Lot 6 area to alleviate capacity constraints during key mid-day periods. | ▪ Valet utilization  
▪ Program cost/revenue  
▪ Customer satisfaction | ▪ Program costs and revenues should balance for a sustainable program  
▪ Work with BSD and area businesses to identify additional revenue options |
| Expand mobile payment options to parking structures | ▪ Work with existing and prospective vendors to decipher opportunities for adding mobile payment options to City garages and lots.  
▪ Expand promotion of IN cards to improve payment options and efficiency. | ▪ Parking utilization  
▪ Share of payments by each option  
▪ # of service calls  
▪ Gate backups  
▪ Customer satisfaction | ▪ Weigh options for use of existing equipment with those that require new capital investment |

**Opportunity: Take Advantage of Excess On-street Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Key Steps</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Other Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reduce short-term parking set-asides in City garages | ▪ **Quick Win:** Reduce the number of spaces held for short-term parkers in select garages once new on-street parking tiers have been established.  
▪ Promote right-fit on-street spaces and monitor utilization to ensure an optimal on- and off-street balance. | ▪ On- and off-street utilization  
▪ Permit wait list #’s  
▪ Customer satisfaction | ▪ Work with adjacent property owners and parking demand generators to ensure parkers have sufficient options |
| Continue providing short-term parkers with convenient, low-cost options | ▪ **Quick Win:** Make some currently-metered on-street parking free to provide a competitive alternative to free parking in City garages.  
▪ Promote right-fit on-street spaces and monitor utilization to ensure an optimal on- and off-street balance. | ▪ On- and off-street utilization  
▪ Customer satisfaction | ▪ Consider peak hour restrictions and off-peak promotions that can facilitate the desired shift in parking activity |
### Opportunity: Capitalize on Data Collection and Analysis Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Key Steps</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Other Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Utilize data collection capacity to support performance-based management** | - *Quick Win:* Activate parking meter vehicle detection sensors to support parking enforcement and collect data.  
  - Monitor sensor data to inform performance-based management, rates, and regulations. | - Utilization  
  - Parking duration  
  - Sensor accuracy | - Monitor sensor accuracy before activation and during operations with regular manual checks |
| **Invest in License Plate Recognition (LPR) Equipment** | - Issue an RFQ to identify LPR equipment vendors, services, and qualifications.  
  - Issue a turnkey solicitation to integrate LPR functionality with existing SKIDATA equipment to improve gate function and garage enforcement/compliance. | - Parking utilization  
  - Compliance/enforcement data  
  - Cost of current v. LPR operations | - Perform reference checks with clients who are using vendor services to address accuracy concerns  
  - Data delivery should be a key component in vendor responses |
| **Upgrade Parking Transaction & Management Software** | - *Quick Win:* Upgrade and automate the permit wait list system.  
  - Issue an RFQ for contracting services that track parking patterns across on- and off-street supplies and integrate with permit and payment systems. | - Parking utilization  
  - Permit wait list #s  
  - Cost of current v. proposed operations | - Perform reference checks with clients who are using vendor services  
  - Consider combining this with an Operator services RFP |

### Opportunity: Optimize Management & Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Key Steps</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Other Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Solicit Competitive Bids for Operator Services** | - Evaluate comparable municipal parking programs and operator agreements.  
  - Develop a comprehensive Operator solicitation that incorporates current City needs and opportunities for new or expanded services that meet City goals. | - RFQ/RFP responses  
  - Cost of current v. proposed operations | - Perform reference checks with clients who are using vendor services |
| **Establish a Parking Ambassador Program** | - *Quick Win:* Rebrand parking enforcement assistants as “Parking Ambassadors.”  
  - Provide ongoing ambassador training on parking information, options and visitor amenities. | - Customer satisfaction | - Long-term, consider optimization of BPD staff hours in line with community goals |
| **Refine the Assessment District Fee Approach** | - Evaluate benefits and drawbacks of a revised approach whereby fees are assessed consistently over time. | - Revenue needs  
  - Revenue projections  
  - Property owner feedback | - Consider both economic and community/political benefits of a refined approach |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Key Steps</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Other Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop Park Once Zoning Strategies</td>
<td>▪ Evaluate the City’s zoning code in line with the upcoming Master Plan update to uncover any conflicts between park once strategies and existing regulations.</td>
<td>▪ Zoning code revisions</td>
<td>▪ Weigh options that support continued development and the need for enhanced access &amp; parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest parking revenues in Public Improvements beyond parking</td>
<td>▪ Evaluate potential restrictions on the use of Parking System Enterprise Funds for non-parking improvements. ▪ Explore opportunities for development of a “benefit district” in which parking revenues can be spent on broader access &amp; mobility improvements.</td>
<td>▪ Dollars invested in non-parking improvements/ benefits ▪ Utilization of funded improvements/ benefits</td>
<td>▪ Align with broader community priorities ▪ Consider non-driving mobility options and commuter benefits ▪ Ensure transparency with annual reports on revenue expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to refine the Joint-Development approach</td>
<td>▪ Continue to pursue joint development opportunities like the N. Old Woodward &amp; Bates Street project. ▪ Look for additional opportunities that take advantage of underutilized properties and can address additional public parking supply needs.</td>
<td>▪ Cost savings compared to stand-alone construction ▪ Completion of N. Old Woodward &amp; Bates Street project</td>
<td>▪ Consider options for investing assessment revenues in projects ▪ Focus on long-term City control of public parking assets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION 1
GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Issuing Office
The Ann Arbor Downtown Development Authority (DDA) issued this Request for Proposal (RFP); all correspondence or contact regarding this RFP should be directed to:

Jada Hahlbrock, Manager of Parking Services
Ann Arbor Downtown Development Authority
150 South Fifth Avenue, Suite 301
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
734-994-6697
Email: jhahlbrock@a2dda.org

B. Objective
The purpose of this (RFP) is to select a firm to operate and manage public parking facilities under the control of the Ann Arbor Downtown Development Authority.

C. Questions
Should any prospective Proposer be in doubt as to the true meaning of any portion of this RFP, or should the Proposer find any ambiguity, inconsistency, or omission therein, the Proposer shall make a written request for an official interpretation or correction. All questions concerning the solicitation and specifications shall be submitted in writing via e-mail to Jada Hahlbrock (jhahlbrock@a2dda.org) by 4:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time (EST), on Thursday, February 2, 2017. A single email response will be provided by the DDA to all Proposers who expressed interest on or before February 8, 2017.

Proposers shall not communicate questions or comments to any other DDA staff or Board members during the proposal review process.

D. RFP Schedule
The following Schedule of Events represents the DDA’s best estimate of the schedule that will be followed. All times indicated are (EST); the DDA reserves the right to adjust the schedule as deemed necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFP Issue Date</td>
<td>January 11, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Proposal Conference/Site Tour:</td>
<td>January 26, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written questions due by 4:00 p.m. (EST):</td>
<td>February 2, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addendum posted:</td>
<td>February 8, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal due date by 4:00 p.m. (EST):</td>
<td>February 13, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-listed Proposer Interviews:</td>
<td>March 9, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Proposal Format
Each Proposer must submit a complete response to this RFP using the format found in Section 3. Responses shall be submitted on standard 8½” x 11” letter size paper, bound vertically on the left side with printed material on both sides; the use of expensive and elaborate materials is not necessary. Please limit
submittals to the format and forms provided in this RFP, excluding boilerplate material as much as possible.

Attachment A - Legal Status of Proposer, must be completed and returned with the proposal. An official, authorized to bind the submitter to its proposal provisions, must sign each proposal copy in ink. Proposals shall remain valid at least one hundred twenty (120) days from the submittal date.

All proposals will become the property of the DDA and no materials will be returned.

F. Selection Criteria
Responses to this RFP will be evaluated using the point system as described in Section 3. A Selection Committee, comprised of DDA board and staff members and possibly others, will be appointed to evaluate each proposal.

The Selection Committee will initially evaluate proposals to determine which Proposer(s), if any, shall be selected for the short-list interview process. For the initial evaluation, they will not consider the fee proposals. The fee proposal(s) of the Proposer(s) selected will be opened and reviewed before the interview(s). The selected Proposer(s) will have the opportunity to discuss in more detail their qualifications, experience and fee proposal during the interview process. To decide the most qualified, capable, and cost-effective Proposer, the Selection Committee will evaluate the proposal(s) and interview(s) using the point system described in Section 3, taking into account the fee proposal.

G. Optional Tour of Facilities
There will be an optional pre-proposal conference and site-tour of the parking facilities at 8:30 a.m. on January 26, 2017. Attendees will meet at the DDA offices located at 150 South Fifth Ave, Suite 301 Ann Arbor MI 48104. No later than January 20, 2017 Proposers must RSVP via email their intent to attend the pre-proposal conference and site-tour to Jada Hahlbrock jhahlbrock@a2dda.org (email response shall include the number of attendees for each Proposer).

H. Proposal Receipt
Proposals are due and must be received by the Ann Arbor DDA no later than 4:00 p.m. (EST) on or before February 13, 2017. The DDA office is open from 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. (Monday – Friday), excluding holidays.

Proposer(s) are responsible for the timely submission of their proposal; proposals submitted late or via oral, telephonic, telegraphic, electronic mail or facsimile will not be considered or accepted. The DDA will not be liable to any Proposer for any unforeseen circumstances, delivery, or postal delays. Postmarking on the due date will not substitute for receipt of the proposal. Additional time will not be granted to a single Proposer; however, additional time may be granted to all Proposer(s) should the DDA determine the circumstances are warranted. All proposals shall become the property of the DDA once reviewed, whether awarded or rejected.

Each Proposer shall submit in a sealed envelope the following: i) one (1) original signed proposal, ii) eight (8) additional proposal copies, iii) one (1) USB flash drive providing a digital copy of the proposal. In addition, a separate sealed envelope (marked Fee Proposal) shall contain the following: i) one (1) original signed fee proposal, and ii) eight (8) additional fee proposal copies. If the fee proposal is not submitted in a
separate sealed envelope, proposal will not be considered or accepted and Proposer will be disqualified.

Documents with original signatures should be clearly labeled as such; failure to comply may be cause for rejection of the proposal.

Proposals submitted must be clearly marked: RFP Parking System Management, and include the Proposers name and address. Proposals shall be addressed and delivered to the following:

Ann Arbor Downtown Development Authority
150 S. Fifth Ave Suite 301 (3rd floor)
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

I. Disclosures
All information included in a Proposer’s submittal is subject to disclosure under the provisions of Public Act No. 442 of 1976 known as the "Freedom of Information Act". This act also provides for the complete disclosure of contracts and attachments thereto.

J. Cost Liability
The DDA assumes no responsibility or liability for costs incurred by the Proposer in preparing their response to this RFP.

K. Independent Proposal and Fee Preparation
By submission of a proposal the Proposer certifies that regarding this proposal:

i. They arrived at the proposal content and fee proposal independently, without consultation, communication, or agreement, for the purpose of restricting competition as to any matter relating to such costs with any other proposal submitter or with any competitor.

ii. No attempt has been made or shall be made by the Proposer to induce any other person or firm to submit or not submit a proposal for the purpose of restricting competition.

The person signing the proposal certifies that she or he is the person in the Proposer’s organization responsible for the decision as to the costs being offered in the proposal and has not participated (and will not participate) in any action contrary the above.

L. Negotiation of an Acceptable Contract
The DDA reserves the right to reject any Proposer if the DDA and the Proposer cannot negotiate a contract acceptable to the DDA within five (5) business days after notice of interest is made by the DDA.

The successful Proposer will be required to provide insurance naming the DDA and the City of Ann Arbor as additional insured parties, and indemnify the DDA and the City of Ann Arbor for work preformed under the contract. These requirements are not subject to negotiation.

M. Reservation of Rights
1. The DDA reserves the right in its sole discretion to accept or reject any or all proposals, or alternative proposals, in whole or in part.
2. The DDA reserves the right to waive or not to waive informalities or irregularities in proposals or procedures, and to accept or further negotiate cost, terms, or conditions of any proposal determined by the DDA to be in the best interests of the DDA even though not the lowest bid.

3. The DDA reserves the right to request additional information from any or all Proposers.

4. The DDA reserves the right not to consider any proposal it determines to be unresponsive and/or deficient in any of the information requested within the RFP.

5. The DDA reserves the right to determine whether the scope of the project will be entirely as described in the RFP, a portion of the scope, or a revised scope is implemented.

6. The DDA reserves the right to select one or more Proposers to perform services.

7. The DDA reserves the right to retain all proposals submitted and to use any ideas in a proposal regardless of whether that proposal is selected. Submission of a proposal indicates acceptance by the firm of the conditions contained in this RFP, unless clearly and specifically noted in the proposal submitted.

8. The DDA reserves the right to disqualify proposals that fail to respond to any requirements outlined in the RFP, or failure to enclose copies of the required documents outlined within RFP.
SECTION 2
BACKGROUND AND SCOPE OF SERVICES

A. Background
The DDA is a public entity created in 1982 to promote economic growth and revitalization of the Ann Arbor downtown area. The mission of the DDA is to undertake public improvements that have the greatest impact in strengthening the downtown area and attracting new private investment. Funding is received through the collection of parking fees and incremental tax collections on downtown real estate.

The DDA assumed the responsibility of managing the City of Ann Arbor off-street parking facilities in 1992. Subsequently (2002), the DDA also began management of the on-street parking meters and several more city parking lots. The DDA is also responsible for curb space, including loading zones and signage, and accessible parking and signage within the DDA parking area as identified in Attachment B. The DDA contracted for the services of a professional parking company to operate its parking facilities, and the current contract is set to expire on June 30, 2017.

The city parking system is currently comprised of eight (8) parking structures, two (2) attended surface parking lots, three (3) monthly-only permit lots, ten (10) metered lots, and over eighteen hundred on-street meters, which together provide approximately 8,200 public parking spaces. Gross parking revenue for FY 2016 was slightly greater than $21 million dollars. A detailed listing that includes facility information and equipment by facility is provided in Attachment C, along with a map of the facilities and parking area in Attachment B. Attachment D shows the current level of staffing for the DDA’s current parking operator.

The DDA offers three types of monthly parking permits: 1) a standard permit that provides access into a parking structure 24 hours/day, 7 days/week; 2) a premium permit that provides an assigned parking space near the entrance into a parking structure or lot 24 hours/day, 7 days/week; and 3) an off-peak/overnight monthly permit that provides access into a structure between the hours of 3:30 p.m. and 9:00 a.m. Monday-Friday and all day on the weekends.

Hourly parking is provided in all parking structures and in thirteen (13) surface lots. Hourly patrons can park their vehicles for up to 72 hours in most structures.

Covered free motorcycle/moped parking is provided in all but one parking structure. All parking structures and lots provide free bike parking and many provide bike lockers. Covered and secure Bike Houses are located at the Maynard and Ann Ashley structures. The DDA also provides electric vehicle charging stations and car-share opportunities in many of the facilities.

In 2015 the DDA commissioned a parking study to understand current usage and how to best manage parking to benefit downtown. Study findings can be found on the DDA’s website: http://www.a2dda.org/current-projects/tdm-analysis/

The DDA is a partner in the get!Downtown program (http://www.getdowntown.org/) and works to provide effective commuting options for downtown employees, including providing 90% of the funding for the go!pass, which is a free bus pass available to all downtown employees.

The DDA has invested significant resources, including time, money, and energy, in shaping the public
parking system. A successful Proposer will understand that parking is viewed as a tool to help the DDA accomplish its mission, with downtown vibrancy and sustainability at the core of all we do. The following management principles have been developed and refined over the years and serve to guide the DDA’s parking investments.

- Parking is part of a transportation system and should be understood in that context.
- Parking is not a silver bullet - no one ever came downtown to park. The right balance of parking availability, location, and price is essential to the downtown’s vitality and growth.
- It’s the people we want downtown, not necessarily their cars. A “menu” of transportation options should be constantly improved upon so people can make transportation and parking choices for themselves about the best way to come to and move through downtown, using such considerations as convenience, price, location, and transportation purpose.
- One of downtown’s strengths and appeal is its compact, walkable form, with short blocks, a clearly defined street grid, and a density of services, businesses, and uses in its core. Well-managed parking enables people to take advantage of these assets.
- Public parking policies should be based on quantified data and analysis.
- Parking is very different in an urban environment than in the suburbs, and it is important to understand the differences between these two settings.
- Parking rates should be set to encourage different behaviors. For instance, the availability of on-street parking meters conveys a great deal about the perceived convenience of shopping or doing business downtown, thus regular turn-over at the meters and long-term parking off-street must be encouraged. Rate configuration can affect parking choices by making it less expensive to park in the surface lots than at a street-meter, and least expensive to park in the structures.

B. Scope of Services
The selected Proposer shall provide quality parking operations and management 24 hours per day, seven days per week, 365 days per year, including holidays.

The DDA will consider proposals from qualified and experienced firms ordinarily engaged in the business of providing public parking system operational, management and maintenance services, as described herein and in accordance with the terms, conditions, and requirements set forth in this RFP.

The DDA is seeking a company with experience and expertise in the following areas:

- Public parking operations management
- Access and revenue control equipment and procedures
- Reporting and operating expense controls
- Utilization and data reporting
- Parking structure maintenance and repair
- Experience with electric vehicle charging stations (installation and operation)
- Exemplary customer service (staff training and monitoring)
In the future, the DDA may assume responsibility for parking enforcement operations within the City of Ann Arbor. Although the DDA does not currently manage enforcement, the Proposer should have proven and effective experience with operating and managing parking enforcement staff, citation issuance, and collection processes.

The terms and conditions of the anticipated contract by and between the DDA and Proposer are set forth herein and attached hereto as Attachment E. The following highlights the basic terms of the proposed contract:

   a. Term: An Agreement for a term of 1 year with renewal options only at the discretion of the DDA.
   b. Scope of Work: Operator will provide all necessary materials, staff, expertise, and services to carry out the Scope of Services outlined in the RFP and Attachment E.
   c. Compensation: As compensation for services rendered, Owner will pay the Operator a base management fee for the professional services provided to manage and administer the daily operation of the system. The base fee will be equal to an amount agreed upon and included in a final negotiated contract.
   d. Cost of Operations: Owner will reimburse the Operator for only those direct labor costs and expenses previously agreed upon. Expenses will be reimbursed to the extent that same are paid or incurred in the performance of Operator’s obligations under the contract.
   e. Capital Improvements: During the Term, certain capital improvements projects may occur that are originated and financed by the DDA. The Proposer may be required to adjust staffing schedules and/or operating methodologies to accommodate these types of projects from time to time during the Term of the contract.

Proposer must state whether their proposal does or does not fully comply with the requirements as defined in this RFP and will provide a detailed list of exceptions to the Scope of Services, sample contract or other RFP requirements including all exhibits, forms, appendices, and addenda. The exception list will be in table form and identify the page, section number, provision and exception, non-conformance and/or substitute language proposed. Failure to identify items of non-compliance will result in the DDA assuming compliance.

Changes to the sample contract will not be considered or negotiated if not submitted as part of the Proposer’s submittal. The DDA, at their sole discretion, may modify or reject any exception or proposed change to the contract document.
SECTION 3
INFORMATION REQUIRED FROM ALL PROPOSAL SUBMITTERS

MINIMUM INFORMATION REQUIRED
Submitters should organize Proposals into the following Sections:
A. Company Identification
B. Organization and Resources
C. Professional Qualifications
D. Previous Experience
E. Unique Services
F. Operations Plan
G. Fee Proposal (submit in separate sealed envelope marked “Fee Proposal”)
H. Authorized Negotiator
I. Required Attachments

Company Identification
1. State the full name, address, telephone number, and web site address of the company.
2. Indicate whether you operate as an individual, partnership or corporation. If as a corporation, include whether it is licensed to operate in the State of Michigan.
3. Provide the name, title, address, email, and telephone number of the individual to whom correspondence and other contacts should be directed during the selection process.
4. Provide the name, title, address, email, and telephone number of the individual who will negotiate with the DDA and who can contractually bind the Proposer’s firm.

The following describes the elements of each Section that should be included in each proposal and the point system that will be used by the DDA for evaluation of the proposals.

B. Organization and Resources – 15 Points
Provide a description of the organizational size and structure of the company, brief history, and services offered. Describe the number of home office staff and the resources provided to clients. Describe how the DDA parking system would fit into your organizational structure.

Provide information about the parking systems currently operated/maintained by your company. Include location, how long each of these systems has been under contract with your firm, whether parking is provided to the public, and the nature of each contract.

Provide a copy of the last financial audit for your firm. The audit should be provided in a separate sealed envelope. The audit provided will be considered confidential and will not be disclosed.

Provide full information concerning hiring practices, security screening practices, problem resolution practices, and other like policies of the firm.

All information describing insurability, including current insurance limits or certificates shall be included.
C. Professional Qualifications – 25 Points

Provide a company organizational chart, and the names and titles of key personnel who shall be responsible for the management of the system. The relevant experience in parking operations (including location), level of responsibility and functions that each shall perform shall be described in detail, including the name and resume of the proposed regional manager and general manager. Additionally, names, position titles, functions, experience and technical competence of managers and key support personnel shall also be listed, as well as the anticipated amount of time that key management and support personnel will spend on the DDA contract and an accounting of their competing workload. Both the regional and general managers named in the proposal must be present at the interviews and must be the people who will ultimately be assigned to the Ann Arbor system.

D. Previous Experience – 25 Points

Minimum Qualifications—Professional parking operators who have directly managed a municipal system of at least 5000 spaces (permit and hourly parking) for a minimum of three years and have directly managed a parking enforcement system of at least 1000 spaces for a minimum of three years are qualified for consideration to operate the DDA parking system.

Provide a minimum of five (5) qualification references. At a minimum, two of the five references shall be for a municipal/public system of similar size, complexity, and scope to the DDA’s system; listing names and phone numbers of the appropriate contact person. Include the brand name(s) and brief description of the equipment and operating methodology at each of these locations.

At a minimum, two of the five references shall be for a system of similar size, complexity, and scope to the DDA’s system, in which the proposing firm was responsible for parking enforcement services; listing names and phone numbers of the appropriate contact person. Include the brand name(s) and brief description of the equipment and operating methodology.

Evidence that the firm has satisfactorily performed the work included in these specifications for a period of five (5) years must be included in the proposal.

Provide demonstrated ability to do the following:

a. Provide a system of maximum revenue generation and operational cost containment, while maintaining an enhanced level of patron satisfaction.

b. Provide high-quality facility maintenance and customer service.

c. Adapt parking policies and procedures to incorporate Transportation/Parking Demand Principles (TDM), and alternative transportation initiatives and options.

d. Provide regular, accurate, and detailed client communication, including accessibility and ability to produce thorough and mistake-free reports on demand.

e. Respond quickly to situational needs with immediate communication to the owner, as well as ability to provide longer-term operational and facility recommendations.

f. Provide technologies both inward and outward facing meant to enhance revenue controls, reporting, and customer interface.

If the Operator has been terminated for default on a contract during the past ten-years, all such incidents
must be reported. Termination for default is defined as notice to stop services due to non-performance or poor performance.

E. Unique Services – 5 Points
Highlight the services or attributes that differentiate you from other parking operators and management companies.

F. Operations Plan – 20 Points
The Proposer shall provide a description of how they will effectively manage and operate the parking system to ensure a quality parking experience for all patrons while maximizing revenue generation. Describe the proposed organization chart and level of staffing, descriptions of positions, associated responsibilities, estimated wage rates, and employee benefits.

Describe the standards for hiring employees and detail personnel policies and performance standards. Policies will include standards for employee courtesy, appearance, identification, and offering assistance to customers.

Describe your proposed procedures for cash handling to include at a minimum the following:
- Management of receipts collected by shift including revenue controls;
- Banking of revenues collected daily;
- Reconciliation and audit procedures proposed for cash, credit cards, deposit slips, bank statements, etc.

Provide a sample budget. Focus should be on areas of expenditures and estimated budgeted amounts.

**Please note that if a contract is awarded the DDA retains the right to select vendors and suppliers for all goods and services.**

Describe your expected management approach and your expected working relationship with the DDA.

Describe procedures for administering customer complaints and damage claims.

Describe customer service training and complaint abatement procedures.

Describe approach to safety and security. Describe how this is different for parking structures and parking lots? Describe how this is different off-peak versus peak periods?

Describe emergency response procedures.

Provide monthly, quarterly, and annual maintenance schedules and details. How are customers able to provide feedback on maintenance levels?

Provide a detailed transition plan for assuming control of the System in the initial 30 days following contract award that demonstrates minimal disruption to the operations.
Describe the ongoing level of support to be provided to the Ann Arbor parking system by the regional manager including number of visits annually.

G. Management Fee Proposal – 10 Points
Submit fee proposal in a separate sealed envelope as part of the general proposal.

H. Authorized Negotiator
Include the name and phone number of persons(s) in your organization authorized to negotiate with the DDA.

I. Attachments
Appendix A (Legal Status of Proposer) must be completed and returned with the proposal. This should be included as an attachment to the proposal submission.
SECTION 4
PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Members of the Selection Committee will evaluate each proposal by the above-described criteria and point system to select the firms to be interviewed. The DDA reserves the right to not consider any proposal that it determines to be unresponsive or deficient in any of the information requested for evaluation. A proposal with all the requested information does not guarantee the proposing firm to be a candidate for an interview. The Committee may contact references to verify material submitted by the Proposers. The DDA will determine whether the final scope of the project to be negotiated will be entirely as described in this RFP, a portion of the scope, or a revised scope.

The Committee then will schedule the interviews with selected firms. The selected firms will be given the opportunity to discuss in more detail their qualifications, experience, proposed work plan and fee proposal. The interview shall consist of a presentation of no more than twenty (20) minutes by the Proposer, including the person who will be the manager on this contract, followed by up to thirty (30) minutes of questions and answers. Audiovisual aids may be used during the oral interviews.

The proposal will be re-evaluated after the interview. A candidate will be selected. Further negotiation with the selected candidate will be pursued leading to the award of a contract by the DDA.
SECTION 5
ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

General Requirements

Operator shall duly observe, conform to, and comply with all valid requirements of any governmental authority relative to the performance of the Proposer’s services and operations under the contract and shall require all its personnel to conform to and comply with all such requirements.

Regulatory and Licensing Requirements

Operator shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. The Operator shall procure and keep in force all permits and licenses required by such laws and regulations. These laws and regulations include, but are not necessarily limited to; the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Family and Medical Leave Act, unemployment compensation laws and regulations, and workers’ compensation laws and regulations.

Living Wage

Proposers are advised that the contract is subject to the City of Ann Arbor’s Living Wage ordinance. Please see links below for City of Ann Arbor Living Wage documents.


ATTACHMENT A
LEGAL STATUS OF PROPOSER

(The Proposer shall fill out the appropriate form and strike out the other two.)

* A corporation organized and doing business under the laws of the state of ________________.

for whom _____________________________________________ bearing the office title of
________________, whose signature is affixed to this proposal, is authorized to execute contracts.

* A partnership, list all members and the street and mailing address of each:

________________
________________
________________
________________

Also identify the County and State where partnership papers are filed:

County of __________________, State of

* An individual, whose signature with address, is affixed to this proposal:

(Initial here)
Ann Arbor Downtown Development Authority Parking Area

Legend
- DDA Parking Area
- Gated Lots
- Parking Structures
- Permit-Only Lots
- Metered Lots
- DDA Boundary
- Edge Of Pavement
**Equipment**-

Lane controls include Amano McGann AGP-1700 and AMG-1800 series parking gates.

In-lane cashier equipment is Amano McGann.

Pay on foot stations include; Amano McGann AMG-4300 Express Pay Station, Amano McGann AMG-7800 Pay Station.

Duncan Eagle single and double head meters, as well as Digital Payment Technologies Luke I and II pay stations are used on-street and in metered lots.

Daktronics LED Message Signs.

PARIS Accounting software & Amano McGann card access software.

**Vehicles**-

2008 GMC Canyon  (Has plow capability)

2012 Ford Transit Connect

2012 Ford F-250 Truck  (Has plow capability)

2014 GMC Sierra K1500 Pickup  (Has plow capability)

2014 Dodge Grand Caravan

2014 Dodge Ram C/V Tradesman Van

2014 Dodge Grand Caravan

2016 GMC Sierra K1500 Pickup  (Has plow capability)
**Office/Storage Space***

4th & Washington 1 bathroom

Maynard 1250 sq ft office space (includes 1 bathroom) and 400 sq ft storage space

Forest 275 sq ft office space (includes 1 bathroom) and 350 sq ft meter shop

4th & William 540 sq ft office space (includes 1 bathroom) and 3000 sq ft storage space

Ann Ashley 670 sq ft office space (includes 1 bathroom)

Library Lane 1700 sq ft office space (includes 1 bathroom) and 1600 sq ft storage space

There are various small storage areas and maintenance closets in each structure.

*Sizes are approximate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Number of Spaces</th>
<th>Number of Elevators</th>
<th>Lane Count</th>
<th>Hours of Operation</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure #1</td>
<td>Fourth and Washington</td>
<td>123 East Washington</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24/7, Sundays free</td>
<td>hourly, permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>built 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure #2</td>
<td>Washington and First</td>
<td>201 South First</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24/7, Sundays free</td>
<td>permit &amp; flat rate entry after hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mixed use/apts above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure #3</td>
<td>Maynard</td>
<td>324 Maynard</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24/7, Sundays free</td>
<td>hourly, permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>built 1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure #4</td>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>650 South Forest</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24/7, Sundays free</td>
<td>hourly, permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>co-owned &amp; co-used City &amp; UM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure #5</td>
<td>Fourth and William</td>
<td>115 E William</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24/7, Sundays free</td>
<td>hourly, permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>largest garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure #6</td>
<td>Liberty Square</td>
<td>510 E Washington</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24/7, Sundays free</td>
<td>hourly, permit, after-hours flat rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mixed use/offices below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure #7</td>
<td>Ann Ashley</td>
<td>220 North Ashley</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24/7, Sundays free</td>
<td>hourly, permit, after-hours flat rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>serves county &amp; city employees, courts, plus others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure #8</td>
<td>Library Lane</td>
<td>343 South Fifth</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24/7, Sundays free</td>
<td>hourly, permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>underground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Lot #1</td>
<td>South Ashley</td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24/7, Sundays free</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>referred to by locals as the &quot;Kline lot&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Lot #2</td>
<td>First and Huron</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24/7, Sundays free</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>leased from private owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Lot #3</td>
<td>Fifth and Huron</td>
<td>115 South Fifth</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Permit Only, 24/7</td>
<td>permit</td>
<td>leased from private owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Lot #4</td>
<td>1st and William</td>
<td>216 West William</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Permit Only, Mon-Sat 8am-6pm</td>
<td>permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Lot #5</td>
<td>415 West Washington</td>
<td>415 West Washington</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24/7, Sundays free</td>
<td>flat rate, permit</td>
<td>lot may be temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Number of Spaces</td>
<td>Number of Elevators</td>
<td>Lane Count</td>
<td>Hours of Operation</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metered Lot #1</td>
<td>Main and William</td>
<td>353 South Main</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforced Mon-Sat 8am-6pm</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metered Lot #2</td>
<td>Farmer’s Market</td>
<td>315 Detroit Street</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforced Mon-Sat 8am-6pm</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>avail non-Market days: M-Th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metered Lot #3</td>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>301 East Huron</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforced Mon-Sat 8am-6pm</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>smallest lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metered Lot #4</td>
<td>Kerrytown</td>
<td>407 North Fifth</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforced Mon-Sat 8am-6pm</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>leased from private owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metered Lot #5</td>
<td>Fourth and Catherine</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforced Mon-Sat 8am-6pm</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metered Lot #6</td>
<td>Community High</td>
<td>401 North Division</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforced Mon-Sat 8am-6pm*</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>avail non school days, primarily Sats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metered Lot #7</td>
<td>Depot Lot</td>
<td>329 Depot Street</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforced Mon-Sat 8am-6pm</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>leased from private owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metered Lot #8</td>
<td>Broadway Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforced Mon-Sat 8am-6pm</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metered Lot #9</td>
<td>Gandy Dancer</td>
<td>401 Depot Street</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforced Mon-Sat 8am-6pm</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metered Lot #10</td>
<td>Main and Ann</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforced Mon-Sat 8am-6pm</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>leased from the County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Street Meters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1823</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforced Mon-Sat 8am-6pm</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT D
CURRENT PARKING SYSTEM ORGANIZATIONAL CHART
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PARKING FACILITY MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT
ANN ARBOR DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

THIS AGREEMENT, to be effective as of July 1, 2017, between the Ann Arbor Downtown Development Authority, a Michigan Municipal Corporation, herein called (“the DDA”) and _____________________, hereinafter called (“Manager.”).

WITNESSETH:

1. The DDA entered a contract with the City of Ann Arbor (the “City”), which expires in 2033, whereby the DDA manages the City-owned parking system.

2. The DDA hereby contracts with Manager under the terms, conditions, and provisions hereinafter set out for Manager to operate its parking system located in Ann Arbor, Michigan, known as the DDA System; hereinafter referred to as the "System".

3. The term of this Agreement shall commence on July 1, 2017 and shall continue in effect for a period of twelve (12) months from the said commencement date. At the expiration of the term, the Agreement shall automatically be renewed for up to seven (7) additional one-year (1) terms unless the DDA hereto should elect to terminate the Agreement after giving no less than ninety (90) days written notice prior to the commencement of the applicable renewal period.

4. The System shall be operated by Manager as a municipal System and shall be used for no other purpose without prior written approval of DDA. Manager shall manage, operate, and promote the use of the System in accordance with all laws and governmental regulations.

5. Manager agrees to set aside the necessary parking spaces to protect any previous or future commitments made by the DDA or the City, and Manager agrees to honor any allocations of parking space that the DDA deems necessary. Manager agrees to operate the System in a manner consistent with satisfying, as efficiently as possible, the operating requests, and expectations of the DDA.

6. Manager shall provide the DDA with an annual budget (the “Budget”), no later than six (6) months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year; defined as July 1st through June 30th. The Budget and any significant changes shall be approved by the DDA.

7. This Agreement shall not be assigned nor subcontracted by Manager in whole or in part without the prior written consent of the DDA.
I. **Relationship and Management Fee**

   A. The Manager shall operate the System at the direction of the DDA.

   B. The “System” shall include all off-street parking structures and surface parking lots, as well as all on-street parking spaces, curb space, and related signage within the DDA parking area identified in Schedule D, attached herewith.

   C. The Manager shall be reimbursed for all direct operating expenses, as established in the approved Budget. Schedule A (attached herewith) provides a list of acceptable operating expenses.

   D. The Manager shall be eligible for an annual base management fee equal to $___________.

      (1) For each month, commencing with the date of this Agreement, the Manager shall be paid the monthly portion of the base management fee equal to $__________ per month.

   In addition to the base management fee, Manager shall be eligible for an annual Performance Based Incentive Fee. The Performance Based Incentive Fee shall be predicated upon, but not limited to the Manager’s performance in the following areas:

   i. Level of customer satisfaction, as measured by a survey sampling of System end-users.

   ii. Increase in the net operating income compared to a target level set jointly by the Manager and DDA.

   iii. Cleanliness and maintenance of the System, as measured by the DDA.

   iv. Reduction and control of “Dead Tickets” by the Manager.

   v. Completion of Special tasks or initiatives set jointly by the DDA and/or the Manager.

   vi. General satisfaction of the Manager’s performance.

The Performance Based Incentive Fee shall be paid at the end of each contract year, and the award of a Performance Based fee shall be made at the sole discretion of the DDA.

E. In performing its responsibilities pursuant to this Agreement, it is understood and agreed that Manager is acting as an independent contractor, and the Manager is not a partner, joint-venture partner, or employee of the DDA or the City. It is expressly agreed that Manager will not for any purpose be deemed an agent, ostensible or apparent agent, or servant of the DDA. Manager agrees to take such action as may be reasonably requested by the DDA or the City to inform the public, patrons of the System, and others utilizing the services of Manager of such fact. Manager
acknowledges and agrees that neither it, nor its employees or agents have any right, power or authority to incur and will not incur any financial obligation, legal obligation or liability, or other obligation on behalf of, or binding upon the DDA or the City. Nothing herein shall diminish the right of Manager to receive reimbursement from DDA for the direct Operating Expenses set forth in this Contract, but DDA shall have no obligation to any third party, directly or otherwise, to pay for Operating Expenses.

F. The DDA and Manager agree that during the term of this Agreement all personnel employed by Manager to operate the System shall be solely the employees of Manager and shall have no contractual relationship with the DDA.

G. Manager shall be responsible for payment of income taxes, unemployment taxes, and payroll related taxes, if any, for all such employees.

H. Manager shall have full responsibility for hiring, firing and managing its employees and/or agents. However, should the DDA request the removal of any personnel for any reason, Manager shall remove such employee as soon as possible, but in any event no more than three (3) working days from the DDA's request, and replace such employee with another qualified employee. In addition, the DDA agrees during the term of this Agreement that it shall not enter into any negotiations, communications, or other actions which have as their intended consequence to induce any such person employed by Manager to enter the employ of the DDA in any capacity whatsoever.

I. Manager shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. The Manager shall procure and keep in force all permits and licenses required by such laws and regulations. These laws and regulations include, but are not necessarily limited to; the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Family and Medical Leave Act, unemployment compensation laws and regulations, and workers’ compensation laws and regulations.

II. Revenue

A. "Gross Revenue" shall include all revenue received by Manager related to the operation of the System. Included in “Gross Revenue” shall be all revenue sources including, but not limited to vending machine receipts, irregular payments for special events, and any other sources that may occur from time to time throughout the term of the contract.

B. Manager covenants that it will collect or cause to be collected all the Revenue due the DDA from the operation and use of the System.

C. All receipts collected by the Manager shall be deposited by the Manager in a
bank account designated by the DDA. The DDA will provide the Manager with deposit slips and re-order forms, and Manager shall be responsible for making deposits in a timely manner.

D. In the event of a loss or theft of funds, the Manager shall immediately notify the DDA. The amount of theft or loss shall be paid to the DDA by the Manager within 30 days.

E. The Manager will account for all permit parking income on an accrual basis. All permit receipts will be remitted to an Ann Arbor address and deposited into the DDA's bank account. The Manager will follow the collection policy of the DDA and twice per year the Manager will present to the DDA a list of uncollectible permit accounts for approval to be written off.

F. The Manager will submit for DDA approval, all revenue and cash handling procedures. The Manager will strive to maximize revenues, but not at the expense of customer service or facility maintenance.

G. In addition to the routine audits/reviews performed by the Manager’s local staff, the Manager shall have the following audits/reviews performed by personnel not involved with the System on a routine basis; the findings of which, shall be provided to the DDA.

   (1) Perform a financial audit of the System after any change in General Manager or Administrative Manager/Controller that would entail comparison of the daily revenue reports to the monthly operating reports and the bank statement for the month in question.
   (2) Perform a bi-annual comparison of the permit cards with access to the System, to the monthly billings for the same period, and review accounts receivable, aging and any billing adjustments.
   (3) Bi-annually, compare five randomly selected daily revenue reports to the tickets pulled during that day.
   (4) Compare the revenues and collections of all the automated pay stations on a bi-annual basis.
   (5) Compare monthly ticket reports to the tickets issued for the month on a quarterly basis.

III. Operating Expenses

A. The DDA will reimburse only for those direct operating expenses that have been previously approved by the DDA through the budget process, or approved after the budget process is completed.

B. "Operating Expenses" shall include all ordinary direct operating expenses incurred by the Manager for the operation of the System covered by this contract and
included in Schedule A. Operating Expenses shall not include those items of a
capital cost nature as included in Schedule B.

C. Manager agrees that it will keep complete and accurate record of all receipts and
  disbursements pertaining to the operation of the System.

D. The DDA will advance the Manager $350,000.00 at the beginning of this contract
to be used to pay for the operating costs incurred managing the System. Any
  portions of said advance remaining at the expiration of this contract, including
  renewal periods, if any, shall be returned to the DDA within 60 days.

E. For the purchase of any goods or services up to $5,000.00 annually from the same
  vendor, the Manager shall verify he/she has obtained oral bids from three
  independent sources for such items. For the purchase of any goods or services
  expected to be in excess of $5,000.00 annually from the same vendor, the Manager
  shall verify it has obtained written bids from three independent sources for such
  items. If the Manager elects to select the vendor that is not the lowest bidder, a
  written request shall be made to the DDA for approval. All bids over $36,000.00
  per annual service contract must be pre-approved by the DDA. For
  reimbursement, all expenses that are not purchased specifically for the System, or
  are invoiced by the Manager, shall contain a copy of the original supplier’s
  invoice. If the goods or service is for multiple contracts there shall also contain
  the written method of allocation. The DDA reserves the right to refuse group-
  purchased items through the Manager, such as group health insurance, and have
  those goods or services purchased specifically for the DDA’s operations.

F. On or before the fifteenth day of each month, Manager shall, render to the DDA a
  complete and accurate accounting of all receipts and reimbursable disbursements
  for the preceding month. Any receipt or disbursement item that cannot be easily
  attributed to a facility will be allocated by number of parking spaces in the facilities
  involved or other mutually agreed upon arrangement.

G. The Manager will use the accrual method of accounting for reporting to the DDA.
  All reports will be delivered electronically in Excel and Adobe PDF format. The
  Manager's books and records relating to the System shall be kept at the local office
  of the Manager and shall be available for inspection, audit, and copying at all
  reasonable times by DDA or its duly authorized representatives. Vouchers,
  receipts, or other records shall support disbursements for all direct operating
  expenses. Such reports will be in a form mutually agreed upon by the DDA and
  Manager. The DDA reserves the right to modify all reports furnished by the
  Manager.

