

Join Zoom Meeting: https://us02web.zoom.us/i/81121361761

Dial by Phone: 888-788-0099 US Toll-free

Meeting ID: 811 2136 1761

If you have any questions you may contact the City Clerk's Office by email or phone: <u>aterry@petoskey.us</u> or 231-347-2500

According to the Attorney General, interrupting a public meeting in Michigan with hate speech or profanity could result in criminal charges under several State statutes relating to Fraudulent Access to a Computer or Network (MCL 752.797) and/or Malicious Use of Electronics Communication (MCL 750.540).

According to the US Attorney for Eastern Michigan, Federal charges may include disrupting a public meeting, computer intrusion, using a computer to commit a crime, hate crimes, fraud, or transmitting threatening communications.

Public meetings are being monitored and violations of statutes will be prosecuted.

CITY COUNCIL

October 5, 2020

- 1. <u>Call to Order</u> 7:00 P.M. Virtual meeting from remote locations
- 2. <u>Recitation</u> Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America
- 3. Roll Call
- 4. <u>Proclamation</u> Hear proclamation concerning Indigenous Peoples' Day
- 5. <u>Consent Agenda</u> Adoption of a proposed resolution that would confirm approval of the following:
 - (a) September 21, 2020 regular session City Council meeting minutes
 - (b) Acknowledge receipt of a report concerning certain administrative transactions since September 21, 2020
- 6. <u>Miscellaneous Public Comments</u>
- 7. <u>City Manager Updates</u>
- 8. <u>Old Business</u> Further discussion and possible adoption of the City's proposed 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Plan

9. New Business

- (a) Hear presentation by the City's Parks and Recreation Director concerning forestry assessment and management plan
- (b) Acceptance of the City Manager's report concerning programs and services as proposed by the City's Downtown Management Board for 2021 that would be financed by the levying of special assessments within the Downtown Management Board's territory and adoption of a proposed resolution that would schedule a public hearing for October 19, 2020 to receive comments concerning these recommended programs and services
- (c) Consideration to extend the time period that dining decks be allowed on City streets until November 15, 2020 as recommended by the Downtown Management Board

10. <u>City Council Comments</u>

- 11. <u>Closed Session</u> Adoption of a proposed resolution that would authorize to recess to a closed session, pursuant to Section 8(a) and 8(h) of the Michigan Open Meetings Act, to consider a periodic personnel evaluation of the City Manager and consider material exempt from disclosure
- 12. Adjournment



WHEREAS Indigenous Peoples' Day was first proposed in 1977 by a delegation of Native Nations to the International Conference on Discrimination Against Indigenous Populations in the Americas; and

WHEREAS the United States endorsed the United Nations Declaration of Rights of Indigenous People on December 16, 2010; and

WHEREAS a growing number of cities and towns in the United States have recognized the second Monday of October as "Indigenous Peoples' Day," as an opportunity to celebrate Indigenous heritage and resiliency; and

WHEREAS the City of Petoskey acknowledges that the historic, cultural, and contemporary significance of Indigenous Peoples of the lands that became known as the Americas; and

WHEREAS the City of Petoskey recognizes that long before the City of Petoskey was granted a Charter in 1879, Odawa Bands villages shared this land; and

WHEREAS the City of Petoskey was named after Ignatius Petoskey as a way to honor and respect the thriving Indigenous community of this land; and

WHEREAS the City of Petoskey values the significant contributions made to our community by Indigenous Peoples' knowledge, labor, technology, science, philosophy, arts, resiliency, and the deep cultural contributions that have shaped the character of the City, State, and Nation: and

WHEREAS the City of Petoskey recognizes that Indigenous People continue to contribute to the character, economy, and vitality of the City of Petoskey;

NOW THEREFORE I, John Murphy, Mayor of the City of Petoskey, do hereby proclaim the second Monday in October as Indigenous Peoples' Day in Petoskey.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 5th day of October, 2020

Agen Mayor John Murphy



BOARD:	City Council	
MEETING DATE:	October 5, 2020	PREPARED: October 1, 2020
AGENDA SUBJECT:	Consent Agenda Resolution	
RECOMMENDATION:	That the City Council approve this proposed resolution	

The City Council will be asked to adopt a resolution that would approve the following consent agenda items:

- (1) Draft minutes of the September 21, 2020 regular session City Council meetings; and
- (2) Acknowledge receipt of a report from the City Manager concerning all checks that have been issued since September 21, 2020 for contract and vendor claims at \$1,098,371.51, intergovernmental claims at \$202,479.49, and the September 17 payroll at \$239,975.22 for a total of \$1,540,826.22.

sb Enclosures



Minutes

CITY COUNCIL

September 21, 2020

A regular meeting of the City of Petoskey City Council was held from virtual locations on Monday, September 21, 2020. This meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M.; then, after a recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, a roll call then determined that the following were

Present: John Murphy, Mayor Suzanne Shumway, City Councilmember Brian Wagner, City Councilmember Lindsey Walker, City Councilmember

Absent: Kate Marshall, City Councilmember

Also in attendance were City Manager Rob Straebel, Clerk-Treasurer Alan Terry, Public Works Director Mike Robbins, Downtown Director Becky Goodman and Executive Assistant Sarah Bek.

Hear Slope Failure Study Presentation

Rory Agnew, representative from Baird and Associates gave a detailed presentation on the slope failure study near Arrowhead Shores including proposed concepts and related costs. As the slope failure issues affect the region, elected officials from Resort Township and Emmet County participated in the presentation to get a better understanding of coastal erosion issues in this area and costs of the \$81,000 study have been shared equally by Resort Township, Emmet County and the City of Petoskey.

City Councilmembers inquired if consultants expect more slope failures and where; how erosion is affecting highway and if it will inhibit the road; heard concerns with continued failures how it will affect the homes near Arrowhead Shores and the highway; and thanked Baird and Associates for the detailed report and all other staff and elected officials involved.

Mr. Agnew responded that more failures are expected due to fall storm season and high water levels; that the study focuses on 100-year water level and doing nothing, failure will continue; that MDOT has installed sensors in road and there are no new erosions since installation; and that MDOT continues to monitor roadway.

Emmet County Commissioners inquired on where the cobblestone would be located; if the construction on bluff is causing instability of bluff; and if amour stone is available if project moves forward.

Mr. Agnew reviewed that cobblestone would be located along the entire shoreline area; discussed drainage into slope and stability of slope; and that amour stone is available if needed, but rates have increased due to demand.

A representative from OHM Advisors that helped with the study responded that buildings near the crest and basements could further destabilize slope; that the lake bottom should be stable with cobblestone; and no lake cutting would occur as with a sandy bottom.

The City Manager reviewed that short-term drawings are needed to have conceptual drawings for area along the highway from East Park to Petoskey and that costs associated with conceptual drawings is \$9,000 and both the City of Petoskey and Resort Township have committed to a 1/3 of the cost and Emmet County will be discussing participation at their meeting in October.

Mayor Murphy asked for public comment heard from those in favor of preparing conceptual plans for a safe, alternate route and thanked everyone involved for the development of study.

Consent Agenda - Resolution No. 19447

Following introduction of the consent agenda for this meeting of September 21, 2020, City Councilmember Wagner moved that, seconded by City Councilmember Walker adoption of the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council does and hereby confirms that the draft minutes of the August 17, 2020 regular session and August 31, 2020 special session City Council meetings be and are hereby approved; and

BE IT RESOLVED that receipt by the City Council of a report concerning all checks that had been issued since August 17, 2020 for contract and vendor claims at \$12,741,029.47, intergovernmental claims at \$6,088,460.40, and the August 20 and September 3 payrolls at \$454,527.55, for a total of \$19,284,017.42 be and is hereby acknowledged.

Said resolution was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Shumway, Wagner, Walker, Murphy (4) NAYS: None (0)

Hear Public Comment

Mayor Murphy asked for public comments and there were no public comments.

Hear City Manager Updates

The City Manager reported that City staff continues to explore the feasibility of incorporating solar panels at the Howard Road landfill and staff is working with Tetra-Tech at a cost of \$8,800 to study the potential impacts on the landfill from installing ground-mounted solar panels; that the City recently received a \$179,269 grant for public safety payroll reimbursement through a federal grant to the State to offset some of the costs associated with the COVID response; that the City also received notice of a one-time \$1,000 bonus pay for all public safety officers through the federally funded Coronavirus Aid Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act; reviewed Planning Commission updates from their last meeting including approval of McLaren Hospital signage, postponement of medical marijuana provisioning center special use permit and conditional zoning changes for properties at 501 and 523 East Mitchell Street; that staff met with NCMC representatives to discuss the design of the future Ring Road connecting Howard Street to Atkins Road; that the City's COVID Preparedness and Response Plan and health monitoring forms have been updated and staff continues to strongly enforce social distancing as well as mask use within all City buildings; thanked all Councilmembers for completing the annual City Manager performance evaluation and that since all Councilmembers couldn't be present tonight, the Mayor decided to discuss evaluation in closed session on October 5; reviewed project updates and that Kalamazoo Avenue improvements are scheduled to be completed near the end of October and Jackson Street improvements are slated to be completed around September 28; that Resort Township committed to funding 1/3 of the costs to develop conceptual drawings for a new trail adjacent to the highway from East Park into the City, which total costs developed by Beckett and Raeder are \$9,750 and he would like the City to commit to sharing costs contingent upon the participation of Emmet County; and reviewed that there has been a second slope failure on the Little Traverse Wheelway and anticipates more of these failures in the coming months.

City Councilmembers inquired why parts of Kalamazoo Avenue and Hill Street can't be open to traffic since it is paved; heard inquiries of how solar project study will be funded; inquired on MPPA objectivity on solar array; and who pays for traffic study for medical marijuana provisioning center.

The City Manager responded that Kalamazoo Avenue and Hill Street is not open to traffic due to one layer of asphalt at this time and it is not able to hold traffic; reviewed costs on solar project study and that monies will be used from grants received; that MPPA will be objective on solar array; and that the developer of medical marijuana provisioning center will pay for traffic study if needed, but may be a discussion rather than a study.

Approve Board Appointments – Resolution 19448-19452

Mayor Murphy reviewed that City Council consider the following appointments.

City Councilmember Shumway moved that, seconded by City Councilmember Wagner adoption of the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council does and hereby approves the appointment of Anne Chaffee, 523 College View Drive, to the Compensation Commission for a one-year term ending September 2021.

Said resolution was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Shumway, Wagner, Walker, Murphy (4) NAYS: None (0)

City Councilmember Walker moved that, seconded by City Councilmember Shumway adoption of the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council does and hereby approves the appointment of Anne Srigley, 510 Harvey Street, to the Compensation Commission for a two-year term ending September 2022.

Said resolution was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Shumway, Wagner, Walker, Murphy (4) NAYS: None (0)

City Councilmember Wagner moved that, seconded by City Councilmember Walker adoption of the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council does and hereby approves the appointment of John Holec, 425 Myrtle Street, to the Compensation Commission for a three-year term ending September 2023.

Said resolution was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Shumway, Wagner, Walker, Murphy (4) NAYS: None (0)

City Councilmember Walker moved that, seconded by City Councilmember Shumway adoption of the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council does and hereby approves the appointment of Gordon Bourland, 121 West Lake Street, to the Compensation Commission for a four-year term ending September 2024.

Said resolution was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Shumway, Wagner, Walker, Murphy (4) NAYS: None (0)

City Councilmember Shumway moved that, seconded by City Councilmember Wagner adoption of the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council does and hereby approves the appointment of Deborah Cadieux, 721 Grove Street, to the Compensation Commission for a five-year term ending September 2025.