(1) After the completion of a calendar month operations the DDA will initiate an
  expense wire transfer of the following amount: i) the amount of the approved
  reimbursable expenses, and ii) the monthly portion due for the base
  Management Fee.
H. The Manager will submit to the DDA a draft annual budget (the “Budget”) seven months prior to the beginning of the DDA’s fiscal year with supporting documentation for any non-routine or large expenses. The DDA may request additional supporting documentation. The DDA may request changes be made to the Budget. The final draft Budget will be incorporated into the DDA’s budget. Changes made to the DDA’s budget during the approval process that impact line items used to fund parking operations will necessitate a change in the Budget. The Budget may be changed prior to or during the budget year by the DDA.

IV. Operations

A. Manager agrees to operate the System in a high-quality and efficient manner following industry standard best practices.

B. Manager agrees to operate the facilities on DDA determined days and hours of operation. For all other hours, Manager shall ensure the System shall be open for business or available free of charge on an unattended basis. The days and hours the system is not operational will be determined by the DDA upon conference with Manager. At this time, free parking is provided to the public on Sundays and holidays. The Manager shall regularly recommend to the DDA suggested changes to the operating hours of any facility to generate a greater net profit or to benefit the community goals of economic vitality and vibrancy.

C. Manager shall employ honest, competent, and courteous personnel who are adequately trained and capable of performing the duties assigned to them in accordance with this Agreement. Manager shall provide adequate staffing levels needed to afford acceptable levels of customer service. This may include, but not be limited to additional staff needed to accommodate special events and/or other special circumstances. All staff shall present themselves in a professional manner, maintain good hygiene, and wear neat and clean uniforms. Manager shall utilize nameplates on the exterior of all parking booths to clearly identify the cashier on duty (when applicable).

D. Manager shall provide appropriate job skills and customer service training to all employees on an on-going basis throughout the term of the Agreement.

E. Manager agrees that the fees charged for parking in the System shall be set by the DDA. The Manager will be given thirty (30) days written notice of any changes.

F. Manager shall ensure at least quarterly visits to Ann Arbor by a Regional Manager employed by the Manager. The purpose of the quarterly visits shall be to meet with the DDA to discuss operations and maintain client satisfaction.
G. Manager shall provide monthly a series of reports compiled into one electronic PDF report. The required reports listed in Schedule C are subject to change and shall be made available in their original file format, upon request by the DDA.

H. During the initial six (6) months of operation, the Manager shall develop a Policies and Procedures Operating Manual for the System and submit the Manual to the DDA for final review, comment, and approval. The approved Manual shall be used in the operation of the System and for ongoing training of staff. The Manager shall annually amend the Manual to address new operating conditions and/or operating methodologies associated with the System.

I. During the initial six (6) months of operation, the Manager shall develop and submit to the DDA an Inventory of System equipment and components. The Inventory shall be kept current and submitted to the DDA annually in January and at time of contract expiration.

J. Manager shall promptly notify the DDA of any issues that impact System operation or customer service, including but not limited to, equipment malfunction or outage and personnel issues. Examples include entrance lanes, exit lanes, or an elevator out of service. Reporting shall include details on expected duration of impact. Manager shall also notify DDA when the issue has been resolved.

K. Manager shall notify DDA promptly of any unusual condition or situation which develops in the course of Manager’s management of the System, such as, but not limited to, theft, impropriety, fire, flood, breakage and casualty, damage to property or injury to persons.

L. During design, planning and construction processes, the DDA may ask Manager to provide expertise and advise on how to achieve maximum operational efficiencies.

V. **Facility Maintenance**

A. Manager agrees to keep the System clean, presentable, attractive, and in a safe and sanitary condition throughout the term of the Agreement.

B. Manager shall not permit anything thereon that violates any insurance provisions contained in the Agreement.

C. Manager shall perform (as a minimum) all housekeeping and preventive maintenance functions as outlined and detailed in the latest edition of the National Parking Association Parking Facility Maintenance Manual.

D. Manager shall implement a maintenance plan to address both daily and seasonal
maintenance tasks such as general maintenance, landscaping, sweeping, power washing, and snow removal throughout the System.

E. Manager shall be responsible for the daily and ongoing maintenance requirements of all mechanical systems including but not limited to the elevators, generators, fire suppression, and storm water systems.

F. Manager shall be responsible for actively managing all warranties and bringing to DDA attention when warranties end.

G. The Manager and DDA shall conduct at least one annual walk-through of the System and create a maintenance and repair list for the year. Time and date of the annual walk-through shall be determined by the DDA.

H. Manager and DDA shall notify each other of any structural, mechanical, electrical, or other installations, or alterations to the System required by statutes or regulations pertaining to air quality, environmental protection, provisions for persons with disabilities or other similar governmental requirements in writing.

   a. DDA may request the Manager to make such installation or alterations with either its own staff or by a third-party contractor under their supervision. Any costs associated with such installations or alterations shall be considered a direct reimbursable operating expense.

I. DDA shall be responsible for all major repairs (over $10,000) to the System. All minor repairs (under $10,000) including, but not limited to electrical, plumbing, pavement repair, painting of the exterior of a structure, replacement of lighting fixtures, window and glass repairs, repairs to the walls and floors, and maintenance of ventilation systems, elevators and signs shall be either completed by the Manager or a third-party contractor under the Manager's supervision, the cost of which shall be considered as a reimbursable operating expense.

J. Manager shall use reasonable diligence in the care and protection of the System during the term of the Agreement, and shall surrender said premises at the termination of the Agreement in as good condition as received; ordinary wear and tear accepted.

K. During design, planning and construction processes, the DDA may ask Manager to provide expertise and advice on how to achieve maximum maintenance effectiveness and extend the durability of parking facility and equipment.

VI. Information Technology

A. Manager shall employee an in-house IT team with the technical competency and experience to create and maintain both effective and user-friendly customer and
client facing IT applications, including but not limited to web-based payment and request systems, a System website, pay-by-phone, and other parking solutions.

B. Manager shall perform routine and preventative maintenance on all parking and information technology equipment with a goal of keeping all equipment up and running effectively.

C. Manager shall have the staff, capability, and capacity to recommend, procure, and implement new technologies to the System as requested. As new technologies are considered or added to the System, the Manager shall provide the DDA with project planning details that include probable cost estimates, timelines, and schedule for implementation.

D. Manager shall abide by data ownership and access, as well as PCI compliance and system security requirements as outlined in Schedule E. DDA shall retain all rights and access to the parking data generated from the System.

VII. Parking Enforcement

Intentionally left blank

VIII. Insurance

The Manager, and any of their subcontractors, shall not commence work under this Agreement until they have obtained the insurance required under this paragraph, and shall keep such insurance in force during the entire term of the Agreement. All coverage shall be with insurance companies licensed and admitted to do business in the State of Michigan and acceptable to the DDA. The requirements below should not be interpreted to limit the liability of the Manager. All deductibles and SIRs are the responsibility of the Manager.

Premiums with respect to such policies required to be carried by the Manager shall be paid by Manager and shall constitute a reimbursable operating expense upon the submission of the original invoice and written evidence of how it was allocated to the System. Such policies shall be subject to the approval of DDA for adequacy, form and protection. If the insurance coverage provided by the Manager is deemed to have been canceled or not in force by the DDA, the DDA reserves the right to obtain coverage and cease reimbursement to the Manager for its insurance cost. Manager is responsible for maintaining all risk property insurance for the System and equipment contained therein naming both DDA and Manager as insured.

Manager shall carry liability insurance in such amounts as shown below, pay all the premiums thereon when due and to cause such insurance to name the DDA and the City as additional insured thereunder:

**Worker’s Compensation Insurance**, including Employers’ Liability Coverage, in
accordance with all applicable statutes of the State of Michigan.

**Workers' Compensation Policy Limits:**
- Coverage A - Statutory
- Coverage B - $100,000

DDA acknowledges that all insurance coverage except Workers Compensation is subject to a deductible amount not to exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000.00) and that the payment of the deductible amount(s) will be considered as a reimbursable direct operating expense of the System. Any losses not covered by the above insurance shall constitute expenses of DDA provided that such loss did not arise in whole or in part by the negligence or willful misconduct of Manager, its agents or employees.

**Commercial General Liability Insurance**, on an “Occurrence Basis” with limits of liability not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence, and $10,000,000 in aggregate.

$1,000,000 combined single limit (which shall include coverage for each occurrence for bodily injury and dishonest acts of Manager's employees and agents and property damage).

**Umbrella Excess Coverage**, excess liability insurance limit of $10,000,000 (Umbrella Form) over the insurance required herein.

Coverage shall include the following extensions: (A) Contractual Liability; (B) Products and Completed Operations; (C) Independent Contractors Coverage; (D) Broad Form General Liability Extensions or equivalent, if not already included; (E) Deletion of all Explosion, Collapse, and Underground (XCU) Exclusions, if applicable.

**Automobile Liability**, including Michigan No-Fault Coverages, with limits of liability not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence combined single limit for Bodily Injury, and Property Damage. Coverage shall include all owned vehicles, all non-owned vehicles, and all hired vehicles.

**Crime**, crime insurance coverage of not less than $10,000, covering acts of fraud, mysterious disappearance, and theft of money, check alteration and forgery, computer fraud, and burglary, etc., and including third-party crime endorsement for DDA property.

**Additional Insured**, Commercial General Liability and Automobile Liability, as described above, shall include an endorsement stating the following shall be Additional Insureds: The Manager, all elected and appointed officials, all employees and volunteers, agents, all boards, commissions, and/or authorities and board members, including employees and volunteers thereof. It is understood and agreed by naming the Member as additional insured, coverage afforded is considered to be primary and any other insurance the Member may have in effect shall be considered secondary and/or excess.
In the event of work performed by third parties within the System, either on behalf of DDA or Manager, such third parties will provide insurance coverage in the forms and amounts shown above, or other coverage as the DDA may reasonably require, naming both DDA and Manager as additional insureds.

**Cancellation Notice:** Certificates evidencing all insurance coverage listed above shall be furnished by the Manager to DDA and such certificates shall contain an endorsement requiring the insurance carrier to provide at least thirty (30) days written notice in the event of cancellation or material change. Advance Written Notice of Cancellation, Non-Renewal, Reduction, and/or Material Change shall be sent to: Ann Arbor Downtown Development Authority 150 South Fifth Ave., Suite 301 Ann Arbor MI 48104.

**IX. Indemnification**

Manager shall defend, indemnify, and hold DDA harmless from and against all actions, costs, claims, losses, expenses, and/or damages, sustained by DDA attributable to the recklessness, carelessness, intentional wrong doing or negligence of Manager or any of its agents, servants, or employees from any cause, including, without limitation by specification, property damage and/or injury or death to any person or persons.

It is agreed that any actions, costs, claims, losses, expenses, and/or damages resulting from design or structural faults or defects shall not be the responsibility of Manager.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained elsewhere in this Agreement, neither the DDA nor Manager shall be liable to the other or to any insurance company (by way of subrogation or otherwise) insuring the other party for any loss or damage to any building, structure or other property or any resulting loss of income, or losses under workers’ compensation laws and benefits, even though such loss or damage might have been occasioned by the negligence of such party, its agents or employees, if, and to the extent that, any such loss or damage is covered by insurance which is maintained by either party, and such insurance does not prohibit the foregoing waiver of subrogation.

**X. Health and Safety**

Manager agrees that Manager has been retained by the DDA for reasons which include Manager’s expertise regarding the safety and health hazards associated with the System to be performed by the Manager. Manager agrees that it has and will have sole responsibility for the health, safety and welfare of its employees and all other persons performing services for the System. At all times while performing services, Manager will also comply with all applicable health, safety, security and environmental procedures, policies, and guidelines of the DDA.

**XI. Penalties and Termination**

A. In the event Manager shall fail to abide to this Agreement fully and faithfully, DDA
shall have the right to forthwith terminate the Agreement immediately, regain immediate possession of the System, and hold Manager liable for any damages resulting to DDA.

B. The DDA may cancel this agreement if the City cancels its management contract with the DDA.

C. If it shall become impossible on account of Force Majeure for Manager or DDA to fulfill its obligations under the Agreement, such party shall be excused from the performance of said obligation for the period that said performance is impossible. The term "Force Majeure" as used in this paragraph shall include: 1) fire, earthquake, flood, tornados, acts of God, strike or other labor disturbance beyond the reasonable control of Manager, riot or civil commotion, failure of power, law or regulation which prohibits performance, court order, insurrections, war or any other matter or situation of a like nature (including hostility, with or without formal declaration of war. 2) Any law regulation or order of any government authority prohibiting the performance of the obligations set forth in this Agreement.

D. If the Manager fails to perform any of the requirements of the Agreement, the DDA has at its discretion the right to make monetary deductions from the Manager's base management fee. The following are monetary deductions applicable to breaches, but shall not be deemed an exclusive list of the monetary deductions the DDA may impose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infraction</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure to maintain facility hours of operations</td>
<td>$5,000.00/incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to follow DDA's Collection Policy</td>
<td>$1,000.00/incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to correct a situation pointed out by DDA staff or Contractor in a reasonable period</td>
<td>$1,000.00/ incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to follow NPA, Parking Garage Maintenance Manual Guidelines, such as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to properly wash down all structures bi-annually;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of non-approved chemicals for de-icing within the structures;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of non-rubber blade snow plow on a Neoguarded surfaces; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to winterize water supply lines in a structure</td>
<td>$2,000.00/incident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enacting fines upon the Manager does not prevent the DDA from holding the Manager financially liable for any lost revenues or increased operating expenses due to their negligence.

XII. **Other**

A. DDA shall have the right to enter and inspect any facility, or part of a System facility at all times throughout the term of the Agreement. Manager shall provide an all access key to the DDA to allow access 24/7.

B. It is understood and agreed that this Agreement shall be binding upon and inure to the
benefits of the heirs, personal representatives, successors and assigns of the parties. The previous sentence notwithstanding, no assignment of or subcontracting under this Agreement or the rights and obligations of Manager shall be valid without the prior written consent of DDA and any attempt to assign or subcontract without such prior written consent shall be void.

C. Notwithstanding all provisions of this Agreement, it is mutually understood between the parties hereto, that this Agreement shall not in any way be construed to be a lease but is merely a recitation of contract provisions.

D. If any section of this Agreement is found unlawful or illegal or becomes so, the remainder of the contracted terms shall remain in full force and effect.

E. The terms of this Agreement shall be modified only by a written addendum signed by both the DDA and Manager.

F. DDA has the right to temporarily shut down part or all of the System for repair at its sole discretion. In this case all fees and contractual obligations shall remain fully intact.

G. DDA has the right to remove spaces or facilities, or to add spaces or facilities to the System in a permanent way, at its sole discretion. In this case all fees and contractual obligations for any deletions or additions to the System shall be mutually negotiated.

XIII. Notification

A. Notice to both the DDA and Manager shall be sent using overnight courier service; signature required for delivery, or by certified mail, return receipt requested; to the following addresses:

To DDA:
Ann Arbor DDA
150 S. Fifth Avenue, Suite 301
Ann Arbor, MI  48104

To Manager:

____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________

This Agreement shall be construed and governed according to the laws of the State of Michigan, without giving effect to its conflict of laws provision. Any suit, action, or proceeding with respect to this Agreement, shall be brought in the Courts of the State of Michigan, or in the United States courts located in the State of Michigan and the parties hereby submit to the jurisdiction of such courts for the purpose of any such suit, action, or proceeding.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, DDA has caused this instrument to be executed in its corporate name by its duly authorized officer and Manager has hereunto set his hand the day and date first above written.

ATTEST: ANN ARBOR DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

BY: ___________________________   BY: ___________________________
Chair, DDA                     Executive Director, DDA

ATTEST: XXXXXXX

BY: ___________________________   BY: ___________________________
SCHEDULE "A"

Operating Expenses – Manager (subject to addition and/or deletion)

1. The direct cost of the wages for all personnel assigned to the System (subject to the City’s Living Wage ordinance) which shall include payroll taxes, reasonable fringe benefits, such as workers' compensation insurance at the State mandatory rate for parking attendants, unemployment insurance, social security, hospital, and sickness insurance.

2. Reasonable business telephone expenses for staff assigned to the System.

3. Licenses and permits necessary to operate the System.

4. Employee recruitment ads.

5. The itemized direct cost of Insurance to the extent required of Manager in this Agreement.

6. Sundry items such as uniforms, tickets, and janitorial supplies for the System.

7. Data processing expense related solely to the processing of financial transactions and revenue and expense data for the System to be paid to the Manager with the monthly cost reimbursement.

8. Normal maintenance and repairs to the System including snow removal, repainting of stall markings, replacement or repair of signs, revenue control equipment, light bulb replacement, painting and cleaning.

9. Legal or audit charges directly attributable to the operation of the System other than those performed by the staff of DDA or Manager except to the extent covered below, if approved in advance by the DDA.

10. The costs of special audits as required by DDA to be performed from time to time by Manager's staff auditor for the mutual benefit of DDA and Manager; provided, however, that the time and manner of the taking of the audit are approved in writing by DDA in advance. Special audit costs qualifying as Operating Expenses shall be limited to a mutually agreed upon per diem rate and the actual out-of-pocket expenses of the auditor during the period of an approved special audit.

11. The cost of the insurance deductible amounts as agreed upon. A copy of all claims will be forwarded to DDA. The DDA shall approve the settlement of any claim over the limit of the policies.


Any changes to the costs listed above shall be approved by the DDA prior to being incurred.
SCHEDULE "B"
Operating Expenses - DDA (subject to addition and/or deletion)

1. Real and personal property taxes of DDA's properties leased for parking facilities.

2. All claims, expenses and/or damages arising from, or caused by structural or design deficiencies or by improper work or supervision during construction including without limitation, settlement, collapse or inadequacy of structure or equipment, and all repairs related thereto.

3. Debt service with respect to land, building and equipment for parking facilities.

4. Costs of legal and auditing fees of DDA.

5. Salaries and wages of all DDA employees, and costs incurred by DDA in the supervision of the Manager.

6. Costs for maintaining elevators, sprinkler and ventilation systems over $10,000.

7. System utility expenses including gas, electricity, and water.

8. Capital expenditures, improvements, alterations, additions and all new equipment, including all architectural and engineering fees in connection therewith.
SCHEDULE "C"
Monthly Report Content
(Subject to Change / Some Samples Included)

Off Street Summary;
Off Street Revenue Report;
Off Street Bank Reconciliation;
Stamp Sales Report;
Ticket Summary;
Permit Activity Report;
Payroll Labor Distribution;
Marriott Valet Report;
Check Register;
Payables Copies; and
Special projects report.

For Each Parking Facility:
Remote Monitoring;
On Street Summary;
On Street Bank Reconciliation;
A/R Aging Summary;
Meters In System;
Meter Monthly Revenue Report;
Meter Cash Card Revenue;
ePark Revenue;
Meter Revenue by Lot; and
Free Meter Bag Report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Billing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation Billing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamps Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Card Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over &amp; Short</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Revenue**

ADD: Beginning A/R

Contracts

Validations

**Total Beginning A/R**

SUBTRACT: Ending A/R

Contracts

Validations

**Total Ending A/R**

**Total Net Revenue**

**EXPENSES:**

**Personnel Expenses**

Payroll

-Salary

-Hourly

Payroll Taxes

Workers Comp

Employee Health Care

**Total Personnel Expenses**

**Operating Expenses**

General Administration

Office Supplies

Tickets Printing

Postage

Gas, Oil, Maintenance

Communications

Material

Data Processing

Uniforms

Insurance

Card Refunds

Bad Debt

RCS Equip & Repairs

Snow Removal

Maintenance Contract

Contract Work

**Total Operating Expenses**

Management Fee

Incentive Fee

**Grand Total Expenses**

**Net Operating Surplus**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>WASHINGTON &amp; FOURTH</th>
<th>FIRST &amp; WASHINGTON</th>
<th>MAYNARD</th>
<th>FOREST</th>
<th>4TH &amp; WILLIAM</th>
<th>LIBERTY SQUARE</th>
<th>ASHLE</th>
<th>LANE</th>
<th>SOUTH ASHLE</th>
<th>FIRST &amp; HURON</th>
<th>PF &amp; HURON</th>
<th>1ST &amp; WILLAMS</th>
<th>415 W WASH.</th>
<th>OLD Y LOT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Card Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADD Beginning A/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Beginning A/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTRACT A/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ending A/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Hourly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Comp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Health Care/Benefits/401k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Card Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Exp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Surplus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue
- Contract Billing
- Validation Billing
- Stamps Income
- Special Event
- Access Card Sales
- Other

Expense Categories:
- Total Personnel Expenses
- Operating Expenses
- Total Operating Expense
- Management Fee
- Incentive Fee
- Grand Total Expenses
- Net Operating Surplus

Use the table to analyze and track financial data for various categories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Loc #</th>
<th># Patrons</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th># Patrons</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th># Patrons</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th &amp; Wash</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st &amp; Wash</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynard</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th &amp; Will</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Sq.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Ashley</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Lane</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Ashley</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st &amp; Huron</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th &amp; Huron</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st &amp; Williams</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Washington</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals:         |       |           |         |           |         |           |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |               |
Offstreet - OCTOBER 2016

Less:
- OCT Revenue Deposited in NOV

Total Credits on Bank Statement
Less:
- SEPT Revenue Deposited in OCT
- Paystation Refunds
- Onstreet Rev Deposited in off street
- Deposit correction captured in net revenue
- Credit card settle difference

Add:
- Off Street Rev Deposited in On Street
- Epark Refunds

Difference $
## 2016 Validation Discount Coupon Sale Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>1 HOUR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2 HOUR</th>
<th></th>
<th>Amount Due</th>
<th>PAYMENT TYPE</th>
<th>SOLD BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/4/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/5/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ 82 Total

---

Total Stamp Sales $
Ticket Summary
(One composite report and separate report for each facility)

1. Price Point Summary- number of each ticket for each day of the month (including percentage of total)
2. Summary of Other tickets total per day including- free, employee, validated, coupon, void, etc..
3. Comparison of tickets collected to tickets issued and ticket loss
### Permit Activity Report

For the month of: **October 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Previous EOM Permit Balance</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Deductions</th>
<th>End of Month Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>4th and Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1st and Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Maynard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>4th and William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Liberty Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Ann &amp; Ashley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Library Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Fifth and Huron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1st and William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>415 W Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

---

**SAMPLE**
## PAYROLL LABOR DISTRIBUTION DETAIL

PERIOD ENDING DATES FROM: 10/01/16 TO: 10/31/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPLOYEE NAME</th>
<th>HOURLY RATE</th>
<th>REGULAR HOURS</th>
<th>OVERTIME HOURS</th>
<th>HOLIDAY HOURS</th>
<th>VACATION HOURS</th>
<th>OTHER HOURS</th>
<th>REGULAR WAGES</th>
<th>OVERTIME WAGES</th>
<th>HOLIDAY WAGES</th>
<th>VACATION WAGES</th>
<th>OTHER WAGES</th>
<th>TOTAL WAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT TEAM:</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASHIERS/UTILITY:</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINTENANCE:</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METERS:</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOURLY GRAND TOTALS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF OVERTIME</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENDOR</td>
<td>CK#</td>
<td>GENERAL Ledger ACCOUNT</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total: 92

Total: 93
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAYROLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYROLL TAXES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401K COMPANY MATCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION DUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE BENEFITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE - EMPLOYEE HEALTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE INC. - DENTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE CLAIMS LIABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE LIABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE AUTO, ETC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE ON STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE WORKMANS COMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE - EMPLOYEE DISHONESTY BOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION ASSISTANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE INCENTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTENDANCE INCENTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ PAYROLL PROCESSING FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSION/BONUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYROLL/INSURANCE EXPENSE SUBTOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA PROCESSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENSE (GRAND TOTAL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Billing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation Billing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamps Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Card Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADD: Beginning A/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Expenses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Hourly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Health Care &amp; Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel Expenses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tickets Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto, Gas, Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCS Equip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Expenses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operating Surplus</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SCHEDULE "E"

System Data Access and Security Requirements

All the direct and indirect costs of the labor, equipment, and other materials necessary for performing the functions as set forth in this document and in keeping with industry standards shall be included in the annual budgeting process.

Data Ownership
DDA shall retain all rights and access to the parking data generated from the Parking System. It is the intent of the DDA to continue to use the data after the contract is terminated. The Manager agrees that the DDA will own the data and must agree to provide data upon termination of the contract to the DDA in a readable electronic form agreed upon by both parties.

Manager shall be responsible for data retention and security compliance issues.

Back-up Files
The Manager will ensure all parking system data is backed up daily to ensure any data loss due to system or equipment failure or data breaches is minimal.

Document Storage and Retrieval
The Manager shall store all documents relating to operations for a minimum of five (5) years. Stored documents must be capable of being retrieved within 48 hours. Documents shall be stored in the Ann Arbor area.

Upon request Manager shall explain in detail the system they intend to use store documents, and how the system shall ensure that documents are retained in usable condition at all times and not misfiled or misplaced.

PCI Certification
Manager must be certified to meet payment card security requirements for Visa, MasterCard, American Express and Discover, including, but not limited to PCI DSS (Payment Card Industry Data Security Standards), PA DSS (Payment Application Data Security Standards) and PABP (Payment Application Best Practices) requirements and other requirements as they are adopted by Visa, MasterCard, American Express and Discover. Documentation must be provided to demonstrate PCI compliance.

Security
Security includes the protection of physical items such as records, files, communications networks, cash, checks and citations. Security shall also include guarding non-physical items such as the
confidentiality of data, prevention of abuse, and limiting access to only personnel with proper authorization.

The Manager shall fully cooperate with regular audits by DDA staff and implement internal audits that shall be performed to review control policies and procedures, both physical and non-physical security, and provide any sample testing that shall be provided to ensure security. The results of internal audits performed by the Manager shall be reported quarterly to the DDA.

Upon request Manager shall describe the physical and non-physical security measures that will be in place.
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)
Specification No. 16-11014-C
FOR
OFF-STREET PARKING FACILITY MANAGEMENT
PROPOSALS WILL NOT BE OPENED AND READ PUBLICLY

Dear Proposer:

The City of Berkeley is soliciting written proposals from qualified firms to provide parking management and operational services at City-owned parking garage facilities. As a Request for Proposal (RFP) this is not an invitation to bid and although price is very important, other factors will be taken into consideration. A mandatory pre-proposal conference is planned for Wednesday, March 30, 2016 (see page 4 for details).

The project scope, content of proposal, and vendor selection process are summarized in the RFP (attached). Proposals must be received no later than 2:00 pm, on Tuesday, April 19, 2016. All responses must be in a sealed envelope and have “OFF-STREET PARKING FACILITY MANAGEMENT” and Specification No. 16-11014-C clearly marked on the outer most mailing envelope. Please submit one (1) unbound original and six (6) copies of the proposal as follows:

Mail or Hand Deliver To:
City of Berkeley
Finance Department/General Services Division
2180 Milvia Street, 3rd Floor
Berkeley, CA 94704

Proposals will not be accepted after the date and time stated above. Incomplete proposal or proposals that do not conform to the requirements specified herein will not be considered. Issuance of the RFP does not obligate the City to award a contract, nor is the City liable for any costs incurred by the proposer in the preparation and submittal of proposals for the subject work. The City retains the right to award all or parts of this contract to several bidders, to not select any bidders, and/or to re-solicit proposals. The act of submitting a proposal is a declaration that the proposer has read the RFP and understands all the requirements and conditions.

For questions concerning the anticipated work, or scope of the project, please contact Danette Perry, Parking Services Manager, via email at dperry@cityofberkeley.info no later Thursday, April 7, 2016. It is the vendor’s responsibility to check for answers to questions or any addenda on the City of Berkeley’s website at http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/ContentDisplay.aspx?id=7128&portalID=20. For general questions concerning the submittal process, contact purchasing at 510-981-7320.

We look forward to receiving and reviewing your proposal.

Sincerely,

Dennis Dang
General Services Manager
I. BACKGROUND /SUMMARY OF FACILITIES

The City of Berkeley is a densely populated community with over 115,000 residents, and home to the University of California-Berkeley, Berkeley City College, and a cornucopia of notable restaurants, businesses, and theaters. The Transportation Element of the City’s General Plan adopted in 2001 dictates Parking Management policy for the Downtown and Southside areas. As of 2015, the City of Berkeley’s three parking structures are part of the permanent goBerkeley program, the City’s demand-responsive parking management program that sets rates and time limits at on-street metered and city-owned off-street parking spaces in the Downtown, Southside and Elmwood neighborhoods. goBerkeley’s practice is to manage the supply of public parking to discourage long-term all-day parking and increase the availability and visibility of short-term parking for local businesses. The operator of the three facilities will be an integral part of the goBerkeley program by ensuring parking availability, providing effective wayfinding and driver information, prioritizing short-term over long-term parkers, and providing excellent customer service.

A. GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The City of Berkeley Public Works Parking Services Group intends to enter into an Agreement with a qualified Operator to provide parking management and operational services for the three primary City-owned off-street parking facilities, and stack parking services for a City owned surface lot location near the Downtown. Two garage facilities will be operational at the beginning of this contract, and the third garage will open by approximately August 2017. These three facilities contain a total of 1,249 spaces and are all located in the mainstream of commercial business districts in the Downtown area (2) and the south side Telegraph Channing area (1). The surface lot has 109 parking spaces and is controlled by pay stations. Stack Parking Services will be required until the 3rd facility is on-line in August 2017.

B. DESCRIPTION OF PARKING FACILITIES

Existing Parking Facilities

The Telegraph Channing Garage, located at 2450 Durant Avenue in Berkeley, was built in 1969 and developed as a mixed-use facility. It is located one-half block west of Telegraph Avenue with entrances on both Channing Way and Durant Avenue. It is the only major public parking facility in the area. The garage is approximately 167,000 square feet and contains five levels of parking with 430 parking spaces. The ground floor contains a retail mall with 16 leased retail spaces. The retail mall is an important part of the Facility in that it shares elevators, access corridors, and two public bathrooms with the garage. Retail tenants are responsible for maintenance inside their leased space. The parking access revenue control system (PARCS) at Telegraph Channing Garage uses Ski-Data equipment with pay on foot stations located on the ground floor. Because of under-utilized parking supply under the goBerkeley program, the Telegraph Channing garage currently offers a “First Hour Free” promotion. Gross annual revenues are over $1.2 million.

The Oxford Parking Garage, located at 2165 Kittredge is one block east of Shattuck Avenue between Kittredge Street and Allston Way in the downtown Berkeley area. It opened in March 2009 as an underground parking facility that has 99 parking spaces and serves movie theaters, restaurants, retail shops, and other businesses located nearby; as well as the University of California. Gross annual revenues are over $500,000.

The Berkeley Way Lot, located on Berkeley Way between Shattuck Avenue and Milvia Street is just north of the downtown area. The self-park lot with 109 parking spaces, has an 8-hour time limit restriction and is controlled by pay and display pay stations. Stack parking adds approximately 20
additional vehicles to the inventory. The lot is open from 7am – 10pm daily. Stack parking services are required 8:00am – 6:30pm Monday- Friday.

**Planned Parking Facilities**

**Center Street Garage – Opening August 2017**

The proposed Center Street Garage will replace the existing parking structure with an eight-level, 720-space parking garage facility that will include a ground floor (first floor) operation center, small retail spaces, public restrooms accessible from both Addison Street and Center Street, an art display area, and secure bicycle parking. The garage is proposed to have six entry/exit lanes and will initially be wired for 24 electric vehicle (EV) charging stations with the capability of expanding to a total of 57 EV charging stations. Photovoltaic (PV) solar panels will extend 10-feet above the rooftop parking surface over parking areas (approximately 50% of the rooftop area) with a structural frame designed to allow expansion to the maximum allowable rooftop coverage (approximately 70-80%).

The facility’s 1,911 sq. ft. operation center will include Parking Operator offices, a break room, supply rooms, employee restroom and storage. The garage will also be designed to capture rainfall for the garage’s irrigational use with a 7,500 gallon cistern and associated built–in infrastructure to contribute captured rainfall to an area wide solution when it has been defined and developed.

The garage is proposed as a “double helix” design with sloping concrete parking ramps extending along the central drive aisles between the Addison Street and Center Street entrances. The floor slabs would have level sections at the north and south ends of the structure where the elevators and stairways are located.

Of the 720 parking spaces proposed, the garage would include 627 standard parking spaces 44 compact spaces, an initial 24 EV charging spaces (4 each on levels 2-7) with built-in infrastructure for expansion to a total of 57 EV charging stations and 33 Clean Air/Vanpool/Electric Vehicle (CAV) spaces. A total of 16 accessible parking spaces are provided on the north and south sides of the second level with direct access to the elevators via protected walkway outside the drive aisles.

Technology that provides dynamic signage and real time information on parking space availability and location will be incorporated in the garage. Larger multiple fixture public restrooms will be provided in the Addison Street lobby near the elevators and smaller (two fixture) public restrooms near the Center Street entrance.

The project will strive to attain a Green Garage Gold level certification, but must achieve at least Silver level. In addition, the project will strive to be zero net energy. Specifically, it will include on-site energy production that generates as much energy as the building consumes on an annual basis for building operations such as lighting, elevator, air conditioning in the office area, and entry/exit gates.

**Other uses & features**

**Bike Station:** On the Center Street frontage, the garage would house the new location for the Downtown Berkeley Bike Station. The Bike Station is managed by Bike Station personnel and will occupy a total of 3,855 sq. ft. offering secure valet bicycle parking for approximately 328 bicycles. The Bike Station makes available for sale bicycle maintenance and repair services, retail sales of biking accessories, bicycle rentals and coffee. In addition, at this new location the Bike Station will oversee a secure bicycle self-parking area (592 sq. ft.) with parking for approximately 56 bicycles. This self-park area will be accessible only to BikeLink pass holders 24 hours per day.

**Micro-retail & Art Gallery:** A small (568 sq. ft.) retail space intended for a quick service restaurant would be located at street level on Addison Street. Next to the micro-retail space will be a three sided art display area (285 sq. ft.) which will be visible from the Addison Street sidewalk and from the lobby/corridor areas within the garage. The art display area will be managed by the Civic Arts
Commission. This art display area provides opportunity to the Commission to exhibit a whole array of art mediums.

C. PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE

A mandatory pre-proposal conference has been scheduled for:

Wednesday, March 30, 2016 at 1:00 pm
City of Berkeley
City Hall
2180 Milvia, Cypress Room 1st Floor
Berkeley, CA 94702

The purpose of this conference is to review the RFP, respond to questions, and discuss the Parking Operations. ALL RESPONDANTS MUST HAVE ATTENDED THIS CONFERENCE. Failure of bidder to attend this conference will result in rejection of bidder's proposal response. It is strongly advised that all prospective operators familiarize themselves with the City of Berkeley and its facilities prior to the pre-proposal conference.

Responding bidders are urged to tour the facilities prior to submitting a proposal and to walk the neighborhoods to understand the importance of these parking facilities to the commercial and institutional areas.

D. SUMMARry OF CHATACTERISTICS OF PARKING FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Telegraph Channing Garage</th>
<th>Center Street Garage</th>
<th>Oxford Garage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Above-Grade Garage</td>
<td>Above-Grade Garage</td>
<td>Underground Garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spaces</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Levels</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Footage</td>
<td>167,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>46,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validations Accepted</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Auto Entry Points</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Elevators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stairwells</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket Dispensers (auto entry)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket Readers (auto exit)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Stations (on foot)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Servers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity Readers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. HOURS OF OPERATION

**Telegraph Channing Garage** hours* of operation are as follows (except on certain business holidays):
Monday through Thursday from 7:00 am to 1:00 am
Friday and Saturday from 7:00 am to 2:00 am
Sunday from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 pm

*Approximately six days per year, when requested in advance by the City, the Telegraph Channing Garage will remain open up to four additional hours.
The **Center Street Garage** hours of operation are as follows (except on certain business holidays):
- Monday through Friday 5:15 am to 12:00 am
- Saturday from 8:00 am to 12:00 am
- Sunday from 12:00 pm to 12:00 am

The **Oxford Garage** hours of operation are as follows (except on certain business holidays):
- Monday through Sunday 8:00 am to 12:00 am

F. **HOLIDAYS**

For the purpose of this proposal, business holidays are as follows:
- New Year’s Day (January 1)
- Thanksgiving Day (the fourth Thursday in November)
- Christmas Day (December 25)

II. **SCOPE OF SERVICES:** Refer to EXHIBIT J: SAMPLE SCOPE OF SERVICES FOR DETAILS (pg. 37)

A. **Contract Term**

The term of the Operating Agreement shall be for a period of five (5) years with two (2) consecutive one-year options to extend the Operating Agreement exercisable at the City’s sole discretion.

B. **Location of Services**

The City of Berkeley Public Works Parking Services Group intends to enter into an Agreement with a qualified Operator to provide parking management and operational services for the three primary City-owned off-street parking facilities. These three facilities will contain a total of 1,249 spaces and are all located in the mainstream of commercial business districts in the Downtown area (2) and the south side Telegraph Channing area (1). The City may include additional off-street parking sites, reduce and/or eliminate current sites at its discretion.

C. **Critical Dates**

The Agreement’s expected commencement date will be August 1, 2016.

The operator must complete all items in the Transition Period Plan (Section 1) for Telegraph Channing and Oxford Garages by 12:01 am, August 8, 2016, and for the new Center Street Garage by its opening date, currently estimated for August 1, 2017.

Because of the planned re-opening of the Center Street Garage, the City of Berkeley reserves the right to a trial period from the commencement date of this contract until 6 months following the opening of the Center Street Garage. This trial period will end on approximately January 31, 2018. Should the selected operator fail to perform according to the City’s expectations as set forth in the Agreement, the City reserves the right to award the contract to the next highest ranked Proposer.

D. **Facility Operations**

The successful Proposer shall provide all parking management services necessary to manage and maintain day-to-day operations of the City-owned parking facilities as to maximize revenues, while providing the highest standard of professional, courteous, and efficient services based on proven and effective operation and management practices in the parking industry, and consistent with the City’s parking management
policies. **Exhibit J - Sample Scope of Services** contains a detailed description of the responsibilities of the Operator and other applicable terms and conditions.

1. **Operator Responsibilities**

Examples of some Operator responsibilities include hiring, training, and supervision of parking personnel, contracting security, and janitorial services to maintain City parking facilities in a safe comfortable manner; enter into maintenance contracts and/or hiring firms to repair Garage equipment and premises as needed (see Exhibit O pg. 87).

Specific responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

**Management and Personnel**

- **Onsite Manager:** Operator shall assign a full-time, on-site manager who is highly qualified and experienced to supervise the operation effectively and ensure business is conducted in an efficient, competent, expeditious, and courteous manner. This person shall have and maintain certification as a parking professional from an accredited organization such as the National Parking Association (NPA), or the International Parking Institute (IPI). The on-site manager must fully understand the functions of operating parking facilities, be knowledgeable about reporting software and be able to supply accounting and statistical data required of the operation. The on-site manager shall be available during normal operating hours as established by the City. The manager must be exclusively assigned only to City of Berkeley parking facility locations during this contract.

- **Onsite Assistant Manager:** Operator shall assign a full-time, on-site assistant manager who is highly qualified and experienced to supervise the operation effectively and ensure business is conducted in an efficient, competent, expeditious, and courteous manner. This person shall fully understand the functions of operating parking facilities, be knowledgeable about reporting software and be able to supply accounting and statistical data required of the operation. The on-site assistant manager shall be available during evening/weekend operating hours as established by the City. The onsite assistant manager must be exclusively assigned only to City of Berkeley parking facility locations during this contract.

- **Continuity of Key Personnel:** The bidder shall be required to identify and contractually assign specific personnel through the successful implementation and completion of the contract. Any changes in onsite personnel from those proposed requires prior written approval of the City of Berkeley. An on-site manager must complete a minimum of two years working at City of Berkeley parking facilities prior to transferring to another Operator managed non-City of Berkeley facility. Notwithstanding, the City reserves the right to force a change in the any of the Operator’s assigned personnel, if, in the City’s sole judgment, assigned personnel are not satisfying contractual requirements.

- **Traffic Control:** Operator shall provide traffic control (to/from Parking Facilities), regulate, and supervise the parking of vehicles within the Parking Facilities.

**Revenue Control**

The selected Operator will be required to fulfill the obligations set forth in the Sample Scope of Services (Exhibit J) with respect to charging, collecting and depositing all parking charges collected during operation of the Facilities.

- **Merchant ID and Taxpayers ID Accounts:** Operator will hold account of record for Merchant ID’s and be fully responsible for Payment Card (PCI) compliance. Operator will be owner of the Garage’s Merchant ID’s (MID’s) and Tax ID (TID’s) accounts, and
responsible for setting up and maintaining 3rd Party vendor agreements with Credit Card Processing companies for Processing City of Berkeley Credit Card transactions. All deposits will be deposited into the City’s owned banking accounts.

- **Revenue Control:** Operator shall be fully responsible for collection of all fees, operation and maintenance of automatic ticket dispensing machines, accounting for all revenue collected during normal operating hours or after-hours according to revenue collection procedures mutually agreed to by the Operator and the City. Operator shall collect revenue from members of the general public. The operator shall collect and process all cash, check and electronic (credit and debit card) payments, including all transient parking fees, monthly parking fees, and validation revenues due from the users of the Facilities. Operator may deduct credit-card fees from Gross Revenue. Operator shall, via electronic transfer, deposit all credit and debit cards end of the day settlements to the City’s contracted financial institution within one (1) business day after close of each shift.