Said resolution was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Shumway, Wagner, Walker, Murphy (4) NAYS: None (0)

Mayor Murphy reviewed that the reappointment of Eric Yetter to the Planning Commission will not be considered at this meeting since the applicant contacted the Mayor to further discuss the position with him due to his busy schedule.

Discuss 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Plan

The City Manager reviewed that copies of the proposed 2021-2026 CIP were distributed to City Council and Planning Commission in advance of this meeting and the draft plan was posted on the City's website on August 27 with four comments received. The Plan was unanimously accepted and recommended for City Council approval by the Planning Commission on August 20, 2020. The City Manager reviewed that the six-year plan totals \$51.8M in expenditures, with capital spending in 2021 proposed at \$4.5M, of which \$921,500 (20.4%) is anticipated to come from grants and other outside sources of revenue; that if approved, projects will be included within the 2021 proposed annual City budget; and reviewed 2021 projects in detail including a full reconstruction of Greenwood Road from Sheridan Street to Charlevoix Avenue; street repaving and curb restoration on portions of Hill Street, West Jefferson Street and Connable Avenue; miscellaneous pavement preservation and repair for Outlook Street, portions of Harvey Street and Washington Street from Buckley to Franklin Streets: water and wastewater improvements as part of the Greenwood Road project: miscellaneous water and sewer main line replacements; sidewalk and crosswalk construction; electric system-wide upgrades; further studies for a potential solar array project at Howard Road landfill; undergrounding of electric lines focusing on portions of Waukazoo, Rush, Beech and Pearl Streets; reviewed planned motor pool purchases; parking structure engineering for the Saville Lot contingent upon execution of a Brownfield Plan associated with a proposed hotel at Bay and Howard Streets; Sunset Park enhancements; engineered drawings for a redesign of Arlington Park and the Lewis Street area; improvements to the Marina's fuel system; resurfacing 1/3 mile of the Little Traverse Wheelway; coastline improvements at Solanus Beach; and engineered drawings for future bathrooms at River Road Sports Complex. The City Manager gave a brief overview of 2022-2026 projects.

City Councilmembers inquired on the status of the City Hall rooftop solar project; asked for clarification on grants vs. expenditures; heard an inquiry on how projects get on plan when not identified in previous plans; and future funding on park improvements should be discussed and secured for Washington, Lockwood and Curtis Parks.

The City Manager responded that City Hall rooftop solar is in the design stage with installation occurring this fall; reviewed grants vs. expenditures and grants and other revenue sources help fund projects; and that engineering for Saville Lot parking structure was prioritized in 2021 over other identified projects in previous plans due to a new developer proposing a project near Bay and Howard Streets.

City Council deferred action on the proposed CIP and will further discuss at the next regular scheduled meeting.

Approve MDOT Application & Sale of Railroad Right-of-Way – Resolution No. 19453

The City Manager reviewed that over the last year, staff has been working with MDOT Rail Division representatives regarding purchase of the former Pennsylvania Railroad property from Emmet Street to Washington Street for continuation of the Greenway Corridor; that freight demand for rail service north of Sheridan Street and south of Washington Street continues so that rail segment is not for sale at this time; that MDOT completed an appraisal of the land for a fair market value of \$28,500; reviewed how the fair market was determined using the sales comparison approach; that staff is currently having a Phase I Environmental Assessment through Mackinac Environmental Technology, Inc. completed and should be finalized in the next week at a cost of \$2,100; and that if environmental remediation is needed, either MDOT or the City may terminate the purchase agreement.

City Councilmember Walker moved that, seconded by City Councilmember Shumway to approve the application to purchase and agreement of Sale for MDOT railroad right-of-way between Emmet Street and Washington Street in the amount of \$28,500.

Said motion was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Shumway, Wagner, Walker, Murphy (4) NAYS: None (0)

<u>Approve Ballot Language for Mayor and Councilmembers Terms of Office – Resolution No.</u> <u>19454</u>

The Clerk-Treasurer reviewed that City Council adopted a resolution on June 23, 2020 to have the City Attorney prepare ballot language that would revise City Charter provisions establishing a two year term of office for Mayor and a three year term of office for Councilmembers; that the ballot language will also have to be approved by the State's Office of Attorney General and Office of the Governor; that approved ballot language could be placed on the November 2021 General Election ballot, unless City Council elects to hold a special election or one is called by another entity; and if approved by voters, the new terms of office would start with terms beginning in 2023, resulting from the November 2022 election.

City Councilmember Wagner moved that, seconded by City Councilmember Shumway adoption of the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Petoskey, Michigan as follows:

1. The said City Council by vote of 4-0 of its members-elect, pursuant to the authority granted by Act 279 of the Public Acts of 1909, as amended, proposes that section 4.2 of the Charter of the City of Petoskey shall be amended to read as follows:

Section 4.2. Terms of Office.

The mayor shall be elected for a term of one (1) year. For the mayoral term of office beginning in 2023, and for each term of office thereafter, the mayor shall be elected for a term of two (2) years. The councilmembers shall be elected for a term of two (2) years and the terms shall be arranged so that two (2) wards elect a councilmember each year. For councilmember terms beginning in 2023, and for each term of office thereafter, councilmembers shall be elected for a term of three (3) years. Terms shall begin on January 1 of the year following the election.

Provisions of existing section 4.2 of the Charter of the City of Petoskey to be altered by such proposal, if adopted, reads as follows:

Section 4.2. Terms of Office.

The mayor shall be elected for a term of one (1) year. The councilmembers shall be elected for a term of two (2) years and the terms shall be arranged so that two (2) wards elect a councilmember each year. Terms shall begin on January 1 of the year following the election.

- 2. The City Clerk shall forthwith transmit a copy of the proposed amendment to the Governor of the State of Michigan for his/her approval, and transmit a copy of the foregoing statement of purpose of such proposed amendment to the Attorney General of the State of Michigan for his/her approval, as required by law.
- 3. The proposed charter amendment shall be, and the same is hereby ordered to be, submitted to the qualified electors of this City at a general election to be held in the City of Petoskey, the 2nd day of November, 2021, and the City Clerk is hereby directed to give notice of the election and notice of registration therefore in the manner prescribed by law and to do all things and to provide all supplies necessary to submit such charter amendment to the vote of the electors as required by law.

4. The proposed amendment shall be submitted to the electors in the following form, to wit:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 4.2 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF PETOSKEY

Shall Section 4.2 of the Charter be amended to change the terms of the mayor from one year to two years and councilmembers from two to three years, beginning with the terms of office starting January 1, 2023?

Yes () No ()

- 5. The proposed amendment shall be published in full together with the existing charter provisions altered thereby in accordance with the laws of the State of Michigan and the Charter of the City of Petoskey.
- 6. The canvass and determination of the votes of said question shall be made in accordance with the laws of the State of Michigan and the Charter of the City of Petoskey.

Said resolution was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Shumway, Wagner, Walker, Murphy (4) NAYS: None (0)

Approve Social District Application – Resolution No. 19455

The Downtown Director reviewed that on August 17, 2020 Council approved a resolution that established a Social District in Downtown according to a specified map and maintenance and operational plan; that as part of the resolution, five local licensees were approved to apply to the State for a Social District Permit that would allow them to sell alcohol that could be consumed in the Commons Area of the Social District; that moving forward, any local licensee that was not included in the resolution needed to be approved individually by Council before applying to the State; that David Meikle, 425 Michigan Street LLC dba The Back Lot, was asking for approval for a Social District Permit; and that Downtown staff recommended that this request be granted.

City Councilmember Walker moved that, seconded by City Councilmember Wagner to approve the Social District Application for 425 Michigan Street LLC dba The Back Lot.

Said motion was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Shumway, Wagner, Walker, Murphy (4) NAYS: None (0)

Council Comments

Mayor Murphy asked for Council comments and Councilmember Wagner thanked the citizens that volunteer to serve on the City's Boards and Commissions. Mayor Murphy commented on the great city we all live in and expressed that the community continue to stay safe.

There being no further business to come before the City Council, this September 21, 2020, meeting of the City Council adjourned at 9:43 P.M.

John Murphy, Mayor

Alan Terry, Clerk-Treasurer

Check Register - Council Check Issue Dates: 9/17/2020 - 9/30/2020

Page: 1 Sep 30, 2020 12:38PM

GL	Check	Check		Invoice	Check
Period	Issue Date	Number	Payee	GL Account	Amount
09/20	09/23/2020	90522	1000Bulbs	582-590-775.000	1,533.35
09/20	09/23/2020	90523	24/7 Sewer & Drain Cleaning	592-556-802.000	385.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90524	Advance Auto Parts	101-345-775.000	17.23
09/20	09/23/2020	90525	Aegion	592-543-802.000	525.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90526	Aflac	701-000-230.180	728.62
09/20	09/23/2020	90527	AIS CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	101-770-775.000	143.76
09/20	09/23/2020	90528	American Waste	592-551-806.000	325.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90529	AT&T	592-538-850.000	298.01
09/20	09/23/2020	90530	AT&T Long Distance	101-345-850.000	49.12
09/20	09/23/2020	90531	Ballard's Plumbing & Heating	592-545-802.000	615.76
09/20	09/23/2020	90531	Ballard's Plumbing & Heating	592-545-802.000	620.49
09/20	09/23/2020	90531	Ballard's Plumbing & Heating	592-545-802.000	1,101.07
09/20	09/23/2020	90531	Ballard's Plumbing & Heating	592-545-802.000	580.28
09/20	09/23/2020	90532	Beckett & Raeder Inc.	101-770-970.000	1,215.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	101-172-724.000	364.12
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	101-201-724.000	3,422.78
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	101-215-724.000	364.12
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	101-265-724.000	502.49
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	101-268-724.000	1,081.45
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	101-345-724.000	10,341.18
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	101-789-724.000	757.38
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	271-790-724.000	4,151.02
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	514-587-724.000	364.12
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	582-588-724.000	3,422.78
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	592-549-724.000	1,092.38
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	592-560-724.000	1,092.38
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	101-400-724.000	582.60
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	101-441-724.000	1,529.33
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	101-754-724.000	491.57
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	101-756-724.000	1,347.26
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	101-770-724.000	2,366.81
09/20	09/23/2020	90533	Blue Care Network	101-773-724.000	371.41
09/20	09/23/2020	90534	Breed, Matthew	101-345-912.000	210.92
09/20	09/23/2020	90535	Consumers Energy	592-558-920.000	151.81
09/20	09/23/2020	90535	Consumers Energy	592-558-920.000	49.37
09/20	09/23/2020	90535	Consumers Energy	592-558-920.000	79.80
09/20	09/23/2020	90535	Consumers Energy	592-558-920.000	81.93
09/20	09/23/2020	90535	Consumers Energy	592-558-920.000	82.05
09/20	09/23/2020	90535	Consumers Energy	592-558-920.000	92.91
09/20	09/23/2020	90535	Consumers Energy	592-558-920.000	43.14
09/20	09/23/2020	90535	Consumers Energy	202-475-920.000	98.33
09/20	09/23/2020	90535	Consumers Energy	592-558-920.000	432.85
09/20	09/23/2020	90536	Dell Marketing L.P.	101-345-751.000	244.19
09/20	09/23/2020	90537	Derrer Oil Co.	661-598-759.000	1,204.19
09/20	09/23/2020	90538	Dornbos Sign Inc.	202-475-775.000	239.60
09/20	09/23/2020	90539	Drost Landscape	204-470-802.000	240.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90539	Drost Landscape	592-554-802.000	2,134.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90539	Drost Landscape	101-770-802.000	4,444.54
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	592-538-920.000	40.54
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	101-265-924.000	47.26
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	582-593-924.000	39.93
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	101-773-924.000	90.65
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	101-265-924.000	50.94
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	592-538-920.000	37.48
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	592-558-920.000	37.48
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	592-551-920.000	68.66

Check Register - Council Check Issue Dates: 9/17/2020 - 9/30/2020

Page: 2 Sep 30, 2020 12:38PM

GL	Check	Check		Invoice	Check
Period	Issue Date	Number	Рауее	GL Account	Amount
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	592-551-920.000	1,026.88
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	271-790-924.000	41.76
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	592-555-920.000	42.75
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	592-538-920.000	43.59
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	101-345-920.100	51.53
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	271-790-924.000	41.76
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	101-268-924.000	64.38
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	101-770-924.000	48.47
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	514-587-802.100	42.98
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	592-538-920.000	38.09
09/20	09/23/2020	90540	DTE Energy	101-345-920.000	62.54
09/20	09/23/2020	90541	Dunkel Excavating Services Inc.	204-470-802.000	1,900.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90541	Dunkel Excavating Services Inc.	203-464-802.000	320.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90541	Dunkel Excavating Services Inc.	582-586-802.000	320.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90542	Dunn's Business Solutions	101-172-751.000	6.04
09/20	09/23/2020	90542	Dunn's Business Solutions	101-201-751.000	6.04
09/20	09/23/2020	90542	Dunn's Business Solutions	101-208-751.000	4.23
09/20	09/23/2020	90542	Dunn's Business Solutions	101-257-751.000	3.02
09/20	09/23/2020	90542	Dunn's Business Solutions	101-215-751.000	3.63
09/20	09/23/2020	90542	Dunn's Business Solutions	101-345-751.000	16.92
09/20	09/23/2020	90542	Dunn's Business Solutions	101-400-751.000	3.02
09/20	09/23/2020	90542	Dunn's Business Solutions	101-441-751.000	9.06
09/20	09/23/2020	90542	Dunn's Business Solutions	101-770-751.000	.60
09/20	09/23/2020	90542	Dunn's Business Solutions	101-773-775.000	.60
09/20	09/23/2020	90542	Dunn's Business Solutions	101-756-751.000	6.04
09/20	09/23/2020	90542	Dunn's Business Solutions	101-789-751.000	1.23
09/20	09/23/2020	90543	Emergency Medical Products	101-345-775.000	8.99
09/20	09/23/2020	90543	Emergency Medical Products	101-345-775.000	8.99
09/20	09/23/2020	90544	Emmet County Treasurer	703-040-222.220	63,480.49
09/20	09/23/2020	90544	Emmet County Treasurer	703-040-222.220	4,088.67
09/20	09/23/2020	90544	Emmet County Treasurer	703-040-228.220	80,468.28
09/20	09/23/2020	90545	Etna Supply	592-544-775.000	282.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90545	Etna Supply	592-010-111.000	4,809.50
09/20	09/23/2020	90545	Etna Supply	592-544-775.000	63.55
09/20	09/23/2020	90546	Factor Systems Inc.	101-208-803.000	6,358.14
09/20	09/23/2020	90546	Factor Systems Inc.	101-208-803.000	3,504.61
09/20	09/23/2020	90546	Factor Systems Inc.	101-208-803.000	3,494.72
09/20	09/23/2020	90547	Firman Irrigation & Landscape Lighting	202-467-802.000	280.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90548	Gale/Cengage Learning	271-790-760.000	212.30
09/20	09/23/2020	90548	Gale/Cengage Learning	271-790-760.000	121.56
09/20	09/23/2020	90549	Grand Traverse Mobile Communications	101-345-850.000	288.50
09/20	09/23/2020	90550	GRP Engineering Inc.	582-588-802.000	1,442.40
09/20	09/23/2020	90550	GRP Engineering Inc.	582-588-802.000	3,325.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90551	HydroCorp	592-545-802.000	1,768.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90552	Integrity Business Solutions	514-587-802.100	73.70
09/20	09/23/2020	90553	Lowery Underground Service	582-020-360.000	7,275.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90553	Lowery Underground Service	582-020-360.000	4,746.25
09/20	09/23/2020	90553	Lowery Underground Service	582-598-802.000	3,906.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90553	Lowery Underground Service	592-545-802.000	3,500.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90553	Lowery Underground Service	582-020-360.000	1,028.33
09/20	09/23/2020	90553	Lowery Underground Service	582-598-802.000	881.67
09/20	09/23/2020	90591		203-451-802.000	48,325.06
09/20	09/23/2020	90591		592-020-342.000	45,394.50
09/20	09/23/2020	90591		592-025-343.000	45,266.33
09/20	09/23/2020	90591	MDC Contracting LLC	204-444-802.000	6,590.32
09/20	09/23/2020	90591	MUC Contracting LLC	582-020-360.000	3,673.38

Check Register - Council Check Issue Dates: 9/17/2020 - 9/30/2020

Page: 3 Sep 30, 2020 12:38PM

GL	Check	Check		Invoice	Check
Period	Issue Date	Number	Payee	GL Account	Amount
09/20	09/23/2020	90592	Mead & Hunt	592-556-802.000	1,540.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90593	Michigan Downtown Association	514-587-912.000	300.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90594	MICHIGAN SECTION A.W.W.A.	592-549-915.000	250.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90595	Midwest Arborist Supplies	101-770-775.000	170.26
09/20	09/23/2020	90596	MIGHTY FINE PIZZA	101-756-808.010	407.50
09/20	09/23/2020	90597	North Country IT	271-790-931.000	386.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90598	Northern Copy Express Inc.	202-475-802.000	115.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90599	Northern Michigan University	271-790-955.000	30.99
09/20	09/23/2020	90600	Paul, Gage	582-588-912.000	212.75
09/20	09/23/2020	90601	Peninsula Fiber Network LLC	271-790-850.000	133.80
09/20	09/23/2020	90601	Peninsula Fiber Network LLC	101-228-850.000	446.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90602	Performance Painting	101-770-802.000	4,700.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90602	Performance Painting	202-473-802.000	875.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90603	Petoskey Public Schools	703-040-236.220	163,279.75
09/20	09/23/2020	90603	Petoskey Public Schools	703-040-237.220	19,726.44
09/20	09/23/2020	90603	Petoskey Public Schools	703-040-237.220	14,007.36
09/20	09/23/2020	90604	Petoskey Regional Chamber	248-540-884.900	1,000.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90605	Power Line Supply	582-588-785.000	332.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90606	Quality First Aid & Safety Inc.	592-549-767.000	23.99
09/20	09/23/2020	90607	Renkes, Tom	248-739-880.200	150.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90608	SIEGRIST FARM AND GREENHOUSE	101-770-775.000	1,122.25
09/20	09/23/2020	90608	SIEGRIST FARM AND GREENHOUSE	101-265-775.000	191.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90608	SIEGRIST FARM AND GREENHOUSE	101-789-775.000	1,343.75
09/20	09/23/2020	90608	SIEGRIST FARM AND GREENHOUSE	101-773-775.000	62.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90608	SIEGRIST FARM AND GREENHOUSE	248-739-774.000	6,405.40
09/20	09/23/2020	90609	Sirchie	101-345-775.000	38.30
09/20	09/23/2020	90610	Solutions Electric Inc.	101-770-802.000	243.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90611	Spectrum Business	101-172-850.000	97.63
09/20	09/23/2020	90611	Spectrum Business	101-201-850.000	52.07
09/20	09/23/2020	90611	Spectrum Business	101-208-850.000	32.54
09/20	09/23/2020	90611	Spectrum Business	101-257-850.000	32.54
09/20	09/23/2020	90611	Spectrum Business	101-215-850.000	26.03
09/20	09/23/2020	90611	Spectrum Business	101-345-850.000	71.59
09/20	09/23/2020	90611	Spectrum Business	582-593-850.000	26.03
09/20	09/23/2020	90611	Spectrum Business	592-549-850.000	39.05
09/20	09/23/2020	90611	Spectrum Business	592-560-850.000	39.05
09/20	09/23/2020	90611	Spectrum Business	101-400-850.000	32.54
09/20	09/23/2020	90611	Spectrum Business	101-441-850.000	58.58
09/20	09/23/2020	90611	Spectrum Business	101-756-850.000	39.05
09/20	09/23/2020	90611	Spectrum Business	204-481-850.000	19.53
09/20	09/23/2020	90611	Spectrum Business	204-481-850.000	19.53
09/20	09/23/2020	90611	Spectrum Business	582-588-850.000	65.09
09/20	09/23/2020	90612	Staples Advantage	101-172-751.000	2.58
09/20	09/23/2020	90612	Staples Advantage	101-201-751.000	2.58
09/20	09/23/2020	90612	Staples Advantage	101-208-751.000	1.81
09/20	09/23/2020	90612	Staples Advantage	101-257-751.000	1.29
09/20	09/23/2020	90612	Staples Advantage	101-215-751.000	1.55
09/20	09/23/2020	90612	Staples Advantage	101-345-751.000	7.22
09/20	09/23/2020	90612	Staples Advantage	101-400-751.000	1.29
09/20	09/23/2020	90612	Staples Advantage	101-441-751.000	3.87
09/20	09/23/2020	90612	Staples Advantage	101-770-751.000	.26
09/20	09/23/2020	90612	Staples Advantage	101-773-775.000	.26
09/20	09/23/2020	90612	Staples Advantage	101-756-751.000	2.58
09/20	09/23/2020	90612	Staples Advantage	101-789-751.000	.50
09/20	09/23/2020	90612	Staples Advantage	582-588-751.000	2.08
09/20	09/23/2020	90612	Staples Advantage	101-172-751.000	5.02