- **PCI- Compliance:** Operator shall be responsible for the security of customer information to the most recent Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCI-DSS) as updated by the Payment Card Industry Security Standard Council. *(See Exhibit J -Section 318 –H pg. 63)*

- **Records:** Operator shall maintain records, books and accounting systems, in the form approved by the City, of transactions related with all business operations. Operator shall provide to the City an accurate statement or report of daily transactions, including credit card fees, and other reports in such form and cycle required by the City.

- **Audit Control:** Operator shall conduct on an unannounced basis, an annual comprehensive audit of its cashiers and fee computer receipts and shall report findings to the City. Operator shall conduct monthly card key reconciliation and provide City with summary report. The City will reserve the right to request at Operator’s expense, an audited financial statement at any time and to audit all financial statements and examine all books, records, documents, and other data related to operation of the Parking Facilities.

---

**Facility and Equipment Maintenance**

- **Cleaning of Facilities:** Operator shall be required to maintain the Parking Facilities in a clean, hygienic, and attractive condition by adhering to the Maintenance Checklist (see Exhibit M pg. 76). The Maintenance Checklist includes daily routine cleaning of all premises related to the operation including: stairwells, pedestrian walkways, restrooms (hourly checks), common areas, elevators and elevator lobbies, retail mall areas, entry ways, sidewalk locations adjacent to garage facilities, and emptying of trash receptacles, as well as power sweep (electric equipment), steam clean of facilities and degrease of driveways, stairwells, and other designated pedestrian walkways at least twice per year.

- **Routine Maintenance, Sweeping and Facility Repairs:** Operator agrees to maintain the Parking Facilities by providing periodic routine maintenance and repairs in order to keep the Garage equipment operating in a safe and efficient manner. Some maintenance includes but is not limited to collecting trash within and surrounding the Parking Facilities, cleaning light fixtures, replacing light bulbs, cleaning facility storage rooms, bio-swell areas, and the Parking Operator’s office areas, as well as power sweep (electric equipment), steam clean facilities and degrease driveways, stairwells, and other designated pedestrian walkways at least twice per year *(see Exhibit J -Section 308 pg. 50).* Operator shall be responsible for the pay and cost of all routine maintenance, and facility repairs as noted in *(Exhibit M)* Maintenance Standards and Form of Schedule.
- **Maintenance of PARCS Equipment**: Operator shall be required to enter into a service contract with a City approved maintenance company to provide supplies and perform equipment service repairs as needed and coordinate scheduled preventative maintenance service with the vendor on a quarterly basis. Operator shall provide the City with a monthly report of preventative maintenance services performed and software upgrades in all facilities and documentation of maintenance/repairs (if requested).

- **Operator-owned Equipment/Furniture**: Operator shall be responsible for providing furnishings and equipment required by Operator for performance of its management and supervision services for the operation of the Parking Facilities. Such equipment includes, but is not limited to maintenance and cleaning equipment, tools, office and accounting equipment, office supplies, office furnishings, and vehicles.

- **Operation and Maintenance of Parking Access Revenue Control System (PARCS)**: Operator shall be responsible for all aspects of the operation of the City’s current PARCS at the commencement date of the contract, including fully-operational hardware and software, as well as internet/data communications, with 99.99% uptime. The City’s current PARCS uses Ski-Data equipment (see Exhibit N pg. 86 for Ski-Data Inventory). If selected, Operator must complete 40-hour training with Sentry Control Systems Inc. on operation of the Berkeley PARCS equipment prior to the Contract commencement date.

**Parking Occupancy/Payment/Duration Data and Transfer**

- **Parking Occupancy/Payment/Duration Data Collection**: The Operator will work with the City’s PARCS to collect, store and update a database containing all parking transactions. Each transaction record shall contain, at the very least, transaction ID, transaction date, transaction entry time, transaction exit time, payment type and rate type. Operator is responsible for customizing an exportable .csv or .xml file of transactions, by given date range, to the specifications of the City.

- **Parking Occupancy/Payment/Duration Data Transfer**: The Operator will store parking occupancy/payment/duration transaction files for the duration of the Agreement. In addition, the Operator will provide the means and be responsible for costs associated with the hourly or daily transfer (“push”) of the exportable .csv or .xml files to the destinations designated by the City.

- **Parking Occupancy/Payment/Duration Data Coordination**: The Operator will be responsible for coordinating with the City’s designated system integrators and/or government agencies (including City of Berkeley) who wish to display parking availability data. The Operator will be responsible for providing parking availability data to the system integrator and/or government agency to the specifications listed by the system integrator/government agency.

**Customer Service**

**Customer Service**: The Operator shall, as a matter of high priority and at all times, assure that the highest levels of service quality are provided in all areas of operation, including, but not limited to, customer service, security, accounting and custodial work. Operator shall handle daily customer service issues with respect to, but not limited to, parking operation questions, requests for monthly parking, facility parking enforcement questions, area directions, distribution of marketing/promotional materials (with approval of City).
**Facility Operation:** Operator shall operate the Facilities as public self-parking facilities for the benefit and convenience of the public. The public will have the right to use the facilities at all times listed in **HOURS OF OPERATION** and at the rates and charges established by the City.

**Transition Period**

**Garage Management Transition:** Operator shall participate in and will be compensated for any necessary transition period services in which the former contract operator for the Parking Facilities will turn over the operations of the Parking Facilities to the new Operator. During this transition period the new Operator shall:

- Hire and train new staff if required.
- Notify the current monthly customers (if any) of the operator change if requested.
- Transfer existing and/or establish new vendor service contracts.
- Transfer utility service accounts.
- Receive all keys.
- Create an inventory of all Parking Facilities’ equipment, personal property and supplies and any other item(s) requiring a transition to the Operator.

City reserves the right to modify, add and/or remove certain tasks and activities prior to Contract execution; or though equitable amendment to the Contact, after Contract execution.

**Additional As-Needed Services**

- **Event Parking Planning and Coordination:** Upon the City’s request, the Operator will manage parking for special events such as festivals, sporting events and cultural events. For each event, the Operator will prepare a proposal, including additional personnel and/or traffic control, to provide customer service and safe/efficient operation. At the City’s approval, the operator will implement the approved plan during that event.

- **Stack Parking Services:** The City will require that the Operator provide stack parking services during the Center Street construction Re-Build Project, and may also request services post-construction during the term of the agreement. At the commencement of this Contract, as a mitigation condition for Center Street Garage Rebuild Construction Project, stack parking will be provided at a surface lot, the Berkeley Way lot, and at the Oxford Garage during the hours of 8:00 am – 6:00 pm through August 2017.

- **Parking Valet Services:** Upon the City’s request, the Operator will provide valet parking services during the term of the agreement. For each instance of valet services, the Operator will prepare a proposal for valet parking rates, additional personnel or supervision, marketing and pick-up/drop off zones and management, to provide customer service and safe/efficient operation and all other items necessary to operate a high quality valet service at City facilities where it is feasible, where demand necessitates and where the City approves.

The Scope of Services is to be used as a general guide and is not intended to be a complete list of all work necessary to complete the project. Bidders should review the pertinent sections and exhibits in the Sample Scope of Services (Exhibit J) and may suggest a modified Scope of Services as part of their submittal.

2. **Adding Parking Facilities**

The City shall have the right, during the term of the Agreement resulting from this RFP, to request that the Operator add additional parking facilities to those under management by the Operator. Any such additional parking facility shall be managed in the manner described in this RFP and the management Agreement. The City will add the Center Street Garage facility to full operation by approximately August 2017, details of which are provided in Sections B and D. In the event that the City desires to add other parking facilities, it shall send a written notice of intent to the Operator.
3. Deleting Parking Facilities

The City shall have the right during the term of the Agreement resulting from this RFP to either temporarily or permanently remove any or all Facilities from the Operator's inventory. In the event that a Facility or Facilities is removed from service and is not being used for public parking (for example, a Facility closed for renovation), or due to a major operational change, the monthly Management Fee will be reduced commensurate to the reduction in service up to full elimination.

4. Parking Rate Information

The City has the sole authority to set and to change parking rates for the parking facilities. Upon approval of any new parking rates, the Operator will be responsible for changing all rate signage based on City standards for signage, making software updates, and charging each patron the appropriate parking fees by the “pre-determined date”. From time to time, the City may request the Operator to conduct a parking rate survey and to make recommendations to the City on proposed rate adjustments.

III. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

All proposals shall include the following information, organized as separate sections of the proposal. The proposal should be concise and to the point.

Proposals must include:

1. Contractor Identification:

   Provide the name of the firm, the firm's principal place of business, the name and telephone number of the contact person and company tax identification number.

2. Client References:

   Provide a minimum of three (3) references preferably other California Cities or other large public sector entities. Provide the designated person's name, title, organization, address, telephone number, and email address (if available). Include the nature of the relationship to the Proposer.

   The references provided are expected to be knowledgeable about the Proposer’s experience, skills and ability to operate and manage parking facilities comparable to the facilities owned by the City of Berkeley as described in this RFP, and should be able to confirm the specific examples that the Proposer's provided in the written proposal regarding its Management Approach/Operational Plan, Maintenance Plan, and Transition Plan. The same questions shall be asked of the three references provided by the Proposers.

   Additionally, the Proposer must provide two (2) references for its proposed facility manager, assistant manager and subcontractors. These references should be able to provide performance related information about proposed Facility Managers and subcontractors that illustrates their ability to perform the work required.

3. Contract Terminations:

   If your organization has had a contract terminated in the last five (5) years, describe such incident. Termination for default is defined as notice to stop performance due to the vendor’s non-performance or poor performance and the issue of performance was either (a) not litigated due to inaction on the part of the vendor, or (b) litigated and such litigation determined that the vendor was in default.
Submit full details of the terms for default including the other party’s name, address, and phone number. Present the vendor’s position on the matter. The City will evaluate the facts and may, at its sole discretion, reject the proposal on the grounds of the past experience.

If the firm has not experienced any such termination for default or early termination in the past five (5) years, so indicate.

4. **Price Proposal:**

The proposal shall include pricing for all services in the format shown in Exhibit Q: Cost Price Proposal Template pg. 94. Pricing shall be all inclusive unless indicated otherwise on a separate pricing sheet.

The Proposal shall indicate three separate price categories:

1. **The monthly management fee**, as based upon the enclosed Sample Scope of Services (Exhibit J) that includes pricing for all services. The Management Fee should be stated as a monthly flat fee. The City uses San Francisco Bay Area All Consumer CIP indexing. Not to exceed 3% annually.
   a) **The monthly management fee** shall be stated for:
      i. **First 12 months** (Telegraph Channing Garage and Oxford Garage, Berkeley Way lot, only)
      ii. **Months 13 – 23** (Telegraph Channing, Oxford AND Center Street Garage)
      iii. **Months 24 – 60** (Three Garages plus CIP indexing)
   b) Fee increase for Months ii) Months 13 – 23 must be based on unit costs for services as described for operation of Telegraph Channing and Oxford garage.

2. **One-time costs** associated with the full operation of Center Street Garage

3. **Additional As-Needed Services:**
   For these “As-Needed Services”, the City requests that the Operator provide fully loaded hourly rates (including any overhead, benefits and other charges) for personnel that may be required. Hourly rates will also be allowed to increase using the San Francisco Bay Area All Consumer CIP index, not to exceed 3% annually.
   a) **Event Parking Planning and Coordination**
   b) **Parking Valet Services**

5. **Letter of Introduction and Executive Summary – 2 pages maximum** (Required, but not scored)

Proposals must include a Letter of Introduction describing the Proposer, how long it has been in business, its ownership structure, including the name(s) of owner(s), and its ability to provide the services in the RFP. The summary must be signed by and contain the name, address and phone number of the person(s) authorized by the Proposer to obligate the Proposer to perform the commitments contained in the Proposal, and to communicate with the City of Berkeley in connection with this RFP.

6. **Minimum Qualifications**

To be considered for award, the Proposer must meet or exceed each of the following Minimum Qualifications. A Proposer that does not meet all of the “Minimum Qualifications” will not be considered. The City may, however, waive any inconsistencies or deficiencies which the City deems, in its sole discretion, to be minor or technical. The Proposer must complete and submit the Minimum Qualification Questionnaire form (Exhibit I).

A. **Qualifications and Experience (Exhibit I)** (Required – Not Scored)
a) The Proposer must currently manage for a client(s) at least three (3) parking facilities, with a minimum of 200 spaces at each location. The Proposer must be the Merchant on record for the Merchant Identification (MID) and Taxpayer Identification (TID) for at least one (1) of the locations provided (identify which location(s)).

b) The Proposer must currently be managing at least three (3) parking facilities, with a minimum of 200 spaces at each location, one (1) of which must be a multi-level structure with a minimum of 300 spaces. The qualifying facilities must have been under the Proposer’s management for a continuous period of three years prior to the date of this RFP. The portfolio must include both monthly and transient parkers.

c) The Proposer must have a minimum of three (3) years of continuous, first-hand experience in the operation and management of parking facilities with:
   i. Combined annual revenues of at least $2,000,000 from all parking facilities under its management; and
   ii. Combined Annual Operating Budgets of at least $1,000,000;

and

d) During said three-year period, the Proposer must have had:
   i. Experience in the use of automated garages with pay stations, automated parking access, garage guidance systems, garage camera security systems and revenue control equipment, and software, including such functions as revenue information retrieval, preparation of advanced spreadsheet and report writing, etc.;
   ii. Experience with additional software including, but not limited to, Microsoft’s Excel, Word, and PowerPoint, and other financial reporting software;
   iii. Experience in managing at least seven (7) full-time operations employees at parking facilities that were staffed and open to the public a minimum of twelve (12) hours per day.

B. Financial Stability  (Required, but not scored)
   a) Proposer must submit a statement from a financial institution verifying the Proposer’s ability to provide or obtain a minimum of One Million Dollars ($1,000,000) either in liquid assets, an irrevocable letter of credit, a line of credit or a qualified loan commitment;

and

   b) Demonstrate ability (a working capital ratio) to cover operating expenses for a 2-month period. The working capital ratio will be adjusted based on actual operating expenses. This financial requirement assures the City that the Proposer, if selected, is credit-worthy.

1. General Qualifications -Written Proposal

A. Experience and Qualifications of the Operator – (up to 10 points)

8 pages maximum
   a. Consideration will be given to Operators demonstrating strong capabilities, experience and reputation in undertakings similar to those described in this RFP. Proposers should convey their experience in managing off-street municipal/public
parking facilities and systems comparable to the City-owned facilities, described in this RFP and in Exhibit J -Sample Scope of Services, Section 102, within the past three (3) years, including any public agency contracts. Similar experience will include providing similar services to major public sector parking operations. Experience in the Western US region is preferred. This section should also include detailed information regarding similar contracts successfully managed by the Operator including contract performance, the reliability of services, and public interaction.

b. The Proposer must describe its experience with the use of automated pay stations, automated parking access, parking guidance systems and revenue control equipment and software, including information retrieval, creating revenue reports and advanced spreadsheets, and organization software, including, but not limited to, Microsoft Excel, other financial reporting software, and any experience with internet reservations, cell phone reservations, variable pricing options including Special Event Pricing, Market Based Pricing to maintain target occupancy levels, and management of Green Garage infrastructure.

c. This section should include an organizational chart and a breakdown of the numbers and categories of key personnel and sub-consultants expected to provide the level of service required to support this RFP project. A brief résumé must be included for the proposed Facility Manager that demonstrates experience managing operations of parking facilities (include number of years) and experience with automated revenue control equipment. Proposers should include a description of how the Facility Manager can enhance services at the Parking Facilities.

B. Management Approach/Operational Plan – (up to 30 points)

15 pages maximum

a. Proposal responses will be evaluated on the comprehensiveness and quality of the approach of the Operator to undertake the services outlined herein, including the proposed operating plan, transition plan, parking system enhancements, and strategies to improve the delivery of parking services, reduce operating costs and increase revenues. The project approach shall be sufficiently detailed to convey the Operator’s understanding of the requirements, staffing levels, organizational structure, and obligations for the successful implementation and operation of this project. Although the City’s interest is to minimize costs, merely speculative statements of lower costs will be disregarded if the basis for the lower cost is not clearly indicated and justified. Proposals will also be evaluated for clarity/accuracy of the information requested. Proposer shall explain how they will provide adequate coverage despite absenteeism, vacations, leaves or turnover of employees, as well as additional staffing needs for special events and circumstances (like the City’s theater seasons, the Garage Re-Build Mitigation parking assists).

b. The City must have one (1) dedicated on-site Facility Manager. The Proposer shall describe how the Proposer will schedule the Facility Manager and additional supervisors to provide adequate management oversight during all days/hours of operation for all Parking Facilities. The Operator’s on-site management team will be required to be exclusively assigned only to City of Berkeley parking facility locations during the contract period. The Proposer must describe how it will support its Facility Manager and assure the successful management of the parking facilities and implementation of its proposal. The Proposer must describe the authority the Facility Manager will have as to vendor selection, shift scheduling, employee disciplinary actions, marketing, budgets, and operational changes, compiling and safe keeping of records.
C. Maintenance Plan – (up to 25 points)
6 pages maximum

a) The Proposer must provide a general Maintenance Plan that describes how the Proposer will monitor, inspect, maintain, and clean the Parking Facilities, based on the following:
   - City’s Maintenance Standards and Form of Maintenance Schedule - Exhibit M
   - Section 309 in the Sample Scope of Services Exhibit J
   - Exhibit M-1 City’s Green Garage Policy

In addition to its other maintenance duties, the Operator will be responsible for scheduling special cleaning when necessary and for overseeing and giving appropriate instruction to any janitorial service companies. Note: Any potential partner or subcontractor must be identified in the RFP. Changes in partners or subcontractors may only be made after receiving written approval from the City.

b) The Proposer must describe two (2) facility maintenance projects that it implemented at other parking facilities that noticeably improved the facility condition, including the resulting cost savings and the Proposer’s role throughout the process. The Proposer should also explain who initiated the project or recommendation. The two (2) examples described by the Proposer will be subject to verification through the reference check process.

D. Transition Plan – (up to 30 points)
10 pages maximum

The Proposer shall be responsible for the project management and all aspects of the two (2) parking garages at the commencement of the contract, and an additional parking garage by August/September 2017. The transition of the third garage (Center Street Garage) will include relocation of the Operator Office and PARCS main hub from the existing location (Telegraph Channing Garage).

a) The Proposer’s Transition Plan shall list all services being provided, including mitigation parking (stack parking) during Center Street Garage (off-line) construction project.

b) Include Project Management Plan for oversite of PARCS Hub relocation, purchase acquisition and installation of the new PARCs equipment at the Center Street Garage.

c) The Transition Plan will list key personnel involved with the transition and their responsibilities by beginning and end dates. The Transition Plan must allow existing personnel the opportunity to apply for, be fairly considered, for employment at the City’s garages under the Agreement.

E. Overall Organization and Clarity of Proposal (Up to 5 Points)
Responsive proposals will be evaluated on the Proposer’s understanding of the scope of work and tasks to be performed, as well as the completeness of the Proposal, and the creativity of ideas included in the Proposal.

**All facilities must remain fully operational during the contract commencement transition period.** The facilities must close for a minimum time period that is pre-approved by the City during the Center Street Garage re-opening Transition. Plan

7. Non-Responsive Proposals

The City will **not** accept a proposal if any of the following occurs:

- a) Any necessary proposal document is incomplete, misleading or missing;
- b) Any RFP forms are left blank, incomplete, or changed in any substantive way;
- c) The Proposer does not meet the minimum qualifications set forth in Section III 6. A. and/or failed to submit the information required by Section III 6. B. of this RFP;
- d) The Proposer does not provide additional/clarification information as requested by the City by the specified date.

**IV. SELECTION CRITERIA**

The following criteria will be considered, although not exclusively, in determining which firm is hired. Criteria to be used in the selection of the best Proposal for the City of Berkeley are listed below. The City of Berkeley shall be the sole judge as to which Proposal best meets its needs. The City of Berkeley reserves the right to contract for any desired service or equipment whether in whole or in part.

1. Written Proposal (100 points)

2. Costs (50 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>MAXIMUM POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Written Proposal</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Qualifications and Experience</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Management Approach: Staffing Operational Plan</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Maintenance Plan – Routine, Cosmetic, Preventative</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Transition Plan</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Overall organization and clarity of proposal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Costs</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Monthly Management Fee</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. One-time Center Street Garage Fee</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. As-Needed Services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Selection Panel will be convened of qualified persons as determined by the Public Works Department. The Panel will review and score all responsive Proposals (see Section III - 8).

**Costs**

- a. Monthly Management Fee - (Up to 35 Points)
Garage Operation Costs Proposal Staffing & Consumables. Lowest responsive bid receives 35 points. Other bids score rankings are based on percentage of lowest bid.

b. **One time Center Street Garage Costs - (Up to 10 Points)**
   One-time costs related to bringing the new Center Street Garage to full operation. Lowest responsive bid receives 10 points. Other bids score rankings are based on percentage of lowest bid.

c. **Additional As-Needed Services Costs – (Up to 5 Points)**
   Per event costs of Special Event and Parking Valet Services. Lowest responsive bid receives 5 points. Other bids score rankings are based on percentage of lowest bid.

**Reference Checks (Required, by not scored)**

a. **Reference Checks** - The Proposer must be able to provide three verifiable references. The references should be able to provide performance related information about the Proposer’s Operations Team, and be knowledgeable about the Proposer’s experience, skills and abilities to operate and manage parking facilities comparable to the facilities administered by the City of Berkeley described in this RFP, and should be able to confirm the specific examples that the Proposer's provided in the written proposal regarding its Management Approach/Operational Plan, Maintenance Plan, and Transition Plan.

b. Additionally, references should be able to provide performance related information on the proposed Facility Managers, and subcontractors that illustrates their ability to perform the work required. The same questions shall be asked of the three references provided by the Proposers.

**A. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED AGREEMENT**

Upon conclusion of the RFP process, the City shall select a proposer to enter into an Operating Agreement to perform all or part of the Scope of Services. The Operating Agreement shall require the proposer to adhere to the terms of their proposal and to act in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations.

This RFP is not intended to be completely definitive of the proposed contractual relationship, the specific terms and conditions will be negotiated following the selection process with consideration to the information provided in response to this solicitation.

**B. AWARD/SELECTION PROCESS**

All responsive proposals will be evaluated by a Selection Committee of qualified persons as determined by the Public Works Department. The proposers which are determined by the Selection Committee to best meet the City’s requirements will be invited to meet with the Committee for further evaluation and final selection. The Committee will rank (by consensus) the participants interviewed in descending order of preference. When the selection process has been completed, all participants will be advised of the number one selection; no other information will be released. If for any reason, an agreement cannot be reached with the Committee’s recommended operator, the next highest ranked operator will be given consideration for award of the contract. The final selection of Operator will be the sole judgment and discretion of the City.

**C. PRESENTATION**
The City may invite one (1) or more proposers, ranked highest among the written submissions, to make an oral presentation to the Selection Panel. Finalists will be required to submit specific financial information from a Dun & Bradstreet Report. Presentations shall be limited to a maximum of one (1) hour per proposer.

Proposers and their subcontractors shall be required to appear before the Selection Panel for an oral interview and presentation of the Proposal and detailed discussion of the various elements of their Proposal. The proposed on-site Facility Managers must be present during the presentations and discussions at the oral interview as the success of facility operations is contingent on the experience and skills of the Facility Manager. Questions from the Selection Panel may be directed to a specific member of the Proposer’s team. The Proposer’s Operations Team will be required to participate in the presentation and oral interview.

Presentations have been tentatively scheduled for the week of April 18, 2016. Actual dates and times shall be scheduled with the short listed firms via email and telephone.

Presentations will be held at:
City of Berkeley
Transportation Division
1947 Center Street 4th Floor
Berkeley, CA 94704

Final selection will be made on the basis of the evaluation of all criteria listed and not only on the basis of cost. Qualifications will be determined from the information furnished by the proposer as well as from other sources determined to be appropriate by the City. The award will not be made until an appropriate investigation of the proposer’s experience, qualifications, and current financial status has been completed. By submitting a proposal, each proposer authorizes the City to make such an investigation.

V. PAYMENT

Invoices: Invoices must be fully itemized, and provide sufficient information for approving payment and audit. Invoices must be accompanied by receipt for services in order for payment to be processed. Mail invoices to the Project Manager and reference the contract number.

City of Berkeley
Accounts Payable
PO Box 700
Berkeley, CA 94701
Attn: Danette Perry/Public Works Department

Payments: The City will make payment to the vendor within 30- days of receipt of a correct and complete invoice.

VI. CITY REQUIREMENTS

A. Non-Discrimination Requirements:

Ordinance No. 5876-N.S. codified in B.M.C. Chapter 13.26 states that, for contracts worth more than $3,000 bids for supplies or bids or proposals for services shall include a completed Workforce Composition Form. Businesses with fewer than five employees are exempt from submitting this form. (See B.M.C. 13.26.030)
Under B.M.C. section 13.26.060, the City may require any bidder or vendor it believes may have discriminated to submit a Non-Discrimination Program. The Contract Compliance Officer will make this determination. This applies to all contracts and all consultants (contractors). Berkeley Municipal Code section 13.26.070 requires that all contracts with the City contain a non-discrimination clause, in which the contractor agrees not to discriminate and allows the City access to records necessary to monitor compliance. This section also applies to all contracts and all consultants. **Bidders must submit the attached Non-Discrimination Disclosure Form with their proposal**

**B. Nuclear Free Berkeley Disclosure Form:**

Berkeley Municipal Code section 12.90.070 prohibits the City from granting contracts to companies that knowingly engage in work for nuclear weapons. This contracting prohibition may be waived if the City Council determines that no reasonable alternative exists to doing business with a company that engages in nuclear weapons work. If your company engages in work for nuclear weapons, explain on the Disclosure Form the nature of such work. **Bidders must submit the attached Nuclear Free Disclosure Form with their proposal.**

**C. Oppressive States:**

The City of Berkeley prohibits granting of contracts to firms that knowingly provide personal services to specified Countries. This contracting prohibition may be waived if the City Council determines that no reasonable alternative exists to doing business with a company that is covered by City Council Resolution No. 59,853-N.S. If your company or any subsidiary is covered, explain on the Disclosure Form the nature of such work. **Bidders must submit the attached Oppressive States Disclosure Form with their proposal.**

**D. Conflict of Interest:**

In the sole judgment of the City, any and all proposals are subject to disqualification on the basis of a conflict of interest. The City may not contract with a vendor if the vendor or an employee, officer or director of the proposer's firm, or any immediate family member of the preceding, has served as an elected official, employee, board or commission member of the City who influences the making of the contract.

Furthermore, the City may not contract with any vendor whose income, investment, or real property interest may be affected by the contract. The City, at its sole option, may disqualify any proposal on the basis of such a conflict of interest. **Please identify any person associated with the firm that has a potential conflict of interest.**

**E. Berkeley Living Wage Ordinance:**

Chapter 13.27 of the Berkeley Municipal Code requires that contractors offer all eligible employees with City mandated minimum compensation during the term of any contract that may be awarded by the City. If the Contractor is not currently subject to the Living Wage Ordinance, cumulative contracts with the City within a one-year period may subject Contractor to the requirements under B.M.C. Chapter 13.27. A certification of compliance with this ordinance will be required upon execution of a contract. The Living Wage rate is currently $14.04 (if medical benefits are provided) or $16.37 (if medical benefits are not provided). The Living Wage rate is adjusted automatically effective June 30th of each year commensurate with the corresponding increase in the Consumer Price Index published in April of each year. If the Living Wage rate is adjusted during the term of your agreement, you must pay the new adjusted rate to all eligible employees, regardless of what the rate was when the contract was executed.
F. Berkeley Equal Benefits Ordinance:

Chapter 13.29 of the Berkeley Municipal Code requires that contractors offer domestic partners the same access to benefits that are available to spouses. A certification of compliance with this ordinance will be required upon execution of a contract.

G. Statement of Economic Interest:

The City’s Conflict of Interest Code designates “consultants” as a category of persons who must complete Form 700, Statement of Economic Interest, at the beginning of the contract period and again at the termination of the contract. The selected contractor will be required to complete the Form 700 before work may begin.

VII. OTHER REQUIREMENTS

A. Insurance

The selected contractor will be required to maintain general liability insurance in the minimum amount of $3,000,000, automobile liability insurance in the minimum amount of $1,000,000 and a professional liability insurance policy in the amount of $3,000,000 to cover any claims arising out of the performance of the contract. The general liability and automobile insurance must name the City, its officers, agents, volunteers and employees as additional insureds.

B. Worker’s Compensation Insurance:

A selected contractor who employs any person shall maintain workers' compensation insurance in accordance with state requirements. Sole proprietors with no employees are not required to carry Worker’s Compensation Insurance.

C. Business License

Virtually every contractor that does business with the City must obtain a City business license as mandated by B.M.C. Ch. 9.04. The business license requirement applies whether or not the contractor has an office within the City limits. However, a "casual" or "isolated" business transaction (B.M.C. section 9.04.010) does not subject the contractor to the license tax. The infirm, warehousing businesses and charitable organizations are the only entities specifically exempted in the code from the license requirement (see B.M.C. sections 9.04.290, 9.04.295 and 9.04.300). Non-profit organizations are granted partial exemptions (see B.M.C. section 9.04.305).

Vendor must apply for a City business license and show proof of application to Purchasing Manager within seven days of being selected as intended contractor.

The Customer Service Division of the Finance Department located at 1947 Center Street, Berkeley, CA 94704, issues business licenses. Contractors should contact this division for questions and/or information on obtaining a City business license, in person, or by calling 510-981-7200.

D. Recycled Paper

All reports to the City shall be on recycled paper that contains at least 50% recycled product when such paper is available at a cost of not greater than ten percent more than the cost of virgin paper, and when such paper is available at the time it is required. If recycled paper is not available the Contractor shall use white paper. Written reports or studies shall be printed on both sides of the page whenever practical.
E. State Prevailing Wage:

Certain labor categories under this project may be subject to prevailing wages as identified in the State of California Labor Code commencing in Section 1770 et. seq. These labor categories, when employed for any “work performed during the design and preconstruction phases of construction including, but not limited to, inspection and land surveying work,” constitute a “Public Work” within the definition of Section 1720(a)(1) of the California Labor Code requiring payment of prevailing wages.

Wage information is available through the California Division of Industrial Relations web site at: http://www.dir.ca.gov/OPRL/statistics_and_databases.html

VIII. SCHEDULE (dates are subject to change)

- Issue RFP to Potential Bidders: Monday, March 21, 2016
- Pre-Proposal Conference (mandatory to bid): Wednesday, March 30, 2016
- Proposals Due from Potential Bidders: Tuesday, April 19, 2016
- Complete Selection Process: Tuesday, May 10, 2016
- Council Approval of Contract (over $50k): Tuesday, June 14, 2016
- Award of Contract: Wednesday, June 15, 2016
- Sign and Process Contract: July 2016
- Notice to Proceed: Monday, August 1, 2016
- Commencement of Parking Operations: Monday, August 8, 2016
- PARCS Installation/Completed; Operational: Monday, July 31, 2017

Thank you for your interest in working with the City of Berkeley for this service. We look forward to receiving your proposal.
Attachments & Exhibits:

- Check List of Required items for Submittal Attachment A
- Non-Discrimination/Workforce Composition Form Attachment B
- Nuclear Free Disclosure Form Attachment C
- Oppressive States Form Attachment D
- Living Wage Form Attachment E
- Equal Benefits Certification of Compliance Attachment F
- Right to Audit Form Attachment G
- Insurance Endorsement Attachment H
- Minimum Qualifications Form Exhibit I
- Sample-SCOPE OF SERVICES Exhibit J
- Parking Facility Rates/Hours of Operation Exhibit K
- Project Management Scope of Work Summary Exhibit L
- Maintenance Standards and Form of Schedule Exhibit M
- Sample -Green Cleaning Policy Exhibit M-1
- Current Parking Revenue Control System (PARCS) Inventory Exhibit N
- New PARCS Equipment Specifications Exhibit O
- PARCS Specified Program Testing Exhibit P
- Compensation Cost Proposal Exhibit Q
- Center Street Garage Facility Management Requirements Exhibit R
ATTACHMENT A

CHECKLIST

☐ Proposal describing service (one (1) unbound original and six (6) copies)

☐ Contractor Identification and Company Information

☐ Client References

☐ Costs proposal by task, type of service & personnel Exhibit Q pg. 94

☐ Minimum Qualifications Form Exhibit I pg. 33

☐ The following forms, completed and signed in blue ink (attached):
  ☐ Non-Discrimination/Workforce Composition Form Attachment B
  ☐ Nuclear Free Disclosure Form Attachment C
  ☐ Oppressive States Form Attachment D
  ☐ Living Wage Form Attachment E
  ☐ Equal Benefits Ordinance Certification of Compliance (EBO-1) Attachment F

ADDITIONAL SUBMITTALS REQUIRED FROM SELECTED VENDOR AFTER COUNCIL APPROVAL TO AWARD CONTRACT.

☐ Provide original-signed in blue ink Evidence of Insurance

  ☐ Auto
  ☐ Liability
  ☐ Worker’s Compensation

☐ Right to Audit Form Attachment G

☐ Commercial General & Automobile Liability Endorsement Form Attachment H

☐ Berkeley Business License
NON-DISCRIMINATION/WORKFORCE COMPOSITION FORM FOR NON-CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

To assist the City of Berkeley in implementing its Non-Discrimination policy, it is requested that you furnish information regarding your personnel as requested below and return it to the City Department handling your contract:

Organization: _____________________________________________________________________________________
Address: _____________________________________________________________________________________
Business Lic. #: ___________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Total Employees</th>
<th>White Employees</th>
<th>Black Employees</th>
<th>Asian Employees</th>
<th>Hispanic Employees</th>
<th>Other Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official/Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para-Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Craft Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is your business MBE/WBE/DBE certified? Yes _____ No _____ If yes, by what agency? _______________________

If yes, please specify: Male: _____ Female: _____ Indicate ethnic identifications: ___________________________

Do you have a Non-Discrimination policy? Yes: _____ No: _____

Signed: ________________________________ Date: __________________

Verified by: ________________________________ Date: __________________
City of Berkeley Contract Compliance Officer
Occupational Categories

Officials and Administrators - Occupations in which employees set broad policies, exercise overall responsibility for execution of these policies, or provide specialized consultation on a regional, district or area basis. Includes: department heads, bureau chiefs, division chiefs, directors, deputy superintendents, unit supervisors and kindred workers.

Professionals - Occupations that require specialized and theoretical knowledge that is usually acquired through college training or through work experience and other training that provides comparable knowledge. Includes: personnel and labor relations workers, social workers, doctors, psychologists, registered nurses, economists, dietitians, lawyers, systems analysts, accountants, engineers, employment and vocational rehabilitation counselors, teachers or instructors, and kindred workers.

Technicians - Occupations that require a combination of basic scientific or technical knowledge and manual skill that can be obtained through specialized post-secondary school education or through equivalent on-the-job training. Includes: computer programmers and operators, technical illustrators, highway technicians, technicians (medical, dental, electronic, physical sciences) and kindred workers.

Protective Service Workers - Occupations in which workers are entrusted with public safety, security and protection from destructive forces. Includes: police officers, fire fighters, guards, sheriffs, bailiffs, correctional officers, detectives, marshals, harbor patrol officers, and kindred workers.

Para-Professionals - Occupations in which workers perform some of the duties of a professional or technician in a supportive role, which usually requires less formal training and/or experience normally required for professional or technical status. Such positions may fall within an identified pattern of a staff development and promotion under a "New Transporters" concept. Includes: library assistants, research assistants, medical aides, child support workers, police auxiliary, welfare service aides, recreation assistants, homemaker aides, home health aides, and kindred workers.

Office and Clerical - Occupations in which workers are responsible for internal and external communication, recording and retrieval of data and/or information and other paperwork required in an office. Includes: bookkeepers, messengers, office machine operators, clerk-typists, stenographers, court transcribers, hearings reporters, statistical clerks, dispatchers, license distributors, payroll clerks, and kindred workers.

Skilled Craft Workers - Occupations in which workers perform jobs which require special manual skill and a thorough and comprehensive knowledge of the processes involved in the work which is acquired through on-the-job training and experience or through apprenticeship or other formal training programs. Includes: mechanics and repairpersons, electricians, heavy equipment operators, stationary engineers, skilled machining occupations, carpenters, compositors and typesetters, and kindred workers.

Service/Maintenance - Occupations in which workers perform duties which result in or contribute to the comfort, convenience, hygiene or safety of the general public or which contribute to the upkeep and care of buildings, facilities or grounds of public property. Workers in this group may operate machinery. Includes: chauffeurs, laundry and dry cleaning operatives, truck drivers, bus drivers, garage laborers, custodial personnel, gardeners and groundskeepers, refuse collectors, and construction laborers.
CITY OF BERKELEY
Nuclear Free Zone Disclosure Form

I (we) certify that:

1. I am (we are) fully cognizant of any and all contracts held, products made or otherwise handled by this business entity, and of any such that are anticipated to be entered into, produced or handled for the duration of its contract(s) with the City of Berkeley. (To this end, more than one individual may sign this disclosure form, if a description of which type of contracts each individual is cognizant is attached.)

2. I (we) understand that Section 12.90.070 of the Nuclear Free Berkeley Act (Berkeley Municipal Code Ch. 12.90; Ordinance No. 5784-N.S.) prohibits the City of Berkeley from contracting with any person or business that knowingly engages in work for nuclear weapons.

3. I (we) understand the meaning of the following terms as set forth in Berkeley Municipal Code Section 12.90.130:

"Work for nuclear weapons" is any work the purpose of which is the development, testing, production, maintenance or storage of nuclear weapons or the components of nuclear weapons; or any secret or classified research or evaluation of nuclear weapons; or any operation, management or administration of such work.

"Nuclear weapon" is any device, the intended explosion of which results from the energy released by reactions involving atomic nuclei, either fission or fusion or both. This definition of nuclear weapons includes the means of transporting, guiding, propelling or triggering the weapon if and only if such means is destroyed or rendered useless in the normal propelling, triggering, or detonation of the weapon.

"Component of a nuclear weapon" is any device, radioactive or non-radioactive, the primary intended function of which is to contribute to the operation of a nuclear weapon (or be a part of a nuclear weapon).

4. Neither this business entity nor its parent nor any of its subsidiaries engages in work for nuclear weapons or anticipates entering into such work for the duration of its contract(s) with the City of Berkeley.

Based on the foregoing, the undersigned declares under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Printed Name: ________________________________ Title: ________________________________

Signature: ________________________________ Date: ________________________________

Business Entity: ________________________________________________

Off-Street Parking Facility Management/16-11014-C Attachment C
CITY OF BERKELEY
Oppressive States Compliance Statement

The undersigned, an authorized agent of ______________________________________________________ (hereafter "Vendor"), has had an opportunity to review the requirements of Berkeley City Council Resolution No. 59,853-N.S. (hereafter "Resolution"). Vendor understands and agrees that the City may choose with whom it will maintain business relations and may refrain from contracting with those Business Entities which maintain business relationships with morally repugnant regimes. Vendor understands the meaning of the following terms used in the Resolution:

"Business Entity" means "any individual, firm, partnership, corporation, association or any other commercial organization, including parent-entities and wholly-owned subsidiaries" (to the extent that their operations are related to the purpose of the contract with the City).

"Oppressive State" means: Tibet Autonomous Region and the Provinces of Ado, Kham and U-Tsang

“Personal Services” means “the performance of any work or labor and shall also include acting as an independent contractor or providing any consulting advice or assistance, or otherwise acting as an agent pursuant to a contractual relationship.”

Contractor understands that it is not eligible to receive or retain a City contract if at the time the contract is executed, or at any time during the term of the contract it provides Personal Services to:

a. The governing regime in any Oppressive State.
b. Any business or corporation organized under the authority of the governing regime of any Oppressive State.
c. Any person for the express purpose of assisting in business operations or trading with any public or private entity located in any Oppressive State.

Vendor further understands and agrees that Vendor's failure to comply with the Resolution shall constitute a default of the contract and the City Manager may terminate the contract and bar Vendor from bidding on future contracts with the City for five (5) years from the effective date of the contract termination.

The undersigned is familiar with, or has made a reasonable effort to become familiar with, Vendor's business structure and the geographic extent of its operations. By executing the Statement, Vendor certifies that it complies with the requirements of the Resolution and that if any time during the term of the contract it ceases to comply, Vendor will promptly notify the City Manager in writing.

Based on the foregoing, the undersigned declares under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Printed Name: ___________________________________ Title: ___________________________________

Signature: ___________________________________ Date: ________________________________

Business Entity: __________________________________________________________________________

Contract Description/Specification No.: Off-Street Parking Facility Management/16-11014-C

I am unable to execute this Statement; however, Vendor is exempt under Section VII of the Resolution. I have attached a separate statement explaining the reason(s) Vendor cannot comply and the basis for any requested exemption.

Signature: _______________________________ Date: ____________________________
CITY OF BERKELEY
Living Wage Certification for Providers of Services

TO BE COMPLETED BY ALL PERSONS OR ENTITIES ENGAGING IN A CONTRACT FOR PERSONAL SERVICES WITH THE CITY OF BERKELEY.

The Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 13.27, Berkeley's Living Wage Ordinance (LWO), provides that contractors who engage in a specified amount of business with the City (except where specifically exempted) under contracts which furnish services to or for the City in any twelve (12) month period of time shall comply with all provisions of this Ordinance. The LWO requires a City contractor to provide City mandated minimum compensation to all eligible employees, as defined in the Ordinance. In order to determine whether this contract is subject to the terms of the LWO, please respond to the questions below. Please note that the LWO applies to those contracts where the contractor has achieved a cumulative dollar contracting amount with the City. Therefore, even if the LWO is inapplicable to this contract, subsequent contracts may be subject to compliance with the LWO. Furthermore, the contract may become subject to the LWO if the status of the Contractor's employees change (i.e. additional employees are hired) so that Contractor falls within the scope of the Ordinance.