Check Register - Council Check Issue Dates: 9/17/2020 - 9/30/2020

Page: 4 Sep 30, 2020 12:38PM

GL	Check	Check		Invoice	Check
Period	Issue Date	Number	Payee	GL Account	Amount
00/20	00/00/0000	00610	Stanlag Advantage		5.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90012	Staples Advantage	101-201-751.000	5.02 3.51
09/20	09/23/2020	90012	Staples Advantage	101-206-751.000	2.51
09/20	09/23/2020	90012	Staples Advantage	101-237-731.000	2.01
09/20	09/23/2020	90012	Staples Advantage	101-345-751.000	14.06
09/20	09/23/2020	90012	Staples Advantage	101-343-731.000	2.51
09/20	09/23/2020	90012	Staples Advantage	101-441-751.000	7.53
09/20	09/23/2020	90012	Staples Advantage	101-770-751.000	7.55
09/20	09/23/2020	90012	Staples Advantage	101-773-775.000	.50
09/20	09/23/2020	90012	Staples Advantage	101-756-751 000	5.02
09/20	09/23/2020	90612	Staples Advantage	101-789-751.000	1.02
09/20	09/23/2020	90012	Staples Advantage	101-441-751.000	30.76
09/20	09/23/2020	90012	Staples Advantage	101-201-751.000	266.95
09/20	09/23/2020	90012	State of Michigan Dept of Transportation	101-770-970.000	28 500.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90614	Structures Inc	202-451-802.000	659.90
09/20	09/23/2020	90614	Structures Inc	592-020-342 000	343 70
09/20	09/23/2020	90014 9061/	Structures Inc.	592-020-342.000	233 72
09/20	09/23/2020	90014 9061/	Structures Inc.	204-444-802.000	137 /8
09/20	09/23/2020	90614	Structures Inc	203-451-802.000	185.60
09/20	09/23/2020	90614	Structures Inc	592-020-342 000	54 99
09/20	09/23/2020	90614	Structures Inc	592-025-343.000	54 99
09/20	09/23/2020	90614	Structures Inc	204-444-802.000	48 12
09/20	09/23/2020	90614	Structures Inc	582-020-360 000	589.20
09/20	09/23/2020	90614	Structures Inc	582-020-360.000	147.30
09/20	09/23/2020	90614	Structures Inc	582-020-360.000	720.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90615	T2 Systems Canada Inc	514-587-802.000	165.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90615	T2 Systems Canada Inc.	514-587-802.000	165.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90615	T2 Systems Canada Inc.	514-587-802.000	165.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90615	T2 Systems Canada Inc.	514-587-802.000	165.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90615	T2 Systems Canada Inc.	514-587-802.000	165.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90615	T2 Systems Canada Inc.	514-587-802.000	165.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90615	T2 Systems Canada Inc.	514-587-802.000	165.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90615	T2 Systems Canada Inc.	514-587-802.000	165.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90615	T2 Systems Canada Inc.	514-587-802.000	165.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90615	T2 Systems Canada Inc.	514-587-802.000	165.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90615	T2 Systems Canada Inc.	514-587-802.000	165.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90615	T2 Systems Canada Inc.	514-587-802.000	165.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90615	T2 Systems Canada Inc.	514-587-802.000	165.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90616	Tahquamenon Area School Public Library	271-790-955.000	17.99
09/20	09/23/2020	90617	Tele-Rad Inc.	101-345-802.000	391.74
09/20	09/23/2020	90617	Tele-Rad Inc.	101-345-802.000	396.74
09/20	09/23/2020	90617	Tele-Rad Inc.	101-345-985.000	332.54
09/20	09/23/2020	90617	Tele-Rad Inc.	101-345-802.000	283.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90618	Temperature Control Inc.	592-554-802.000	726.50
09/20	09/23/2020	90619	Thompson Park Avenue Properties LLC	514-587-802.100	778.47
09/20	09/23/2020	90620	Tri County Excavating	582-020-360.000	390.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90621	Trophy Case, The	271-790-751.000	16.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90622	United Fiberglass of America	582-010-111.000	6,012.59
09/20	09/23/2020	90623	Valley City Linen	271-790-752.000	25.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90623	Valley City Linen	271-790-752.000	25.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90623	Valley City Linen	271-790-752.000	25.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90623	Valley City Linen	271-790-752.000	25.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90624	Van's Business Machines	271-790-931.000	65.00
09/20	09/23/2020	90624	Van's Business Machines	514-587-802.000	47.51
09/20	09/23/2020	90625	Voss Lighting	582-590-775.000	118.80
09/20	09/30/2020	90634	Aerko International Michigan Inc.	101-345-775.000	338.00

Check Register - Council Check Issue Dates: 9/17/2020 - 9/30/2020

Page: 5 Sep 30, 2020 12:38PM

GL	Check	Check		Invoice	Check
Period	Issue Date	Number	Payee	GL Account	Amount
09/20	09/30/2020	90635	Alliance Entertainment	271-790-761.100	162.47
09/20	09/30/2020	90635	Alliance Entertainment	271-790-761.000	296.46
09/20	09/30/2020	90635	Alliance Entertainment	271-790-761.000	57.00-
09/20	09/30/2020	90636	All-Phase Electric Supply	101-770-775.000	65.85
09/20	09/30/2020	90636	All-Phase Electric Supply	582-010-111.000	384.93
09/20	09/30/2020	90636	All-Phase Electric Supply	582-586-775.000	32.93
09/20	09/30/2020	90636	All-Phase Electric Supply	582-586-775.000	49.39
09/20	09/30/2020	90636	All-Phase Electric Supply	582-010-111.000	322.09
09/20	09/30/2020	90636	All-Phase Electric Supply	582-010-111.000	179.15
09/20	09/30/2020	90636	All-Phase Electric Supply	271-790-752.000	240.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90636	All-Phase Electric Supply	582-586-775.000	119.48
09/20	09/30/2020	90637	AT&T	271-790-850.000	297.04
09/20	09/30/2020	90638	Beckett & Raeder Inc.	101-770-970.000	2,187.12
09/20	09/30/2020	90638	Beckett & Raeder Inc.	101-770-802.000	1,785.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90638	Beckett & Raeder Inc.	101-770-970.000	1,080.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90639	Blarney Castle Oil Co.	101-789-772.000	1,879.21
09/20	09/30/2020	90639	Blarney Castle Oil Co.	101-789-772.000	3,855.48
09/20	09/30/2020	90639	Blarney Castle Oil Co.	101-789-772.000	5,138.77
09/20	09/30/2020	90640	BLUE CROSS\BLUE SHIELD - MICH.	101-172-724.000	943.69
09/20	09/30/2020	90640	BLUE CROSS\BLUE SHIELD - MICH.	101-208-724.000	764.75
09/20	09/30/2020	90640	BLUE CROSS\BLUE SHIELD - MICH.	101-345-724.000	7,655.49
09/20	09/30/2020	90640	BLUE CROSS\BLUE SHIELD - MICH.	101-441-724.000	1,179.61
09/20	09/30/2020	90640	BLUE CROSS\BLUE SHIELD - MICH.	204-481-724.000	2,909.72
09/20	09/30/2020	90640	BLUE CROSS\BLUE SHIELD - MICH.	271-790-724.000	393.21
09/20	09/30/2020	90640	BLUE CROSS\BLUE SHIELD - MICH.	514-587-724.000	786.42
09/20	09/30/2020	90640	BLUE CROSS\BLUE SHIELD - MICH.	592-549-724.000	3,517.18
09/20	09/30/2020	90640	BLUE CROSS\BLUE SHIELD - MICH.	592-560-724.000	393.21
09/20	09/30/2020	90641	BOYNE CITY TIRE & BRAKE	661-598-932.000	741.44
09/20	09/30/2020	90642	CDW Government	101-201-751.000	162.98
09/20	09/30/2020	90642	CDW Government	101-201-751.000	83.38
09/20	09/30/2020	90642	CDW Government	101-228-775.000	141.41
09/20	09/30/2020	90642	CDW Government	101-228-775.000	282.82
09/20	09/30/2020	90643	Char-Em United Way	701-000-230.800	75.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90644	Complete Paint & Supplies	101-268-775.000	14.95
09/20	09/30/2020	90645	Crooked Tree Arts Center	248-739-880.400	2,000.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	101-172-724.000	49.97
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	101-201-724.000	179.31
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	101-208-724.000	40.77
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	101-215-724.000	1.58
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	101-265-724.000	23.81
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	101-268-724.000	47.86
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	592-549-724.000	239.98
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	592-560-724.000	75.01
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	701-000-230.110	1,476.12
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	101-773-724.000	16.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	101-789-724.000	32.03
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	204-481-724.000	131.51
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	271-790-724.000	222.79
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	514-587-724.000	37.10
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	582-588-724.000	175.92
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	101-345-724.000	882.40
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	101-400-724.000	31.86
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Delta Dental	101-441-724.000	135.98
09/20	09/30/2020	90646		101-754-724.000	24.88
09/20	09/30/2020	90646		101-756-724.000	74.37
09/20	09/30/2020	90646	Deita Dental	101-7724.000	122.90

Check Register - Council Check Issue Dates: 9/17/2020 - 9/30/2020

Page: 6 Sep 30, 2020 12:38PM

GL	Check	Check		Invoice	Check
Period	Issue Date	Number	Payee	GL Account	Amount
00/20	00/20/2020	00647	Demes		800.06
09/20	09/30/2020	90647	Demco	271-790-802.000	800.96
09/20	09/30/2020	90649		592-544-775 000	452.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90649		592-544-775.000	1 119 36
09/20	09/30/2020	90650	Emergency Medical Products	101-345-775 000	97.48
09/20	09/30/2020	90651	Ever-Green Lawn Care	582-586-802.000	45.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90652	Ferguson Enterprises LLC #2000	101-268-775 000	11 13
09/20	09/30/2020	90653	Fraternal Order of Police	701-000-230 400	899.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90654	Gibby's Garage	202-469-802.000	102.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90654	Gibby's Garage	582-593-930.000	34.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90654	Gibby's Garage	661-598-931.000	646.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90654	Gibby's Garage	661-598-932.000	68.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90654	Gibby's Garage	661-598-931.000	272.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90654	Gibby's Garage	661-598-932.000	782.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90654	Gibby's Garage	582-593-930.000	238.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90655	HAVEN, JODI	271-790-912.000	32.20
09/20	09/30/2020	90656	Heritage Fire Equipment	101-345-802.000	740.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90658	Jennifer Shorter	248-739-886.100	60.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90659	Krecke. Paul	248-739-886.100	30.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90660	Kring Chevrolet Cadillac. Dave	661-598-932.000	238.66
09/20	09/30/2020	90661	Lancashire. Liz	248-739-886.100	30.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90662	LexisNexis Risk Data Management Inc.	101-208-802.000	150.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90662	LexisNexis Risk Data Management Inc.	514-587-802.000	150.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90663	Lynn Auto Parts Inc.	661-598-932.000	44.75
09/20	09/30/2020	90663	Lynn Auto Parts Inc.	661-598-785.000	11.35
09/20	09/30/2020	90663	Lynn Auto Parts Inc.	661-598-932.000	36.40
09/20	09/30/2020	90663	Lynn Auto Parts Inc.	661-598-932.000	5.92
09/20	09/30/2020	90663	Lynn Auto Parts Inc.	661-010-111.000	9.81
09/20	09/30/2020	90663	Lynn Auto Parts Inc.	661-598-932.000	40.00-
09/20	09/30/2020	90663	Lynn Auto Parts Inc.	661-598-932.000	3.65
09/20	09/30/2020	90663	Lynn Auto Parts Inc.	592-551-775.000	11.69
09/20	09/30/2020	90663	Lynn Auto Parts Inc.	661-010-111.000	20.44
09/20	09/30/2020	90663	Lynn Auto Parts Inc.	661-598-785.000	107.73
09/20	09/30/2020	90663	Lynn Auto Parts Inc.	661-598-932.000	164.85
09/20	09/30/2020	90663	Lynn Auto Parts Inc.	661-598-785.000	37.13
09/20	09/30/2020	90663	Lynn Auto Parts Inc.	661-598-932.000	18.00-
09/20	09/30/2020	90663	Lynn Auto Parts Inc.	661-598-932.000	28.93
09/20	09/30/2020	90663	Lynn Auto Parts Inc.	101-345-775.000	21.34
09/20	09/30/2020	90664	Magazine Subscription Service Agency	271-790-760.400	4,177.12
09/20	09/30/2020	90665	Michigan Library Association	271-790-912.000	45.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90665	Michigan Library Association	271-790-912.000	90.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90665	Michigan Library Association	271-790-912.000	90.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90665	Michigan Library Association	271-790-912.000	90.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90665	Michigan Library Association	271-790-912.000	90.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90666	Michigan Municipal League	101-345-751.000	121.44
09/20	09/30/2020	90667	Michigan Officeways Inc.	101-172-751.000	15.70
09/20	09/30/2020	90667	Michigan Officeways Inc.	101-208-751.000	10.99
09/20	09/30/2020	90667	Michigan Officeways Inc.	101-201-751.000	15.70
09/20	09/30/2020	90667	Michigan Officeways Inc.	101-257-751.000	7.85
09/20	09/30/2020	90667	Michigan Officeways Inc.	101-215-751.000	9.42
09/20	09/30/2020	90667	Michigan Officeways Inc.	101-345-751.000	40.82
09/20	09/30/2020	90667	Michigan Officeways Inc.	101-400-751.000	7.85
09/20	09/30/2020	90667	Michigan Officeways Inc.	101-441-751.000	23.55
09/20	09/30/2020	90667	Michigan Officeways Inc.	101-770-751.000	4.71
09/20	09/30/2020	90667	Michigan Officeways Inc.	101-773-775.000	1.57
09/20	09/30/2020	90667	Michigan Officeways Inc.	101-756-751.000	15.70

Check Register - Council Check Issue Dates: 9/17/2020 - 9/30/2020

Page: 7 Sep 30, 2020 12:38PM

GL	Check	Check		Invoice	Check
Period	Issue Date	Number	Payee	GL Account	Amount
09/20	09/30/2020	90667	Michigan Officeways Inc.	101-789-751.000	3.14
09/20	09/30/2020	90668	MIDEASTERN MICHIGAN LIBRARY	271-790-958.000	350.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90669	Midwest Tape	271-790-761.000	39.99
09/20	09/30/2020	90669	Midwest Tape	271-790-761.000	39.99
09/20	09/30/2020	90670	National Hose Testing Specialties Inc.	101-345-802.000	2,150.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90671	Northern Michigan Review Inc.	248-739-880.200	490.50
09/20	09/30/2020	90671	Northern Michigan Review Inc.	247-751-802.000	28.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90671	Northern Michigan Review Inc.	101-400-802.000	63.40
09/20	09/30/2020	90672	Northern Tool & Equipment	101-770-985.000	144.99
09/20	09/30/2020	90673	Petoskey Regional Chamber	271-790-880.000	150.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90674	Pontius Flower Shop, A.R.	248-739-774.000	116.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90675	Power Line Supply	582-586-775.000	114.84
09/20	09/30/2020	90675	Power Line Supply	582-010-111.000	3,100.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90675	Power Line Supply	582-010-111.000	41.76
09/20	09/30/2020	90675	Power Line Supply	582-588-785.000	1,800.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90675	Power Line Supply	582-588-785.000	1,800.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90675	Power Line Supply	582-586-775.000	923.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90676	Pro Image Design	514-587-884.000	1,634.88
09/20	09/30/2020	90677	Quadient Finance USA Inc.	101-172-751.000	300.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90677	Quadient Finance USA Inc.	101-201-751.000	300.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90677	Quadient Finance USA Inc.	101-208-751.000	210.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90677	Quadient Finance USA Inc.	101-257-751.000	150.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90677	Quadient Finance USA Inc.	101-215-751.000	180.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90677	Quadient Finance USA Inc.	101-345-751.000	840.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90677	Quadient Finance USA Inc.	101-400-751.000	150.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90677	Quadient Finance USA Inc.	101-441-751.000	450.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90677	Quadient Finance USA Inc.	101-770-751.000	30.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90677	Quadient Finance USA Inc.	101-773-775.000	30.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90677	Quadient Finance USA Inc.	101-756-751.000	300.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90677	Quadient Finance USA Inc.	101-789-751.000	60.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90678		661-598-932.000	20.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90678	Royal Tire	661-598-932.000	25.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90679	Ryan Brothers Inc.	582-020-360.000	277.20
09/20	09/30/2020	90679	Ryan Brothers Inc.	203-451-802.000	099.03
09/20	09/30/2020	90079	Ryan Brothers Inc.	101 780 775 000	1,924.20
09/20	09/30/2020	90000	SiteOne Landscape Supply	101-769-775.000	372.32
09/20	09/30/2020	90000	Sileone Lanuscape Supply	249 720 996 100	199.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90001	Sloculli, Belljanini Spostrum Businese	240-739-000.100	50.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90062	Spectrum Business	582 588 850 000	09.03
09/20	09/30/2020	90002	Spectrum Business	101-345-850 100	181 55
09/20	09/30/2020	90002	Spectrum Business	514-587-802 100	101.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90682	Spectrum Business	101-770-850 000	104 98
09/20	09/30/2020	90683	Standard Electric Company	582-586-775.000	79.59
09/20	09/30/2020	90683	Standard Electric Company	582-010-111 000	52.88
09/20	09/30/2020	90683	Standard Electric Company	582-010-111 000	45.32
09/20	09/30/2020	90683	Standard Electric Company	582-586-775.000	237.95
09/20	09/30/2020	90684	Summit Companies	271-790-930 000	122.29
09/20	09/30/2020	90685	TEAMSTERS LOCAL #214	701-000-230 400	1,006.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90686	Tri County Excavating	202-451-802 000	79,233 19
09/20	09/30/2020	90686	Tri County Excavating	592-020-342 000	134,356 66
09/20	09/30/2020	90686	Tri County Excavating	592-025-343 000	61.926 50
09/20	09/30/2020	90686	Tri County Excavating	204-444-802 000	4 303 24
09/20	09/30/2020	90686	Tri County Excavating	582-020-360 000	5,496 87
09/20	09/30/2020	90687	Trophy Case. The	514-587-775 000	9.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90688	Voss Lighting	582-590-775.000	175.20
-0,20					

CITV		DET	JOK	ΈV
CIT	OF.	FEIN	Jor	L I

Check Register - Council Check Issue Dates: 9/17/2020 - 9/30/2020

Page: 8 Sep 30, 2020 12:38PM

GL	Check	Check		Invoice	Check
Period	Issue Date	Number	Payee	GL Account	Amount
00/20	00/30/2020	00680	VSD	101 172 724 000	26.88
09/20	09/30/2020	90009	VSP	101-172-724.000	20.00
09/20	09/30/2020	00680	VSP	101-208-724.000	10.88
09/20	09/30/2020	00680	VSP	101-200-724.000	39.76
09/20	09/30/2020	90003	VSP	101-265-724.000	11 98
09/20	09/30/2020	90689	VSP	101-268-724 000	23.32
09/20	09/30/2020	90689	VSP	592-549-724.000	117 88
09/20	09/30/2020	90689	VSP	592-560-724.000	39.76
09/20	09/30/2020	90689	VSP	101-773-724 000	8.06
09/20	09/30/2020	90689	VSP	101-789-724 000	15.62
09/20	09/30/2020	90689	VSP	204-481-724 000	66 64
09/20	09/30/2020	90689	VSP	271-790-724 000	117 04
09/20	09/30/2020	90689	VSP	514-587-724 000	21.28
09/20	09/30/2020	90689	VSP	582-588-724 000	85 12
09/20	09/30/2020	90689	VSP	101-345-724.000	448.58
09/20	09/30/2020	90689	VSP	101-400-724.000	16.46
09/20	09/30/2020	90689	VSP	101-441-724.000	69.89
09/20	09/30/2020	90689	VSP	101-754-724.000	13.24
09/20	09/30/2020	90689	VSP	101-756-724.000	36.57
09/20	09/30/2020	90689	VSP	101-770-724.000	65.24
09/20	09/30/2020	90690	Walters Sharpening Service Inc.	101-770-985.000	72.00
09/20	09/30/2020	90690	Walters Sharpening Service Inc.	101-770-985.000	76.50
09/20	09/30/2020	90691	Wild Flowers	101-770-802.000	6,404.31
09/20	09/30/2020	90692	Integrity Business Solutions	514-587-802.100	56.99
09/20	09/30/2020	999083	ACH-CHILD SUPPORT	701-000-230.160	160.23
09/20	09/30/2020	999084	ACH-EFTPS	701-000-230.200	12,370.23
09/20	09/30/2020	999084	ACH-EFTPS	701-000-230.100	20,585.56
09/20	09/30/2020	999084	ACH-EFTPS	701-000-230.200	12,370.23
09/20	09/30/2020	999084	ACH-EFTPS	701-000-230.200	2,893.02
09/20	09/30/2020	999084	ACH-EFTPS	701-000-230.200	2,893.02
09/20	09/30/2020	999085	ACH-ICMA 457	701-000-230.700	1,984.38
09/20	09/30/2020	999085	ACH-ICMA 457	701-000-230.700	5,240.00
09/20	09/30/2020	999086	ICMA 401	701-000-230.700	641.21
09/20	09/30/2020	999087	ICMA-ROTH	701-000-230.900	595.00
				-	

Grand Totals:

1,095,663.78

=

Report Criteria:

Check.Check issue date = 09/17/2020-09/30/2020

Check Number	Check Issue Date	Name	GL Account	Amount
90517	09/23/2020	Aquila, Josh	582040285000	48.22
90518	09/23/2020	Best In Detail	582040285000	76.28
90519	09/23/2020	Scenic Hill LLC	701040274000	658.10
90520	09/23/2020	Shultz, Sherman & Julie	582081642300	16.87
90521	09/23/2020	Stubbs, Will	582040285000	42.80
90626	09/30/2020	Concord Academy	101087654000	225.00
90627	09/30/2020	Gueramy, Carol	582081642300	55.46
90628	09/30/2020	Kaplowitz, Beverly	582081642300	25.54
90629	09/30/2020	Manthei, Janet	101756808110	25.00
90630	09/30/2020	PMEC Associates LLC	703040233020	756.96
90631	09/30/2020	Rasper, Angelika	582081642300	10.00
90632	09/30/2020	Riley, Barbara	101087654000	225.00
90633	09/30/2020	Thelen, Al	101087653000	542.50
Grand Tot	als:			2,707.73



BOARD:	City Council	
MEETING DATE:	October 5, 2020	PREPARED: October 1, 2020
AGENDA SUBJECT:	Second Discussion and Possible Adoption of the 2021-2026 Capita Improvement Plan	
RECOMMENDATION :	That the City Council adopt the enclosed proposed resolution	

Summary This is the second discussion of the proposed six-year Capital Improvement Plan for 2021-2026. At the September 21 City Council meeting, staff made a detailed presentation of the Capital Plan with no official action taken. The Planning Commission has reviewed the draft Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) on August 20, 2020 and unanimously recommended approval by City Council. The draft CIP was posted on the City's website on August 27, 2020 with four comments received to date. See enclosed comments.

The following was included in the September 21 agenda item.

Please bring your copy of the 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Plan to the meeting.

Overview The CIP represents a long-term financial plan and helps to establish priorities for the City's investment in capital infrastructure. The CIP, along with the Annual Budget which appropriates funding for projects identified in the CIP, help set priorities and future direction for the City.

The 2021-2026 CIP totals \$51.8 million in expenditures, with capital spending in 2021 proposed at \$4.5 million, of which \$921,500 (20.4%) is anticipated to come from grants or other outside sources of revenue.

2021 Planned Projects Highlights

The 2021 plan contains funding for a variety of infrastructure improvements including street improvements, utility upgrades and trail and park enhancements. Specifically, highlights of capital improvement projects for 2021 include:

Streets and Drainage

In 2021, Greenwood Road from Sheridan Street to Charlevoix Avenue will be fully reconstructed with new pavement and curb lines. The project will also include a new sidewalk on the west side of the street enhancing both bicyclist and pedestrian safety. Grant funding from the Little Traverse Bay Band of Odawa Indians in the amount of \$350,000 will offset overall project costs to the City.

The City will match \$81,500 in MDOT grant funding for street repaving and curb restoration on portions of Hill Street, West Jefferson Street and Connable Avenue. Total project costs for these three streets is estimated at \$163,000. Lastly, \$200,000 has been earmarked for miscellaneous pavement preservation, paving and repair work for Outlook Street, portions of Harvey Street, and Washington Street from Buckley to Franklin Streets.

Water and Wastewater System

The Greenwood Road infrastructure project will include replacing all underground utilities including a 55+ year-old cast iron main that is a critical loop in the City's water distribution system. Costs for both water and sewer main replacement are estimated at \$650,000. There is also another \$250,000 budgeted for water and sewer main line replacement associated with repaving projects and maintenance work to be completed on the City's sewer lift stations.