Section I.

1. IF YOU ARE A FOR-PROFIT BUSINESS, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS

   a. During the previous twelve (12) months, have you entered into contracts, including the present contract, bid, or proposal, with the City of Berkeley for a cumulative amount of $25,000.00 or more?
      YES ____  NO ____

      If no, this contract is NOT subject to the requirements of the LWO, and you may continue to Section II. If yes, please continue to question 1(b).

      b. Do you have six (6) or more employees, including part-time and stipend workers?
         YES ____  NO ____

         If you have answered, “YES” to questions 1(a) and 1(b) this contract IS subject to the LWO. If you responded "NO" to 1(b) this contract IS NOT subject to the LWO. Please continue to Section II.

2. IF YOU ARE A NON-PROFIT BUSINESS, AS DEFINED BY SECTION 501(C) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS.

   a. During the previous twelve (12) months, have you entered into contracts, including the present contract, bid or proposal, with the City of Berkeley for a cumulative amount of $100,000.00 or more?
      YES ____  NO ____

      If no, this Contract is NOT subject to the requirements of the LWO, and you may continue to Section II. If yes, please continue to question 2(b).

      b. Do you have six (6) or more employees, including part-time and stipend workers?
         YES ____  NO ____

         If you have answered, “YES” to questions 2(a) and 2(b) this contract IS subject to the LWO. If you responded "NO" to 2(b) this contract IS NOT subject to the LWO. Please continue to Section II.

Section II

Please read, complete, and sign the following:

THIS CONTRACT IS SUBJECT TO THE LIVING WAGE ORDINANCE. ☐

THIS CONTRACT IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE LIVING WAGE ORDINANCE. ☐
The undersigned, on behalf of himself or herself individually and on behalf of his or her business or organization, hereby certifies that he or she is fully aware of Berkeley's Living Wage Ordinance, and the applicability of the Living Wage Ordinance, and the applicability of the subject contract, as determined herein. The undersigned further agrees to be bound by all of the terms of the Living Wage Ordinance, as mandated in the Berkeley Municipal Code, Chapter 13.27. If, at any time during the term of the contract, the answers to the questions posed herein change so that Contractor would be subject to the LWO, Contractor will promptly notify the City Manager in writing. Contractor further understands and agrees that the failure to comply with the LWO, this certification, or the terms of the Contract as it applies to the LWO, shall constitute a default of the Contract and the City Manager may terminate the contract and bar Contractor from future contracts with the City for five (5) years from the effective date of the Contract termination. If the contractor is a for-profit business and the LWO is applicable to this contract, the contractor must pay a living wage to all employees who spend 25% or more of their compensated time engaged in work directly related to the contract with the City. If the contractor is a non-profit business and the LWO is applicable to this contract, the contractor must pay a living wage to all employees who spend 50% or more of their compensated time engaged in work directly related to the contract with the City.

These statements are made under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of California.

Printed Name: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Business Entity: ___________________________________________________________________________________

Contract Description/Specification No: Off-Street Parking Facility Management /16-11014-C

Section III

** FOR ADMINISTRATIVE USE ONLY -- PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY **

I have reviewed this Living Wage Certification form, in addition to verifying Contractor's total dollar amount contract commitments with the City in the past twelve (12) months, and determined that this Contract IS / IS NOT (circle one) subject to Berkeley's Living Wage Ordinance.

Department Name ___________________________ Department Representative ___________________________
Form EBO-1
CITY OF BERKELEY
CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH EQUAL BENEFITS ORDINANCE
If you are a contractor, return this form to the originating department/project manager. If you are a vendor (supplier of goods), return this form to the Purchasing Division of the Finance Dept.

SECTION 1. CONTRACTOR/VENDOR INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Vendor No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>City:</th>
<th>State:</th>
<th>ZIP:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Person:</th>
<th>Telephone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-mail Address:</th>
<th>Fax No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 2. COMPLIANCE QUESTIONS

A. The EBO is inapplicable to this contract because the contractor/vendor has no employees.
   [ ] Yes [ ] No  (If “Yes,” proceed to Section 5; if “No”, continue to the next question.)

B. Does your company provide (or make available at the employees’ expense) any employee benefits?
   [ ] Yes [ ] No
   If “Yes,” continue to Question C.
   If “No,” proceed to Section 5. (The EBO is not applicable to you.)

C. Does your company provide (or make available at the employees’ expense) any benefits to the spouse of an employee?
   [ ] Yes [ ] No

D. Does your company provide (or make available at the employees’ expense) any benefits to the domestic partner of an employee?
   [ ] Yes [ ] No

If you answered “No” to both Questions C and D, proceed to Section 5. (The EBO is not applicable to this contract.)
If you answered “Yes” to both Questions C and D, please continue to Question E.
If you answered “Yes” to Question C and “No” to Question D, please continue to Section 3.

E. Are the benefits that are available to the spouse of an employee identical to the benefits that are available to the domestic partner of the employee?
   [ ] Yes [ ] No

If you answered “Yes,” proceed to Section 4. (You are in compliance with the EBO.)
If you answered “No,” continue to Section 3.

SECTION 3. PROVISIONAL COMPLIANCE

A. Contractor/vendor is not in compliance with the EBO now but will comply by the following date:
   [ ] By the first effective date after the first open enrollment process following the contract start date, not to exceed two years, if the Contractor submits evidence of taking reasonable measures to comply with the EBO; or
   [ ] At such time that administrative steps can be taken to incorporate nondiscrimination in benefits in the Contractor’s infrastructure, not to exceed three months; or
   [ ] Upon expiration of the contractor’s current collective bargaining agreement(s).
B. If you have taken all reasonable measures to comply with the EBO but are unable to do so, do you agree to provide employees with a cash equivalent?* ........................................ Yes □ No □

* The cash equivalent is the amount of money your company pays for spousal benefits that are unavailable for domestic partners.

SECTION 4. REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION

At time of issuance of purchase order or contract award, you may be required by the City to provide documentation (copy of employee handbook, eligibility statement from your plans, insurance provider statements, etc.) to verify that you do not discriminate in the provision of benefits.

SECTION 5. CERTIFICATION

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that I am authorized to bind this entity contractually. By signing this certification, I further agree to comply with all additional obligations of the Equal Benefits Ordinance that are set forth in the Berkeley Municipal Code and in the terms of the contract or purchase order with the City.

Executed this ______day of ________________, in the year __________, at __________________, ________

                      ____________________________                      ____________________________
                      Name (please print)                      Signature

                      ____________________________                      ____________________________
                      Title                      Federal ID or Social Security Number

FOR CITY OF BERKELEY USE ONLY

□ Non-Compliant (The City may not do business with this contractor/vendor)
□ One-Person Contractor/Vendor □ Full Compliance □ Reasonable
□ Provisional Compliance Category, Full Compliance by Date:

Staff Name(Sign and Print): ____________________________ Date: __________
CITY OF BERKELEY
Right to Audit Form

The contractor agrees that pursuant to Section 61 of the Berkeley City Charter, the City Auditor’s office may conduct an audit of Contractor’s financial, performance and compliance records maintained in connection with the operations and services performed under this contract.

In the event of such audit, Contractor agrees to provide the Auditor with reasonable access to Contractor’s employees and make all such financial, performance and compliance records available to the Auditor’s office. City agrees to provide Contractor an opportunity to discuss and respond to/any findings before a final audit report is filed.

Signed: ________________________________ Date: ______________

Print Name & Title: ________________________________

Company: ______________________________________

Please direct questions regarding this form to the Auditor's Office, at (510) 981-6750.
CITY OF BERKELEY
Commercial General and Automobile Liability Endorsement

The attached Certificates of Insurance are hereby certified to be a part of the following policies having the following expiration dates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy No.</th>
<th>Company Providing Policy</th>
<th>Expir. Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scope of the insurance afforded by the policies designated in the attached certificates is not less than that which is afforded by the Insurance Service Organization's or other "Standard Provisions" forms in use by the insurance company in the territory in which coverage is afforded.

Such Policies provide for or are hereby amended to provide for the following:

1. The named insured is ________________________________________.

2. CITY OF BERKELEY ("City") is hereby included as an additional insured with respect to liability arising out of the hazards or operations under or in connection with the following agreement:
   ____________________________________________________________.

   The insurance provided applies as though separate policies are in effect for both the named insured and City, but does not increase the limits of liability set forth in said policies.

3. The limits of liability under the policies are not less than those shown on the certificate to which this endorsement is attached.

4. Cancellation or material reduction of this coverage will not be effective until thirty (30) days following written notice to __________________________________, Department of __________________________, Berkeley, CA.

5. This insurance is primary and insurer is not entitled to any contribution from insurance in effect for City.

   The term "City" includes successors and assigns of City and the officers, employees, agents and volunteers.

   ____________________________________________________________
   Insurance Company

   Date: ____________   By: ______________________________________
   Signature of Underwriter's
   Authorized Representative
EXHIBIT I:
MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS FORM

PROPOSERS MUST SUBMIT THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE
The following statements as to experience, and financial responsibility qualifications of the Proposer are submitted with the proposal to confirm the status of the Proposer with respect to meeting the minimum qualifications for the Off-street Parking Facility Management RFP, as a part thereof; and any material misstatement of the information submitted herein must be grounds for submitting a non-responsive bid.

1. NAME:___________________________________________________________
   (Print name of corporation, individual or firm name)
   Tel. No.: ( ) ______________________ Fax No.: ( ) ______________________

MAILING ADDRESS:__________________________________________________
   St. Address/P.O. Box   City   State   Zip Code

2. GENERAL PARKING GARAGE EXPERIENCE:

   Note: All parking experience stated below must be within the United States and Canada

A. Summary Information of Garages Managed During the Last Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Garages Managed per Year between 2010 and 2015:</th>
<th>2010 _____</th>
<th>2011 _____</th>
<th>2012 _____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013 _____</td>
<td>2014 _____</td>
<td>2015 _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Total Gross Parking Related Revenue:</td>
<td>2010 $______</td>
<td>2011 $______</td>
<td>2012 $______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013 $______</td>
<td>2014 $______</td>
<td>2015 $______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Parking Related Employees in 2015:</td>
<td>□ Full Time: _______  □ Part Time: _______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Garage Operations (provide number of each):</td>
<td>□ Self Park: _______  □ Attendant Park: _______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Combination: _______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A. Specific Garage Information (Currently Managing Minimum of Three Years)

**Facility One**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Parking Facility:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Garage Facility:</td>
<td>Multi-level □ yes □ no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Owner of Agent:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number:</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spaces:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Dates of Operation (Month/Year):</td>
<td>From: __________ to __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours Operated per Weekday:</td>
<td>□ _______ hours per day or □ 24/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Vehicle Volume (provide number of each):</td>
<td>□ Transient: ________ □ Monthlies: ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Gross Parking Related Revenues:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Operating Budget:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Related Employees:</td>
<td>□ Full Time: ________ □ Part Time: ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage any 3rd Party Contractors for this Facility</td>
<td>□ yes □ no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Services Provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Control Equipment Manufacturer:</td>
<td>Name: ________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of PARCS Equipment (check all that apply):</td>
<td>□ Automated Pay Stations □ Centralized Cashiering □ Exit Cashiering □ Hybrid System □ In-Lane Paymt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Facility Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Parking Facility:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Garage Facility:</td>
<td>Multi-level □ yes □ no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Owner of Agent:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number:</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spaces:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Dates of Operation (Month/Year):</td>
<td>From: _____________ to _____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours Operated per Weekday:</td>
<td>□ _______ hours per day or □ 24/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Vehicle Volume (provide number of each):</td>
<td>□ Transient: _________ □ Monthlies: __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Gross Parking Related Revenues:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Operating Budget:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Related Employees:</td>
<td>□ Full Time: _______ □ Part Time: _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage any 3rd Party Contractors for this Facility</td>
<td>□ yes □ no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Services Provided:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Control Equipment: Manufacturer:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of PARCS Equipment (check all that apply):</td>
<td>□ Automated Pay Stations □ Centralized Cashiering □ Exit Cashiering □ Hybrid System □ In-Lane Paymt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Facility Three**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Parking Facility:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Garage Facility:</th>
<th>Multi-level □ yes □ no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Owner of Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephone Number:</th>
<th>( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Spaces:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Dates of Operation (Month/Year):</th>
<th>From:_______________ to ________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Hours Operated per Weekday:</th>
<th>□ ______ hours per day  or □ 24/7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Yearly Vehicle Volume (provide number of each): | □ Transient: __________ | □ Monthlies: __________ |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
|                                                |                          |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Gross Parking Related Revenues:</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Operating Budget:</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Parking Related Employees: | □ Full Time: __________ | □ Part Time: __________ |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|
|                            |                          |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manage any 3rd Party Contractors for this Facility</th>
<th>□ yes □ no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name Services Provided __________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Control Equipment: Manufacturer:</th>
<th>Name:__________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of PARCS Equipment (check all that apply):</th>
<th>□ Automated Pay Stations □ Centralized Cashiering □ Exit Cashiering □ Hybrid System □ In-Lane Paymt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
EXHIBIT J: SAMPLE-SCOPE OF SERVICES

Article I: Management Services & Terms of the Agreement

Section 101. Management Services

A. General Authority to Manage. Subject to Subsections A through C of this Section, Contractor is hereby given general authority to manage and supervise the day-to-day operation of the Facilities and to perform the specific duties hereinafter set forth, subject to, governed by, conditioned upon, and in accordance with the terms and provisions of this Agreement.

B. Control Retained by the City. The City shall at all times retain the authority to exercise control over the Facilities, and Contractor shall perform the duties required to be performed by it under this Agreement in accordance with policies and directives of the City. Any terms in this Agreement referring to direction from the City shall be construed as providing for direction as to policy and the result of Contractor’s work only, and not as to the means by which such a result is obtained. The City does not retain the right to control the means or the method by which Contractor performs work under this Agreement.

C. Access to Facilities. The City and their duly authorized agents shall have access to the Facilities at all times for the purpose of (i) inspection, (ii) to make any repairs, additions or renovations as the City shall deem advisable, and (iii) for use by the City in case of emergency, as determined by the City in its sole discretion.

D. Contractor agrees to manage and operate the City’s off-street public parking Facilities for public parking purposes only. Contractor shall as a matter of utmost priority assure that the highest levels of service quality are provided in all areas of operation, including, but not limited to, customer service, security, accounting and custodial work.

E. The public shall have the right to use the Facilities during normal operating hours. Contractor shall use its best efforts to promote and develop the business of the Facilities in conjunction with City efforts and prior written approval by City.

F. Contractor shall be responsible for maintaining the premises in a safe manner during the period in which the Facilities are open, including floors, walls, aisles, parking spaces, pedestrian walkways, driveways, stairways, and elevators. Contractor shall be responsible to City for all damages to Facilities to the extent caused by the negligence or willful acts of Contractor, its employees, sub-contractors, or agents. Contractor possesses, nor accrues, any rights not expressly granted herein.

G. As hereafter set forth in this Contract, Contractor shall:
   1. Manage and operate the Facilities in an efficient, competent, expeditious, and courteous manner for the benefit and convenience of the Facilities’ patrons and the City, while maximizing revenues and reducing operational costs, in accordance with the rates and charges, rules and regulations and operational
procedures established or approved from time to time by the City. Operator shall handle daily customer service issues with respect to, but not limited to, parking operations’ questions, requests for monthly parking, facility parking enforcement questions, area directions, distribution of marketing/promotional materials (with approval of City).

2. Operate and maintain the Ski-Data Parking Access and Revenue Control System (PARCS) equipment in each garage.

3. Be responsible for hiring, training, and supervision of parking personnel, revenue collection, security, janitorial services, and equipment maintenance and repair services.

4. Be responsible for general maintenance, emergency repairs, security and other necessary services at all Facilities during non-business hours.

5. Operator will hold account of record for Merchant ID’s and be fully responsible for Payment Card (PCI) compliance. Operator will be responsible for setting up and Maintaining 3rd Party vendor agreements with Credit Card Processing companies for the processing of credit card transactions as stipulated by the City.

6. Be responsible for collecting and delivering deposits of all parking fees and other revenues of Facilities on a daily basis to the City’s designated bank account(s). Deposits shall be in accordance with the City’s instructions and the deposit pick-up schedules.

7. Furnish managerial, supervisorial, and line staff meeting the qualifications herein set forth.

Section 102. Term of Agreement

A. The term of the Agreement shall be for a period of five (5) years, commencing at 12:00 a.m. on the Commencement Date and expiring at 11:59 p.m. on the Expiration Date, with two (2) consecutive one-year options to extend the Agreement exercisable at the City’s sole discretion.

B. The City Manager of the City may extend the term of this Agreement by giving written notice prior to expiration of the Term set forth above. Such extension shall be on the same terms and conditions of this Agreement, and the Management Fee paid to Contractor shall be at the rate specified in this Agreement.

Section 103. Facilities

At the commencement date of this Agreement, the City owns two facilities to be managed by Contractor:

- **Telegraph Channing Garage**, 2425 Channing Way, was built in 1969 and developed as a mixed-use facility. It is located one-half block west of Telegraph Avenue between Channing Way and Durant Avenue. It is a major public parking facility in the area. The garage contains five levels of parking at approximately 167,000 square feet and 430 parking spaces. The ground floor contains a retail mall with 16 leased retail spaces, managed by the City. The retail mall is an important part of the facility in that it shares elevators, access corridors, and two public bathrooms with the garage.

- **Oxford Parking Garage**, 2165 Kittredge Street, opened in March 2009 as an underground parking facility. It is one block east of Shattuck Avenue between Kittredge Street and Allston Way in the downtown area. The garage occupies approximately 46,000 square feet and has 99 parking spaces.
on a single level. The facility serves movie theaters, restaurants, retail shops, and other businesses located nearby, as well as the University of California.

- Berkeley Way Lot, Stack parking services will be provided at this 109-space surface lot during a 14-month construction period. Parking payments will occur via self-serve pay stations located within the lot. Operator will retrieve keys from stack parked vehicles and relocate to vacant spaces within the lot as they become available.

Summer 2017 (tentative opening August), the City will open an additional facility to be managed by Contractor:

- **Center Street Garage.** The proposed Center Street Garage will replace the existing parking structure with an eight-level, 720-space parking garage facility that will include a ground floor (first floor) operation center, small retail spaces, public restrooms accessible from both Addison Street and Center Street, an art display area, and secure bicycle parking. The project will strive to attain a Green Garage Gold level certification, but must achieve at least Silver level certification. The facility serves the Civic Center, University of California, Berkeley City College, multiple cultural institutions, movie theaters, restaurants, retail shops, and other businesses located nearby and is located within 1 block of the Downtown Berkeley BART station and AC Transit Downtown Berkeley hub. *Description of services for Center Street Garage is provided in Exhibit R*

### Section 104. Withdrawals and Additions

City reserves the right to withdraw all or portions of any of the Facilities or to increase or decrease the number of parking spaces in each Facility either temporarily or permanently. If City adds or withdraws all or portion of the Facilities, Contractor shall have no cause of action against City for such addition or withdrawal. Contractor further agrees that it will not be entitled to any damages for loss of business or otherwise, in whole or in part, due to the closing or construction of additions and or modifications to Facilities.

City may add an existing public parking lot, construct additional public parking facilities, and designate such Facilities as covered, under a written amendment to this Agreement. In such an event, City shall be solely responsible for all acquisition, rental, and lease costs. Contractor agrees to operate said Facilities under this Agreement in exchange for a negotiated adjustment in the Management Fee.

The City has hereby notified the Contractor that the Center Street Garage will open in Summer 2017, and has provided details on the planned garage and its operation and management requirements. For this Agreement, the Contractor and City will agree to defined 1) one-time costs associated with the opening of a fully operational Center Street Garage, and 2) increase in the flat monthly Management Fee following the opening of Center Street Garage. These defined costs are shown in Exhibit Q.

Except for Center Street Garage, City shall use its best efforts to give Contractor written notice of part or parts of Facilities to be added or withdrawn at least sixty (60) days prior to the date required in the event the City elects to make such addition or withdrawal either temporarily or permanently. At the time such withdrawal or addition becomes effective the monthly cashiering,
cleaning, and security fees shall be revised to reflect the number of employee hours actually required for the Facilities as altered.

Contractor shall provide unit rates for hourly services provided to the City for operation of parking Facilities to include:

1. cashier personnel
2. janitorial personnel
3. security personnel
4. supervisory personnel

The City may add new programs, such as valet or stacked parking, or off-street parking programs such as a merchant validation program, under a written amendment to this Agreement. For temporary changes to the operation of the Facilities, such as special events or temporary accommodations requested by the City, the City shall provide prior written notice of such events at least three (3) days in advance. Temporary changes shall not require a written amendment to this Agreement. Additional operating costs incurred by such new programs or temporary changes to the operation shall not incur any additional fees including Management Fees to the City. However, if prior written notice of such events or temporary accommodations is not requested three (3) days in advance, or extend beyond the additional hours as set forth (see Exhibit J Section E, Hours of Operation) the City and Contractor may negotiate any additional operating expenses required. City shall reimburse Contractor for any approved additional staff hours and overtime.

Section 105. Merchant Validation Programs
Manage and promote merchant validation programs at City Facilities.

A. Contractor shall work with the City, or a designated entity, to maintain and provide merchant validation programs at any of the City’s Facilities. Contractor may be asked to keep records and submit bills for the number and value of redeemed validations, and produce accurate monthly reports to City. This program shall be managed by Contractor, coordinating its operation with the City or its designated entity in cooperation with merchants and public parking garages to support economic activity by providing validation stamps to reduce parking costs.

Section 106. Damage or Destruction
A. Partial Destruction or Damage. If one or more of the Facilities are partially destroyed or damaged, the City may, at its option, terminate this Agreement by giving written notice to Contractor. Alternatively, the City may determine, in its sole and absolute discretion, whether it wishes to continue to operate the Facility(ies) under the terms of this Agreement. Should the City elect to continue the operation of the Facility(ies) under this Agreement, the City shall proceed with the reconstruction of the damaged portion of the Facility(ies). So long as the damage to the Facility(ies) was not due to negligence or willful misconduct of Contractor, the City shall pay the cost of repairing the Facility(ies).

B. Management Agreement During Reconstruction. In the event that the City elects to reconstruct the damaged portions of the Facility(ies), the City will make a determination as to whether the Facility(ies) will continue to operate during the reconstruction period. If the City
determines that the Facility(ies) will operate during such time, this Contract shall remain in full force and effect; provided, however, the Management Fee may be adjusted in accordance with Section 106 (E) of this Contract. If the City determines that the Facility(ies) cannot continue to operate during all or part of the reconstruction period, the City shall suspend this Agreement with respect to the damaged Facility(ies) during such period of inoperability without altering the Expiration Date.

C. **Total Destruction.** If one or more the Facilities are totally destroyed from any cause, whether or not covered by the insurance required hereunder, this Agreement shall automatically terminate as of the date of such total destruction with respect to those Facilities.

D. **Damage Near End of Term.** If one or more of the Facilities are partially destroyed during the last 12 months of the term of this Agreement from any cause, whether or not covered by the insurance required hereunder, the City may, at its option, terminate this Agreement in its entirety or with respect to the damaged Facility(ies) by giving written notice thereof to Contractor.

E. **Adjustment of Management Fee.** Where operation of one or more of the Facilities is terminated or suspended in accordance with Section 106 (A through D) of this Agreement, the Management Fee due to Contractor may be adjusted by determining the total number of parking spaces affected by the termination or suspension as a percentage of the total number of parking spaces under management under this contract, and reducing the Management Fee otherwise due by an equivalent percentage. Such fee shall be reinstated to the extent that spaces are returned to service.

**ARTICLE II: ASSIGNMENT AND ACCESS**

**Section 201. Assignment**

Contractor shall not assign this Agreement or any rights hereunder without the prior written consent of the City. Subject to the provisions hereof relating to assignment, this Contract shall bind and inure to the benefit of the successors and assigns of the parties hereto.

**Section 202. Access by Contractor and Acceptance of Facilities**

Subject to any and all other relevant provisions herein contained, Contractor has the right of access to the Facilities, and Contractor agrees that Facilities, and equipment therein contained, are accepted for all purposes of this Agreement.

**Section 203. Access by City**

The grant of rights hereunder is subject to the following reservations: City and its authorized officers, employees, agents, Contractors, sub-Contractors, and other representatives shall have access and the right (at such times as may be reasonable under the circumstances and with as little interruption of Contractor’s operations as is reasonable and practicable) to enter the Facilities for the purpose of inspecting operations, repairing, improving and or adding to existing facilities, to perform its obligations under this Contract, and to observe and evaluate the performance of Contractor.
ARTICLE III: OPERATING HOURS, RESPONSIBILITIES AND PROCEDURES

Section 301. Hours of Operation/Holidays

Hours of operation, parking rates, charges and policies are established by City Council resolution. Resolutions are amended periodically at the recommendation of the City Manager. Contractor shall not establish any other hours of operation, parking rates, charges or policies, nor offer any other service not mentioned in this Contract, unless permitted to do so in writing by the City.

Contractor shall operate the Facilities as public self-parking facilities for the benefit and convenience of the public. The public will have the right to use the Facilities at all times listed in Operating Hours, Responsibilities and Procedures at the rates and charges established by the City Council in the approved fee schedules. Contractor shall use its best efforts to promote and develop the business of the Facilities.

Contractor shall keep the Facilities open and shall conduct business and furnish services as follows:

Telegraph Channing Garage
Telegraph Channing Garage operates Monday through Thursday from 7:00 am to 1:00 am, Fridays and Saturdays from 7:00 am to 2:00 am, and Sundays from 8:00 am to 10:00 pm, except holidays. When so requested in advance by the City with at least three (3) days notice, Telegraph Channing Garage shall remain open as directed.

Center Street Garage- CLOSED: UNDER CONSTRUCTION JUNE 2016 – SUMMER 2017 (tentative opening AUGUST)
Center Street Garage operates Monday through Friday from 5:15 am to 12:00 am, Saturdays from 7:00 am to 12 am, and Sundays from 12:00 pm to 12:00 am, except holidays. When so requested in advance by the City with at least three (3) days notice, Center Street Garage shall remain open as directed.

Oxford Street Garage
Oxford Garage operates Monday through Sunday from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m. except holidays. When so requested in advance by the City with at least three (3) days notice, Oxford Garage shall remain open as directed.

Holidays:
All Facilities shall be closed on holidays. For purposes of this Agreement, holidays are:
- New Year’s Day (January 1)
- Thanksgiving (the fourth Thursday in November)
- Christmas Day (December 25)

Section 302. Staffing, Employees, and Contracting
A. Staffing shall include: an on-site manager, supervisors, cashiers/attendants, janitorial/maintenance workers, and security personnel.

B. Employees of Contractor or of Contractor’s Vendors: Work under this Agreement shall be performed only by competent personnel under the supervision of and or in the employment of Contractor. Contractor will comply with the City’s reasonable requests
regarding assignment of personnel, but Contractor must supervise all personnel, including any assigned at City’s request. Contractor shall select, furnish, and employ on its own behalf such competent and qualified operating personnel necessary to operate the Facilities in an efficient and workmanlike manner.

C. All personnel engaged in operation of the Facilities shall be employees of Contractor or employees of vendors hired by Contractor, subject to Contractor's sole supervision, direction and control, and under no circumstances shall Contractor's employees or employees of vendors be considered employees of the City. Contractor shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, ordinances and regulations pertaining to its employees.

D. Contractor shall provide qualified employees to carry out Contractor’s obligations, and shall appoint and retain at all times during the term of this Agreement such employees as may be necessary to manage and operate the Facilities in an efficient, competent, expeditious, and courteous manner. Contractor agrees to establish a system of pre-assignment and in-service training programs, such as operating procedure manuals, scheduled instructional programs and equipment for training employees. Such training programs shall be sufficient in scope to produce the high quality of service required hereunder.

E. Contractor shall at all times exercise control over the conduct, demeanor and appearance of all Contractor employees in the operation of the City’s Facilities. Such personnel shall be trained by Contractor to render a high degree of courteous and efficient service to the parking patrons and it shall be the responsibility of Contractor to maintain close supervision over said employees so as to assure continuation of the highest standard of service. Each employee must understand that a significant aspect of their duties is public relations and, as such, they are required to effectively communicate with the public.

F. **On-site Manager.** Contractor shall appoint a full-time Operational Manager located on-site, who must be a highly qualified and experienced manager of automobile parking facilities, with responsibility and authority to manage operations at all of the Facilities. This person shall have and maintain certification as a parking professional from an accredited organization such as the National Parking Association (NPA), or the International Parking Institute (IPI), and must fully understand the functions of operating parking facilities, be knowledgeable about reporting software and be able to supply accounting and statistical data required of the operation. At all times when the Facilities are open for public parking and the On-site Manager is not present, one on-duty and on-site employee at the Facility shall be designated the Acting On-site Manager and shall be authorized to direct any other employees to respond to emergencies, inquiries and complaints. In addition, the On-site Manager shall be competent in creating reports from the Parking Access and Revenue Control System (PARCS) Equipment and other on-site parking facility equipment, including but not limited to, revenue reports and parking utilization reports. The On-site Manager shall have a working knowledge of the figures contained in each Monthly Report and must be able to prepare and produce specific reports requested by the City, including graphs and tables. The duties of the On-site Manager shall be exclusively and entirely dedicated to the operations of the City of Berkeley Facilities. The On-site Manager shall be the employee and agent of Contractor, but the City shall retain the right to direct Contractor to replace the On-site Manager should the
City’s Parking Services Manager determine that the On-site Manager is not acting in the best interest of the Facilities.

G. **Onsite Assistant Manager:** Operator shall assign a full-time, on-site assistant manager who is highly qualified and experienced to supervise the operation effectively and ensure business is conducted in an efficient, competent, expeditious, and courteous manner. This person shall fully understand the functions of operating parking facilities, be knowledgeable about reporting software and be able to supply accounting and statistical data required of the operation. The on-site assistant manager shall be available during evening/weekend operating hours as established by the City. The on-site assistant manager must be exclusively assigned to the City of Berkeley’s Parking Facilities during the duration of this Agreement.

H. **Supervisory & Administrative Staffing.** Contractor shall provide the City’s parking operation with supervisory and administrative employees with the following titles, working hours and job descriptions:

1. **One (1) On-site Manager:** Minimum of 2,080 hours annually, eight hours daily, Monday through Friday. Execution of On-site Manager’s duties may require his/her presence at the Facilities at other times in addition to the minimum time specified above, including returning to the Facilities after hours to resolve operational or security problems. The On-site Manager shall be the on-site individual in charge of all Facilities. The On-site Manager shall report to Contractor’s General Manager or other authorized corporate officer.

   The On-Site Manager shall possess the following qualifications:

   a. Graduation from an accredited four-year college or university with major course work in Accounting, Business Administration, or related subject area, and two years experience managing or supervising a parking facility with ten or more employees on a multi-shift operation, or

   b. Graduation from high school and five (5) years experience managing or supervising a parking facility with ten or more employees on a multi-shift operation.

   c. This person shall have and maintain certification as a parking professional from an accredited organization such as the National Parking Association (NPA), or the International Parking Institute (IPI),

   d. A résumé of the proposed On-site Manager, with education and experience listed, shall be submitted to the City for approval.

   e. Certification in management and use of Ski-Data Parking Access Revenue Control (PARCS) Equipment by the commencement date of this contract, at the Contractor’s expense.

   The On-Site Manager’s duties shall include but not be limited to the following:

   a. The On-Site Manager shall be available during regular business hours from 8:00am to 5:00pm. At any time the On-site Manager shall not be present during regular business hours he/she shall notify the City in advance. The On-site Manager shall be available
on an on-call basis at all times any of the Facilities are open for business, by telephone or personal pager, the cost of which shall be borne by Contractor.

b. During the term of this Agreement the Contractor’s On-site Manager shall reside in Northern California and maintain the ability to respond in-person to any Facility emergency occurrence or incident within a one-hour time frame. The On-site Manager and Supervisory positions are identified as specific key personnel assigned to this Contract. Any changes in on-site personnel from those assigned at the commencement of this Agreement will require prior written approval of the City. The Contractor’s On-site Manager shall be assigned to manage the Garage facilities 100% of his/her time.

c. The On-site Manager is responsible for developing and monitoring the accuracy of the revenue and expense information and monitoring revenue controls, as necessary. The On-site Manager shall be proficient in the use of the revenue control equipment and fully understand its capabilities and weaknesses. This person should be fully knowledgeable about the basic reporting software for the fee computers and be able to supply accounting and statistical data required by this Contract.

d. The On-site Manager shall be responsible for the development of training and operational manuals covering all aspects of the parking operation.

e. The On-site Manager shall establish performance criteria and job descriptions for all staff and make such information available to the City upon request.

f. The On-site Manager shall develop all forms for use in all aspects of the parking operations, subject to City approval, for such items as transaction records, daily and weekly lot activity reports, erroneous transaction reports, applications for monthly parking, applications for validation programs, accident report forms, complaint report forms and other forms that are deemed necessary to facilitate efficient management of the City’s parking Facilities.

2. The On-site Manager, his/her designated assistant, or key supervisory personnel shall perform the following duties:

a. Fully supervise Contractor’s employees;

b. Require all staff to be properly trained, follow rules of conduct and be properly dressed in uniform and otherwise prepared and suitable for their assigned duties;

c. Discipline or dismiss employees, with cause, who fail to abide by the standards specified in this Agreement;

d. Provide the City with a weekly staffing schedule by facility in advance, including all staff assigned (managers, customer service reps/cashiers, janitorial, and security);

e. Provide staff to answer the telephone during normal business hours and handle customer complaints, carry out the overall cash handling functions and accounting functions for all facilities, including monthly parking cards, and accurate record keeping of facility assets;
f. Provide office hours at each garage as needed to handle specific patrons’ business needs with Contractor (i.e., issue disabled person parking program card keys);

g. Daily inspection of the entire parking operation. Report or correct any problems in accordance with the requirements of this Agreement;

h. Understand the maintenance requirement of the parking facilities and the revenue control equipment and proactively and aggressively manage this responsibility;

i. Ensure Contractor compliance with the City’s facilities maintenance schedule (Section 309).

Within sixty (60) days following the effective date of this Agreement, Contractor shall provide the City with one copy of a training manual and an operation manual specific to each Facility. Contractor shall provide regularly-scheduled formal training to staff in the operation of the revenue control equipment, cash-handling, safety, sustainability factors and product use, on-the-job behavior requirements, conduct, operational rules, proper dress and employee attitude, and other job-related functions. Contractor shall maintain and make available their employee training records for inspection by authorized City staff. Contractor shall provide copies of training materials to the City as requested. Training manuals and their content shall be subject to the sole and complete approval of the City and shall be updated as needed.

j. Develop an employee attitude and parking sensitivity survey to be administered to the public on a routine basis to determine the public acceptance and performance of Contractor and its employees no later than ninety (90) days following the effective date of this Agreement, and to provide this information to the City on a semi-annual basis;

k. The Contractor shall implement stack parking and/or valet parking if requested by the City;

l. Contractor shall manage the Disabled Person Parking Program – issues discounted card key access to garage facilities, and provides free parking to program participants.

m. Contractor may be required by the City to manage carpool and vanpool programs, including registration and verification of carpool and vanpool participants.

n. Perform other field supervision activities as necessary.

3. The City expects Contractor to have supervisory staff available at one of the City-owned facilities during all operating hours. The supervisory staff should be able to provide information to the public, be in charge when there is more than one staff person present, and capable of making decisions and interpreting operating standards in typical and unusual situations.

4. Contractor shall employ and schedule the number of employees required to cover all regularly scheduled garage, and potential stack parking/valet operations as agreed by the City, so that efficient and effective customer service is provided at all times.
5. At Telegraph Channing Garage, the City expects that Contractor shall have a minimum of at least one (1) janitorial and one (1) security personnel on duty at all times the garage is open;
   - In addition, the City expects that Contractor shall have at least one (1) other supervisor, service attendant, janitor, and security guard within a 15-minute response time at all times. Security guards must be on duty from 7am through garage closing each day.
   - At the commencement of this Agreement the Center Street Garage will be under construction. Center Street Garage will re-open as a 720-space garage. The City expects that Contractor shall have at least one (1) customer service rep/cashier on duty at all times when the garage is open. In addition, the City expects that Contractor shall have at least one (1) other supervisor, one (1) janitor, and two (2) security guards (desk assignment and roving) assigned.
   - At Oxford Garage, the City expects that Contractor shall have at least two (2) parking attendants on duty during peak times the garage is open; until such time that the Parking Mitigation Plan for Center Street Garage Re-Build Project is completed and the garage re-opens. After construction completion, Oxford Garage shall have at least one (1) other supervisor, service attendant, janitor, and security guard within a 15-minute response time at all times.

6. All personnel must have the legal right to work in the United States and must read, write, and speak fluent English if their assignments require communication with the public. Employees who move cars or drive any vehicle in the course of performing their job responsibilities must possess a valid Class C California Driver’s License.

7. Except as otherwise provided herein, Contractor shall have the exclusive right to hire, assign, supervise, manage, discipline, suspend, terminate, layoff, and otherwise discharge its employees. Notwithstanding the above, the City reserves the right to request a change in the Contractor’s personnel, in the City’s sole discretion.

8. Upon the City’s request, Contractor shall provide evidence satisfactory to the City that Contractor has adequately provided for all legally required employment benefits.

9. Maintenance Personnel and Contracting. Contractor shall employ, or contract for, sufficient personnel to perform the routine maintenance and repair work at the Facilities in a prompt and efficient manner so as to keep the premises at all times in a first-class operating condition that is clean, safe, and attractive, as specified in Exhibit D, Maintenance Standards and Form of Maintenance Schedule. Contractor shall provide evidence acceptable to the City that any contractor engaged by Contractor to perform work on the property maintains insurance in amounts on policies of coverage and offered by companies satisfactory to the City, including but not limited to, Worker's Compensation Insurance (including Employers' Liability Insurance), general liability insurance covering personal injury and property damage, and insurance covering the use of owned, non-owned or hired vehicles and equipment.

10. Security Personnel and Contracting. Contractor shall enter into a security agreement with a contractor or contractors acceptable to the City to provide security guards to be
stationed at the Facilities to protect the Facilities, its staffing and users, and property in the Facilities against damage, injury, theft or other loss.

a. Guards hired to provide security at the Facilities shall not carry firearms.

b. Should the City determine at any time that Contractor has not employed an adequate pool of security guards to perform responsibilities, as outlined in this Agreement at one or more of the Facilities, the City shall notify Contractor in writing of such deficiency. Should Contractor fail to remedy the situation within forty-eight (48) hours of such notice, the City shall have the right to contract for temporary security guards and direct such guards to work at the Facilities until such time Contractor has provided the City with satisfactory evidence that the Facilities will be adequately staffed with security personnel.

c. The City shall have the right to deduct administrative costs associated in providing security (per 12 b.) from the Management Fee.

11. **Subcontracting Must be Authorized.** Except as otherwise authorized under this Agreement and to ensure the quality of work performed at the Facilities, Contractor is prohibited from subcontracting any of its duties under this Agreement or any part of it unless such subcontracting is first approved by the City in writing. Neither party shall, on the basis of this Agreement, contract on behalf of or in the name of the other party. An agreement made by Contractor and a subcontractor that is in violation of this provision shall confer no rights on any party and shall be null and void.

**Section 303. Professional Behavior**
Contractor shall be responsible for the conduct, demeanor and appearance of its employees while on or about the Parking Facilities or while acting in the course and scope of employment.

1. While on or about the Parking Facilities or while acting in the course and scope of employment, all employees of the Contractor, shall be neat and clean, and shall act in a courteous and professional manner. No employee shall use improper language or act in a loud, offensive or otherwise improper manner.

2. Staff members are trained as to the purpose of their positions and the importance of performing their jobs.

3. All employees are at all times polite and courteous in their dealings with Customers, treating the public with care and respect.

4. All employees are to be attentive, alert and responsive to all Customers issues, needs, comments or complaints.

5. All employees speak clearly and in a professional manner while interacting with Customers, offering the assistance needed by each Customer;

6. All employees are prohibited from any behavior that shall make a Customer feel threatened, insecure, or ignored while in the Parking Facilities.

**Section 304. Dress Code/Uniforms**

1. Employees staffing the Parking Facilities shall wear a photo I.D. badge and distinct uniform, identifying such persons as parking service employees of Contractor.
2. All Contractor employees shall wear uniforms of a design and color approved by the City to present a clean and efficient image.

3. All uniforms must be approved by the City. The Parking Services Manager shall approve any uniform and I.D. badge proposed by the Contractor. Uniforms shall at minimum consist of shirt, pants or skirt, and name tags.

4. The Parking Services Manager shall not unreasonably withhold approval of any uniform and I.D. badge proposed by the Contractor.

5. The Parking Services Manager reserves the right to require changes in such uniforms at his/her reasonable discretion.

6. Uniforms are required to be clean, pressed and professional in appearance.

7. Requested exemptions from the uniform requirement shall be subject to the prior written approval of the City.

8. Contractor is expected to provide its employees with appropriate weather protection equipment.

9. Contractor’s uniform policy shall be covered in Contractor’s operation manual.

10. Contractor shall prominently display an employee’s name in cashier booths while on duty so that it is clearly visible to the public.

**Section 305. Customer Service, Quality of Service, Operations and Personnel**

Contractor shall maintain the highest degree and standards of courteous, polite and inoffensive conduct and demeanor on the part of its representatives, agents, subcontractors, and employees. Operator shall conduct its operation in an orderly and appropriate manner so as to be pleasing to customers, patrons, and the public in or around the Garage, and shall refrain from any and all conduct which might tend to annoy, disturb, or be offensive to such persons in or around the Garage. Contractor shall provide professionally trained and experienced personnel to assure that the highest levels of service quality are provided in all areas of operation, including, but not limited to, customer service, security, accounting and custodial work. To this end, the selected Contractor shall:

1. Handle daily customer service issues with respect to, but not limited to, parking operations questions, requests for monthly parking, parking enforcement questions, area directions, distribution of informational/marketing/promotional materials (with approval of City).

2. Assist facility users who have forgotten where their car is parked.

3. Establish standards and make provision for the release of parking patrons determined to be without funds.

4. Establish standards under which a patron without funds would be allowed to exit without payment and provide evidence of non-payment through the deposit reports, and

5. Establish policies acceptable to the City for dealing with the acceptance of checks for monthly parking payment and parking charges due, including requirements for patron identification.
Section 306. Attendance at City Meetings
Contractor’s general manager shall attend City meetings upon request of the City and shall provide the City with his/her recommendations for improving service to the public and increasing usage of the Facilities. Said recommendations may include observations and/or studies of parking occupancy, turnover, duration, appearance of the Facilities, validation program maintenance, parking rates, parking demand, promotion, and other items associated with management of the Facilities. City shall give due consideration to such recommendations.

The Contractor’s On-site Manager shall attend weekly meetings with the Parking Services Manager and City staff.

Section 307. Provision of Property and Services
Contractor shall select and provide, at its expense, the property and services required for the successful accomplishment of Contractor’s obligations under this Contract including, but not limited to:

1. Copiers, and all other necessary office equipment; and
2. Licenses and fees; and
3. Training manuals for employees covering all aspects of the parking program as applicable to each employee’s duties and responsibilities; and
4. Site-specific operations manual for parking operations and procedures.

City shall provide vehicle as listed in Exhibit F for Contractor use. Contractor agrees that City shall not be liable for any injuries sustained by Contractor employees or their contractor arising from or related to their use of those vehicles provided to Contractor by City. Contractor will obtain Commercial General Liability, workers compensation, and other related coverage for its employees. City will not be liable for, and will not be required to provide any personal injury protection or other insurance coverage for, any claims, liabilities or damages arising from or related to those vehicles provided to Contractor by City. Contractor shall be responsible for all vehicles operating costs including but not limited to gas, fluids, maintenance, operators insurance, any official Contractor markings on the outside of the vehicles, registration or inspection fees, and repairs. Such vehicles shall only be used by Contractor for garage management operations and associated functions under this Agreement and not for Contractor’s business or personal use. Any damage to City vehicles incurred during use by Contractor’s employees or subcontractors, and any repairs required to correct such damage, is the full responsibility of the Contractor.

Section 308. Cleaning Requirements
Green Garage Certification - The City is committed to a Green Cleaning Policy to promote and encourage healthy and functional environments within their facilities for all occupants, including guests and employees. This involves maintaining sustainable purchasing goals that will require Contractor to provide purchasing records of approved cleaning products. All maintenance personnel must be trained to properly use, maintain, and dispose of all cleaning products within the facility’s occupied space. This strategy includes written policy directives, guidelines, training, and manuals to ensure proper implementation. City will stipulate cleaning procedures in
the Agreement for Contractor and/or third party vendors. See Exhibit M-1 Sample Green Cleaning Policy.

Contractor shall maintain the facilities in a clean and attractive condition. Contractor shall conduct daily routine cleaning of all premises related to the operation, including stairwells, pedestrian walkways, restrooms, booths, elevators, retail mall areas, entry ways (elevators), control and break rooms and Operator’s office areas.

Contractor will furnish all cleaning chemicals and consumables including but not limited to paper towels, toilet paper, seat covers, soap, garbage can liners, approved green cleaning agents including: detergents, window cleaner, disinfectants, wax, shampoo, and similar items.

Contractor will furnish all janitorial equipment as necessary to properly perform the work described in this Scope of Services. The equipment shall include but not be limited to mops, dusting cloths, brushes, buckets, steam cleaning equipment, and similar items.

A. Contractor shall keep all Facilities clean during all hours of operation. Garages shall be cleaned at night prior to closing. Contractor shall provide all labor, transportation, supplies, materials and equipment to perform all of the janitorial services described herein to the satisfaction of the City’s Parking Services Manager. The City’s Parking Services Manager shall decide all questions that may arise as to quality or acceptability of work performed. Contractor may subcontract cleaning services with written City approval. All subcontracted employees shall be paid in compliance with the City’s Living Wage Ordinance.

1. Cleaning and/or maintenance personnel may be direct employees of Contractor, or may be, with prior written approval by the City, a subcontractor. In either case, Contractor accepts full and total responsibility for provision of service and satisfaction of quality standards.

2. Cleaning services shall include at a minimum litter cleaning, sweeping, mopping, deodorizing, and graffiti abatement.

3. Janitorial and cleaning services shall include, at a minimum: cleaning and polishing all stainless steel in elevators, dusting interiors, damp mopping, interior graffiti removal, and touching up signs at each of the Facilities.

4. Mopping and cleaning includes:
   a. Applying absorbent as needed, sweeping up, and mopping of any spillage of oil or other fluids on parking decks, floors, stairs, landings, and halls; and
   b. Mopping and waxing elevator floors and clean interior walls, windows, doors, and light covers; and
   c. Mopping and waxing on-site office space provided for Contractor; and
   d. Cleaning cashier booth windows, ticket dispensers and gate arm equipment housings and the exterior of all waste receptacles; and
   e. Mopping restroom floors, cleaning and disinfecting restroom fixtures, ceiling (when necessary), and walls, and filling all restroom dispensers.

B. General Cleaning/Locations
1. **At Telegraph Channing Garage**, cleaning shall be directed at the elevator(s), public restrooms, mall lobby, private storage and private restrooms, stairwells, mall corridors and all exterior surfaces of the retail spaces. Retail tenants shall be responsible for maintenance inside their leased space.

2. **At Oxford Garage**, cleaning shall be directed at the elevator(s), public restroom, elevator lobby and Allston Street corridor.

3. **At Center Street Garage**, cleaning shall be directed at the elevator(s), public restrooms, private storage and office space, stairwells, and all exterior sidewalks of garage.

4. **Public Restrooms**: All urinals, toilets and lavatories must be thoroughly cleaned with a solution containing a commercial grade, approved disinfectant and sprayed with an approved germicide to kill surface germs. All lavatory room floors shall be mopped with germicidal solution. All walls around sinks, urinals and toilets shall be appropriately cleaned. All mirrors shall be cleaned with an ammoniated glass cleaner. All paper towel dispensers and soap dispensers shall be filled.
   
   a. Telegraph Channing Garage and Center Street Garage have high volume public restroom usage and shall be cleaned at least every two hours during all hours the facilities are open to the public. Contractor shall provide cleaning materials, supplies, and replenishment of soap, paper towels, and toilet paper in the restrooms.
   
   b. Contractor shall, on a daily basis empty and sanitize waste receptacles and replace trash liners; clean mirrors; clean and disinfect sinks, toilet bowls and urinals; spot clean tile, walls, and partitions; spot clean walls around sinks; mop floors with a disinfectant solution approved by the City; refill soap dispensers as necessary; refill paper towels, toilet tissue, seat covers, and remove all graffiti.
   
   c. Contractor shall on a weekly basis wash/polish walls and toilet partitions; pour clean water in floor drains to prevent sewer gas and thoroughly scrub floors and baseboards.

5. Contractor shall conduct regular systematic inspection of his/her work crew and shall be responsible for providing adequate supervision to ensure competent and satisfactory performance of the services required under this Agreement.

6. Contractor shall notify the Parking Services Manager or other designated personnel by phone or letter/email to note special comments or janitorial needs.

_Section 309. Maintenance and Minor Repair_

Contractor is required to maintain all necessary Facilities’ equipment or enter into a service contract with a City approved Maintenance Company to perform scheduled preventative maintenance service and equipment repairs on a quarterly basis. Effective on commencement date of this Agreement, **Costless Maintenance Service Company** is the approved subcontractor to provide maintenance services at the City’s Facilities. Contractor shall provide the City, upon request, with a monthly report of all maintenance/repair services performed in all Facilities.

Contractor shall maintain the Facilities in a clean, safe, and sanitary condition. For purposes of this management Agreement, “routine maintenance and repair work” shall mean all ordinary maintenance and repair of the premises and equipment and replacement of supplies that are normally performed on a day-to-day or routine basis in order to keep the facilities in an efficient,
clean, and safe condition. Such routine maintenance and repair work shall include without limitation:

**Daily Maintenance**

Litter cleaning includes picking up and removal of all litter, debris, bottles, cans, and other extraneous material from the Facility, landscaped areas adjacent to the Facility, ramps, and sidewalk areas next to ramps and adjacent to Facility, and the emptying and disposal of contents of all waste receptacles in Facility.

1. Contractor shall on a daily basis; perform litter cleaning, power broom and hand sweeping, mopping and cleaning, and graffiti abatement at each of the Facilities.

2. Contractor shall on a daily basis; sweep, dust mop and mop all floors of all Facilities, empty all waste containers and replace trash liners in all trash receptacles as necessary with prior City approval as set forth below; clean, polish, and disinfect drinking fountains; clean entrance doors and surrounding glass removing smudges and streaks; sweep and/or mop stairwells; sweep and/or mop entrance and walkways; secure all doors and windows, and set alarms.

**Routine Maintenance Duties**

1. Contractor shall power broom or hand-sweep the parking decks, entrance ramps, sidewalks in and next to entrance ramps and driveways of each Facility thoroughly. Elevator floors, stairs, stairwells, halls, corners, areas between rows of wheel stops or wheel stops and curbs, and any other areas inaccessible to the power broom shall be thoroughly hand swept. Interior walls, corners, ceilings, and fixtures shall be cleaned of cobwebs, dust, loose soil, and prompt removal of pigeon nests and droppings from floors and all accessible surfaces.

2. Contractor shall scrub and rinse as needed interior facility wall; thoroughly mop stairs and stairwells, and spaces between steps and walls and under steps shall be cleaned of residue. The interior liners of all waste receptacles shall be scrubbed and disinfected to ensure that they are clean and odor-free. Appropriate detergents and cleaners shall be used in cleaning as necessary.

3. Contractor shall on a weekly basis in all Facilities dust baseboards, ledges and windowsills; dust all desks, chairs, counters, shelves, bookcases and file cabinets in Parking offices and cashier booths and spot clean painted walls and partitions.

4. Steam cleaning as needed in specific areas, including but not limited to all sidewalks and interior and exterior stairwells, elevators, vehicle and pedestrian access areas shall be performed on a quarterly basis and each entire Garage on a semi-annual basis with industrial steam cleaning equipment. At the discretion of the Parking Services Manager, steam cleaning may be required to be performed less frequently if the facility, including sidewalks and stairwells, is maintained in a clean and orderly state.

**Graffiti Removal and Painting**

1. Contractor shall abate graffiti at any Facility within 24 hours of appearance.
2. Contractor shall clean all interior and exterior surfaces of Facilities and applicable parking lot areas affected by graffiti and repaint with matching color of surface or paint.

3. The Contractor shall maintain the striping of the floors and surfaces and all such directional markings within the Parking Facilities as are necessary to facilitate the safe movement and parking of vehicles.

4. The Contractor shall perform cleaning, sweeping and striping of floors; cleaning and painting of elevator walls and cleaning and painting of interior curbs and drive aisles. (Particularly when such surfaces have been marred by graffiti or other forms of vandalism).

**Landscaping (Center Street Garage only)**

Contractor shall provide landscape maintenance both within and around the parking Garage, or as otherwise directed by City. Should the Contractor not have extensive landscape maintenance experience and/or required licensure and equipment, Contractor may outsource this responsibility to an experienced and licensed landscaping service provider.

**Minor Repair**

1. Other maintenance duties Contractor shall perform include: Replacing bulbs, monitor fire extinguishers and hose boxes for good working order; and report malfunctions to City Public Works Department.

2. Contractor shall monitor and check elevators in parking garages and report any malfunction to authorized City representatives and City Public Works Department.

3. Contractor shall notify the City of major equipment malfunctions that cannot be repaired by parking operations staff or extend beyond the normal service calls of the equipment maintenance company.

4. The Contractor shall take all reasonable and prudent Emergency Actions necessary to protect people and property from injury, loss or damage and, if appropriate, to avoid further injury, loss or damage, upon discovering any condition in a Parking Facility that has caused or that threatens to imminently cause such injury, loss or damage. Such Emergency Actions shall include, but not be limited to; posting signs/notices, erecting signs, barricades, lights and other warning devices. The Contractor shall inform the Parking Services Manager immediately of any such emergency conditions by the Contractor. If additional actions need to be taken by the City, the Contractor is responsible for recommending such actions to the Parking Services Manager.

The Contractor shall perform all the foregoing maintenance duties in accordance with the Maintenance Schedule attached hereto as Exhibit D. The Parking Services Manager shall have the right to require the Contractor to perform certain duties specified in such schedule more frequently than provided therein. The Contractor shall be responsible for providing a “Maintenance Checklist” record of the completed work, and maintaining such checklist on premises at the Garage at all times. Upon demand of the Parking Services Manager, or her designee, the Contractor shall present the Maintenance Checklist.
Non-Routine Maintenance

Non-Routine maintenance shall mean all maintenance and repair work that is not defined as routine maintenance and minor repair work, and generally includes structural repairs, repair of electrical, heating, cooling, plumbing, fire alarm/sprinkler, lighting, elevator and paving/concrete deck repair. Contractor shall notify the City of all non-routine maintenance and repair work of which Contractor has or should have actual knowledge that is required to keep the Parking Facilities in a good and safe operating state.

Section 310. Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS)

Contractor shall supply all cleaning chemicals. Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) for all “hazardous substances” used by Contractor must be submitted to the City before commencing work. City will provide a list of “Green Products” that Contractor must use. See Exhibit M-1.

1. Contractor shall supply all perishables. This includes all paper towels, toilet paper, seat covers, soap, etc.

2. The City shall inform Contractor about hazardous substances to which it may be exposed while on the job site and protective measures that can be taken to reduce the possibility of exposure.

Section 311. Security Requirements

Contractor shall furnish security guards at all facilities daily as directed. Contractor may subcontract security services with written City approval. Effective on commencement date of this Agreement Treeline Security Inc. is the approved subcontractor to provide security services for City Facilities. In the event of subcontracting, Contractor accepts full and total responsibility for provision of service and attainment of qualifications. All subcontracted employees shall be paid in compliance with the City’s Living Wage Ordinance.

1. All security guards must have at least six months experience in similar work. They must possess a current and valid identification card issued by the State of California and not have a criminal record. To that end, guard applicants must be successfully investigated by the State Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Security personnel shall not carry any weapons.

2. Contractor shall conduct a comprehensive pre-employment check of all personnel for potential assignment under this Contract in order to determine suitability for employment on the basis of such factors as qualifications, reliability, integrity, and psychological and physical fitness, prior to assignment.

3. Contractor’s on-site manager shall be responsible for supervision of all guards through designated supervisory level representatives who shall be available at all times to respond promptly and appropriately to calls for assistance from guards on duty or from authorized representatives of the City. Contractor’s supervisory level personnel shall perform unscheduled and unannounced inspections of each guard post once during each shift, each week.

4. Contractor shall be responsible for furnishing guards with appropriate uniforms, approved by the City, report forms, portable radios, log books, and other necessary
equipment. Uniforms shall include trousers, shirt, name tag, jacket (when weather requires), shoes, and hat. Uniforms shall be worn at all times while on duty.

Responsibilities

1. Guards shall:
   a. Call 911 immediately when confronted with a situation requiring an emergency police presence.
   b. Regularly patrol designated areas of the Facilities.
   c. Deter and report individuals attempting to gain unauthorized access to Facilities or attempting to damage or steal vehicles or property therein.
   d. Respond to alarm signals or other indications of suspicious activities.
   e. Act appropriately in the event of any situation affecting the security of the Facilities or the safety of Facility patrons, including, but not limited to, fires, accidents, civil disturbances and disorders, criminal acts, and earthquakes or other acts of God.
   f. Maintain an effective liaison with the Berkeley Police Department.
   g. Never leave duty stations or patrol areas until properly relieved.
   h. Maintain a daily written record of all guard activity, and provide City with a detailed weekly written report of any matters or occurrences relating to the security of the Facilities or vehicles therein.
   i. Inspect vehicles to deter and detect theft of contents and parts.
   j. Inspect vehicles that have been parked in the Facility for more than 24 hours, and report to Berkeley Police any unauthorized vehicles parked over 72 hours.
   k. Direct patrons to parking areas and assist with traffic circulation in the Facilities.
   l. Be knowledgeable of facility parking rules, rates and revenue equipment use to assist customers as needed.
   m. Man security desk at Center Street Garage Facility during all hours of operation.
   n. Perform other security duties and services as requested. More detailed duties, patrol routes, and responsibilities for each Facility shall be furnished by the City and revised from time to time by the Parking Services Manager.

2. Contractor shall recommend to the City an increase or decrease of security guard services at one or more Facilities based on documented need. Contractor shall list all vehicle license numbers parked in Facilities overnight.

3. Failure to properly perform this work may be cause for withholding of partial or full payment of Contractor’s Management Fee then due, immediate termination of this Contract, or all of the above.

Section 312. Emergency Response Program

Contractor must notify City immediately in the event of the following: a) any property damage and/or b) any police action(s). Contractor shall document any and all incidents to include but not limited to preparing incident reports, taking photographs of incident, and interviewing affected
parties and/or witnesses. Except as requested by law enforcement agencies, Contractor shall not release any incident information to any other party without City’s advance written permission.

1. Contractor shall develop and implement a Parking Facility emergency response program for dealing with disasters, medical emergencies, and other crises that may arise. The emergency response program shall be submitted to the City in writing for approval.

2. If a release of hazardous materials or hazardous waste occurs that cannot be controlled, Contractor shall immediately notify the Berkeley Fire Department at 911, the City’s Toxics Management division at 510-981-7460, and the Environmental Compliance Specialist at 510-981-6629. Contractor shall take the necessary steps to close off hazardous areas to the public until containment, clean up or repairs can be accomplished.

3. Contractor shall immediately notify the City of any hazardous conditions at the Facilities.

Section 313. Materials and Trade Fixtures:
All the materials required in the operations performed by the Contractor including, but not limited to, all parking tickets, printer and cash register paper, ribbons, detergents, solvents, mops, sweeping equipment, light bulbs, brooms, forms, office supplies, and uniforms shall be provided by Contractor. Contractor shall maintain all trade fixtures and furniture in the cashier booths and all windows and electric light bulbs in or attached to cashier booths and City-provided offices.

Section 314. Ordering and Purchasing of Supplies, Equipment and Furnishings
Contractor shall provide such supplies, equipment and furnishings required for performance of the management, supervision, and administration services in the operation of the parking facilities, including, but not limited to, maintenance and cleaning equipment, tools, office and accounting equipment, office furnishings, and vehicles at its own expense. A list of all equipment, supplies and other tangible personal property belonging to the City and located in the parking facilities is attached hereto as Exhibit F. Contractor may use these items during the term of this Agreement. The items on such list, any replacements (parts) for or additions to those items are hereinafter referred to as “City Property” and shall be and remain the property of the City. Contractor shall be fully responsible for the care and safekeeping of all City Property and shall use such property only in connection with the operation of the Parking Facilities. Contractor shall be responsible for the return of all City Property in good working condition excluding normal use wear and tear. Except for supplies and other property that are routinely used and consumed in the operation of a parking garage, Contractor shall not dispose of any City Property without the prior written consent of the Parking Services Manager.

Section 315. Parking Revenue Equipment Maintenance
Contractor shall be responsible for the operation and maintenance of City parking equipment. Effective on commencement date of this Agreement Sentry Control Systems Inc. is the approved subcontractor to provide operation of Ski-Data Parking Access Revenue Control System (PARCS) equipment at City Facilities. Contractor shall keep a written log of all service and repairs. Contractor shall also be responsible for training and monitoring employees in the use of all equipment.

1. The City shall have the right to prescribe the form and dispensing method of printed parking tickets to be used, or alternate collection controls. The City shall review and
approve tickets used for parking control. Contractor shall supply such tickets and shall also supply and install printer paper, ribbons, and receipt paper in all cash control and parking equipment.

2. Contractor shall, as necessary, re-supply the automatic ticket dispenser with tickets. Contractor shall train its On-site Manager and other supervisory staff so that at all times they are capable of providing emergency minor repair and routine preventive maintenance for all parking automation equipment including, without limitation, ticket dispensers, automatic gates, car count equipment, detectors, and fee computers.

3. Routine maintenance includes tasks such as, but not limited to, adjusting time mechanisms, changing ribbons, replacing damaged gate arms, checking and cleaning print heads, cleaning and checking coin and bill acceptors, replacing audit tapes, replacing parking tickets for automatic ticket dispensers, routine maintenance to ticket mechanisms, replacing light bulbs that demarcate exit and entrance areas and/or tire damage signs and the performance of other minor preventive maintenance as necessary. Contractor shall immediately report damage or minor malfunctions to the City and shall notify an authorized service company to make necessary repairs. Contractor shall keep a written log of all equipment services and repair. Service companies servicing City owned revenue control equipment shall be approved by the City.

4. Contractor shall, with respect to pre-existing City-owned and installed fee computers and revenue control equipment, maintain all publications and operation manuals and institute training programs in the operation of the equipment for its employees.

5. The City may request, in writing, Contractor to perform or contract for certain maintenance operations not otherwise required in this Contract. City shall compensate Contractor for all direct and agreed upon indirect costs associated with such maintenance operations.

Section 316. Traffic Control and Signage

1. Contractor shall regulate, control and supervise the parking of motor vehicles within the Parking Facilities and erect and maintain such additional directional or diagrammed signs in such a manner as will facilitate the orderly, efficient, and safe parking of such vehicles, thereby preventing traffic delays. Signs shall be subject to City approval.

2. Contractor shall immediately erect and maintain such signs, barricades, and other devices to warn Facility users of any dangerous or defective conditions known or expected to be known to Contractor and take such actions as may be reasonably necessary to protect such users from injury, loss or damage which might result because of such condition.

3. Anytime a dangerous or defective condition may reasonably be known to exist by Contractor, Contractor shall immediately advise City in writing of such condition and the action taken.

4. Contractor shall not erect or display or permit to be erected or displayed any sign, poster, advertising matter, or structure of any kind on the Facilities without first obtaining written consent of City; provided however, that Contractor shall provide, install, and maintain suitable signs as requested and approved by City to designate rates, days and hours of operation, rules and regulations, and extent of liability. Contractor shall change
signs as needed to reflect changes in approved rate schedules. The City shall install suitable sign(s) at the Facilities designating them to be City public parking facilities.

**Section 317. Payroll and Log**

Contractor shall employ directly all personnel and pay all direct and indirect payroll expenses, including making timely payroll tax payments, timely remittance of all employee deductions to the respective agencies and organizations and timely filing of all required returns and reports. Contractor and any sub-Contractor(s) shall be responsible for compliance with the City’s Living Wage and Equal Benefits Ordinances. Contractor shall submit to City a quarterly report indicating the number of staff employed, number of hours worked, and salary costs. This report shall show combined activity for all Facilities.

1. Contractor shall keep accurate payroll records showing the name, address, employee identification number, work classification, and straight time, and overtime hours worked for each day and week, and the actual per diem wages paid to each employee employed by Contractor in the Facilities.

2. Contractor shall supply the City with a full and complete copy of its contract or contracts with represented unions (if applicable).

**Section 318. Revenue Control**

A. Finance/Banking Requirements

1. **Contractor must utilize the City’s designated bank.**

2. Contractor shall utilize the City’s approved fraud prevention program, set up by the Finance Department of the City.

3. Credit Card Processing
   a. Must be Payment Card Industry – Data Security Standards (PCI-DSS) compliant
   b. Credit Card payment processor is either City’s designated bank or is a member of City’s Bank Merchant Services Network.

B. Definition of Gross Receipts

All income required to be collected and accounted for by Contractor from the operation of the Parking Facilities including but not limited to:

1. Undercharges – Contractor is responsible for all lost revenue as a result of Contractor’s staff collecting less than the amount due.

2. Lost Tickets – A lost ticket is a ticket lost by the patron. The Contractor shall determine how long the patron’s car has been in the facility and charge that amount.

C. Collections and Deposits of Gross Receipts

All gross receipts derived from the operations of the Parking Facilities are the property of the City at all times during the term of this Agreement, and Contractor shall as trustee for the benefit of the City, take appropriate precaution to ensure that all sums due and owing the City from patrons of the Parking Facilities operated by Contractor are properly assessed, collected, and accounted for. Contractor shall be entirely responsible and liable for payment to the City of all funds collected or required to be collected by the Contractor, without excuse for non-payment.
1. Contractor shall collect from transient users and monthly parkers at the Parking Facilities all parking fees and other charges, the rates of which shall be determined by the City.

   a. At least once each day, seven days per week, at a time acceptable to the City as evidenced in writing, Contractor shall assemble all Parking Facilities’ receipts collected during the immediately preceding twenty-four (24) hours, and Contractor shall transfer deposit all transient parking fees, monthly parking fees, debit card, credit card, and validation revenues due from users of the Facilities as follows: currency, checks and coins to the City’s contracted armored courier service; and credit and debit cards end of the day settlements to the City’s contracted financial institution via electronic transfer as specified in writing by the City. Contractor agrees to use the utmost diligence and care in safeguarding and transferring all such receipts.

   b. Immediately after such deposit and on said day, Contractor shall deliver to the City a duplicate deposit slip and courier service receipt of transfer of funds. On weekends, Contractor shall obtain and provide to City duplicate deposit slips and courier service receipt of transfer of funds on the next business day.

   c. Contractor shall establish and carry out procedures and programs to safeguard all receipts collected by the Contractor’s employees from the Parking Facilities using drop safes provided by the City at each Facility location. Contractor agrees that all receipts are and shall remain monies of the City.

   d. City may change fees, and Contractor shall implement such changes. City shall notify Contractor of fee changes in a timely manner. Contractor shall be entirely responsible for payments to City of all funds collected and shall reconcile collections and deposits by site on daily cash reports submitted to City, Monday through Friday. Cash reports submitted on Monday shall encompass activity on Saturday and Sunday. Contractor shall be responsible for the operation of automatic pay on foot machines, and the removal accounting and deposit of parking revenues derived there from. Such monies collected should be included with gross receipts.

   e. Deposit amounts must equal fees and monies due. Contractor shall, on a daily basis, report any differences between the amounts deposited and the amounts due, regardless of cause. Contractor shall be responsible for and shall reimburse City for all shortages of processed and validated tickets. These differences shall be deducted from Contractor’s management fee then due; City will be free of claims, demands, or counterclaims of any kind by Contractor against the City.

   f. Shortages from any given shift’s, day’s, Facility’s, week’s, or month’s receipts may not be made up for by overages from any other given shift’s, day’s, Facility’s, week’s, or month’s receipts. Any overages which occur are to be reported as such and deposited in City’s designated bank account. Contractor will be responsible for any and all shortages; monies shall be deducted from Contractor’s management fee when due.

   g. On a daily basis, Contractor shall report on forms approved by the City the total parking fees and other monies due and collected, including monthly parking and validation revenue, and an accounting of all parking tickets used from the preceding day. For each Facility, each report shall detail the number of vehicles parked, tickets
issued, total tickets collected, revenue tickets, lost tickets, unaccountable tickets, extra
tickets, special event tickets, maintenance tickets, deposits, overages and shortages,
revenue collected from monthly parkers, and accounts receivable, and shall be certified
as correct by the Contractor’s General Manager.

h. Failure to make deposits to the City’s bank accounts or with the City’s contracted
courier service company within the specified time period or furnish reports on time may
result in withholding of partial or full payments of the Contractor’s Management Fee
then due, the immediate termination of this Agreement, any other remedy available to
the City under this Agreement or by law; or all of the above. Deposits shall be free
from all claims, demands, setoffs, or counterclaims against the City of any kind or
character, including those by Contractor.

i. Contractor shall establish policies regarding acceptance of checks for payment of
parking charges due, including requirements for patron identification, and minimum
standards for acceptable checks, such as pre-printed name, address and bank account
information. Contractor may elect to establish a policy of not accepting checks for
payment of hourly parking charges. Contractor must accept checks and debit cards for
payment of monthly parking charges, providing that the patron complies with the
above check-acceptance policies. All check acceptance policies shall be pre-approved
in writing by the City.

j. Contractor shall not collect any other parking rate unless permitted to do so by the
City.

D. Free Parking.

1. There shall be no free parking except as follows:
   a. One space per each of Contractor’s on-duty employees.
   b. Utility service vehicles servicing the Parking Facilities.
   c. City service vehicles and or its Contractor’s vehicles only while performing
      construction, maintenance, re-location, or repair activities on the Parking Facilities.
   d. As authorized in writing by the City.

2. Upon leaving, those vehicles with validated parking tickets, service vehicles providing
   services to the Parking Facilities, vehicles of Contractor’s employees, emergency
   vehicles, or other vehicles as authorized by the City, will be permitted to leave. The
   drivers of the exiting service vehicles shall write down their license number of the vehicle
   on their ticket and sign them.

E. Parking Ticket Discrepancies

1. A “lost ticket” is a parking ticket which cannot be located by a patron. Charges will be
calculated from the time the Parking Facility opened to the exit time, up to the applicable
daily maximum. Contractor shall time stamp the register to validate a lost ticket form
with the fee on it. Any lost ticket form in which Contractor is unable locate that does not
have both a cash register validation and an out time stamp shall be treated as a “missing
ticket”.
2. A “missing ticket” is defined as any parking ticket other than a “lost ticket” which cannot be located by the Contractor to correspond to a transaction recorded in the cash register. Contractor assumes responsibility for all “missing tickets”. Any ticket that is accounted for in a daily report shall be deemed to have been collected upon by the Contractor and shall be included in the gross revenue deposited.

3. All other discrepancies in ticket value shall be reported daily to the City. If the Contractor can justify the discrepancy in writing to the satisfaction of the City, the amount undercharged or not collected is not owed by the Contractor. All amounts overcharged by Contractor and all overages (amounts received by Contractor in excess of amounts reported) shall be paid to the City irrespective of amounts undercharged or of shortages.

F. Record Keeping

1. Contractor shall establish a revenue control plan, as part of the Operations Procedural Manual, which is designed to prevent the loss of revenues through error, theft, or fraud. The revenue control system shall provide a complete audit trail for each transaction. Any permanent transaction files shall be secure so as not to be arbitrarily edited.

2. Contractor shall establish and maintain at the Facilities, books, records and systems of account, including all records relating to Revenue Control Equipment at the facilities in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, consistently applied reflecting all business operations of Contractor transacted under this Agreement.

3. Contractor shall carry out, on an unannounced basis, an annual comprehensive audit program of its cashiers and fee computer receipts and shall report results of said audits to City. Contractor shall make recommendations to the City regarding the revenue control equipment as it relates to improved revenue control capability and/or loss of integrity.

4. The City will reserve the right to request at Operator’s expense, an audited financial statement at any time, no more than once per year.

5. Pursuant to Section 61 of the Berkeley City Charter, the City Auditor’s Office may conduct an audit of Contractor’s financial, performance and compliance records maintained in connection with the operations and services performed under this Contract. In the event of such audit, Contractor agrees to provide the City Auditor with reasonable access to Contractor’s employees and make all such financial, performance and compliance records available to the Auditor’s Office. City agrees to provide Contractor an opportunity to discuss and respond to any findings before a final audit report is filed.

G. Monthly Parking Permits

1. With respect to monthly parking for each facility, Contractor shall sell and issue monthly parking permits (key cards) upon proper payment.

   a. Operator shall be responsible for the security of customer information to the most recent Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCI-DSS) as updated by the Payment Card Industry Security Standard Council. For each Facility, Contractor shall maintain a waiting list of individuals or businesses that desire monthly parking in that Facility, and whenever a vacancy or vacancies occur, follow current City policies to contact those individuals or businesses on the waiting list.
2. Contractor shall record the name of the purchaser, date of issuance, and such other information as requested by City. In addition, Contractor will review, renew, and or revoke previously issued permits as appropriate.

3. Contractor shall conduct a monthly reconciliation of key cards issued and provide the City with a summary report.

4. If Contractor fails to exhaust the current waiting list in order to fill any existing vacancy or vacancies within ten (10) days from the date the vacancy occurred, the City may deduct from the Management Fee then due Contractor an amount equal to the monthly fees which would have otherwise been received from the unfilled vacancies until such vacancies are filled.

H. Payment Card Industry (PCI) Compliance for Third Party Providers

1. Operator shall be responsible for the security of customer information to the most recent Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCI-DSS) as updated by the Payment Card Industry Security Standard Council.

2. Within 30 days of execution of this Agreement, Vendor shall provide an Attestation of Compliance (AOC) with scope verification that matches the type of service provided in the Agreement or other PCI compliance document as acceptable to the City. Vendor shall annually provide the AOC or other PCI compliance document acceptable to the City on the anniversary date of this Agreement or the AOC renewal date. During the contract term, Vendor must provide the City with a valid PCI compliance document.

3. At the same time that the Vendor provides its PCI compliance documents, Vendor shall provide a written acknowledgement of responsibilities for PCI controls. The acknowledgement shall provide that Vendor will maintain, on an on-going basis, all applicable PCI DSS requirements to the extent Vendor handles, has access to, or otherwise stores, processes, or transmits City customers’ cardholder data or sensitive authentication data or manages the City’s cardholder data environment on behalf of the City. Vendor shall sign the City’s responsibility Matrix, acknowledging its role in PCI Compliance.

4. Within 30 days of any new Payment Card Industry Data Security Standards (PCI DSS) requirements, as issued by the PCI Security Standards Council, Vendor shall provide an updated written acknowledgement of responsibilities to include the new PCI DSS requirements.

5. Within 30 days of this Agreement, Vendor shall provide a copy of the Vendor’s Incident Response Plan (“IRP”) that will be implemented in the event of system and/or data breach/compromise. The IRP must be tested and updated at least annually. The IRP shall include but not be limited to:

   a) Roles, responsibilities, contact names and communication strategies in the event of a data breach/compromise, including notification to the City and the payment card brands (Visa and MasterCard).
   
   b) Specific incident response procedures.
   
   c) Business recovery and continuity procedures.
d) Data back-up processes.
e) Analysis of legal requirements for reporting compromises.
f) Coverage and responses of all critical system components.
g) Reference or inclusion of incident response procedures from the payment card brands (Visa and MasterCard).

6. Vendor shall provide documentation of its systems, as they pertain to the City’s Cardholder Data Environment (“CDE”). The term “Systems” includes not only the information systems that collect and store data, but also all of their connections and components that are linked to the Cardholder Data Environment. Vendor shall provide CDE diagrams and narrative clearly illustrating and describing all connecting devices, processes (payment channels and business functions), technologies (e-commerce systems, internal network segments, processor connections, POS systems), people (technical support, telephone operators and those who may have access to card data) and locations (call centers, data centers and locations where cardholder data is stored, processed, transmitted or available in media: physical reports or e-reports.) In addition, Vendor shall provide documentation for the City to assess Vendor systems that store, process and transmit cardholder data. Vendor shall provide information about their credit card and debit card processing software and platform for the City to assess Vendor system compatibility with that of the City’s merchant bank.

7. Vendor shall maintain an inventory of its system components, including, but not limited to: hardware, software, payment devices and locations which are part of its Cardholder Data Environment. Upon request by the City, Vendor shall provide inventory documentation for all its system components.

8. City hereby appoints Vendor as its agent to work directly with Sentry Control Systems in connection with PCI compliance issues relative to the PARCS equipment.

9. The City will review and verify Vendor’s written acknowledgement of responsibilities for PCI controls, as stated in #2 above, at least once a year.

Section 319. Ticket Storage

1. Contractor shall retain and store dispensed and collected tickets, arranged by date and facility, to be made available to City for review and audit. Contractor may discard said tickets, after obtaining City’s permission to do so, after three years from date of collection.

2. Contractor shall be responsible for protecting all parking tickets, new and used, from theft or other misuse and will be held accountable for all such tickets to the extent of their loss caused by Contractor’s negligence or fault. All collected tickets will be stored in individual containers until daily report is completed and so as to be available for inspection by the City for a period of three years (3) form date of receipt. Upon request, Contractor shall make them available to appropriate officials for inspection and audit.

Section 320. Discrepancies

City may hold Contractor responsible for discrepancies between the actual monies due from an individual patron and the actual amount collected. Any monies due City as a result of such
discrepancies shall be paid by Contractor, or if not so paid, may be deducted from Contractor’s Management Fee when due.

**Section 321. Reports**

A. **Daily and Weekly Reports**: Contractor shall create and maintain basic daily reports of financial and facility parking activity. These records shall be made available to City on a daily and weekly basis to the City’s Public Works/Transportation Division, to permit routine audit and general and detailed analyses of rates, fees due, cashier performance, and parking activity. City may prescribe the forms for keeping such records and reports.

Daily reports shall also include the following:

1. Reconciliation of tickets stocked, issued, and collected, including exceptions such as tickets lost due to maintenance, missing, or voided tickets, on a daily basis.
   - For each Facility, the maximum acceptable number of lost tickets, as calculated on a monthly basis, shall be one and one-half percent of the total number of tickets issued. For any month in which the lost tickets at any Facility exceed this maximum number, the City may deduct from Contractor’s Management Fee then due an amount equal to the average daily fee possible for each missing ticket exceeding the one and one half percent maximum, at the discretion of the City.

2. Cashier shift reports identifying the Facility, the shift, the number of each fee amount collected, and the total for the shift shall be summarized monthly by day and date, and totaled for each Facility.

3. Daily revenue control equipment transaction tapes.

Weekly reports shall include the following:

1. Special reports of vehicles in the Facilities that appear to have been abandoned. Contractor shall attempt to contact owner of record by telephone and by registered letter before the vehicle is towed if registered in the monthly parking program.

2. Length of stay by time of day, by day of week, number of vehicle entries and exits by time of day, by day of week, time of arrival and departure by day of week, percent occupancy by hour of day, by day of week, summary of number of cars parked and number of vehicles for special events.

3. Report on time zone usage by facility for ½ hour increments; graph of usage by lot; and summary of number of cars parked.

B. **Special reports and analyses that may be requested by the City**. Contractor shall be expected to generate this type of reporting on an as-needed basis and shall be requested to provide data in both hard copy and electronically. Contractor shall also provide a monthly report of merchants participating in the validation programs, number of validations purchased by each merchant, and the number of validations redeemed from each merchant. Contractor shall provide to City an accurate statement or report of daily transactions and other reports in such form and at such intervals as shall be specified by the City. Frequency for submitting daily reports shall be based on the cycle mutually agreed to by the Contractor and the City.

C. **Monthly Accounting and Cost Analysis Report** Contractor shall additionally provide a monthly Accounting and Cost Analysis Report that details parking revenues recovered for
each Facility, and includes operating expenditure listings to include: number of days, payroll
expense, insurance, professional services, supplies, garage and parking supplies, maintenance
and repair, access card refunds, taxes and license fees, garage marketing/advertising. This
report shall be submitted monthly by the 15th of the month for the previous month’s
expenses.

D. **Other reports:** Contractor shall also file with City, at such times and form as may be
specified by the City, such reports and information, in addition to that required by other
provision of the contract, relating to the operation of the Parking Facilities.

**Section 322. Audits and Inspection of Books and Records**

1. Contractor agrees to maintain and make available to the City, during regular business hours,
accurate books and accounting records relating to its work under the Agreement. Contractor
will permit the City to audit, examine and make excerpts and transcripts from such books and
records, and to make audits of all invoices, and materials covered by the Agreement.

2. Contractor shall maintain such data and records in an accessible location and condition for a
period of not less than three (3) years after final payment under the Agreement or until after
final audit has been resolved, whichever is later.

**Section 323. Fraud Prevention**

Contractor shall carry out on a routine and surprise basis a comprehensive audit program of its
cashiers and fee computer receipts. Contractor shall establish and maintain a program for
selection of employees assigned to the parking facilities and for monitoring their conduct in a
manner that is reasonably calculated to preclude theft by Contractor’s employees and other
persons of parking facilities receipts. The City may also conduct routine and surprise audits of
programs and records in accordance with Section 318, F.5 of this Agreement. In addition, the
City may activate an independent, internal audit of Contractor activities related to this Contract.
Contractor shall present to the City within thirty (30) days following the effective date of this
Contract a written report describing the internal auditing procedures for both on-site operations
and administrative operations as they apply specifically to the City’s Facilities and revenue
control equipment. This report shall be updated and current as new PARCS equipment is
installed. When requested by the City, Contractor shall provide the City with a copy of revised or
updated procedures.