<u>Sidewalks</u>

Sidewalk and crosswalk construction will coincide with the Greenwood Road street reconstruction project and other areas of the City identified by the Non-Motorized Facility Plan. \$150,000 has been budgeted for sidewalk projects in 2020.

Electric System

Each year the City makes substantial investments into the municipal electric distribution system enhancing reliability through system upgrades and the undergrounding of overhead electric lines. In 2020, the City will continue its strong investments in the electric distribution system by earmarking almost \$1.1 million for system-wide upgrades.

Specifically, \$150,000 has been earmarked for the Petoskey Substation Capacitor Banks to compensate for increased in flows on distribution circuits. The City also anticipates further studies to be done for a potential solar array project at the Howard Road Landfill. To date, the City has worked with Harvest Solar in mapping out potential sites at the landfill that could generate upwards of 2 megawatts of electricity. Once sizing and output is formally determined, a constructability and interconnect analysis can be performed to establish feasibility and overall costs.

The City will continue its aggressive undergrounding of electric lines focusing on portions of Waukazoo, Rush, Beech and Pearl Streets. To date, the City has been very successful in undergrounding an estimated 70% of electrical lines creating a very reliable and safe electric distribution system. Monies have also been budgeted for backup generators at critical facilities, for Greenwood Road lighting and potential relocation of a transformer at the Saville Lot.

<u>Motorpool</u>

Motorpool purchases planned for 2021 include the following:

- Two patrol vehicles and a staff vehicle;
- Replacement of a ³/₄ ton pick-up truck with plow;
- Replacement of a one-ton dump truck;
- Replacement of a flusher truck for Streets;
- Replacement of a Toro Workman Rescue Cart;
- Bobcat Toolcat with snow blower, forks, and rotating broom;
- 70-Foot ladder truck refurbishment.

Downtown Area

Parking structure engineering for the Saville Lot has been earmarked for 2021. The project is contingent upon execution of a Brownfield Plan associated with a proposed hotel at Bay and Howard Streets. With so many economic unknowns associated the current COVID-19 pandemic, this project may be postponed until a later date.

Parks and Special Facilities Improvements

Combining the newly installed stair tower with completing a US-31 Highway Realignment Project, Sunset Park enhancements will be undertaken improving park access as well as viewing areas over Little Traverse Bay. Tax Increment Financing dollars will be used for this project. Engineered drawings for a redesign of Arlington Park and the Lewis Street area will be completed in 2021 complementing both the highway realignment project and improvements to Sunset Park.

The City Marina's fuel system will undergo major improvements by replacing tanks and piping and increasing storage for diesel fuel. The 25+ year-old system is in need of replacement and DNR Waterways grant funding will be pursued.

Approximately 1/3 of a mile of the Little Traverse Wheelway will be resurfaced in 2021 using potential grant funding. The popular Little Traverse Wheelway has suffered substantial damage over the last year as a result of unprecedented high water levels leading to shoreline erosion. Currently, engineering studies are being undertaken both within the City of Petoskey and at an approximately one-mile stretch in Resort Township that experienced a major slope failure. Additionally, coastline improvements at Solanus Beach including an accessible boardwalk to the water, shoreline erosion mitigation, and new bathroom facilities are also scheduled for 2021.

Lastly, the City has earmarked \$10,000 to develop engineered drawings for future bathrooms at River Road Sports Complex.

2022 Planned Project Highlights

- Reconstruction of East Lake Street from Kalamazoo to Division Street including installation of new water, sewer and storm water lines, conversion of overhead electric lines to underground, and new sidewalks and ADA ramps.
- A multi-year project to upgrade public works and parks and recreation facilities will commence in 2022 with the construction of a cold storage building on the Curtis Avenue property and creation of an access drive along the former Jarman Spur to connect the parks and public works facilities.
- City Hall renovations including waterproofing foundation walls and upgrades to HVAC systems.
- Widening with addition of site amenities on the Park Avenue sidewalk in Pennsylvania Park from Bay Street to Mitchell Street.
- Shoreline stabilization improvements with construction of public access walkway at Solanus Beach.
- Construction of a cover over the Winter Sports Park hockey rink to extend ice rink season.

2023-2026 Planned Project Highlights

The years 2023-2026 may have projects adjusted based on funding availability and demands. Some projects planned for the final four years of the CIP include:

- Improvements to the Lime Kiln Well including new chlorine feed system, new submersible pumps and renovations to control and monitoring systems (2023);
- Winter Park roof repairs and interior renovations (2023);
- Replacement of the Department of Public Works Building (2023);

- Howard Street reconstruction and utility upgrades from Jennings Avenue to State Street (2024);
- Two-block Downtown Greenway Corridor extension between Emmet Street and Washington Street (2024);
- Construction of salt sheds and material storage building on north side of Sheridan Street (2024);
- Community gardens and yard waste disposal area relocated to south side of Sheridan Street (2024);
- Downtown streetscape improvements enhancing pedestrian safety and incorporating green infrastructure (2025);
- Improvements to Lockwood Park through according to Park and Recreation Master Plan (2026).

<u>Action</u> To further solicit public comment, staff has continued to post the CIP on our website with no new comments received as of noon, Thursday, October 1.

If Council is comfortable with the proposed CIP, a motion can be made to approve the enclosed resolution in support of the Capital Improvement Plan for 2021-2026.

rs Enclosures



WHEREAS, as part of the City's annual budget-preparation process, the City Planner submitted to the Planning Commission on August 20, 2020 the City staff's proposed update to the City's six-year capital improvement program; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed this proposed 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Program on August 20, 2020, and recommended its adoption by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council reviewed the proposed plan on September 21, 2020 and October 5, 2020 and concurs with the recommendation of the Planning Commission:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Petoskey City Council does and hereby approves the 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Program as submitted by the City Manager dated October 5, 2020 and approved by the Planning Commission August 20, 2020.

Sarah Bek

From: Sent: To: Subject: jennifer riffer <riffer333@hotmail.com> Thursday, August 27, 2020 2:33 PM CityManager Petoskey improvements

We seriously need to fix the wheel way section to east park. Some of these other ideas are not nearly as important. No one wants to be redirected up on the highway! The bike path is for everyone, families use it alot. We don't need more holes dug for parking, or fancy stuff at sunset park. PLEASE fix the bike path 1st!!!!! Sent from my iPad

Sarah Bek

From:	Jeff Grantham <jeff@granthambuildremodel.com< th=""></jeff@granthambuildremodel.com<>
Sent:	Sunday, August 30, 2020 9:00 AM
То:	CityManager
Subject:	Recreation dependence and parklands

I saw the conceptual plan for Sheridan Public Works building and parkland development it make me think of <u>this article</u>. Please read it and share with staff, commissioners and council persons. It's great the city staff and council wants to consolidate city DPW operations but I caution on the continued land preserved for parks for several reasons:

- 1. It takes away from land that could be used to address housing shortages. A recent example includes the addition of the Peoples' Park and its impact on the Redevelopment Ready designation already in place for that property which would have including adding housing options in the city. I also think a chunk of Curtis Park divided into lots along two of its street borders could be sold at a premium to build move-up homes which will free up other homes for entry-level buyers, a win-win since the large, under-used park will still remain very accessible to the rest of the community from its other two bordering streets.
- 2. The capital improvement of yet another park space when we have miles and miles of waterfront trails is wasteful when the city's streets and infrastructure are in need of repair and maintenance. E. Mitchell will need a complete resurfacing in five years as its poor design and mix of pavement materials was bound to age prematurely. This is neither sustainable nor resilient. I can readily name several other streets worthy of improvement prioritized over additional parkland development.
- 3. The concept Sheridan plan shows a restroom facility on the current salt barn location. I have a question: why was there a restroom facility built at the one end of the Riverbend Trail North end by E. Mitchell bridge) and not the other (by DPW building) when it was all built yet both ends of the Bayfront Park have them? The Taj Mahal bathroom at the end of Bayfront Drive is another example of over-spending; to get utilities to that remote location required city expenditures not budgeted for or included in the contract to build the building, likely costing an additional \$100,000 out of sight of the council and public because it was in DPW expense not Capital Improvement. I realize that area is TIFF but the point remains the same, spend more wisely; the bathroom location in the concept plan is in yet another remote location with no utility services on that side of the street. If the city built the restroom on same side of the street (say attached to the DPW building in the area of the parking lot to the south trail head), it would cost one-quarter what it would cost to build a stand-alone building where it's proposed. Another great example of this type of wastefulness it the Eppler Road County EMS Building. The county already owned land at the fairgrounds, only a few hundred yards from where they ultimately built. The fairgrounds has easy access in multiple directions, is served by water, sewer and natural gas and has good drainage. The new facility required multiple land acquisitions and easements to get utilities to the site. It continues to need site improvements since it was built in a low land of a rural farm area and its upkeep is a drain on county resources. The most suitable spot for the EMS station was at the Eppler Road entrance to the fairgrounds.
- 4. From a use standpoint, I fault the design of the former salt barn to have a paved lot, river overlook, bathroom combined with, get this, compost drop-off. How is that combination attractive to residents and visitors? It also is disingenuous to think yet another acre of park space will better serve residents and attract visitors. Those "visitors" may well be township residents driving in to park to walk, ride or otherwise use city park resources at city resident expense and the "city residents" already enjoy the greatest amount of parkland per capita in the state, or close to it.

I'll stop there since any further statements would be duplicative. I'm asking you to ask questions about place-making, consider long-term maintenance costs, consider impacts on housing shortages and overall outlays by the city at a time when it is admittedly short on revenues and heavy on under-utilized existing parklands.

Thank you for your service and I look forward to working with you to continue to provide a balance between "needs of residents" and "desire for utopia."

JEFF GRANTHAM GRANTHAM BUILDING AND REMODELING, LLC PETOSKEY, MICHIGAN (231)838-8777 2013 MICHIGAN "REMODELER OF THE YEAR" 2015 N. MICHIGAN "BUILDER OF THE YEAR" "EXPERIENCE. RESULTS."

From: Jeff Grantham <jtg231@live.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2020 3:28 AM
To: Jeff Grantham <jeff@granthambuildremodel.com>
Subject: Recreation dependance

https://www.outsideonline.com/2416295/outdoor-recreation-tourism-economy-covid

Sarah Bek

From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Robert Straebel Monday, September 14, 2020 11:36 AM Derek Sarah Bek; Mike Robbins FW: Public comment

Derek,

Public Works Director Mike Robbins is in charge of the City's Motor Pool so I asked him to address your questions. See replies below and feel free to reach out if more information is needed.

Your comments will be shared with City Council as part of the CIP presentation on September 21.

Thanks,

Rob

From: Derek <<u>d.r.shiels@gmail.com</u>> Sent: Sunday, September 13, 2020 9:41 PM To: Robert Straebel <<u>rstraebel@petoskey.us</u>> Subject: Public comment

Dear Manager Straebel,

Thank you for receiving, considering, and sharing with Council, the following public comments regarding the CIP.

The need for replacing two patrol vehicles in one year caught my eye. I would want council to be satisfied that the city is maximizing use of existing vehicles while balancing the need for having reliable vehicles. Are vehicles replaced based on age or after reaching a certain mileage?

Whether its age or mileage really depends on the vehicle and its use. Patrol vehicles are typically based on mileage, once they approach the 100,000 mile mark we start to see maintenance expenses increase due to larger fixes such as transmissions, major engine components etc. Public Works vehicles tend to be more based on age due to the low miles they are actually driven to and from the job site. Larger Public Works vehicles and equipment are tracked not only by age but hours of use.