**Section 324. Bankruptcy or Reorganization Proceedings**

In the event Contractor shall file a voluntary petition in bankruptcy, or that proceedings in
bankruptcy shall be instituted against Contractor, and Contractor is thereafter adjudicated
bankrupt pursuant to such proceedings, or that the court shall take jurisdiction of Contractor and
its assets pursuant to proceedings brought under the provisions of any federal reorganization act,
or that a receiver of Contractor’s assets shall be appointed, City shall have the right to terminate
this Contract forthwith. Such termination shall, in such instance, be deemed to occur upon the
happening of any said events, and from thenceforth Contractor shall have no rights in or to the
Facilities, or to any of the rights herein conferred, and City shall have the right to take possession
of said Facilities forthwith. Contractor shall have no claim for damages against the City based
upon such termination.
Section 325. Obligations of City

The City shall be responsible for all maintenance and repairs of existing Facilities. City hereby appoints Vendor as its agent to work directly with Sentry Control Systems in connection with PCI compliance issues relative to the PARCS equipment, except as otherwise noted in this Agreement. The City shall pay for all utility services including gas, electricity, and water furnished to or used by Contractor on or about the Facilities. Except as otherwise provided under this Agreement, City shall provide and pay for the following:

1. All electric, natural gas, water, and sewer services used in and on the Facilities.
2. Debt service with respect to City-provided land, buildings, and equipment.
3. All items in the nature of capital expenditures which the City may deem to be necessary or convenient in the operation of the Facilities, after giving due consideration to any express requests or recommendations of Contractor.
**EXHIBIT K:**
**PARKING FACILITY RATES AND HOURS OF OPERATION**

| Address | Telegraph Channing Garage  
|         | 2450 Durant Avenue, Berkeley, CA 94704  
|         | Located 2 blocks from UC Campus  
|         | 436 Spaces, Height Clearance 6’6”  |
| Phone Number | (510) 843-1788 |
| Days & Hours of Operation | Mon - Thu: 7:00 AM to 1:00 AM  
|         | Fri - Sat: 7:00 AM to 2:00 AM  
|         | Sun: 8:00 AM to 10:00 PM |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute Increments</th>
<th>Hourly Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 hour (60 min)</td>
<td>FREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ hrs (61-120 min)</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ hrs (121-180 min)</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ hrs (181-240 min)</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ hrs (241-300 min)</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ hrs (daily maximum) (301+ min)</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monthly Rates:**  
- Deposit for Monthly-card - $25 (not to exceed 105 spaces)  
- Regular Monthly Parking - $160.00  
- Motorcycle Monthly Parking - $25

| Early Bird (M - F, in by 9am, out by 6pm) | $9.00 |
| After 8PM flat rate | 4.00 |
| Overnight charge | 20.00 |
| Lost ticket | 20.00 |
| Bicycle | Free |
| Disabled parking – 8 spaces | Free |
| Merchant Validations | EZ Park Validation |
| Special Events | Football, Basketball & Graduation – Up to $25.00 |
| Address | Oxford Garage  
Kittredge between Oxford Street & Shattuck Avenue  
Berkeley, CA 94704  
Located Downtown Berkeley  
99 Spaces, 2 City CarShare Spaces  
Height Clearance 6’6” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>(510) 843-1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days &amp; Hours of Operation</td>
<td>Sun - Sat: 8:00 AM to 12:00 Midnight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute Increments</th>
<th>Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 hour (0-60 min)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ hrs (61-120 min)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ hrs (121-180 min)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ hrs (181-240 min)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ hrs (daily maximum) (241-300 min)</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Monthly Rates: Deposit for Monthly-card - $25 (not to exceed 20 spaces) | Regular Monthly Parking - $170.00  
Motorcycle Monthly Parking - $25 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After 5PM flat rate</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight charge</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost ticket</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled parking – 4 spaces</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Validations</td>
<td>EZ Park Validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>Football, Basketball &amp; Graduation – Up to $20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT L:
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - PARKING ACCESS & REVENUE CONTROL SYSTEM (PARCS) EQUIPMENT ACQUISITION & INSTALLATION

ARTICLE V: PARCS Equipment

Section 101. Equipment Purchase

Contractor shall be responsible for overseeing the installation of new Ski Data Parking Access and Revenue Control System equipment, purchased by the City as specified for the new Center Street Garage parking facility, to include any required software upgrades, and the relocation of PARCS HUB equipment from the Telegraph Channing Garage to the new Center Street Garage.

CONTRACTOR will be responsible for ordering the PARCS equipment per approval, on the City’s behalf, and ensuring that the PARCS equipment is installed and fully operational within the pre-determined schedule for the opening of the Center Street Garage (no later than August 1, 2017). Once the equipment is installed and fully operational for public use, the City must accept the equipment as properly installed.

A. Physical security standards. City requires all servers and networking equipment to be located in access controlled (locked), ventilated cabinet or closet with a UPS. Contractor shall supply all cabinets and other enclosures required to properly house and protect the control system equipment and UPS.

B. Equipment must be installed and fully operational before the scheduled opening of the Center Street Garage. Once installed, the PARCS equipment in each facility will require a Parking System Completion Test document which must be certified by the PARCS equipment vendor (Sentry Control Systems) as successfully completing all portions of the specified program testing [see Exhibit P]. The subject categories for the PARCS testing are listed below:

- Entry Lane Equipment
- Exit Lane Equipment
- Card Key Access
- Credit Card Access
- Credit Card Entry
- Credit Card Exit at Exit Stations
- Pay of Foot Pay Stations
- Pre-Paid Ticket Holder Exit at Exit Station
- Unpaid Ticket at Exit Lane
- Exit Lane Full Sign
- Software- Report Writing
- Revenue Reports
- Count Monitor- Control Reports
- Card Access Reports
- Summary Reports

Section 102. PARCS Installation-Project Management

Contractor shall serve as project manager and is solely responsible for planning, coordination and project implementation with the City, subcontractors, vendors, merchants, suppliers, parking patrons, and all operational matters related to the installation of new PARCS equipment into City Facilities and relocation of PARCS equipment Hub to the new Center Street Garage Facility.
Contractor shall coordinate and oversee the installation of entire Parking Operations Access and Revenue Control System (PARCS) equipment relocation for a complete and operable control system.

Contractor shall coordinate all labor, materials, services, equipment and appliances required to perform all work to complete the PARCS relocation installation.

City shall maintain a PARCS equipment warranty from Sentry Control Systems Inc. Sentry Control Systems Inc. Contractor will manage the equipment if there are issues with it. City authorizes Contractor to open/manage trouble-tickets (work requests) with Sentry Control Systems to resolve equipment issues, and monitor quarterly maintenance schedule.

Section 103. PARCS Equipment Testing and Acceptance

Once new equipment is installed and Hub equipment is relocated, the PARCS equipment in each facility will require a Parking System Completion Test document which must be certified by the PARCS equipment vendor as successfully completing all portions of the specified program testing.

Contractor, as the Project Manager is solely responsible for the oversight and successful completion of all PARCS equipment testing and certification. System testing (for each parking facility) shall be done in three phases:

1. Factory Acceptance Test;
2. On-Site Acceptance Test; and
3. 30-Day Operation Demonstration Test (ODT)

The first phase of the testing plan shall consist of a Factory Acceptance Test prior to shipment of all the System components. The second test phase shall consist of onsite inspection and test immediately following complete equipment installation and Hub equipment relocation for the entire PARCS at respective garages. The third phase shall consist of a 30-Day ODT following On-site Acceptance Test of that project phase and shall include completion of Exhibit P.

The Contractor is responsible to correct any deficiencies or problems found during these tests at no cost to the City. The Contractor must correct the problems identified in each testing phase before the acceptance of the System. All acceptance testing reports shall be submitted to the City and shall be approved before acceptance of these Systems.

All the test reports generated during FAT, SAT and ODT as a direct result of System tests shall not influence the City’s Daily, Weekly, Monthly, and Yearly report and the System shall be able to separate the test reports from the actual operation/production reports.

Section 104. Factory Acceptance Test (FAT)

A. The Factory Acceptance Test shall be comprised of structured specific tests. Prior to shipment of the System, conduct a formal Factory Acceptance Test with the City designated representative in attendance. Notify the City in writing at least two weeks prior to the FAT that a dry run of the FAT has been successfully performed and that the System is ready for the formal testing. Also, certify in the notification that all documentation scheduled for completion prior to the Factory Acceptance Test is complete and ready for inspection.

B. In the event the first attempt to pass the Factory Acceptance Test is not successful, correct the faults and then notify the City in writing at least one week in advance, that the faults found earlier are corrected and Sentry Control Inc. is ready for resumption of testing.
C. The test procedure shall:

1. Contain the test number, name and description for each test.
2. Define each step-by-step procedure, providing the expected response for each step and providing space for the actual response for each test.
3. Contain minimal reference to other documents.
4. Be structured so that simpler tests generally are run first.
5. Provide space, in the test documents, for approval/remarks by both the Proposer and the City representative for each test.

D. Testing shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Verify correct inventory of hardware. This shall include all documentation and Proposer’s manuals. Documentation shall include all drawings and as-built drawings.
2. Verify that all hardware is operational.
3. Demonstrate all hardware and software diagnostics.
4. Demonstrate all software and its functions and capacity.
5. Create and demonstrate proper handling of typical error and failure conditions, and power failure and System recovery.
6. Demonstrate that all software is operational, including fee calculating, editing software, fee calculation changes, summary reporting, logon, logoff, exception transactions, data transfer, and security functions.
7. Demonstrate the operation and performance of all Cashier Terminal, Facility Management System, and Central Management Computers including, but not limited to:
   a. Quality control check on manufacturer.
   b. Proper wiring and cabling.
   c. Proper fee display.
   d. Fee calculation and accuracy for all transactions.
   e. Ticket reading.
   f. Diagnostics.
   g. Gate control.
   h. Receipt issuing.
   i. Summary reporting and format.
   j. Data transfer/export.

8. Demonstrate the operation of the data collection device including, but not limited to, data collection, storage and transfer to the CITY’s network, applications programs, editing functions and security software.

9. Demonstrate all functions of the ticket issuing dispensers including ticket issuing, encoding, low and empty ticket alarms, and gate controls.
   a. Demonstrate entire system operation including interfacing to existing equipment (loop detectors, loops, and intercom system).
   b. Verify that the hardware and software documentation accurately represents the System supplied by Sentry Control System.
c. Visual tests including, but not limited to, verifying the outer frame of the hardware is free of sharp edges, and wire management inside the device is done according to the industry standards.

**Section 105. Site Acceptance Test (SAT)**

1. Upon installation of equipment, perform a Site Acceptance Test – SAT that is similar to tests that were performed for FAT. The SAT will demonstrate every function of the equipment under test and verify the integrity of the equipment. SAT shall be performed on all the PARCS devices (Proposer supplied equipment and integrated equipment that were reused in the new PARCS, such as, Pedestrian warning buzzers, Video cameras) to make sure that the System at the facility under SAT performs as a whole and without any compatibility and/or interface issues.

2. The tests shall be witnessed by the Contractor, project manager and the Parking Services Manager. Contractor shall notify the City in writing at least one week prior to the test that the equipment is ready for testing.

3. In the event that the test(s) are not successful in the first pass, correct deficiencies and notify the City at least two days in advance, that testing is ready to resume.

**Section 106. Operation Demonstration Test (ODT)**

1. Perform a 30-day Operation Demonstration Test. During this time PARCS will run on its own and demonstrate System functionalities without any interaction (including, but not limited to, fixing bugs, installing patches, and replacing hardware) from the Contractor or its employees.

2. In case of any modifications and/or troubleshooting to the PARCS, the City, at its own discretion, may require a reset of the ODT. In that scenario, the Contractor shall ensure that the issue is fixed within a reasonable time and after verification of the fix, ODT will resume from day one.

3. The test shall be unstructured and CONTRACTOR personnel shall be allowed to operate the Berkeley Facilities Systems with the SKI DATA equipment installers only observing. The System shall perform as specified and any deviations shall be corrected and re-tested.

4. During the ODT, all required data shall be accurately collected, stored, transferred to database, and accurately reported.

5. Upon repeated failure of the same problem in more than 30 percent of similar components or three times in individual device, the test shall stop until the problem is corrected and re-tested for 30 days (unless waived by the City).

6. Document and maintain, in a problem Log File, discrepancies found during testing. Describe the subsequent correction. The Contractor shall be responsible to verify proper operation of the System and its equipment.

7. Faulty and/or incorrect operation of major functions may, at the discretion of the City, be cause for suspending or restarting of any test.

8. ODT will also require successfully completing all portions of specified testing in (City’s RFP) Exhibit P.

Should the Contractor decide to cancel the contract prior to the complete installation and testing of the PARCS, for reasons other than breach of contract by the City, the Contractor agrees to pay for the full portion of the PARCS equipment.
Section 107. Project Approach

1. SAT will start after installation of the PARCS at individual parking facilities on facility by facility basis.

2. Unless approved by the City, installation of the PARCS at any subsequent facility shall not start until after the SAT of the last installation has been successfully completed.

3. ODT will be performed as the last step of installation project. ODT for each Facility will start after successful completion of City Acceptance Test (SAT) of all three Facilities.

4. Prior to the completion of ODT, Contractor shall provide City with a written Disaster Recovery Policies and Plan for Berkeley Facilities.

5. The City expects that in the event of a disaster or if the PARCS crashes, it would be brought up without loss of more than 36 hours of transactional data and without loss of user-configuration.

Section 108. System Training

The training material shall include, but not be limited to, maintenance manuals, operational manuals and drawings of all system components and software.

A. The training provided shall be for the overall Parking Control System. CONTRACTOR Project Manager shall coordinate and schedule the on-hands training to be provided by Sentry control Inc. prior to actual system acceptance to ensure City competence in the operation of the overall system.

B. The CONTRACTOR Project Manager shall provide the City with written documentation describing the training procedures to be used by the Contractor and training schedule for staff as identified by City (System Training Plan). The training plan shall be approved by the City before the Contractor implements the plan.

C. The Contractor shall conduct the following Owner training classes as a minimum:

1. Detailed training and training documentation for City personnel concerning the use of the Parking Control System, its operating principles, and administrative capabilities. The Contractor shall ensure that City personnel become well acquainted with the operating and software systems to fully utilize system capabilities to aid in cost reduction and system management.

2. Contractor will provide a structured training covering the knowledge areas described in the following subsections. Spot instruction will not constitute fulfillment of this portion of the contract.

D. Operator Training

1. At minimum, perform training for three operator levels. Contractor may suggest/include other levels of training:

a. Level 1: Cashier Training. Instruct CONTRACTOR personnel on all features of new cashier terminals (or Central Cashier stations) and procedures for generating shift reports.

b. Level 2: System Monitoring and Reporting. Train CONTRACTOR personnel on all parking management and monitoring features of the Facility Management System and Central/Remote Management Computer(s). Include basic data display and interpretation of graphics, addresses, system alarm and status descriptions, all manual commands, program change Operations, generation of all shift and management reports for operator levels one and two.
Upon completion of software training, a CONTRACTOR parking facility manager/supervisor must be knowledgeable to manage the System.

c. **Level 3**: Total System Programming. Train the City and CONTRACTOR Management teams on all System operating and monitoring features. Including, but not limited to, on-the-job “hands on” training on reports, system configuration, and system monitoring. This training tract will be advanced audit, accounting, and data mining procedures. Representative(s) from the City will also attend all training sessions for Cashier and Manager/Operator.

2. Training will be conducted by using the hands-on training methods and shall include demo(s) of the hardware and software features. After the initial PARCS installation, Contractor shall allow for modifications to the training program will be made to adjust subjects and dwell time on areas of the System that were commented upon from the initial training sessions.

E. **Maintenance Training**

1. Maintenance training shall be performed. Contractor shall ensure CONTRACTOR personnel and designated City staff receive instruction on the proper maintenance and repair of all the parking revenue control equipment.

2. Training shall cover normal Operations of equipment, common failures and repairs, detailed instruction of equipment Operations using Operations and maintenance manuals.

3. Train the designated City staff on equipment safety, preventive maintenance and other basic troubleshooting steps.
EXHIBIT M:
MAINTENANCE STANDARDS AND FORM OF MAINTENANCE SCHEDULE

Maintenance Standards
The City of Berkeley’s goal is to provide the public, at all times, safe, clean, sanitary, well-lighted, and efficient facilities. The following maintenance standards are designed to achieve this goal.

Lighting: All lights must be in working order and bright enough to convey a sense of safety, especially in and around stairways and restrooms. Burned-out or missing bulbs or lamps must be replaced within twenty-four (24) hours. Bulbs or lamps must be secured and must be the same color. Low Mercury fluorescent lights are to be used as replacement lights are needed. Non-working fixtures must be reported to Public Works (service request) within Forty-eight (48) hours.

Light Standards: All fluorescent tubular lighting must be all T-8 or smaller (HOT-5, etc.). No T-12s are allowed. Flood lighting, Pendant and canister fixtures must also be low mercury if fluorescent. Fluorescent Lighting Color MUST be 5000K; no exceptions. Incandescent lighting is not allowed. LED Lighting must provide the same deliverable lumens as T8 fluorescents.

Walls & Doors: All walls and doors must be kept clean and free of stains, dirt and graffiti. Special attention shall be given to restrooms and their surrounding areas. Graffiti must be removed or painted over within twenty-four (24) hours. Black marks from bumpers must be painted over as needed but, not less than once a month.

Odors: Foul odors must be removed within twenty-four (24) hours. Special attention shall be given to walkways, restrooms and their surrounding areas. Stairwells and sidewalks must be steam cleaned as needed but, not less than once a month.

Cleaning: Each Facility must be cleaned daily, including interior and exterior walkways, restrooms, parking areas and sidewalks. Parking areas and Facility floors must be swept, grease and oil must be removed, foul odors must be deodorized, pigeon droppings must be removed, and all litter must be removed. Public restrooms shall be inspected and cleaned at minimum, every two hours. All cleaning products must be Green Seal Certified or equivalent.

Steam Cleaning: Steam cleaning of each facility in its entirety shall be performed on a semi-annual basis. Best practices during cleaning process shall be used and all water shall be properly disposing of in accordance with City of Berkeley regulations. Wash water must be collected during the cleaning process (i.e. a mechanical scrubber that collects the dirty cleaning fluid as it cleans), and no water shall be discharged to the storm water system. At the discretion of the Parking Manager, steam cleaning may be required to be performed less frequently if the facilities, including interior walkways, are maintained in a clean and orderly state.

Signs: Signs must be easily understood and professionally made; not hand printed or copy machine reproduced. All signage must be approved by City’s Parking Manager before being installed. Manager will be allowed to post nonprofessional signs only in case of an emergency, but the emergency signs
must be replaced within one week. Signs must also be repaired or replaced promptly when damaged (includes all wood, metal, plastic, within and/or upon parking facilities).

**Windows (where applicable):** All windows, mirrors and glass cases must be cleaned as needed but, in no event, not less than once a month. All windows visible to the public must be inspected daily and cleaned as needed. All Broken windows must be made safe immediately and kept secure until window is replaced.

**Safety Equipment:** Inspect equipment including fire alarm call boxes, fire extinguishers, and fire hose at least once a month. Any malfunction shall be reported to Public Works (service request) within twenty-four (24) hours. The malfunction shall be documented by the inspection date. Upon inspection of fire extinguisher dates, Contractor shall be initial each fire extinguisher as being checked. Closed circuit cameras and the intercom system must be inspected at least once a week and maintained by Operator.

**Parking Control Equipment Repair & Maintenance:** Parking Access and Revenue Control Equipment (PARCS) in each facility is to be monitored at least daily to ensure all equipment is operational. Broken or damaged gate arms are to be replaced immediately. Parking ticket and paper receipt jams are to be cleared immediately. Contractor must supply all system approved proximity cards, and supply and maintain all parking tickets, spare gate arms, and other parking supplies and equipment necessary for management of day-to-day operations. Operator shall promptly contact approved service vendor for equipment repairs beyond the scope of Operator’s staff and/or under service warranty.

**Structural Inspections:** Structural inspections, including water leaks, exposed rebar, concrete cracks and metal rust must be performed and documented not less than once a year.

**Sidewalk Inspections:** Inspections of the sidewalks abutting the Facility for the presence of any sidewalk tripping hazards, including tree planting areas not at sidewalk grade, must be performed once a month. In the event any hazards are observed, such hazards shall be reported immediately to the City’s Customer Service Center (service request).

**Other Work:** All other ordinary maintenance and repair work of the premises and equipment shall be done as needed.

**Security Personnel (Uniformed):** Operator may sub-contract services. Personnel shall direct patrons to parking areas and assist with traffic circulation in the Facilities in a friendly and courteous manner, redirect individuals who are loitering, deter and report individuals attempting to gain unauthorized access to Facilities or attempting to damage or steal vehicles or property, and perform all facility parking security responsibilities as noted in Exhibit J, Section 311 Security Requirements.

**Janitorial Services:** Operator may sub-contract services. All cleaning products/agents must be Green Seal Certified or equivalent. For specific requirements and schedule see Exhibit J, Section 308 Cleaning Requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
<th>Semi-Annually</th>
<th>Annually</th>
<th>As needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspect</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace burned-out bulbs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspect/Report broken fixtures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace discolored covers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check elevator and stairwell bulbs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial/Maintenance Cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator areas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairwell areas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lobbies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking areas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom floors, walls &amp; fixtures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter Pick-up</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean inner and outer doors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird Abatement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping –Center St Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam Clean stairwells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam Clean Garage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint over graffiti</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over other foreign marks</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch-up</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspect striping</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch up ceilings, walls, and railings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide accent colors at elevator lobbies and stairwells for way finding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restripe stalls &amp; lanes – all levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restripe stairwell &amp; elevator lobby – non-slip textured floor plaint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASKS</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Semi-Annually</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspect elevator operations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti removal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspect signs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair &amp; replace all signs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install and maintain directional signage for Vehicles &amp; Pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspect fire alarm equipment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspect exit lights</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Lots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor and remove litter and debris</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor lot perimeter and remove litter and debris</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty trash receptacles. Replace liners</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair signage as needed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspect/Service Closed-Circuit cameras</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wipe down parking pay stations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checked for burned out lights</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors open/lock properly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspect Parking Equipment/repair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspect HVAC operations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspect for water leaks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspect for exposed rebar</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspect metal for rust, doors, rails, exposed pipes conduits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DRAFT - GREEN CLEANING POLICY

1.0 Intent and Goals:
CITY wants to promote and encourage healthy and functional environments within their facilities for all occupants, including guests and employees. In order to do this, CITY wishes to limit exposure to chemicals and dirt that might be hazardous to human and/or environmental health. This policy has been developed to provide guidelines for management and operations teams for purchasing, using, and training staff regarding cleaning products, equipment, and processes that create a safe and healthy environment for the occupants, and, in extension, the connected natural ecosystems.

2.0 Scope:
This Green Cleaning Policy applies to the occupied spaces within the parking structure. The policy detailed and discussed herein will act as a guiding document for the building's cleaning products, equipment, and procedures at 2025 Center Street, Berkeley, CA 94704.

3.0 Responsible Parties:
The management and operational team at CITY is responsible for education, communication, and implementation of this Green Cleaning Policy overseen by the [Title], [Name of responsible party, i.e. individual]. The operational/management team includes:

[Name of responsible party] – [Title] [PROJECT NAME], [Project Address]

4.0 Policy Performance Measurement and Requirements:
The Green Garage Certification requirements for the Cleaning Procedures – Occupied Spaces credit are as follows:

➢ All maintenance personnel are trained to properly use, maintain, and dispose of all cleaning products within the facility’s occupied space. This strategy includes written policy directives, guidelines, training, and manuals to ensure proper implementation.
➢ 75% of cleaning chemicals used in occupied space and hand cleaners (by total cost) must meet at least one of the standards listed below:
   • Cleaning products:
     ▪ Green Seal GS-37 Cleaning Products for Industrial and Institutional Use
     ▪ Environmental Choice CCD-110 Cleaning and Degreasing Compounds
     ▪ Environmental Choice CCD-146 Hard surface Cleaners
     ▪ Green Seal GS-40 Floor Care Products for Industrial and Institutional Use
     ▪ Environmental Choice CCD-112 Biological Digestion Additives for Cleaning and Odor Control
     ▪ Environmental Choice CCD-113 Drain and/or Grease Trap Additives
     ▪ Environmental Choice CCD-115 Odor Control Additives
     ▪ Environmental Choice CCD-147 Floor Care Products
Hand cleaners:
- Green Seal GS-41 Hand Cleaners for Industrial and Institutional Use
- Environmental Choice CCD-104 Hand Cleaners Industrial and Institutional Use

CITY will track the performance metrics as follows:
- Purchase of Sustainable Cleaning Products: Develop and track by means of excel spreadsheets, or other means, the cost of new purchased products in accord with Cleaning Procedures – Occupied Spaces. Review of cost tracking to be done on a yearly basis with vendors as applicable to allow CITY to make adjustments in purchasing to keep on track with stated goal, by cost, of 75% implementation. Maintain copies of an invoice from the parking structure’s cleaning supply distributor detailing supplies purchased with distributor contact information.
- Maintenance Personnel Training and Education: Develop and track by means of excel spreadsheets, or other means, a list of training events and details provided by its vendors for their respective janitorial personnel. Review of this list to be done on a yearly basis with vendors to allow CITY to make adjustments as needed to ensure proper education and training is being provided for vendor janitorial personnel.
- Hand Hygiene: Develop and track by means of excel spreadsheets, or other means, a list of training events for hand hygiene and on-site spot checks, provided by vendors, for their respective janitorial personnel. Review of this list to be done on a yearly basis with vendors to allow CITY to make adjustments in hand hygiene program to keep on track with goal of 100% implementation.

5.0 Procedures and Strategies:
The strategies outlined in the following section will be used as a guideline for adopting high-performance and high-efficiency cleaning practices that are as low-impact as possible regarding environmental, human, and the economic health at CITY.

In order to ensure the successful implementation of the Green Cleaning Policy, CITY is requiring that all relevant vendors and Responsible Parties (maintenance personnel) are informed of these policies and comply with the actions below:
- Review the targeted strategies within the policy.
- Determine to what extent the policy can be implemented within the building, and its cost impacts.
- Discuss pertinent policy issues with the appropriate service suppliers/vendor.
- For strategies targeting Green Garage Certification credits, develop written implementation plans and discuss them with relevant parties.
- Obtain relevant parties' approval in writing.
- In the event that vendor or contractor is unable to implement the policy or parts of the policy, it needs to provide a written rational for non-compliance.
CITY encourages the safe and responsible use and storage of cleaning chemicals to minimize accidental leaks, spills, and unsafe levels of exposure to chemicals, for staff, guests, and food stores. The safe and effective storage of chemicals and availability of information and proper equipment for safe handling are required, and the manager and on site supervisor, in charge of training employees must ensure that other staff are properly educated on safe chemical use and handling.

**Cleaning Procedures – Parking Decks**

CITY is implementing green cleaning practices for the parking decks in addition to occupied spaces. Selected requirements for the parking decks include:

- Spot clean oil spills at least twice a year with an environmentally friendly safe oil degreaser. Degreasers should meet at least one of the following environmentally safe standards:
  - Green Seal GS-34: Cleaning and Degreasing Agents
  - Green Seal GS-37: Cleaning Products for Industrial and Institutional Use
  - Environmental Choice CCD-110: Cleaning and Degreasing Compounds
  - Green Seal GS-40: Floor Care Products for Industrial and Institutional Use

- Sweep the parking structure at least every month (and ideally once a week) by an electric sweeping mechanism. Any sweeping debris or waste should be disposed of in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. If cleaners are used during the power scrubbing process, they must meet at least one of the standards listed above.

- Scrub parking structure with a power scrubber regularly, decreasing the amount of wash downs needed each year and conserving water. Any scrubbing debris or waste must be disposed of in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. Furthermore, any cleaning supplies used in the power scrubbing process are environmentally safe products as detailed above.

**Green Cleaning – Implementation of Standard Operating Procedures**

CITY encourages the creation of Standard Operating Procedures (SOP's) that describe how the building's cleaning and floor and carpet care systems will be developed, implemented, enforced, and audited on a consistent basis. In addition, these SOP's will describe the cleaning of food-contact surfaces, dishes, glassware, silverware, ovens, and other kitchen/restaurant specific items and areas. Goal is for 75% implementation for Occupied Spaces and 100% for Parking Decks, which is to be reviewed on a yearly basis with the [Name of responsible party] and the Vendor. The SOP's will promote the following strategies:

- The reduction or elimination of potentially hazardous chemicals
- The removal of particulate contaminants when possible
- The preservation of building surfaces from harm during cleaning
- The reduction of contaminant entry into the building
- Zero-tolerance for any chemical-food cross-contamination
Priority of food safety for employees and guests
- Proper training of employees and occupants regarding amounts of green chemicals used to avoid waste of chemicals
- Identify and protect vulnerable building occupants who are sensitive to the impacts of cleaning products and practices.
  - Identify vulnerable occupants with special needs or sensitivities to cleaning products and practices and take steps to minimize negative impacts of cleaning on those occupants. Such building occupants can be but are not limited to:
    - Elderly individuals.
    - Individuals with disabilities.
    - Individuals with asthma or respiratory illnesses.
- Develop a cleaning schedule that meets the cleaning needs of the building efficiently and effectively, while minimizing exposures of cleaning products and practices to vulnerable occupants. The Contract Administration Manager and Quality Assurance Supervisor will reassess the cleaning schedule every six months to maintain efficiencies and prevent redundant cleaning.

Establish an effective cleaning and hard floor and carpet maintenance system to protect building occupants and maintenance personnel, with special attention to vulnerable populations.

**Green Cleaning – Maintenance Personnel Training and Education**

CITY requires the effective training of all maintenance staff responsible for any cleaning tasks that include the use of chemicals and machinery to ensure that the Green Cleaning Policy and those procedures discussed herein are carried out within the building and affected areas on a consistent basis. [PROJECT NAME, Name of responsible party] requires that [Vendor] staff must be properly educated about all green cleaning products (Green Seal certified products, Environmental Choice CCD products, etc.) and procedures, as well as their goals, to ensure that the program is carried out effectively and consistently. Personnel/staff training will include:

- Training in the potential hazards, proper use, handling, storage, emergency spill procedures, and disposal and recycling of cleaning chemicals and equipment, including their packaging, which will attempt to be reduced in any way possible.
- Training must be provided before the use of chemicals if the cleaning chemicals are hazardous.
- Training in the proper use of personal protective equipment required for using the cleaning product, such as gloves, safety goggles and respirators or as recommended by the product manufacturer.
- Training to obtain and use hazard information, including an explanation of labels and MSDSs (Material Safety Data Sheet).
- Training at a level and in a language and vocabulary that can be understood.
- Training in the use of chemical concentrates and the appropriate dilution procedures to
minimize chemical use hazards.

- Training in the use of sustainable cleaning materials and products covered under Green Garage Certification – Cleaning Procedures, Occupied Spaces credit and on the use of cleaning equipment covered Cleaning Procedures, Parking Decks.

- Training in the proper use of machinery used frequently by staff such as, floor scrubbers, sweepers, etc. that require periodic cleaning and use of chemicals and directly influence the smooth operations of CITY.

[PROJECT NAME, Name of responsible party or Vendor] will provide an annual report of janitorial staff training completion and will be reviewed by [Owner] Facilities and Maintenance [Name of responsible party, Title].

**Green Cleaning – Handling and Storage of Cleaning Chemicals**

CITY has developed the following guidelines for the safe handling and storage of cleaning chemicals.

- Obtain and maintain Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) for all hazardous cleaning products and chemicals used in the building. MSDS sheets must be readily accessible to workers.
- Warn workers not to mix cleaning products that contain bleach and ammonia.
- Operating ventilation systems as needed during cleaning tasks to allow sufficient air flow and prevent buildup of hazardous vapors.
- Provide workers with a place to wash up after using cleaning chemicals.
- Keep cleaning chemicals in a locked, secured area.
- Ensure that all containers of cleaning products and chemicals are labeled to identify their contents and hazards.
- Check for expiration dates. If expired chemical is hazardous dispose per EPA or California hazardous waste regulatory agency laws.
- Follow directions on product label for the correct disposal of empty containers.
- Keep containers tightly sealed and dry. Whenever possible keep chemicals in a space with dedicated air exhaust.
- Keep containers with chemicals that can rupture or shatter upon falling in cabinets with closeable doors or shelves with edge rails. Secure storage cabinets/shelves to walls in earthquake prone zones.

**Green Cleaning – Hazardous Cleaning Chemical Spill Management**

CITY requires regular inspections of the cleaning chemicals storage facility and proper training of maintenance personnel per section “Maintenance Personnel Training and Education” when hazardous cleaning chemicals are present on-site. This section covers only incidental hazardous cleaning chemical spills that may occur in the building or building grounds that do not pose a significant safety or health hazard to employees in the immediate vicinity nor does it have the potential to become an emergency within a short time frame.

- Train personnel to identify hazardous cleaning chemicals that may be present and what would constitute a spill.
- If hazardous cleaning chemicals are kept in the building ensure that appropriate spill-containment material, as recommended by the manufacturer, is kept on hand for a spill.
- Conduct regular training with maintenance personnel of incidental spill procedures and the specific actions needed based on the particular hazardous cleaning chemicals that may be present on-site.
- First, cordon off the spill area, or place warning cones, to prevent occupants from inadvertently spreading the contamination over a larger area.
- Train maintenance personnel to notify persons in the immediate area that a spill has occurred and to notify their maintenance supervisor of the spill at once.
- Contain any volatile material within a room by keeping doors closed. Close of any return air grilles and open windows if possible or increase air extraction exhaust if possible.
- Maintenance personnel supervisor should evaluate the toxicity, flammability, and other hazardous properties of the chemical, and action recommended, based on consulting the MSDS for the specific hazardous chemical(s) which shall be kept on-site at all times. Supervisor should evaluate the size and location of the spill to determine whether evacuation or additional assistance is necessary.
- It is strongly encouraged for the supervisor to call the manufacturer of the chemical, usually listed in the MSDS with an emergency call number, for immediate assistance and escalation of incident if deemed necessary.
- Wear protective equipment such as goggles, apron, laboratory coat, gloves, shoe covers, or respirator. Base the selection of the equipment on the hazard and the recommendations of the chemical manufacturer for clean-up procedures.
- Dispose of all materials used for clean-up per EPA or California hazardous waste regulatory agency laws.
EXHIBIT N:

CITY OF BERKELEY PROPERTY EQUIPMENT INVENTORY
PARKING CONTROL OR BUILDING ACCESS SYSTEM EQUIPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SKIDATA Barrier Gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SKIDATA Credit Card (CC only) Pay on Foot Machines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SKIDATA Interface Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SKIDATA Easy Cash Full Service Pay on Foot Machines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SKIDATA Entry Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SKIDATA Exit Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SKIDATA Control PC’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SKIDATA Manual Pay Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SKIDATA Process Servers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Commend G3 Intercom System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Laser Printer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>IP Cameras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Validation equipment E-Val</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT O:
PARKING ACCESS AND REVENUE CONTROL EQUIPMENT – PARCS SPECIFICATIONS

### PAY ON FOOT STATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT NAME</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FULL SERVICE EASY CASH POF</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. License, SQL 2008 SRV-CAL/V2, MS SQL</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SFTW MS XP Embedded - Order with SKIDATA PC's only</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. POF Easy.Cash Rack</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. POF-EC Bank Note Reader &amp; Recycler</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. POF-EC Coder Unlimited</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. POF-EC Coder Unlimited Feeder+</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. POF-EC Crosswise Barcode</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. POF-EC Easy Cash Basic Unit (3-Color) - Order with 946010324</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. POF-EC Mag Stripe Reader (1 way)</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hardware LVPs</td>
<td>x (8.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Weigand converter board for SKIDATA</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ProxPoint Reader, Weigand Output (Beige)</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit Card Only POF</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic Unit Credit.Cash V3</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. POF-CC Coder Unlimited</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. POF-CC Coder Feeder+</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. POF-CC Mag Stripe Reader</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. POF-CC Crosswise Barcode</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. POF Credit.Cash Rack</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. License, SQL 2008 SRV-CAL/V2, MS SQL</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SFTW MS XP Embedded - Order with SKIDATA PC's only</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Weigand converter board for SKIDATA</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ProxPoint Reader, Weigand Output (Beige)</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CASHIER STATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT NAME</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANUAL PAYSTATION W/RFID FOR CASHIERED EXIT</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. DT Coder Cable for Cash Drawer Contact</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. DT Desktop Coder Unlimited</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. DT Crosswise Barcode</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DT Mag Stripe Reader (1 way)</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. DT RFID Kit for Coder Unlimited</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. MISC Cash Drawer</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MPS Fee Display - Power Supply</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. MPS Fee Display - Backlight</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SFTW Exit Cashiering</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. SKIDATA OEM PC - Dell XE DT</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hardware LVPs</td>
<td>x (5.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VOIP INTERCOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT NAME</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMEND GE300 9-12 SUBSCRIBERS WITH TEL CARD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. G3 GE 300 IP-Intercom Server</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. G3 - Intercom subscriber card G3-GET-4B</td>
<td>x (3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. G3 - License upgrade G3 GET-4B to G3-GET-4P</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Desk Station, Handset 6 Digit alphanumeric Display</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. G3 Telephone Interface Card</td>
<td>x (1.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LANE EQUIPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT NAME</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXIT POWER.GATE UNLIMITED, HID</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Power.Gate-EXIT</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CO UNLIMITED BU</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CO UNLIMITED FEED+</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CO UNLIMITED BC C</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 CO UNLIMITED 1x2 MAG</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Power.Gate/ Lite.Gate Touchscreen 7&quot;</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Hardware LVPs</td>
<td>x (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Power.Gate User Interface Illuminated</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Power.Gate /Lite.Gate contour stripe illuminated</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Power.Gate Interface extension large</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Power.Gate Intercom analog</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Power.Gate/Lite.Gate lock keyed the same</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Weigand converter board for SKIDATA</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Power.Gate Ticket Tray - Small</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT NAME</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTRY POWER.GATE BASIC, HID</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Power.Gate-ENTRY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Power.Gate Ticket Tray - Small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CO BASIC BU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CO BASIC FEED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CO UNLIMITED BC C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Power.Gate/ Lite.Gate Graphic Display 7&quot;quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hardware LVPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Power.Gate User Interface Illuminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Power.Gate /Lite.Gate contour stripe illuminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Power.Gate Interface extension large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Power.Gate Intercom analog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Power.Gate/Lite.Gate lock keyed the same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Weigand converter board for SKIDATA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT NAME</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC-BARRIER.GATE-ADA NON-ILLUMINATED</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 AC-BARRIER.GATE-BASIC-US</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 AC-BARRIER.GATE-CABLE-LOOPDE</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 AC-BARRIER.GATE-DET</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 AC-BARRIER.GATE-F-BOOM 2.5-2.34</td>
<td>x (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT NAME</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RED / GREEN LIGHT - LED</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT FULL SIGN &amp; MOUNTING POLE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE DETECTION LOOPS (CUT, WRAP, AND SEAL)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTECTION POST</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPACES AVAILABLE SIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT NAME</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPACES AVAILABLE SIGN (WALL MOUNT)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Terminal Credit Card Acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIX PAYMENT SERVICES EMV CONTACT READER XENO A ECO</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIX PAYMENT SERVICES EMV SETUP--ONE TIME</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIX PAYMENT SERVICES EMV ATTENDED TERMINAL YOMANI XR</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accessories / Other

**Pricing is Lumpsum & includes applicable taxes, labor, & freight**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAT 6 CABLE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Software

**Pricing is Lumpsum & includes applicable taxes, labor, & freight**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFTW NON SKIDATA READER, EACH ADDL READER</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking Guidance Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAMERA BASED COUNT SYSTEM (PER SPACE)</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CCTV System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAMERA, 3MP, 360 PTZ</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMERA, 3MP LICENSE PLATE</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANASONIC 16CH H.264 DVR VMD SEARCH 3TB DVR</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV PINHOLE COLOR CAMERA (INTEGRATED IN LANE EQUIPMENT)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMERA BRACKET</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Optional Items - Point-of-Sale Add-Ons

- Print @ Home 2D Barcode Scanner for Easy.Cash (New equipment) | 3
- Print @ Home 2D Barcode Scanner for Easy.Cash (Legacy equipment) | 1

### Optional Items - LAND EQUIPMENT ADD-ONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power.Gate Print @ Home 2D Barcode Scanner for Entry Exit Column &amp; CC-Only POF (New equipment)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power.Gate Print @ Home 2D Barcode Scanner for Entry</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection Post</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mounting Plate for Columns &amp; Gates</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mounting Plate - Lane Equipment x (1.00)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT P:
PARCS EQUIPMENT PROGRAM TESTING

Parking Access and Revenue Control System (PARCS) Equipment Program Testing
The Operator is responsible for project management of equipment acquisition and installation of the Parking Access and Revenue Control System. Once the system is installed and fully operational, equipment testing shall be conducted at each facility by the PARCS equipment vendor (Sentry control System Inc.), and certified as completed/fully functional. The signed documentation must be submitted to the City before final payment. The following testing program is required:

ENTRY LANE EQUIPMENT

Ticket Vend Test
1. For system with vehicle detection armed ticket dispenser issuance, attempt to vend ticket without arming loop activation (no vehicle or metal on loop). If ticket dispenser is armed ticket shall not issue.
2. Attempt to vend ticket with loop activated, ticket shall be issued.
3. Gate opens.
4. Gate closes automatically from signal from safety-close loop at gate arm after vehicle passes from gate arm path.
5. Retain ticket to check ticket tracking in software test.

Card Access Test
1. Attempt to use card without arming. Gate shall not open.
2. Attempt to use card with arming. Gate opens.
3. Attempt to issue ticket after card use. Ticket shall not vend.
4. Gate closes automatically from signal from safety-close loop at gate arm after vehicle passes from gate arm path.
5. For systems with anti-passback: Attempt to reuse same card at entry prior to using card for exit. Gate shall not open.

Credit Card Entry
1. Insert credit card in entry station. Card shall be returned. Gate shall open.

Pay-On-Foot Stations
1. Confirm pay station voice prompt to insert ticket, ticket acceptor sequential lighting operative.
2. Insert valid entry ticket in the ticket acceptor. Voice prompts for insertion of validation coupons or credit card.
3. If the ticket has a magnetic code validation, or a validation ticket is inserted, the validation shall be displayed.
4. The adjusted fee due shall be displayed.
5. The voice prompt will request credit card or cash payment.
6. The cash amount tendered shall be displayed.
7. The change amount shall be displayed.
8. If a credit card is utilized for payment the card shall be inserted and returned.
9. A receipt shall be programmed to be printed either automatically or initiated by pressing a blinking soft button.