Are higher mileage vehicles being switched to low mileage duties, and vice versa, to extend life? Yes, we do track and monitor Public Safety vehicles, patrol units are assigned based on time of year, age and miles acquired. In regards to Public Works vehicles, it is not uncommon for vehicles to be reassigned to a different division based on age and use. A good example would be a Publics Works pickup that is used year around is reassigned to Parks & Rec, which is now used seasonally extending the life of the vehicle.

I recommend the city start planning for purchasing electric vehicles when updating the motorpool (there are even hybrid electric police vehicles coming on the market). Maybe this does not need to be spelled out in the CIP, but should new charging stations for City fleet vehicles be considered in future budget projections? We are watching markets closely in regards to electric vehicles and feel options are forthcoming. The 2021 CIP does include replacing Motor Pool vehicle #29 that is a 2010 Ford Escape Hybrid. This vehicle is used as a

"pool" or "travel car" by the city and depending on availability may be replaced with an electric vehicle. In regards to fleet charging stations, we can most certainly include in future budget projections and include such needs in future building improvements such as the proposed new Public works facility.

Thank you,

Derek Shiels 1221 Hazelton St.

Seek "not blind opposition to progress, but opposition to blind progress" - John Muir



43

SEP 1 6 2020

September 14, 2020

REQUEST FOR REVISION TO 2021-2026 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

TO: Members of City Council c/o City Manager

10

We reside at 602 E. Lake, the corner of E. Lake and Williams. For many years now, we have awaited the electric underground installation and other work needed on E. Lake.

We have enclosed a ziplock bag of the electric wiring insulation that continues to fall off the old overhead wiring – this insulation is most likely asbestos. The bag contains just what has fallen off so far this year onto our lawn; at least this much falls off onto our lawn *every* year.

In the second ziplock bag are six copies of 4 photos marked A, B, C, and D:

- In photo A you can see a piece of hanging wiring insulation (again, likely asbestos) which fell off after this photo was taken.
- In photo B you can see one of two ancient poles (rough-hewn logs probably circa 1900) that are close to our house; more old poles continue up the street.
- In photo C you can see just one example of the existing unsightly jumble of overhead electric wiring, the uppermost having already lost its insulation.
- In photo D you can see the crumbling curb at our house, and neighbors around us suffer the same. Jim sprained his ankle this past Spring cutting the lawn when he unwittingly stepped into the hole. These curb/street holes eventually get filled by the City each year, but the repairs do not last and each Spring the holes reappear.

Looking back to the CIP for 2015-2019, the work on Kalamazoo which was done this year (2020) was originally slated to be done in 2017, with the work on E. Lake slated for 2018. This timetable was revised in the 2016-2021 CIP which pushed the Kalamazoo work to 2020, and pushed the E. Lake work to 2021. But now in the 2021-2026 CIP the E. Lake work is being pushed back again from 2021 to 2022. Instead of our street being done in 2021, now Waukazoo/Rush/Beech/Pearl are going to be done in 2021 instead of E. Lake.

Why is Waukazoo/Rush/Beech/Pearl being given priority over E. Lake??!!?? We have a seriously unsafe situation here on E. Lake with likely-asbestos insulation continually falling on our lawn, old wiring that has lost its insulation, poles that are probably over 100 years old, and crumbling curbs/streets creating a hazard.

Further, the state of affairs on E. Lake is not only unsafe, it is also unsightly. Our economy relies heavily on tourism, and many tourists walk up E. Lake from downtown. What a negative impression they must get about the City, as they attempt to avoid stepping into holes along the curbs, and witness dangling wiring and old poles that look like they might fall over any day. We don't know why Kalamazoo was ever given priority over E. Lake in the first place, however we accepted that. But now we are going to be pushed back again another year, with Waukazoo/Rush/Beech/Pearl replacing us for 2021? Not acceptable.

We have invested a lot of time, energy, and money renovating our historic home. Our hope was that the City would support infrastructure improvements and beautification of our downtown neighborhood. Instead, other neighborhoods get supported before ours. From the standpoint of safety and tourism, there is no justification for it. We are discouraged and disappointed.

We are asking that the 2021-2026 CIP be revised to put the work for E. Lake back on the schedule for 2021 and that (at long last) the work actually be done in 2021.

Sincerely,

Alison L. Paton

James D. McIntyre

Enclosures: (2) ziplock bags, one with insulation, other with five sets of four photos



2021-2026 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

DRAFT



Capital Improvement Plan 2021 through 2026 Overview

Mayor Murphy, Members of the Petoskey City Council, and Citizens of Petoskey:

I am pleased to submit to you the 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the City of Petoskey. Pursuant to the Planning Enabling Act, we have again developed a six-year capital plan that serves as an instrument to identify needs and financing sources for public infrastructure improvements. It also informs city residents how the City plans to address capital needs over the next six years.

This document gives significant direction to the City on funding priorities. However, only those programs scheduled during the first year are financed and adopted as part of the Annual Budget. Programs slated for construction in subsequent years may be adjusted or eliminated to reflect priority changes or funding constraints. In addition, projects beyond the six-year horizon are identified, some have funding sources while others lack an identified funding mechanism. Most of these needs exist today, or have already been deferred in recent years.

The CIP is a flexible plan that can be altered as conditions and regulations change. We will review all projects every year to evaluate any changes in scope, and to update all of our financing opportunities whether it be with tax revenues, bonds, grants or other outside funding sources.

The 2021-2026 CIP totals \$51.8 million in expenditures. Within the CIP, proposed projects in 2021 total \$4.5M of which \$921,500 (20.4%) is projected to come from grants or other outside sources.

The following chart compares the capital spending in previous years with the proposed 2021-2026 CIP and highlights the anticipated increases in capital spending in 2022 due to a street and utility reconstruction project on Lake Street (\$1.96M), first of three phases for the Public Works/Parks and Recreation Building Improvements (Curtis Building and Service Drive-\$3.4M), construction of a cover over the Winter Sports Park's ice rink (\$300,000) and Solanus Beach Improvements (\$500,000).



■2016-2026 CIP Expenditures by Program Year

Additionally, capital improvements in 2023 are scheduled to increase as a result of constructing a new Department of Public Works Building on Sheridan Street (\$11.5M).

Consistent with the last two years, the six-year CIP was expanded upon to address critical infrastructure needs further into the future. These projects are listed under "Long-Term Projects/Capital Items Lacking Funding" and include a backlog of on-going maintenance issues such as marina upgrades to respond to fluctuating water levels in Lake Michigan, Little Traverse Wheelway resurfacing (\$2M for eight miles), Bayfront Park Shoreline Stabilization (\$7M), and Arrowhead Shores trail remediation efforts with potential relocation of the trail adjacent to US-31. Also, City staff has included a placeholder for replacement of lead and copper water pipes in the community according to recently promulgated Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE) lead pipe regulations. A cost estimate of the lead pipe replacement program has yet to be calculated. Other costly capital improvement projects scheduled for the long-term include new water wells, new aeration blowers at the wastewater treatment plant and a water main replacement from Sheridan Street to the US-131 water tower. The long-term capital projects list shall serve as a strong reminder to City officials of the need to address critical future infrastructure needs each and every year to maintain and enhance the highest quality municipal services.

Preparation of the CIP each year is a result of considerable efforts from staff in all departments of the City. I am especially grateful for the work of Department Heads, as well as Supervisors in each division who worked diligently to prioritize infrastructure needs within the context of limited budgets. My sincere thanks for their hard work and dedication.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cale Atrabel

Rob Straebel City Manager

CIP Overview

The Capital Improvement Plan is a six-year schedule of proposed major capital projects, cost estimates and financing methods. The requirement for capital budgeting is found in Act 33 of the Michigan Public Acts of 2008 being the Michigan Planning Enabling Act.

The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) establishes the City's blueprint for investment in its capital infrastructure. This document is used as a tool to help ensure that the City's long and short-term capital investments are made in the context of careful consideration of the City's needs as well as the resources available to fund all projects.

The financial guidelines used in the preparation of the CIP will provide assurance that the City can meet, in a full and timely manner, both our debt service obligations and all other obligations competing for available resources. It is our objective to complete as many needed capital improvement projects as financially possible while maintaining flexibility and the ability to adapt to changes as they occur.

Capital Improvement Plan vs. Annual Operating Budget

The Capital Improvement Plan and Annual Operating Budget are two critical documents prepared each year. The relationship between these two documents is summarized by the following points:

Capital Improvement Plan

- Represents a long-term financial plan, including funding sources.
- Establishes priorities and serves as a planning document or blueprint for the City's investment in capital infrastructure.
- Provides a breakdown of major project costs and their phasing.
- Does not appropriate money.
- As indicated by the above points, the Annual Operating Budget is the document which authorizes the actual funding for the major and non-major capital projects.

Annual Operating Budget

- Appropriates money to implement the first year of the Six-Year Capital Improvements Plan.
- Appropriates money to implement current year's phase of a major, multi-year project.
- Appropriates money for operating expenditures and expenditures of a continuing nature.

Capital Improvement Plan Guidelines & Benefits

There are several key guidelines the Administration utilized in determining the City's fiscal capacity to complete capital projects over the next six years. These are summarized as follows:

- The Capital Improvement Plan will be reviewed and updated annually.
- The City has determined that paying cash for projects where financially possible (pay-asyou-go financing) reduces long term costs and maintains financial flexibility for the future. In utilizing pay-as-you-go financing, revenue projections and estimated fund balances will be reviewed and evaluated to assure that sufficient reserves are maintained.
- It is not economically feasible to issue debt for some projects, nor do all projects have a projected lifespan long enough to warrant the issuance of debt.
- Under current economic conditions, the ability to complete many projects will depend on identifying and obtaining outside sources of funding.

- Our philosophy for projecting property tax revenues is to be conservative. Between 2009 and 2012 property tax revenues decreased 20%. Fortunately, in the last three years the City has experienced increases in taxable value of 2.8% in 2018, 3.4% in 2019 and 2.9% in 2020. For 2021, with many unknowns regarding the current COVID-19 pandemic, the City is being very conservative in our property tax revenue forecasts anticipating no increases in taxable value in 2021.
- Changes in personal property tax laws are negatively impacting revenues, although this has been lessened by voter approval of the State ballot proposal on the August 2014 Primary Election ballot providing some reimbursement of the loss in personal property tax revenue.
- The availability of adequate financial reserves or balances that can be used to address unforeseen contingencies or take advantage of sudden opportunities is a critical element in evaluating financial strength.
- Since a significant portion of outstanding debt and future capital improvements are related to the water and sewer utility, user fees associated with these utilities are evaluated in parallel with the CIP.
- As a matter of general policy, the City will do the following in order to be able to fund additional projects needed to serve the citizens of Petoskey:
 - Pursue, when feasible, federal, state and local assistance in the form of grants, low-interest loans, cost-sharing, etc.
 - Look increasingly at ways to obtain revenue through user fees as a means to fund capital projects or as a way to free-up other dollars so they may become available to fund capital projects.

There are many benefits of an effective and ongoing Capital Improvement Plan, including:

- Coordination of the community's physical planning with its fiscal planning capabilities;
- Ensuring that public improvements are undertaken in the most desirable order of priority;
- Assisting in stabilization of tax and utility rates and other charges over a period of years;
- Producing savings in total project costs by promoting a "pay as you go" policy of capital financing thereby reducing interest expense and financing costs;
- Providing adequate time for planning and engineering of proposed projects;
- Ensuring the maximum benefit of the monies expended for public improvements; and
- Scheduling municipal construction activities to be better coordinated with those of other public agencies within the community.