**EXIT LANE TEST**

**Cashier Exit**
1. If arming is utilized, attempt to start transaction without arming. Transaction shall not initiate.
2. With lane armed (vehicle on arming loop), insert valid entry ticket in the validator. Fee computer display and LED fee display shall display fee due.
3. If the ticket has a magnetic code validation, the validation shall be displayed.
4. If the validation is a validation coupon (pre-encoded ticket) the coupon(s) will be inserted into the validator.
5. The adjusted fee due shall be displayed.
6. The cash amount tendered shall be entered into the fee computer and be displayed.
7. The change amount shall be displayed.
8. If a credit card is utilized for payment the card shall be swiped.
9. A receipt shall be printed either automatically or initiated by a keystroke depending on the system configuration.
10. Once change is tendered and the cash drawer closed, the gate shall open.
11. Once the vehicle passes over the exit-safety loop the gate shall automatically close.
12. Hardware to export parking occupancy count information

**Card Access Exit**
1. If the system utilizes arming, the card shall be passed or swiped without arming (no vehicle on loop). The gate shall not open.
2. With the system armed a card shall be passed or swiped and the gate shall open.
3. If a card configured for debit is utilized and the card reader includes a display, the account balance shall be displayed is so configured.
4. Once the vehicle passes over the exit-safety loop the gate shall automatically close.

**Credit Card Exit at Exit Station**
1. If a credit card is utilized for entry in a credit card in/credit card out system, the same credit card shall be inserted in the exit station reader. Per configuration the credit card shall be validated in real time DSL.
2. A validation coupon can then be inserted into the exit station.
3. A valid card shall be returned to the cardholder and a receipt issued.
4. The gate shall open.
5. Once the vehicle passes over the exit-safety loop the gate shall automatically close.

**Pre-Paid Ticket Holder Exit at Exit Station**
1. Ticket is inserted into exit station.
2. The gate shall open.
3. Once the vehicle passes over the exit-safety loop the gate shall automatically close.

**Unpaid Ticket at Exit Station**
1. Ticket is inserted into exit station.
2. Validation coupon can then be inserted into the exit station.
3. Credit card shall be inserted into the exit station.
4. Credit card shall be returned to cardholder.
5. Receipt shall be issued.
6. The gate shall open.
7. Once the vehicle passes over the exit-safety loop the gate shall automatically close.

**Intercom Test**
1. Assistance button at each intercom shall be pressed, communication with master station shall commence.
2. Cameras\on integrates with assistance button at each intercom shall be pressed, viewing at master station.

**Exit Lane “Full Sign”**
1. Count software shall be configured to shunt ticket dispenser(s) and activate “FULL SIGN” when count reaches pre-programmed “full” level.
2. Ticket dispenser shall be reactivated an FULL SIGN de activated when pre-programmed number of spaces become available.
3. Ticket dispenser shall be reactivated an FULL SIGN de activated when pre-programmed number of spaces become available.

**SOFTWARE TEST**
1. Display and run all standard reports based on system data.
2. Software exporting parking occupancy count information at a minimum 60-second intervals and saving this information in “commas delineated” file format for use by a future parking guidance system.

**REVENUE REPORTS**
1. Run each report.
2. General Totals
3. Daily Revenue
4. Attendant Totals
5. Attendant Sign on/off
6. Daily Revenue
7. Parking Fee
8. Validation
9. Transaction Reports
10. Ticket Tracking Reports
11. Alarms/Events
12. User Changes
13. Power Up

**COUNT MONITOR-CONTROL REPORTS**
1. Count Total
2. Count Statistics
3. Entry/Exit
4. Entry/Exit Transient
5. Count Lane Volume
6. Count Remote Vend
7. Count Alarms
8. Differential Count changes

**CARD ACCESS REPORTS**

1. Card Status
2. Card Activation
3. Card Activity
4. Quick Card Search Activity
5. Access Group Activity
6. Last Activity
7. Holiday Report
8. Cardholder Report
9. Debit
10. Credit Card
11. All Credit Card Acceptance devices
12. Alarms
13. User Changes
14. Reader Performance
15. Reader Events

**SUMMARY REPORTS**

1. Entry/Exit
2. Duration of Stay

**Note:** The revenue control system shall provide the hardware and software necessary to exporting parking occupancy count information at a minimum 60-second intervals and saving this information in “commas delineated” file format for use by a future parking guidance system. The RCS shall have the ability to transmit this information via a serial interface to the PGS.

**INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**

- PCI-DDS Compliant meeting all requirements
- System Failure
### EXHIBIT Q: COMPENSATION

#### COST PROPOSAL

- **Cost Proposal Template**
- Proposers must complete the Cost Proposal Template below. An electronic spreadsheet version of this template can be found at: [http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/ContentDisplay.aspx?id=7128&portalID=20](http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/ContentDisplay.aspx?id=7128&portalID=20).

#### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Telegraph Channing</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Berkeley Way Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel and Benefits&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Monthly Fee per Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Monthly Fee Months 1-12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Telegraph Channing</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Center Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel and Benefits&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Monthly Fee per Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Monthly Fee Months 13-24**

---

1 Personnel and Benefits must be listed for all proposed staff in cost sections 1, 2 and 3 as part of Table 1: Hourly Rates of Parking Management Personnel in this Exhibit.
1c) Monthly Management Fee (Months 25-60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Telegraph Channing</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Center Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Months 25-36 (Year 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months 37-48 (Year 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months 49-60 (Year 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. One-time Center Street Costs
One-time costs associated with the full operation of Center Street Garage in approx. August 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Center Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel and Benefits¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software and Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: _______________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. As-Needed Services

3a) Event Parking Planning and Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel and Benefits¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: _______________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3b) Parking Valet Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel and Benefits¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: _______________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parking Unit Rates
In the event of change orders, additions or withdrawals of services, the pricing terms listed below shall be used to determine rate of pay. Annual Inflator: Effective August 8, 2017, these rates will be increased annually on July 1st for the term of the contract based on the April CPI for the San Francisco Bay Area All Consumers not to exceed 3%.

Contractor shall provide unit rates for hourly services provided to the City for operation of parking Facilities for both pre and post PACRS equipment installation to include:

1. Extended parking operation per hour for each facility
2. Cashier personnel
3. Janitorial personnel
4. Security personnel
5. Supervisory personnel

Hourly rates shall be as follows for each Garage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Hourly Rate (all-inclusive - including benefits, training, insurance, uniforms, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1: Monthly Management Fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2: One-time Center Street Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3a: Event Parking Planning and Coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3b: Parking Valet Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashier personnel</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial personnel</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security personnel</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory personnel</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit R: Center Street Garage Parking Facility Management Requirements

The Center Street Garage will re-open in August 2017 as a 720-space parking garage. The Operator will required to incorporate the following daily activitites into the operations management:

Parking Rates- will include hourly, daily, monthly, and event rates. All garage rates and fees are set by City. Center Street is parking of the goBerkeley Parking Program (demand –based program) and rate adjustments are driven by data.

Staffing- The City expects that Contractor shall have at least one customer service rep/cashier on duty at all times when the garage is open. In addition, the City expects that Contractor shall have at least one other supervisor, one janitor, and minimum of two security guards (desk assignment and roving) assigned. All personnel shall be trained on PARCS system and be able to make contact with on-duty staff to correct any issues.

Security – A security post is part of the new Center Street Garage design located in the mall area of the garage on Addison Street Sign. A uniformed security personnel must be assigned and stationary at that location during all business hours of the garage. Additionally, roving security personal is required during all hours that the facility is open.

Maintenance/Janitorial- The Facility will be a Green Garage in which all cleaning products must be part of a pre-approved list. Specific training will be required for all cleaning and management personnel. See Exhibit M-1: Sample Green Garage Policy.
  • Mall areas, Retail, Art Display windows and Bike Station common areas will be part of the operator cleaning responsibilities.
  • Sidewalk areas on Center Street and Addison Street adjacent to Garage facility will be part of the operator cleaning responsibilities.
  • The benches on Center Street in front of Bike Station will be part of the operator cleaning responsibilities.

Landscaping - Operator shall provide landscape maintenance both within and around the parking Garage, or as otherwise directed by City. Should the Operator not have extensive landscape maintenance experience and/or required licensure and equipment, Operator may outsource this responsibility to an experienced and licensed landscaping service provider.

Transportation- At the time of the garage opening, Operator must provide at minimum an electric cart/ vehicle assigned to the Center Street Garage only, for security personal to monitor facility in.

Parking Equipment- Operator will be responsible for operation and monitoring of the Parking Guidance System to ensure accurate parking information is displayed and functioning at all times.
  • Operator will be responsible for monitoring all system security cameras covering all three garages and ensuring corrective action is taken if there is a concern or issue.
  • Operator will monitor all PARCS equipment and respond in a timely manner if there is a problem.
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UTILIZATION ASSESSMENT

On-Street
Field data was collected by team members on a typical Wednesday in March, prior to Old Woodward construction start

Off-Street
Occupancy data was provided by SP+ for a typical weekday at mid-day in October 2017 and January 2018. Additional data was collected from January through July 2018.

Optimal utilization is 85% during peak periods
Utilization Measures: Weekday Midday
Utilization Measures: Weekday Evening
ENGAGEMENT
WHO DID WE HEAR FROM?

Business District Survey
- Business Owners and Operators – 98 (23%)
- Employees – 297 (71%)
- Property Owners – 23 (5.5%)

Merchants
- May 16 Merchants Meeting – 20+ participants

Visitors
- May 16 Intercept Surveys – 24 on-street conversations

Broader Community
- June 6 Community Open House – 10+ participants
KEY FINDINGS

On-Street

• Availability exists throughout the network, with at least half of the metered block segments underutilized (<70%) at all times.

• Usage is heaviest within 1-2 blocks of Maple/Old Woodward/Pierce

• Mid-day (12pm – 2pm) is the peak period, with nearly 70% system-wide; utilization is around 60% during remaining hours.

• Core area (see at right) utilization ranges from 80% – 88% between 12pm – 8pm
KEY FINDINGS

Off-Street

- During the peak, mid-day period, all 5 City decks exceeded 90% occupancy
- **Chester** is most heavily used by commuters with >70% of parkers staying between 5-12 hours.
- **Peabody** and **Pierce** are used most heavily by short-term parkers, with nearly 2/3 of users staying 4 hours or less.
- The **Park** and **N. Old Woodward** decks are evenly distributed between short (<4 hours) and long (>4 hours) stay parkers
- There are >3,000 parkers on the permit wait list, but many of them are parking in the garages today.
- An estimated 600 parkers per day are non-permit holders staying 5-12 hours.
WHERE PEOPLE PARK DOWNTOWN

- On-street in the downtown: 74%
- On-street on neighborhood streets: 14%
- Triangle District (east of Woodward Ave.): 7%
- A public parking deck or lot downtown: 3%
- A private parking deck or lot downtown: 1%
- I don't park (I usually walk, bike, use transit, or carpool): 1%
PARKING AS A WORK BENEFIT

**Does Your Employer Provide Parking As Benefit?**

- **NO, MY PARKING COSTS ARE FULLY MY RESPONSIBILITY:** 94
- **YES, BY PAYING SOME PORTION OF MY DAILY-VALIDATION PARKING COSTS:** 4
- **YES, BY PAYING SOME PORTION OF MY PARKING PERMIT COST:** 3
- **YES, BY PAYING FOR DAILY-VALIDATION PARKING IN A CITY GARAGE:** 39
- **YES, BY PROVIDING A PARKING PERMIT TO A CITY GARAGE:** 99
- **YES, BY PROVIDING FREE PARKING ON-SITE:** 18

**Do You Provide Parking as a Benefit to Your Employees?**

- **NO, THEIR PARKING COSTS ARE THEIR FULL RESPONSIBILITY:** 33
- **YES, BY PAYING SOME PORTION OF THEIR DAILY-VALIDATION PARKING COSTS:** 0
- **YES, BY PAYING SOME PORTION OF THEIR PARKING PERMIT COST:** 6
- **YES, BY PAYING FOR DAILY-VALIDATION PARKING IN A CITY GARAGE:** 7
- **YES, BY PROVIDING A PARKING PERMIT TO A CITY GARAGE:** 23
- **YES, BY PROVIDING FREE PARKING ON-SITE:** 15

- A majority of employees are provided with some form of free parking
- 55% of respondents said their employees paid the full cost of their parking
- Around 1 in 3 employees are solely responsible for their parking
- Most parking is provided for employees off-site in City garages
SPECIFIC PARKING FEATURES (WEIGHTED AVERAGE)

How Would You Rate the Following Parking Features (1-5 Scale)?

- **FREE 2 HOUR PARKING IN PARKING DECKS/STRUCTURES**: 3.7
- **DESIGN AND CIRCULATION WITHIN PARKING STRUCTURES**: 2.5
- **ON-STREET SIGNAGE**: 2.8
- **THE TIME/COST OF METERED PARKING**: 1.8
- **THE AMOUNT OF TURNOVER OF ON-STREET PARKING**: 2.2
- **TIME IT TAKES TO FIND A PARKING SPACE**: 2.1
ADDITIONAL STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK

Employee Parking
Availability of parking for permit holders is key
The cost of parking without a permit is a primary concern
Remote parking options with circulator service would be an attractive option

Customer Parking
Turnover is key during daytime hours
Longer stays are desired during evening hours
More options for short-term pick-up and drop-off are needed
STRATEGIES & RECOMMENDATIONS
ENSURE COMMUTER ACCESS TO MONTHLY PERMITS

- Sell more permits
- Performance-Based Rate Policy
- Adjust Rates to Align Supply/Demand
- Expand Non-Driving Commuter Benefits
- Refine Rooftop Valet Strategy
- Expand Employee Parking Options
SELL MORE PERMITS IN SELECT CITY GARAGES

Issue:
There are approximately 3,000 people on the permit wait list and the cost to park for a full day without a permit is more than 2x as expensive.

Opportunity:
Many commuters are already parking in the garage, suggesting that adding permits would not necessarily add new parkers.

Recommendations:
• Offer permits to the first 10 people on the wait lists for the Pierce and Peabody garages.
• Continue monitoring utilization in all garages and sell additional permits quarterly as warranted.
DEFINE A PERFORMANCE-BASED PRICING APPROACH

Issue:
Current pricing is based on a combination of operating cost and perception of what the market will bear.

Opportunity:
Pricing can be used as a tool to distribute demand more broadly across the downtown network and achieve the key performance indicator (KPI) of availability.

Recommendations:
• Adopt a policy linking parking rates to demand.
• Establish availability as the KPI.
• Set target utilization ranges for the parking system and assemble data to inform pricing decisions.

TARGET
85% occupancy per block
15% availability per block

PROGRESSIVE PARKING
If block/lot is too full, increase the price
If block/lot is too empty, lower the price
If block/lot is just right, keep the same price
ADJUST PARKING RATES TO REFLECT DEMAND PATTERNS

Issue:
Demand for parking exceeds supply at key times and locations, both on- and off-street.

Opportunity:
Use pricing to shift demand to underutilized spaces throughout the system.

Recommendations:
• Raise permit rates at the Chester, Park, and N. Old Woodward garages.
• Gradually raise rates across all garages.
• Offer “flex” permits and discounted rates for carpools and vanpools and occasional users.
• Explore transitioning monthly permits to daily pricing structure.
PROVIDE & PROMOTE COMMUTER BENEFITS

Issue
The vast majority of Birmingham’s commuters drive alone to work each day.

Opportunity
Transportation demand management (TDM) programs can free some capacity within the downtown parking system.

Recommendations:
• Work with key partners to create a “welcome” package for new and existing employees that outlines commuter options.
• Collaborate with agencies like SMART and SEMCOG to develop more robust programs and benefits for employees.
CONTINUE TO REFINE THE ROOFTOP VALET PROGRAM

Issue:
Commuter use and perceptions of the rooftop valet are lower than desired.

Opportunity:
Optimization of the program could improve customer experience and expand capacity.

Recommendations:
• Add mobile functionality to the valet program.
• Collect and analyze data on use of both rooftop and on-street valet by commuters.
• Examine options for moving valet pick-up/drop-off to lower levels of the garage.
• Ensure operating costs and revenues are balanced.
EXPAND EMPLOYEE PARKING OPTIONS

Issue:
Off-street lots and garages are regularly at or near capacity during weekday peak hours and additional demand for permits exists.

Opportunity:
Underutilized space in the on-street network can be used to expand supply during peak periods.

Recommendations:
• Institute an employee program in residential permit parking (RPP) blocks, with permits limited to daytime parking when resident parking demand is lowest.
• Add on-street permits in underutilized metered blocks, such as has been initiated at the south end of Old Woodward.
• Examine on-street permit options on blocks that are not currently metered or included in RPP districts.
IMPROVE VISITOR ACCESS TO SHORT-TERM PARKING

- Performance-Based Rate Policy
- Minimize Use of 1-Hour Time Limits
- Ensure Drivers Know All Options
- Optimize PARK ONCE Efficiencies
- Refine Public Valet Strategy
- Expand Garage Payment Options
ADJUST PARKING RATES TO REFLECT DEMAND PATTERNS

Issue:
Demand for parking exceeds supply at key times and locations, both on- and off-street.

Opportunity:
Use pricing to shift demand to underutilized spaces throughout the system.

Recommendations:
• Establish a third pricing tier to create a “premium rate” within the on-street system.
• Make some currently-metered on-street spaces free during times when capacity is constrained elsewhere.
• Continue to monitor utilization and review rates annually.
• Publish annual reports to ensure transparency, focusing on the KPI and rationale for pricing adjustments.
MINIMIZE USE OF 1-HOUR TIME LIMITS

Issue:
1-Hour time limits are too restrictive for a destination-economy downtown.

Opportunity:
An emphasis on demand-based pricing can ease the burden of time limits for ensuring turnover.

Recommendations:
• Make 2-Hours the default on-street parking time limit, with 1-Hour limits assigned only where specific conditions/needs merit.
• Ensure that this is communicated, coincident with any on-street rate increases.
ENSURE DRIVERS KNOW ALL THEIR OPTIONS

Issue:
Drivers (especially visitors) need more information on where to find available parking, what it will cost, and how to use it.

Opportunity:
A cohesive parking information system will enhance understanding of options and guide users to “right fit” parking spaces.

Free, evening parking in permit lots is an example of a parking option that is under-communicated to visitors.

Recommendations:
• Implement a comprehensive communications strategy to ensure parkers know their options.
• Align citywide planning & wayfinding efforts to build a cohesive and recognizable brand and align parking signage within this structure.
OPTIMIZE “PARK ONCE” EFFICIENCIES

Issue:
Birmingham has a compact, walkable downtown, but some areas are less connected, leading to “re-parking” by visitors on a single visit.

Opportunity:
Further enhancing downtown’s “park once” assets can improve visitor experience, connect remote destinations and reduce overall parking demand.

Recommendations:
• Explore options for adding a downtown circulator to improve connectivity across downtown.
• Continue to pursue opportunities to enhance pedestrian and bicycle safety & connectivity.
CONTINUE TO REFINE THE PUBLIC VALET PROGRAM

Issue:
Visitor use of the public valet program is strong, but the business model and user patterns are unresolved.

Opportunity:
Program refinement could increase long-term sustainability, improve customer experience, and address additional demand constraints.

Recommendations:
• Add mobile functionality to the public valet program.
• Collect and analyze data on use by all users.
• Explore options for expanding service north to Lot 6.
• Ensure operating costs and revenues are balanced.
EXPAND PAYMENT OPTIONS IN THE PARKING GARAGES

Issue:
Parking garage payment is limited to credit card, IN Card, and permit/voucher.

Opportunity:
Additional options add flexibility and could improve customer experience and reduce gate backups.

Recommendations:
• Work with ParkMobile and SKIDATA to extend mobile functionality to City parking garages.
• Explore other options, including Bluetooth mobile solutions that will work with existing equipment.
• Expand promotion of IN cards to improve payment options and efficiency.
MAKE USE OF EXCESS ON-STREET CAPACITY

Use Price to Attract More Visitors

Reduce Short-term Garage Set Asides Nearby
USE PRICE TO ATTRACT MORE VISITORS TO THESE SPACES

Issue:
Visitors will still look for bargains within walking distance of their destinations, regardless of the availability of free garage spaces.

Opportunity:
Pricing cues and information could direct visitors to areas where on-street spaces are consistently available within a short walk of the downtown core.

Recommendations:
• Make some on-street spaces free to provide an alternative to free, higher demand, garage spaces.
• Promote these spaces as part of the communication and signage plan.
REDUCE SHORT-TERM PARKING SET-ASIDES IN CITY GARAGES

Issues:
Uneven use of on-street resources, creating perception that availability is lacking; Waitlists for monthly permits

Opportunity:
Making nearby on-street spaces more attractive would ease congestion on other blocks, and allow City to reduce off-street set asides nearby, freeing up capacity to offer more permits.

Recommendations:
- Reduce rates, or make parking free, on underutilized blocks
- Reduce the number of spaces held for short-term parkers in nearby garages.
MONITOR PERFORMANCE

Make Use of Existing Data Collection Capacities
Invest in License Plate Recognition Tech
Upgrade Back-Office Software
UTILIZE DATA COLLECTION CAPACITY TO SUPPORT GOALS

Issue:
On-street utilization data is not readily available and current efforts to obtain this data are labor-intensive.

Opportunity:
Utilizing the sensor capacity of the recently installed CivicSmart meters will enable greater data collection to support performance-based management goals.

Recommendations:
• Activate the vehicle detection sensors and begin collecting utilization data.
• Manually verify collected data to ensure accuracy.
• Use verified data to inform enforcement protocols and regulations, such as adjustments to pricing.
INVEST IN LICENSE PLATE RECOGNITION EQUIPMENT

Issue:
Existing parking equipment has limited capacity to collect user data and does not fully support enforcement of parking regulations.

Opportunity:
LPR equipment offers opportunities to improve garage ingress/egress and both on- and off-street enforcement, while also collecting utilization data.

Recommendations:
• Issue a turnkey solicitation for LPR equipment and service that integrates with existing parking equipment.
• Utilize data to support performance based management objectives.
UPGRADE PARKING TRANSACTION & MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE

Issues:
The existing permit management system is antiquated and inefficient. Utilization data for City garages has flaws and is non-existent for surface lots and on-street metered spaces.

Opportunity:
Innovations in parking data management solutions can enable detailed, real-time analysis of parking transactions and utilization in support of performance-based management.

Recommendations:
• Upgrade & automate the permit wait list system.
• Explore options for a permit & transaction management software platform that can provide analytics across on- and off-street supplies.
Solicit Competitive Bids for Next Services Contract
Establish a Parking Ambassador Program
Update Assessment District Program

OPTIMIZE MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS
**SOLICIT COMPETITIVE BIDS FOR OPERATOR SERVICES**

**Issue:**

The maintenance and operations contract for the City’s 5 garages has not been subject to competitive bidding or amendment since the original signing date in 1991.

**Opportunity:**

Issuing a solicitation for operator services that addresses the changing needs of the City provides an opportunity to build in best practices and needs for current and future initiatives.

**Recommendations:**

- Evaluate comparable municipal parking programs and operator agreements.
- Develop a comprehensive Operator solicitation that incorporates current City needs and opportunities for new or expanded services that meet City goals.
ESTABLISH A PARKING AMBASSADOR PROGRAM

Issue:
There is a negative perception of parking enforcement by some users of the downtown parking system.

Opportunity:
A customer-centered “ambassador” approach could change perceptions, help improve user experience and increase understanding of the parking system.

Recommendations:
• Rebrand Parking Enforcement Assistants as “Parking Ambassadors.”
• Train ambassadors on parking regulations, technology, and downtown information to help reinforce the customer service.
• Monitor this approach and consider shifting ambassador responsibility to a non-police division or agency.
UPDATE THE ASSESSMENT DISTRICT PROGRAM

Issue:
The current Birmingham Parking Assessment District model relies on periodic fees assessed to property owners that can be substantial and unexpected.

Opportunity:
An alternative model could offer a more sustainable approach, while also providing a dependable revenue stream to support downtown’s parking system needs.

Recommendation:
• Evaluate the benefits and drawbacks of a revised approach.
• Examine opportunities to expand or otherwise modify the Assessment District boundary.
PREPARE FOR FUTURE GROWTH

Update Zoning Approach/Expand Strategies
Refine/Formalize Joint-Development Strategies
Improve Active & Emerging Mobility Opportunities
Develop TDM Standards for Downtown Development
NEAR-TERM PRIORITIES

Develop Park Once Zoning Strategies

Evaluate the zoning code in coordination with the City’s upcoming Master Plan update to ensure that parking can be expanded, as needed, to support continued growth in the downtown area and beyond.

Invest Parking Revenues in Other Public Improvements

Ensure that Parking System Enterprise Funds can be used for non-parking improvements. Pursue opportunities to implement a “benefit district” where resources can be allocated beyond the parking system to non-driving mobility.

Continue to Refine the Joint-Development Approach

Continue to pursue the N. Old Woodward & Bates Street redevelopment project with the goals of increasing downtown investment and meeting the growing demand for parking within the downtown parking system.
LONGER-TERM OPPORTUNITIES

Broker Shared Parking
Unlock off-hour capacities among private parking facilities through brokered agreements.

Seek Emerging Mobility Opportunities
Reduce parking demand by facilitating increasingly attractive and effective driving alternatives.

Improve and Promote Active Transportation
Continue working with the MMT Board and other partners to implement Multi-modal Transportation Plan recommendations.

Develop TDM Standards for Downtown Development
Require/incentivize TDM for downtown development projects to reduce overall parking impacts, and shift more mobility/travel to modes offering significant co-benefits for downtown vitality.
NEXT STEPS
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO INTERVIEW FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE
BIRMINGHAM SHOPPING DISTRICT BOARD

At the regular meeting of Monday, November 19, 2018 the Birmingham City Commission intends to interview applicants for three positions on the Birmingham Shopping District Board to serve four-year terms to expire November 16, 2022.

The goal of the shopping district board shall be to promote economic activity in the principal shopping districts of the city by undertakings including, but not limited to, conducting market research and public relations campaigns, developing, coordinating and conducting retail and institutional promotions, and sponsoring special events and related activities. (Section 82-97(a)) The board may expend funds it determines reasonably necessary to achieve its goal, within the limits of those monies made available to it by the city commission from the financing methods specified in this article. (Section 82-97(b)).

The ordinance states that the City Manager will make the appointment with the concurrence of the City Commission.

Interested persons may submit a form available from the city clerk’s office. Applications must be submitted to the city clerk’s office on or before noon on Wednesday, November 14, 2018. These documents will appear in the public agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Qualifications of Open Position</th>
<th>Date Applications Due (by noon)</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two members shall have an ownership interest in property located within the Birmingham Shopping District, and one member shall represent, as an operator, a business located within the District.</td>
<td>11/14/18</td>
<td>11/19/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: All members of boards and commissions are subject to the provisions of City of Birmingham City Code Chapter 2, Article IX, Ethics and the filing of the Affidavit and Disclosure Statement.
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO APPOINT TO THE CABLECASTING BOARD

At the regular meeting of Monday, November 19, 2018 the Birmingham City Commission intends to appoint one member to the Cablecasting Board to serve the remainder of a three-year term expiring March 30, 2019. Applicants must be residents of the City of Birmingham.

Interested citizens may submit an application available at the City Clerk’s office or online at www.bhamgov.org/boardopportunities. Applications must be submitted to the City Clerk’s office on or before noon on Wednesday November 14, 2018. These applications will appear in the public agenda for the regular meeting at which time the City Commission will discuss recommendations, and may make nominations and vote on the appointments.

**Duties of the Cablecasting Board**

1) Advise the municipalities on matters relating to cable communications;
2) Monitor the franchisee’s compliance with the franchise agreement and the cable communications ordinance;
3) Conduct performance reviews as outlined in Chapter 30, Article VII of the city code;
4) Act as liaison between the franchisee and the public; hear complaints from the public and seek their resolution from the franchisee;
5) Advise the various municipalities on rate adjustments and services according to the procedure outlined in Chapter 30; Article VI
6) Advise the municipalities on renewal, extension or termination of a franchise;
7) Appropriate those moneys deposited in an account in the name of the Cablecasting Board by the member communities;
8) Oversee the operation of the education, governmental and public access channels;
9) Apprise the municipalities of new developments in cable communications technology;
10) Hear and decide all matters or requests by the operator (Comcast Cablevision);
11) Hear and make recommendations to the municipalities of any request of the operator for modification of the franchise requirement as to channel capacity and addressable converters or maintenance of the security fund;
12) Hear and decide all matters in the franchise agreement which would require the operator to expend moneys up to fifty thousand dollars;
13) Enter into contracts as authorized by resolutions of the member municipalities;
14) Administer contracts entered into by the Board and terminate such contracts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Qualifications of Open Position</th>
<th>Date Applications Due (by noon)</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member must be resident of the City of Birmingham.</td>
<td>11/14/2018</td>
<td>11/19/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** All members of boards and commissions are subject to the provisions of City of Birmingham City Code Chapter 2, Article IX, Ethics and the filing of the Affidavit and Disclosure Statement.
NOTICE OF INTENTI ON TO APPOINT TO BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

At the regular meeting of Monday, November 19, 2018 the Birmingham City Commission intends to appoint one (1) regular member to the Board of Zoning Appeals to serve the remainder of a three-year term to expire October 10, 2019.

Interested parties may recommend others or themselves for these positions by submitting a form available from the City Clerk's office. Applications must be submitted to the city clerk's office on or before noon on Wednesday, November 14, 2018. Applications will appear in the public agenda at which time the commission will discuss recommendations, and may make nominations and vote on appointments.

Duties of Board
The Board of Zoning Appeals acts on questions arising from the administration of the zoning ordinance, including the interpretation of the zoning map. The board hears and decides appeals from and reviews any order, requirement, decision or determination made by the building official.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Qualifications of Open Position</th>
<th>Date Applications Due (by noon)</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members shall be property owners of record and registered voters.</td>
<td>11/14/18</td>
<td>11/19/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: All members of boards and commissions are subject to the provisions of City of Birmingham City Code Chapter 2, Article IX, Ethics and the filing of the Affidavit and Disclosure Statement.
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO APPOINT TO THE PARKS & RECREATION BOARD

At the regular meeting of Monday, November 19, 2018, the Birmingham City Commission intends to appoint one alternate member to the Parks and Recreation Board to serve the remainder of a three-year term to expire March 13, 2020.

Interested citizens may submit an application available at the City Clerk’s office or online at www.bhamgov.org/boardopportunities. Applications must be submitted to the City Clerk’s office on or before noon on Wednesday, November 14, 2018. These applications will appear in the public agenda for the regular meeting at which time the City Commission will discuss recommendations, and may make nominations and vote on the appointments.

Responsibilities
The Parks & Recreation Board consists of seven members who serve for three-year terms without compensation. The goal of the board is to promote a recreation program and a park development program for the City of Birmingham. The Board shall recommend to the City Commission for adoption such rules and regulations pertaining to the conduct and use of parks and public grounds as are necessary to administer the same and to protect public property and the safety, health, morals, and welfare of the public.

The meetings are held the first Tuesday of the month at 6:30 P.M.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Qualifications of Open Position</th>
<th>Date Applications Due (by noon)</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members must be electors (registered voters) of the City of Birmingham.</td>
<td>11/14/18</td>
<td>11/19/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:  All members of boards and commissions are subject to the provisions of City of Birmingham City Code Chapter 2, Article IX, Ethics and the filing of the Affidavit and Disclosure Statement.
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO APPOINT TO
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

At the regular meeting of Monday, November 19, 2018 the Birmingham City Commission intends to appoint one member to the Design Review Board to serve the remainder of a three-year term to expire September 25, 2019 and one member to serve the remainder of a three-year term to expire September 25, 2021.

Interested parties may submit an application available from the city clerk's office on or before noon on Wednesday, November 14, 2018. Applications will appear in the public agenda at which time the commission will discuss recommendations, and may make nominations and vote on appointments.

The function and duty of the Design Review Board is to advise the City Commission in regard to the proper development of the City. The Design Review Board is specifically charged with carrying out the goals, objectives and intent of the City's adopted master plan and urban design plan and other development-oriented plans which may subsequently be adopted. The Design Review Board is authorized to advise and cooperate with the City Commission, City Planning Board, Historic District Commission and other City advisory boards and cooperate with the planning, historic district and legislative bodies of other governmental units in any area outside the boundaries of the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Qualifications of Open Position</th>
<th>Date Applications Due (by noon)</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Members shall represent, insofar as possible, different occupations and professions such as, but not limited to, the legal profession, the financial or real estate professions, and the planning or design professions. Members shall be residents.</td>
<td>11/14/18</td>
<td>11/19/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: All members of boards and commissions are subject to the provisions of City of Birmingham City Code Chapter 2, Article IX, Ethics and the filing of the Affidavit and Disclosure Statement.
At the regular meeting of Monday, November 19, 2018 the Birmingham City Commission intends to appoint one regular member to the Historic District Commission to serve the remainder of a three-year term to expire September 25, 2021.

Interested parties may submit an application available from the City Clerk's Office on or before noon on Wednesday, November 14, 2018. Applications will appear in the public agenda at which time the commission will discuss recommendations, and may make nominations and vote on appointments.

The function and duty of the Historic District Commission is to advise the City Commission with respect to the proper development of the City with primary emphasis upon the City’s established historic districts, sites, properties and historic resources. The Commission is also authorized to recommend for the guidance of the City Commission amendments to the City Code relating to the control and development of lands within historic districts.

### Criteria/Qualifications of Open Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/ Qualifications of Open Position</th>
<th>Date Applications Due (by noon)</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • A majority of the members shall have a clearly demonstrated interest in or knowledge of historic preservation.  
• Must be a resident | 11/14/2018 | 11/19/2018 |

**NOTE:** All members of boards and commissions are subject to the provisions of City of Birmingham City Code Chapter 2, Article IX, Ethics and the filing of the Affidavit and Disclosure Statement.
2017 Rooftop valet utilization increased due to the Park Street Paving Project.
## MONTHLY PARKING PERMIT REPORT

For the month of: August 2018  
Date Compiled: September 18, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pierce</th>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Peabody</th>
<th>N.Old Wooc</th>
<th>Chester</th>
<th>Lot #6/$210</th>
<th>Lot #6/$150</th>
<th>South Side</th>
<th>Lot 8</th>
<th>3501 Woodward</th>
<th>Lot 12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1. Total Spaces**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pierce</th>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Peabody</th>
<th>N.Old Wooc</th>
<th>Chester</th>
<th>Lot #6/$210</th>
<th>Lot #6/$150</th>
<th>South Side</th>
<th>Lot 8</th>
<th>3501 Woodward</th>
<th>Lot 12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. Daily Spaces**

3. Monthly Spaces

4. Monthly Permits Authorized

5. Permits - end of previous month

6. Permits - end of month

7. Permits - available at end of month

8. Permits issued in month includes permits effective 1st of month

9. Permits given up in month

10. Net Change

11. On List - end of month*

12. Added to list in month

13. Withdrawn from list in month (w/o permit)

14. Average # of weeks on list for permits issued in month

15. Transient parker occupied

16. Monthly parker occupied

17. Total parker occupied

18. Total spaces available at 1pm on Wednesday 8/22

19. "All Day" parkers paying 5 hrs. or more

A: Weekday average. B: Maximum day

20. Utilization by long term parkers

---

(1) Lot #6 does not have gate control, therefore no transient count available  
(2) (Permits/Oversell Factor + Weekday Avg.) / Total Spaces  
Average Maximum day not available currently in Skidata  
** Unique individuals represent the actual number of unique people on the wait list regardless of how many structures they have requested.
### Birmingham Parking System
#### Transient & Free Parking Analysis
#### Months of August 2017 & August 2018

**August 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GARAGE</th>
<th>TOTAL CARS</th>
<th>FREE CARS</th>
<th>CASH REVENUE</th>
<th>% FREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEABODY</td>
<td>18,114</td>
<td>10,396</td>
<td>$55,518.00</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>18,434</td>
<td>9,457</td>
<td>$47,688.00</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHESTER</td>
<td>7,833</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>$54,356.07</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD</td>
<td>14,555</td>
<td>7,091</td>
<td>$39,876.00</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE</td>
<td>30,218</td>
<td>15,426</td>
<td>$78,247.00</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CARS</td>
<td>89,154</td>
<td>45,235</td>
<td>$275,685.07</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**August 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GARAGE</th>
<th>TOTAL CARS</th>
<th>FREE CARS</th>
<th>CASH REVENUE</th>
<th>% FREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEABODY</td>
<td>17,851</td>
<td>10,051</td>
<td>$28,386.02</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>21,696</td>
<td>9,618</td>
<td>$49,665.02</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHESTER</td>
<td>7,874</td>
<td>2,661</td>
<td>$49,817.03</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD</td>
<td>13,536</td>
<td>6,227</td>
<td>$34,215.02</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE</td>
<td>27,771</td>
<td>13,586</td>
<td>$67,893.03</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CARS</td>
<td>88,728</td>
<td>42,143</td>
<td>$229,976.12</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BREAKDOWN:**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CARS</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE CARS</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH REVENUE</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Structure Occupancy at 1pm Tuesday-Thursday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4   Chester-72</td>
<td>5   Chester-51</td>
<td>6   Chester-40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.O.W.-130</td>
<td>N.O.W.-36</td>
<td>N.O.W.-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Park-5</td>
<td>Park-8</td>
<td>Park-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peabody-49</td>
<td>Peabody-28</td>
<td>Peabody-43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pierce-74</td>
<td>Pierce-56</td>
<td>Pierce-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11  Chester-13</td>
<td>12  Chester-16</td>
<td>13  Chester-91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Park-15</td>
<td>Park-10</td>
<td>Park-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peabody-88</td>
<td>Peabody-86</td>
<td>Peabody-71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pierce-138</td>
<td>Pierce-114</td>
<td>Pierce-109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18  Chester-55</td>
<td>19  Chester-53</td>
<td>20  Chester-62</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.O.W.-62</td>
<td>N.O.W.-88</td>
<td>N.O.W.-78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Park-13</td>
<td>Park-24</td>
<td>Park-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peabody-46</td>
<td>Peabody-55</td>
<td>Peabody-31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pierce-21</td>
<td>Pierce-62</td>
<td>Pierce-67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25  Chester-31</td>
<td>26  Chester-32</td>
<td>27  Chester-66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.O.W.-57</td>
<td>N.O.W.-78</td>
<td>N.O.W.-93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Park-3</td>
<td>Park-52</td>
<td>Park-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peabody-33</td>
<td>Peabody-28</td>
<td>Peabody-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pierce-110</td>
<td>Pierce-94</td>
<td>Pierce-77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>Valet-2 cars</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Labor Day-Closed</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>Valet-2 cars</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chester Street Structure**

Garage full list

**SEPTEMBER 2018**
## N. Old Woodward Garage

### September 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
<td>Garage not filled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SEPTEMBER 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
Structure did not fill.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Labor Day-Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Valet-5 cars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Structure Occupancy at 1 pm Tuesday-Thursday
Average Available Spaces - September 2018

Chester  N. Old Woodward  Park  Peabody  Pierce

Tue  Wed  Thur

43  56  23  54  85
38  61  21  28  82
65  68  9  49  86

86  82  86
Parking Full Status by Structure

September 2018 Business Days Only (M-Friday)

- Pierce St.: 0
- Peabody St.: 0
- Park St.: 0
- N. Old Woodward: 0
- Chester: 0

- Rooftop valet utilized 1 day
- Rooftop valet utilized 4 days
- Rooftop valet utilized 2 days

Total Occurrences by structure of being full 1-4 hrs
Park Street Structure
Valet Assist Data - Sept. 2017 - Sept. 2018

- Days valet assisted to keep garage open
- Business days valet open, Mon-Friday
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Chester(880)</th>
<th>N.O.W.(745)</th>
<th>Park(811)</th>
<th>Peabody(437)</th>
<th>Pierce(706)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/4/2018</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/2018</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/6/2018</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/7/2018</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/8/2018</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/2018</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2018</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2018</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2018</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/2018</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/2018</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15/2018</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/2018</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2018</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18/2018</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Chester(880)</td>
<td>N.O.W.(745)</td>
<td>Park(811)</td>
<td>Peabody(437)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/2018</td>
<td>10am</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11am</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12pm</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2pm</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Chester(880)</th>
<th>N.O.W.(745)</th>
<th>Park(811)</th>
<th>Peabody(437)</th>
<th>Pierce(706)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/20/2018</td>
<td>10am</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11am</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12pm</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2pm</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Chester(880)</th>
<th>N.O.W.(745)</th>
<th>Park(811)</th>
<th>Peabody(437)</th>
<th>Pierce(706)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2018</td>
<td>10am</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11am</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12pm</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2pm</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Chester(880)</th>
<th>N.O.W.(745)</th>
<th>Park(811)</th>
<th>Peabody(437)</th>
<th>Pierce(706)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/22/2018</td>
<td>10am</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11am</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12pm</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2pm</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Chester(880)</th>
<th>N.O.W.(745)</th>
<th>Park(811)</th>
<th>Peabody(437)</th>
<th>Pierce(706)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/23/2018</td>
<td>10am</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11am</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12pm</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2pm</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Chester(880)</th>
<th>N.O.W.(745)</th>
<th>Park(811)</th>
<th>Peabody(437)</th>
<th>Pierce(706)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2018</td>
<td>10am</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11am</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12pm</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2pm</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Chester(880)</th>
<th>N.O.W.(745)</th>
<th>Park(811)</th>
<th>Peabody(437)</th>
<th>Pierce(706)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2018</td>
<td>10am</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11am</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12pm</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2pm</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Chester(880)</th>
<th>N.O.W.(745)</th>
<th>Park(811)</th>
<th>Peabody(437)</th>
<th>Pierce(706)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/26/2018</td>
<td>10am</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11am</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12pm</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2pm</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Chester(880)</th>
<th>N.O.W.(745)</th>
<th>Park(811)</th>
<th>Peabody(437)</th>
<th>Pierce(706)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2018</td>
<td>10am</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11am</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12pm</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2pm</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Chester(880)</th>
<th>N.O.W.(745)</th>
<th>Park(811)</th>
<th>Peabody(437)</th>
<th>Pierce(706)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/28/2018</td>
<td>10am</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11am</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12pm</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2pm</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>10am</td>
<td>11am</td>
<td>12pm</td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>2pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4/2018</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/2018</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/6/2018</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>793</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/7/2018</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2018</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2018</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2018</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/2018</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/2018</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>758</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2018</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18/2018</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/2018</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20/2018</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2018</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2018</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2018</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/26/2018</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2018</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28/2018</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Park Occupancy-811 Spaces
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>10am</th>
<th>11am</th>
<th>12pm</th>
<th>1pm</th>
<th>2pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/4/2018</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/2018</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/6/2018</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/7/2018</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2018</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2018</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2018</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/2018</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/2018</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2018</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18/2018</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/2018</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20/2018</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2018</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2018</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2018</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/26/2018</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2018</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28/2018</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: September 13, 2018

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: J. Cherilynn Mynsberge, City Clerk

SUBJECT: County Commission Ad-Hoc Committee on Election Infrastructure Report

Following the August 7, 2018 Primary Election the Birmingham City Commission adopted a Resolution requesting the Oakland County Board of Commissioners investigate the actions, causes, and impacts of the role of the Oakland County Clerk’s Office in administering the August 7, 2018 Primary Election. Birmingham was not the only Oakland County jurisdiction which experienced ballot shortages in August. In response to concerns expressed by election officials, city and township officials, and voters, the Oakland County Board of Commissioners created a bipartisan Ad-Hoc Committee on Election Infrastructure to review issues which occurred during the Election and to recommend improvements to the system.

The Committee released its report on September 26, 2018. The full report is attached for your review.
REPORT ON BALLOT SHORTAGES AND PROBLEMS RELATED TO PRIMARY ELECTION 2018

September 26, 2018

Ad-Hoc Committee on Election Infrastructure

Commissioner Tom J. Berman, Co-Chair
Commissioner Nancy Quarles, Co-Chair
Commissioner Marcia Gershenson
Commissioner Adam Kochenderfer
September 26, 2018

To the Members of the Board of Commissioners

Dear Colleagues,

We are pleased to present this report and recommendations to the Oakland County Board of Commissioners for your consideration. Our charge, to conduct an in-depth assessment of the elections system infrastructure, processes and procedures relative to ability to manage the historically high levels of voter turnout, has been completed. We believe the recommendations provided within the report are fair and balanced.

We wish to thank the Oakland County Clerk, the Oakland County Director of Elections and Oakland County’s local city and township clerks, as well as the many precinct workers, voters and citizens, who provided valuable insight as we conducted this review.

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled, "No right is more precious in a free country than that of having a voice in the election of those who make the laws under which, as good citizens, we must live." Let us work together to improve our elections in the spirit of ensuring every voter’s voice will be heard.

Sincerely,

Tom J. Berman
Oakland County Commissioner, District #5

Nancy Quarles
Oakland County Commissioner, District #17

Adam Kochenderfer
Oakland County Commissioner, District #15

Marcia Gershenson
Oakland County Commissioner, District #13

cc: Secretary of State Ruth Johnson
    Oakland County Clerk Lisa Brown
    Oakland County Elections Director Joe Rozell
    Oakland County Township and City Clerks
    Oakland County Police Chiefs Association
    Oakland County Homeland Security Division
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COMMITTEE SUMMARY

OVERVIEW

The Ad-Hoc Committee on Election Infrastructure has conducted an extensive review of the events of the August 7, 2018 Primary Election. The Committee sought and received input from election administrators, voters and other interested parties to gain a comprehensive understanding of the issues and consider recommendations for improvements to the Oakland County election system. The Committee received surveys from 48 local municipal clerks, 166 precinct election workers and 33 voters impacted by the events on Election Day. Two public forums were held at which information was shared by the County Clerk, Director of Elections, Board of Canvassers, local clerks, election workers and citizens.

EVENTS OF AUGUST 7, 2018 PRIMARY ELECTION

The combined survey data and reports submitted to the Committee were utilized to develop an analysis of the type and extent of the problems experienced on Election Day. Based on this information, we estimate **approximately 75 precincts completely exhausted supplies of ballots** during Election Day, requiring implementation of emergency balloting procedures. We further estimate **approximately 140 precincts experienced shortages but were successfully resupplied with ballots during Election Day**. The lack of available ballots can be attributed to long standing ballot ordering practices that were heavily reliant on historic voting behavior patterns. Certain municipalities, and precincts within municipalities, experienced unprecedented voter turnout growth, exposing an increasingly unpredictable political environment. Local clerks and precinct workers struggled to manage an increasingly widespread problem in the late afternoon and early evening hours, and their actions taken during the crisis ultimately had a significant impact on delays experienced by voters. Many valuable lessons about emergency preparedness and response can be gained from this experience.

RECOMMENDATIONS

FUND ADEQUATE BALLOT SUPPLIES AND WORK COLLABORATIVELY WITH LOCAL CLERKS TO DETERMINE APPROPRIATE NUMBER OF BALLOTS NEEDED IN THEIR COMMUNITIES

We recommend that the county budget be amended to authorize sufficient funding for the County Clerk to provide ballots for up to 100% of registered voters in future primary elections. We also recommend that the County Clerk develop a new procedure for ballot allocation that involves working collaboratively with local clerks to utilize their professional judgement regarding the needs of their respective communities and precincts.

UTILIZE TECHNOLOGY TO DEVELOP BETTER PLANNING TOOLS

We request that the Secretary of State provide county elections staff access to absentee voter data to improve election planning capabilities. We encourage the Elections Division to utilize this data to develop an absentee voter tracker program that can be integrated with historical voter data to assist with more accurate forecasting of voter turnout levels.
MINIMIZE BALLOT SPOILAGE
The County Clerk has investigated the unusually high number of spoiled ballots that occurred in some precincts in Oakland County. We recommend that the Clerk forward the results of this investigation to the Bureau of Elections and to the local clerks, along with any recommendations the Clerk may deem appropriate for addressing these issues prior to the next federal primary election.

The Committee supports approving the Clerk’s request for $25,000 for voter education directed at reducing the number of spoiled ballots in primary elections. We recommend that this campaign be targeted to the communities and precincts that experienced high ballot spoilage rates during the August 7, 2018 Primary Election.

We also recommend the State Legislature consider legislation returning the political party logos (vignettes) to the ballot design.

PLAN FOR ELECTION DAY EMERGENCIES
We believe that the situation on Election Day could have been mitigated had there been a clearly understood, unified response plan prepared by election officials. We recommend that the Elections Division, in partnership with the Oakland County Clerks Association, offer to host a training session to discuss the creation and implementation of a unified response plan for future ballot shortages. We recommend that local clerks communicate the problems and successes they experienced on Election Day in this forum, and that the Secretary of State’s Bureau of Elections be invited to participate to address questions and conduct any necessary training.

We are of the opinion, based on our analysis, that the Voter Assist Terminals (VATs) are not an appropriate means for managing ballot shortage emergencies at the precinct level except on a short-term basis. Therefore, we further recommend that this policy be communicated to precinct workers at their next available training sessions.

IMPROVE COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTION DAY SUPPORT NETWORK
We believe opportunities exist to improve communications and resources available to election officials in the event of an emergency during an election in the future. We request that the Oakland County Clerks Association and Elections Division invite the Oakland County Chiefs of Police and the Oakland County Homeland Security Division to discuss opportunities for greater partnership and planning for emergencies. We also recommend that all polling locations be shared with emergency response and law enforcement officials.

EXPLORE SOUTH OAKLAND ELECTION DAY OPERATIONS CENTER
Reaching local clerks and precincts in a timely manner was another problem on Election Day. Having a presence close to the situation in the southern population centers of the county may be useful. In the long run, supplying an emergency ballot printer on site with quick access to these local communities may be more cost effective than over estimating on ballot orders.
PREVENT ELECTION EQUIPMENT FAILURES AND PROVIDE IMPROVED ELECTION DAY SUPPORT

We request that the County Clerk maintain timely, high quality customer service from the voting equipment vendor in advance of and during elections.

We request that the Secretary of State investigate the problems experienced in Oakland County polling locations with e-poll book failures and the failure in some precincts to continue utilizing e-poll books throughout Election Day.

EXPAND ELECTION WORKER TRAINING AND SUPPORT

We believe our election workers deserve and could benefit from additional coordinated training opportunities. In support of this goal, we recommend that local clerks and the Elections Division partner to offer ongoing election worker training, including more advanced preparedness training for precinct chairs. We suggest that these sessions be organized on a regional basis to be convenient for workers to participate. In support of these cooperative training programs, we recommend that the Board of Commissioners consider providing funding support for this potential initiative.

We also recommend that the Board of Commissioners consider creating a grant program to assist local communities with efforts to recruit new precinct election workers.

Finally, we recommend that the Elections Division and local clerks redouble their efforts in advance of the upcoming election to ensure all workers are properly trained to process voters who attend the polls without photo identification. We received multiple reports of problems experienced by voters who were turned away from the polls.
INTRODUCTION

On August 7, 2018, voters throughout Michigan came to the polls in record breaking numbers for a fall primary election. This historic surge in voter participation was particularly strong in Oakland County, as our countywide turnout climbed higher than in the neighboring counties of Wayne and Macomb. Within Oakland County, several communities and precincts were hardest hit with massive surges of voters coming to the polls. This civic awakening tested an elections system that has become accustomed to voters following long-established, predictable patterns of behavior. As Election Day unfolded and historic numbers of voters turned out, a crisis developed at many polling locations throughout Oakland County. As the available supply of ballots was exhausted by the unexpected turnout, the voting process was significantly delayed for many voters. Voting machine failures, high ballot spoilage rates and other errors compounded the impact of these problems on a system already under unprecedented stress.

At precincts where these problems were most severe, voters waited for an hour or more to cast a ballot, and some voters reported leaving the polls without casting a ballot. As administrators of elections, Oakland County’s local clerks were under significant pressure to manage a crisis they had limited capability to prepare for. County elections staff reacted to the emergency by acting quickly to print and deliver emergency ballot supplies as the list of calls for help kept growing. On the front lines, there were hundreds of precinct election workers who took the brunt of a frustrated electorate and did their best to manage a very difficult situation. In many instances, the quick and appropriate actions of these individuals made all the difference in terms of protecting the rights of voters and getting the voting process back on track in precincts throughout Oakland County.

The right to vote is fundamental to our constitutional system of self-government. As Americans, we cherish our freedom to choose our own leaders by secret ballot, free from intimidation or obstruction. In our nation’s history, these rights have been won and expanded through the courageous acts and sacrifices of brave individuals. We must be mindful that, for many of our fellow citizens, these struggles continue. This election brought many first-time and young voters to the polls. We must work together to rebuild their confidence in the process. Many voters were asked to cast their ballots in a way they are not accustomed to, and some continue to question whether all votes were counted. We must communicate effectively to these voters that their voices were heard. There is evidence that some voters were turned away from the polls or left the polls of their own volition because of excessively long lines and wait times due the ballot shortage. We must work together to ensure this never happens again.

In the immediate aftermath of the election, there was a period of intense debate and speculation about Oakland County’s election problems in the media and at various public forums. Much of the resulting discussion proved to be unhelpful to the overall goal of strengthening the elections process or gaining a better understanding of what occurred. The Board of Commissioners determined the best course of action was to establish a committee to conduct a thorough and independent review of the issues and events related

---

1 Macomb County 29.9%, Wayne County 27.4%. Of Michigan’s most populated counties, only Washtenaw County (34%) matched or exceeded Oakland’s turnout.
to the election. The Board determined this review must be completely free of partisan bias and determined it would appoint an equal number of members from each party.

Our committee was tasked with: “...conducting an in-depth survey of the ability of the elections infrastructure system within Oakland County to manage the historically high levels of voter turnout. The committee shall seek input from voters, poll workers, election administrators, candidates, and other relevant individuals regarding events that occurred during the administration of August 7, 2018 election.” To conclude our work, we were required to issue this report, which summarizes our findings and recommendations, to the full Board of Commissioners within 45 days of our appointment. We are pleased to report that we have concluded our review and are prepared to present a series of recommendations for improving the election process in Oakland County.

**COMMITTEE PROCESS**

Michigan has a de-centralized system of administrating elections that requires the involvement of several layers of individuals in the election process. The Committee felt it was important to gain the perspective of as many participants as possible to: 1) understand what occurred on Election Day; and 2) obtain extensive and valuable feedback regarding potential improvements to the system. The Committee believed it was important to reach out directly to voters for first-hand accounts regarding their experiences at polling locations across the county.

In support of these goals, Board staff were instructed by the Committee to forward surveys to all local clerks that administer federal elections in Oakland County. As a follow up measure, staff conducted phone interviews with local clerks that did not respond to the survey. With the cooperation of local clerks, surveys were also distributed to precinct workers. To reach voters impacted by issues at the polls, an online portal was established on the Board’s website that allowed constituents to submit “Voter Incident Report” forms. News releases announcing the opportunity for voters to report their experiences via the online portal were sent out to local media outlets countywide on August 9 and August 28, 2018. Additionally, social media advertisements were placed in communities identified as experiencing severe ballot shortages.

The Committee also held two open forums – on August 30 in Pontiac and September 12 in Southfield – that offered an opportunity for a thorough, open dialogue regarding election issues. We wish to thank Oakland County Clerk Lisa Brown, County Elections Director Joe Rozell, as well as the members of the Board of Canvassers, the many local township and city clerks, election workers and citizens who attended and offered valuable insights during these public sessions.

In response to our outreach efforts, 48 of the 52 local clerks that administered the primary election returned surveys or responded to phone interview requests; 166 precinct election workers returned surveys, and 33 voters completed Voter Incident Reports via our online portal. The Committee actively sought information about issues at precinct locations and disruptions to the voting process to gain a better understanding of how widespread the problem was and how it was managed. The integration of the information provided by Oakland County voters, precinct workers and local clerks supplied the Committee with a valuable snapshot of what occurred during the August primary election. These insights provided a unique, multi-layered perspective that informed our approach when making practical policy recommendations for a stronger elections system our voters can rely upon.
COMMITTEE STATEMENT

The purpose of our review and recommendations is to build a stronger elections system for future elections in Oakland County. The goal of this process was not to assign blame for the issues that arose in the last election to any individual or office, so no such determination will be made by the Committee or found in this report. While we conducted a thorough review of what occurred, our aim in this effort was to gain insights from that experience, not to second guess the decisions of others with the benefit of hindsight.

We must also recognize that the Board of Commissioners is not in the business of conducting elections, a very complex task in which many complicated issues can potentially arise. To the greatest extent possible, we have attempted to perform a thorough review of this intricate process in a very limited time frame. We respect the independent nature of the offices of the election administrators at the state, county and local level. Nonetheless, significant problems emerged in the most recent primary election that must be addressed. It is our position that involved parties share the goal of ensuring that our elections are run effectively and efficiently. This committee believes our elections are better run and our communities are stronger when all parties work together in a collaborative and transparent manner to solve problems.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

OVERVIEW OF MICHIGAN’S ELECTION ADMINISTRATION PROCESS AND ROLES

Michigan has a decentralized, multi-layered election administration system that relies upon a great deal of cooperation and communication. From the Secretary of State to the local precinct inspectors, everyone must carry out their duties correctly for the election process to function effectively. The election administration responsibilities of the Oakland County Clerk include: printing ballots, supplying state mandated election materials for polling locations, selecting voting machines, managing computer processed election returns and election inspector training for communities with populations under 10,000. The Clerk’s Election Director is the chief administrative officer charged with carrying out these duties.

Local clerks serve on the front lines of administering elections in their communities. They select and train election inspectors; maintain, test and prepare election equipment; oversee the absentee voting and election day polling process and maintain accurate voter registration files. All township clerks are elected officials. City clerks are either elected or appointed officials, depending on their respective city charters. Village clerks do not conduct federal elections. Election inspectors or precinct workers are the citizens appointed in every precinct that are charged with: issuing ballots to registered voters, setting up supplies and utilizing voting equipment, ensuring the election is conducted in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, assisting voters, verifying registration and managing crowds. The first three (3) election inspectors must be at least 18 years of age. Additional inspectors may be 16 or 17 years old. Inspectors are required to be politically balanced by major partisan identification “as nearly as possible.”

The principle function of the Board of Canvassers is to bring closure to the voting process by receiving the balloting materials that were sealed on election night in the individual precincts, and conducting a thorough
Preparation for the election – ordering and allocating ballot supplies

Michigan law grants authority and responsibility for printing and preparing ballots for a federal election to county clerks. Oakland County Clerk Lisa Brown, consistent with the longstanding practice of her predecessors, delegated those responsibilities to the County Elections Director, Joe Rozell.

Decisions regarding ballot ordering must comply with state laws, which provide the guidelines for the minimum number of ballots to be printed per precinct in each election. The law requires ballots for 100% of registered voters in a precinct for a federal general election. Due to historically low turnout levels, the law sets a much lower bar for a federal primary election. In these elections, the minimum standard is no less than 25% more than the total number of voters who participated in the primary election in each precinct four (4) years prior.

After the last primary election, many questions were raised regarding why Oakland County failed to supply precincts with ballots for 100% of registered voters. The decision to order less than 100% was entirely consistent with long-standing, standard Oakland County practices, and is common among nearly all election administration officials. The primary motivation of these election administrators is simply to eliminate unnecessary waste and to save taxpayer funds. Oakland County has conducted 33 separate elections during the current decade. Of those elections, 21 resulted in a 20% or lower voter turnout. For all the scrutiny and criticism, the County Clerk’s office received about their ballot order following the most recent election, they likely would have faced tremendous criticism over the years if millions of dollars in taxpayer funds went in the recycle bin in the form of unused ballots.

The Elections Director has the unenviable task of attempting to forecast voter behavior months in advance of an election on a precinct by precinct basis. When this forecast is accurate, the taxpayers save a lot of money and everything runs smoothly. When the forecast is inaccurate, people are often quick to forget the other times when the Elections Director was right. In a county as large as Oakland, it is a massive undertaking to monitor and forecast voter turnout in 52 communities and 516 precincts. Historic voting patterns, balanced with informed decisions regarding local political factors, has provided a solid foundation for building these forecasts for many years, but it is not an exact science. Shifting absentee ballot requests can give an early indication of an upcoming increase in voter activity. However, the political dynamics in the country and Oakland County are changing very quickly. In the future, election officials will need to shift from a mindset of forecasting to a focus on preparedness.
BALLOT SHORTAGES – RESEARCH & ANALYSIS

EXTENT OF BALLOT SHORTAGES

The integration of information from the County Clerk, Elections Director, Board of Canvassers, local clerks, precinct workers and voters provides the clearest picture available regarding the extent of the ballot shortage issues on Election Day.

Shortages Resupplied with Ballots

In these instances, the supply of ballots was exhausted and subsequently resupplied. Primarily this situation was addressed by local clerks delivering ballots previously reserved for absentee voters or ballots that were originally printed to test voting equipment. In addition, the Elections Division printed and delivered emergency ballot supplies to relieve these shortages. Fortunately, voters realized little to no delays in these precincts as clerks and election workers managed to stay ahead of the impending problems. From the data provided, we estimate approximately 140 precincts reported ballot shortages and were resupplied on Election Day.

In the days that followed the election, there was a great deal of attention focused on the negative aspects of the relationship between some elections officials, but these numbers tell a different story. Once Election Day began, county Elections Division staff worked tirelessly to assist local clerks by delivering emergency ballot supplies and providing support within the capabilities of their limited resources. While no doubt a stressful process, our local clerks stepped up to the challenge and ensured thousands of ballots were delivered to precincts ahead of the curve. Working together, our election officials contained and managed a problem that potentially could have negatively impacted voters in as many as 25% of county polling places.

Total Exhaustion of Ballot Supply

The problems voters experienced on Election Day were most severe when the precinct had completely exhausted their supply of ballots, requiring poll workers to utilize emergency ballot procedures. Disruption to the voting process varied dependent on whether the precinct was resupplied with photocopied ballots or voters were processed using a voting machine primarily designed to assist voters with disabilities. Periods of complete exhaustion of ballot supplies occurred in approximately 75 precincts according to survey data and reports submitted to the Committee.

REASONS FOR BALLOT SHORTAGES

There are several reasons the Committee identified as having contributed to the lack of adequate ballot supplies on Election Day.

Forecasting Ballot Needs for 516 Oakland County Precincts

While we have the benefit knowing the outcome of the election and turnout numbers, the timeline of planning and ordering ballot supplies starts months prior to Election Day. The ballot order is placed in late May/early June because ballots must be delivered by county clerks to local clerks by June 23 to meet absentee voter deadlines. Precinct and absentee ballots are the same, but local clerks are given the option
of having their allocation of absentee ballots be pre-folded for mailing for their convenience. A ballot for one precinct is not transferrable to another, as candidates down to partisan precinct delegates are specific to each precinct. As a result, the allocation of ballots to precincts is a critical step in this process. As the election draws closer, the Elections Director has the option of supplementing the order of ballots as necessary.

In developing his forecast for ballot allocations, Mr. Rozell shared with the Committee that he utilized the 2010 primary election as his initial benchmark for planning for this election. As the last primary featuring an open gubernatorial race (no incumbent candidate in either party’s primary for Governor), this was a reasonable basis to plan for the upcoming election. Mr. Rozell explained that he then adjusted his plan based upon additional factors, including the open congressional primary elections in the county and the national political environment. As you can see below, the near exact voter turnout rate in 2002 and 2010 demonstrates a very consistent voter turnout level pattern.

As the election drew closer, early warning signs of high turnout came in many forms and Mr. Rozell supplemented his ballot order. Many local clerks contacted the Elections Division requesting additional ballots due to increased activity among absentee voters, spoiled ballots and the mood of the electorate. In total, the Elections Division ordered 437,000 ballots – the equivalent of one ballot for approximately 46% of Oakland County’s registered voters. The additional ballot order proved insufficient to meet demand as the increase in turnout was not distributed evenly among Oakland County’s precincts. While only 324,000 or 34% of voters came to the polls on August 7, 2018, they often came in highly concentrated geographic pockets of surging turnout growth. In other areas of the county that traditionally have experienced high voter turnout, these numbers did not follow the trend and in some instances even dropped.
Volatile Political Environment Shifted Turnout Geography

The 2018 primary election demonstrated the challenge of making precinct ballot allocations during a period of rapidly shifting political dynamics. To gain a better understanding of those shifting dynamics and how the geography of turnout changed, it is helpful to take a closer look at the benchmark 2010 primary election against the results of the 2018 primary. These results provide valuable insight into why ballot shortages occurred and how we can be better prepared in the future. The precinct map below is a good visual presentation of the shifts within the county.

Cities in southeast and south Oakland County were hardest hit with surging turnout. Many of the same communities also had the most significant problems with ballot shortages on Election Day.

**Municipalities with largest turnout percentage increase comparable to the 2010 Primary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ferndale</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathrup Village</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Ridge</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Southfield</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novi Township</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Woods</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkley</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Novi</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Royal Oak</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list does not include many communities that had precincts with double digit turnout percentages, including West Bloomfield Township, Farmington Hills, Troy, Novi, Commerce Township, White Lake Township, Rochester Hills, Birmingham and others. In Ferndale’s Precinct #1, the number of voters casting a
ballot jumped from 357 to 1,219, a 241% increase in voter turnout. In the City of Royal Oak, 10 precincts experienced turnout increases of 300 to 500 voters.

Human Error

Problems occurred in precincts on Election Day that may have compounded or been the source of the ballot shortages in some precincts. During the process of conducting the canvass of votes, the County Clerk, Elections Director and Board of Canvassers took a closer look at many of these issues. These issues are broadly categorized as “human error.” They are mistakes made by either election officials or voters that contributed to the depletion of available ballots.

- **Discovery of Un-Opened Ballots**
  
  The Board of Canvassers, County Clerk and Elections Division reported to the Committee that in approximately five (5) precincts, packs of unopened ballots were discovered during the canvassing process. These packs of 100 uncast ballots may have helped these precincts avoid ballot shortages altogether or at least helped significantly reduce voting delays.

- **Ballot Spoilage**
  
  A contributing factor to ballot shortages was an abnormally high rate of spoiled ballots in some precincts. Numerous precincts recorded 100-200 spoiled ballots, reducing the number of available ballots for the remaining voters in these precincts.

**PLANNING AND RESPONSE - ELECTION DAY EMERGENCIES**

**RESPONSE TO BALLOT SHORTAGES**

The elections system in Oakland County was placed under intense strain on August 7, 2018. In any crisis, strengths and weaknesses are exposed. The management of this election emergency was a valuable opportunity to assess the response at all levels, gain insights and provide recommendations for building a stronger election system.

When a precinct completely exhausts their supply of ballots, there are limited options available to continue the voting process. The lack of a uniform response resulted in varying degrees of success eliminating delays for voters.

While we found many examples of county, local and precinct election officials stepping up to make a difference on August 7, 2018, there are two (2) that we would like to highlight for the purpose of demonstrating the value of quick, appropriate action and planning for emergencies.

To illustrate the value of quick implementation of proper emergency balloting procedures, we wish to commend the City of Ferndale and their City Clerk, Marne McGrath:
As has been noted in earlier in this document, no community had a larger surge in voter turnout growth by percentage. By early evening, six (6) of nine (9) Ferndale precincts had completely exhausted their supply of ballots. The City Clerk, Marne McGrath implemented emergency balloting procedures, mobilizing staff to assist with photocopying and delivering ballots out to precincts (even Mayor Dave Coulter was called into service). The photocopied ballots immediately addressed the problem at polling locations. The number of photocopied ballots cast by voters throughout the evening required three (3) days to process after Election Day. It is evident that Ms. McGrath and her elections team made all the difference in ensuring countless Ferndale voters had their voices heard.

In an emergency, there is no substitute for solid preparation and good planning. Local clerks are put in a difficult position when planning for an election because they can’t determine how many ballots are ordered for their community. The City Clerk in Royal Oak, Melanie Halas, was determined to be prepared for the election regardless of how many ballots she received:

Melanie Halas, City Clerk of Royal Oak, noticed a sharp increase in absentee ballot activity in her community. She requested more ballots from the County but, even with the late supplemental order, she didn’t feel comfortable that the supplies were adequate to meet demand. Increasingly concerned, Ms. Halas took matters into her own hands a week prior to the election and established an effective back-up plan by copying numbered ballots onto blank ballot paper ordered for VAT machines (see below). By noon on Election Day, Ms. Halas reported most precincts had exhausted their supplies, requiring implementation of her back-up plan. It is apparent, for much of Election Day, a large portion of the City of Royal Oak’s precincts relied upon Ms. Halas’ back-up plan ballots to continue operating. Her foresight and determination saved the day in Royal Oak.

The Committee solicited and received comments from many voters and election workers that were impacted by ballot shortages. It is noteworthy that in these two municipalities, which experienced the combination of surging voter turnout and near complete exhaustion of ballot supplies, we received only positive feedback regarding their management of these issues. It is not possible to share all the positive examples of individuals who demonstrated exemplary leadership and quick thinking on August 7, 2018.

A brief explanation of emergency balloting procedures when ballot supplies are exhausted:

- **Voter Assist Terminal (VAT)**
  
  Voter Assist Terminal (VAT) machines are ballot marking devices designed to assist voters in need of special accommodations for hearing, visual, physical and other disabilities. Voters make selections on a computer and the machine prints a ballot after the voter has finalized their choices.

- **Photocopy Duplication**
  
  Local clerks utilized an original or sample ballot from the precinct to produce photocopies. When a voter casts their ballot on a photocopied ballot it cannot be processed by the ballot tabulator. The ballot is placed in a secured auxiliary bin under the tabulator. These ballots are tabulated and added to the vote totals during the canvassing process. While less than ideal in some respects, this emergency balloting procedure is the only appropriate means to end the disruption at the precinct and ensure all voters can be accommodated. We received questions about this process and voters
expressed concerns regarding whether ballots were counted. The Secretary of State’s Election Official’s Manual provides instructions to local clerks for photocopy duplication as the recommended procedure when a precinct exhausts their supply of ballots.

Invariably, many of the worst problems experienced by voters were in precincts where voters cast their ballots on the VAT machines. While helpful to keep a precinct operating for short periods, the VAT is clearly not appropriate as the sole balloting device for a precinct. The time interval for each voter to utilize the machine essentially limits a precinct to processing approximately 15 to 20 voters an hour. Extended reliance on the VATs resulted in long lines, individuals leaving the polls without casting a ballot and incredible stress on precinct workers.

We cannot account for every precinct and situation, but much of the feedback we received from local clerks on this issue related to conflicting directions and communication problems on Election Day. A memo sent that morning from the Elections Division provided direction to utilize the VAT and to order emergency ballot supplies in the event of shortages (see below). Unfortunately, ballot shortages became widespread, overwhelming the Elections Divisions’ limited staff. Clerks reported they had trouble reaching Elections staff on the phone. Some clerks took measures into their own hands at this point, and others continued to seek help from the County.

“Ballot Supply – It’s important to monitor your ballot supply throughout the day to make certain the supply is adequate based on your individual precinct turnout. Please notify us as soon as possible if you need additional ballots printed. Also, remember, the touch writer (VAT) can print blank ballots if necessary and you can use any blank test or folded ballots as well until we are able to bring you additional ballots.”

Clerks ran into a variety of problems in their attempts to quickly generate copies of ballots. Ballots are large and do not fit on standard copy machines. Different clerks employed successful and creative solutions to overcome these barriers. We believe training and sharing knowledge gained from this experience would be valuable for all concerned in the event this situation should re-occur.

Ballot transportation problems were also addressed in survey information. Traffic jams proved an impediment to speedy delivery of back-up ballot supplies in some instances. We hope that in future emergencies, law enforcement and emergency services personnel are fully utilized to assist in the delivery of emergency election supplies.

Elections are a critical government service and interruptions to the voting process should be considered an emergency worthy of significant planning and public resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. FUND ADEQUATE BALLOT SUPPLIES AND WORK COLLABORATIVELY WITH LOCAL CLERKS TO DETERMINE APPROPRIATE NUMBER OF BALLOTS NEEDED IN THEIR COMMUNITIES

Oakland County’s local city and township clerks serve on the front lines of election administration in their respective communities. As we move forward to meet the challenges of this rapidly changing political
environment, we will need an elections system that is flexible and capable of responding quickly to developing trends. Local clerks have their finger on the pulse of their electorate and are best equipped to monitor changes within local precincts. They are an underutilized resource and can be tapped to improve the process of accurately allocating ballot order amounts and ensuring we are prepared for future elections. Our elections are best conducted on the basis of mutual respect, excellent communication and teamwork. The Committee believes Oakland County’s centralized process of determining ballot allocations no longer represents the best model, despite the advantages to the County for controlling costs and managing the process.

The Committee recommends that the Board of Commissioners approve an amendment to the budget to ensure funding is available to order ballots for up to 100% of registered voters in every precinct in all future primary elections. Further, we request that the County Clerk develop a new policy and procedure for ballot allocation that involves working collaboratively with local clerks to utilize their professional judgement regarding the needs of their respective communities and precincts.

2. UTILIZE TECHNOLOGY TO DEVELOP BETTER PLANNING TOOLS
While this election exposed the potential pitfalls of an overreliance on past election data, there is also evidence that careful observation and analysis of past data can provide “early warning signs.” Absentee ballot requests are often utilized as a leading indicator of turnout for an upcoming election by election administrators. With the benefit of time to study data closely, we can see some of this evidence leading up to the 2018 primary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Increase – Absentee Ballots Cast in 2010 Primary to Absentee Ballots Requests/Issued for 2018 Primary Election</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ferndale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Southfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A broken link exists in our current process that is limiting the usefulness of this data. The individuals tasked under state law with ordering ballots, county clerks and their staff, lack direct access to absentee voter data. As the process currently works, local clerks monitor changes and communicate with their county clerks to request supplementary orders. Far too often there are opportunities for communications to break down. We believe the Secretary of State should grant direct access to absentee voter data to assist county elections officials with forecasting turnout and planning ballot orders.
If Oakland County is granted access to this data, we must recognize the task of matching up this data with the historic voting patterns of 516 precincts would be daunting. We believe technology can provide a smart solution to this dilemma. A tool that tracks absentee ballot activity integrated with precinct level statistics would have the potential to assist in the process of forecasting election turnout levels and planning ballot order needs.

We request that the Secretary of State provide access to absentee voter data to county elections staff to improve election planning capabilities. We encourage the Elections Division to utilize this data to develop an absentee voter tracker program integrated with historical voter data to assist with forecasting turnout levels and improve election planning.

3. MINIMIZE BALLOT SPOILAGE

The County Clerk conducted a review of the results of the canvass and the precincts with an abnormally high ballot spoilage rate. The results indicated that spoilage rates for a typical August primary election are around 2%. This is due primarily to voters who “split their ticket” and vote in more than one party primary. In this election, certain precincts had very high spoilage rates of 10% to 22%. Some voters in these precincts were found to have spoiled as many as four (4) or five (5) ballots.

In isolating these precincts, the County Clerk identified many of the contributing issues: unusually high percentage of first time primary voters, missing voting instructions and a large number of voters surrendering absentee ballots at precincts, opting instead to vote in person.

The County Clerk has requested that the Board of Commissioners approve $25,000 in funding for a voter education campaign targeted at minimizing ballot spoilage in advance of the next federal primary election. The proposal stated potential marketing materials might include stickers on the newspapers delivered by US mail, bookmarks and posters for libraries and community centers, and Public Service Announcements.

A local clerk that experienced high spoilage rates shared with the Committee that a significant contributing issue in her community was a change in state law that required the removal of the party logos (vignettes) at the top of ballot.

We recommend that the County Clerk forward the results of the ballot spoilage investigation to the Bureau of Elections and respective local clerks along with any recommendations for improvements. The Committee supports approving the Clerk’s request for $25,000 for voter education directed at reducing the number of spoiled ballots in primary elections. We recommend that this campaign be targeted to the communities and precincts that experienced high ballot spoilage rates during the August 7th Primary.
We also recommend the State Legislature consider legislation returning the political party logos to the ballot design to promote clarity for primary voters and prevent related spoilage.

4. PLAN FOR ELECTION DAY EMERGENCIES
The lack of a clear, unified plan in the event of ballot shortage emergency was evident on Election Day. As a result, an opportunity to recover quickly in some communities and precincts was lost and voting delays were exacerbated. Many opportunities to learn from this experience, develop plans, policies, improved communication and training exist.

We recommend that the Elections Division offer to host a session, in partnership with the Oakland County Clerks Association, to discuss a unified response plan for ballot shortages. We recommend that local clerks discuss problems and successes they experienced on Election Day and that an invitation be extended to the Secretary of State’s Bureau of Elections to address questions and conduct any necessary training. It is also our recommendation that VAT machines are inadequate and inappropriate as the sole emergency balloting device upon the complete exhaustion of ballot supplies except for short term periods. We recommend this policy be communicated to election workers during their next training sessions.

5. IMPROVE COMMUNICATION AND ELECTION DAY SUPPORT NETWORK
Communications breakdown brought to light questions about our overall preparedness for any number of emergencies that may occur on an election day. We strongly encourage the Elections Division and Oakland County Clerks Association to explore opportunities to build a stronger relationship with law enforcement and homeland security officials to develop a disaster response plan and gain a better understanding how their emergency planning/response tools could be used to assist elections officials.

We request that the Oakland County Clerks Association and Elections Division invite the Oakland County Chiefs of Police and the Oakland County Homeland Security Division to discuss opportunities for greater partnership and planning for emergencies. We also recommend that all polling locations be shared with our emergency response and law enforcement officials.
6. EXPLORE SOUTH OAKLAND ELECTION DAY OPERATIONS CENTER
Reaching local clerks and precincts in a timely manner was another problem on Election Day. Having a presence close to the situation in the southern population centers of the county may be of assistance. In the long run, supplying an emergency ballot printer on site with quick access to these local communities may be more cost effective than over estimating on ballot orders.

To assist with the rapid deployment of staff and resources on Election Day, we recommend that the County consider creating an additional operations center in southern Oakland County. We further recommend that the Elections Division assess the viability and cost of installing an additional ballot printer at this location.

7. PREVENT EQUIPMENT FAILURES
Ballot shortages were not the only source of problems at polling locations. Many precincts experienced a variety of issues with voting machines and election equipment. In some instances, these issues led to interruptions or delays in the voting process.

We request that the County Clerk maintain quality and timely customer service from their voting equipment vendor in advance of and during elections.

Numerous precincts also experienced problems with e-poll books. This equipment is maintained and serviced by the Secretary of State. E-poll book failures delayed voting in several precincts. In addition, numerous precinct workers ceased using their e-poll books during the process of conducting the election. The failure to maintain a complete record of voters who cast ballots in these precincts is a significant discrepancy worthy of note.

We request that the Secretary of State investigate the problems experienced in Oakland County polling locations with e-poll book failures and the failure in some precincts to continue utilizing e-poll books throughout Election Day.

8. EXPAND ELECTION WORKER TRAINING AND SUPPORT
It is evident we are blessed with many dedicated election workers who are passionate about the election process and protecting the rights of the voters in their communities. They have offered a tremendous amount
of insight through their surveys. While many expressed disappointments in the events of the day, the clear majority expressed a strong desire for this process to move forward in a productive way rather than remaining focused on the past.

The job of being an election inspector is becoming increasingly complex as more technology and rules are introduced into the process. Non-traditional voters and unpredictable voter behavior will be testing their abilities in new ways. Our traditional approaches to election worker training may need to be adjusted to meet these challenges.

We believe our election workers can be aided through additional coordinated training opportunities. In this support of the goal we recommend that local clerk and the Elections Division partner to offer ongoing election worker training, included more advanced preparedness training for precinct chairs. We suggest that these sessions be organized on a regional basis to be convenient for worker to participate. In support of these cooperative training programs, we recommend that the Board of Commissioners consider providing funding support for this program.

It is increasingly challenging to find young people willing to serve in the role of precinct worker. At a time when the position is becoming more physically and mentally demanding, as well as more technologically dependent, it is important we bring new people into the process.

We recommend that the Board of Commissioners consider creating a grant program to assist local communities with efforts to recruit new precinct election workers.

The primary results indicated an unusually large number of first-time and young voters came to the polls for a mid-term election. We received several troublesome reports on our portal about potential voters being turned away at the polls due to photo identification issues. If correct, in each of these instances poll workers failed to follow proper procedures and the voter’s rights may have been compromised.

We recommend that the Secretary of State, the Elections Division and local clerks redouble their efforts to ensure precinct workers understand the correct procedures to assist voters who attend the polls without photo identification.
DATE: September 27, 2018  
TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager  
FROM: Lauren A. Wood, Director of Public Services  
SUBJECT: CN Maple Road Bridge – Update

I am pleased to provide a brief update, since submitting a Right of Entry (ROE) Application on April 13, 2018 to CN Railroad, on the recent input by CN as well as the next steps regarding the appearance and lighting improvements to the Maple Road bridge.

As you are aware, the past few months, I have been pursuing a meeting on-site with CN Railroad to prompt and expedite a response to the ROE application. Carrie and I met on Tuesday, September 25, 2018 with two CN Railroad representatives. One representative from the bridge group and the second from the public works group. These two groups oversee over 2,000 bridges throughout four States.

We met on-site to determine the process in order to expedite this work. This included finding out what work is acceptable under a ROE permit and what work CN will pay for as part of structural improvements in advance of the City cosmetic improvements.

Here is what we discovered:

- The CN bridge group does not have any plans for work at this location at this time.
- CN will prepare a quote to perform all of the painting work at the bridge; including non-structural concrete repair work (patching the shallow steel wall areas along the pedestrian walkways). Painting will include all concrete surfaces such as the fascia, interior walls, underside columns and wing walls. But, no painting of the ceiling. After examination, by painting all surfaces, the bridge will not look partially done. CN must perform the maintenance on the bridge.
- Based on the quote from CN for the painting work, we can scale down the scope of work, if necessary, depending on the price.
- The electric work (LED lighting of pedestrian passage way) will be the responsibility of the City of Birmingham. This will require a ROE permit.
- The pedestrian sidewalk will be the responsibility of the City of Birmingham. This will require a ROE permit.
- A preliminary estimate from CN to start/perform this work is, at the earliest, the summer of 2019.
- It is estimated it will take thirty (30) work days for CN to complete this project.
- A mural on the bridge is not so easily approved by CN and will have to be investigated further.
The recent Bloomfield Hills bridge improvements with CN was about eight years in the making.

Between now and the project start there will be plenty of administrative tasks to perform, such as securing permits and insurance between both parties. In addition, the City will research pulling electrical to the location and getting recommended lighting options along with preparing a lighting plan for the pedestrian areas of the bridge.

The recommended sequence at this time for the suggested improvements is CN painting the bridge, the City hire the lighting installation and new sidewalk be added to the City’s 2019 sidewalk replacement program. CN does not fund any of this proposed work.

As more details and information becomes available, I will provide you with further updates.