As a regional service center, the City of Petoskey streets, utilities (water, sewer, stormwater, electric), public facilities and parkland service much more than the City's 5,600 residents, therefore, the capital needs are many and will certainly surpass available resources. Capital improvement planning and budgeting encourages the early identification of those needs and resources and thus improves the scheduling, financing, and coordination of individual and related projects to reflect the goals and objectives established in the City's Master Plan and other planning documents.

Funding Sources

The City of Petoskey primarily uses the General Fund, Enterprise funds or Special Revenue funds for capital project funding. Examples of Enterprise funds in this CIP are Parking, Water, Sewer and Electric Funds. Special Revenue funds are supported by resources dedicated to a specific use, but not supported entirely by their own fee structures.
An example is the Right-of-Way Improvement Fund, which receives revenues through annual property-tax levies to offset costs of maintenance operations and public improvements within street rights-of-way. Capital outlays for buildings and grounds, including parkland, come primarily from the General Fund or Tax Increment Finance Fund. Outside sources of funding have also significantly contributed to capital projects and this is reflected in the current capital plan as well. Projects that identify outside funding sources have a more uncertain time-frame, but staff has attempted to be realistic with projections based on the need for a match in local funding.

Capital Improvement Plan and Structure

A capital expenditure is defined as an item that has a significant value and a useful life greater than three years. Expenditures for building construction and renovation, land purchases and improvements, and major equipment are generally capital expenditures in contrast to operating costs such as salaries, supplies and services that are budgeted annually in the various department operating budgets.

Significant value is defined for purposes of the Plan as any infrastructure project that costs \$25,000 or more and any equipment, materials or vehicles that cost \$10,000 or more. Minor capital purchases such as office furniture, computers, etc. are not included in this document.

Projects that correspond with City priorities and have a potential funding source available, are included in the Plan. The Capital Improvement Plan is then presented to both the Planning Commission and City Council. The CIP is designed to be amended on an annual basis, as projects scheduled in later years are identified on a needs basis, and may not have an available funding source. Projects can be added or subtracted as the needs and resources of the community change.

The 2021-2026 CIP provides information on eight project categories including: Streets and Drainage, Water and Wastewater Systems, Sidewalks, Electric System, Motor Pool, Downtown Area, Buildings and Grounds, and Parks and Special Facilities Improvements.



2021 Capital Expenditures by Fund

2021 Scheduled Capital Improvement Projects

Streets and Drainage

In 2021, Greenwood Road from Sheridan Street to Charlevoix Avenue will be fully reconstructed with new pavement and curb lines. The project will also include a new sidewalk on the west side of the street enhancing both bicyclist and pedestrian safety. Grant funding from the Little Traverse Bay Band of Odawa Indians in the amount of \$350,000 will offset overall project costs to the City.

The City will match \$81,500 in MDOT grant funding for street repaving and curb restoration on portions of Hill Street, West Jefferson Street and Connable Avenue. Total project costs for these three streets is estimated at \$163,000. Lastly, \$200,000 has been earmarked for miscellaneous pavement preservation, paving and repair work for Outlook Street, portions of Harvey Street, and Washington Street from Buckley to Franklin Streets.

Water and Wastewater System

The Greenwood Road infrastructure project will include replacing all underground utilities including a 55+ year-old cast iron main that is a critical loop in the City's water distribution system. Costs for both water and sewer main replacement are estimated at \$650,000. There is also another \$250,000 budgeted for water and sewer main line replacement associated with repaving projects and maintenance work to be completed on the City's sewer lift stations.

Sidewalks

Sidewalk and crosswalk construction will coincide with the Greenwood Road street reconstruction project and other areas of the City identified by the Non-Motorized Facility Plan. \$150,000 has been budgeted for sidewalk projects in 2020.

Electric System

Each year the City makes substantial investments into the municipal electric distribution system enhancing reliability through system upgrades and the undergrounding of overhead electric lines. In 2020, the City will continue its strong investments in the electric distribution system by earmarking almost \$1.1 million for system-wide upgrades.

Specifically, \$150,000 has been earmarked for the Petoskey Substation Capacitor Banks to compensate for increased in flows on distribution circuits. The City also anticipates further studies to be done for a potential solar array project at the Howard Road Landfill. To date, the City has worked with Harvest Solar in mapping out potential sites at the landfill that could generate upwards of 2 megawatts of electricity. Once sizing and output is formally determined, a constructability and interconnect analysis can be performed to establish feasibility and overall costs.

The City will continue its aggressive undergrounding of electric lines focusing on portions of Waukazoo, Rush, Beech and Pearl Streets. To date, the City has been very successful in undergrounding an estimated 70% of electrical lines creating a very reliable and safe electric distribution system. Monies have also been budgeted for backup generators at critical facilities, for Greenwood Road lighting and potential relocation of a transformer at the Saville Lot.

<u>Motorpool</u>

Motorpool purchases planned for 2021 include the following:

- Two patrol vehicles and a staff vehicle;
- Replacement of a ³/₄ ton pick-up truck with plow;
- Replacement of a one-ton dump truck;
- Replacement of a flusher truck for Streets;
- Replacement of a Toro Workman Rescue Cart;
- Bobcat Toolcat with snow blower, forks, and rotating broom;
- 70-Foot ladder truck refurbishment.

Downtown Area

A parking deck engineering study for the Saville Lot has been earmarked for 2021. The project is contingent upon execution of a Brownfield Plan associated with a proposed hotel at Bay and Howard Streets. With so many economic unknowns associated the current COVID-19 pandemic, this project may be postponed until a later date.

Parks and Special Facilities Improvements

Combining the newly installed stair tower with completing a US-31 Highway Realignment Project, Sunset Park enhancements will be undertaken improving park access as well as viewing areas over Little Traverse Bay. Tax Increment Financing dollars will be used for this project. Engineered drawings for a redesign of Arlington Park and the Lewis Street area will be completed in 2021 complementing both the highway realignment project and improvements to Sunset Park.

The City Marina's fuel system will undergo major improvements by replacing tanks and piping and increasing storage for diesel fuel. The 25+ year-old system is in need of replacement and DNR Waterways grant funding will be pursued.

Approximately 1/3 of a mile of the Little Traverse Wheelway will be resurfaced in 2021 using potential grant funding. The very popular Little Traverse Wheelway has suffered substantial damage over the last year as a result of unprecedented high water levels leading to shoreline erosion. Currently, engineering studies are being undertaken both within the City of Petoskey and at an approximately one-mile stretch in Resort Township that experienced a major slope failure. Additionally, coastline improvements at Solanus Beach including an accessible boardwalk to the water, shoreline erosion mitigation, and new bathroom facilities are also scheduled for 2021.

Lastly, the City has earmarked \$10,000 to develop engineered drawings for future bathrooms at River Road Sports Complex.

City of Petoskey Capital Improvement Plan For the Years 2021 through 2026

			<u>Ex</u>	pend	iture Summar	У					
		2021	 2022		2023		2024		2025	_	2026
General		180,000	390,000		722,000		450,000		605,000		528,000
Parking	3	300,000	65,000		65,000		470,000		200,000		0
Streets	6	631,500	1,000,000		425,000		1,100,000		500,000		1,000,000
Electric	1	,091,000	1,022,000		1,426,000		948,000		928,000		1,004,000
Water & Sewer	:	900,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000
Motorpool	:	507,000	577,000		619,000		458,000		667,000		417,000
Grants/Other		921,500	 4,845,000		14,995,000	:	3,092,000		100,000		3,700,000
Total	4	,531,000	 8,899,000		19,252,000		7,518,000		4,000,000		7,649,000
					C			6-ye	ar Total	5	51,849,000
				Rever	ue Summary						
Fund		2021	 2022		2023		2024		2025		2026
General	\$	183,971	\$ 6,279	\$	125,718	\$	146,060	\$	279,340	\$	297,594
Parking		75,000	75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
Streets		742,680	822,770		845,916		769,743		794,268		819,513
Electric		1,100,000	1,250,000		1,250,000		1,250,000		1,250,000		1,250,000
Water & Sewer		1,000,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000
Motorpool		500,000	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000
Grants/Other		921,500	 4,845,000		14,995,000		3,092,000		100,000		3,700,000
Total	\$	4,523,151	\$ 8,399,049	\$	18,691,634	\$	6,732,802	\$	3,898,609	\$	7,542,107
								Six	ear Total	\$	49,787,352

<u>Revenue Assumptions</u> General Fund and Streets based on General and ROW spreadsheet showing available balance. Parking Fund based on assumption of \$75,000 in net income annually after meter rate increase.

Electric Fund based on assumption of \$1,250,000 in net income and depreciation totaling in excess of this amount.

Water & Sewer is allocated \$1,000,000 in total for both systems based on 2018 rate study.

from cash reserves. Adjust succeeding years for purchases that exceed allocated amount. Grants/Other is applicable grants covering a specific proposed project in the given year and projects that would require bonding.

City of Petoskey Capital Improvement Plan Revenue and Expense Estimates General Fund

	Actual	Actual	Budget	dget Estimated						
	2018	2019	2020		2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Revenues:										
Operating:										
General operating property tax revenue	\$ 3,345,813	\$ 3,379,545	\$ 3,449,500	\$	3,449,500	\$ 3,449,500	\$ 3,535,738	\$ 3,624,131	\$3,714,734	\$ 3,807,603
Solid waste property tax revenue	215,776	222,152	226,000		230,520	235,130	241,009	247,034	253,210	259,540
Public Safety Equipment	373,305	383,191	387,700		-	-	-	-	-	-
Other sources**	4,545,389	4,984,342	4,874,500		4,923,245	4,972,477	5,022,202	5,072,424	5,123,148	5,174,380
Bond Proceeds/Grants-nonrecurring	14,685	291,770	513,500		-	-	-	-	-	-
Marina reserve capital outlay purchase	-	-	-		100,000	-	-	-	-	-
	8,494,968	9,261,000	9,451,200		8,703,265	8,657,108	8,798,948	8,943,589	9,091,092	9,241,523
Less: bond proceeds/grants/contribution	14,685	291,770	513,500		-	-	-	-	-	-
Revenues as adjusted	\$ 8,480,283	\$ 8,969,230	\$ 8,937,700	\$	8,703,265	\$ 8,657,108	\$ 8,798,948	\$ 8,943,589	\$9,091,092	\$ 9,241,523
Expanditurae					*	*	*	*	*	*
Original amount loss dobt novments	¢ 7 649 500	¢ 0 /15 022	¢ 0 002 000	¢	0 202 204	¢ 0 106 000	¢ 0 552 221	¢ 0 601 500	¢ 0 011 750	¢ 0 0 1 2 0 2 0
Debt paymente, marina/public cofety (actual)	φ 7,040,009 566 409	φ 0,415,032 504.000	φ 0,093,000 1 005 000	φ	0,302,294	φ 0,420,020 224.000	φ 0,000,201 220,000	φ 0,001,029 216 000	φ 0,011,752 100,000	φ 0,943,929 100.000
Debt payments- manna/public salety (actual)	500,420	504,900	1,095,000		217,000	224,000	220,000	210,000	100,000	100,000
Less:										
Cash reserves funding capital outlay	n/a	n/a	-		-	-	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)
Public Safety Equip purchase	n/a	n/a	-		-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Outlay	n/a	n/a	(714,200)		-	-	-	-	-	-
Expenditures as adjusted	8,214,937	8,919,932	9,274,600		8,519,294	8,650,828	8,673,231	8,797,529	8,811,752	8,943,929
Revenues as adjusted	8,480,283	8,969,230	8,937,700		8,703,265	8,657,108	8,798,948	8,943,589	9,091,092	9,241,523
-										
Revenue available for projects & outlays	\$ 265,346	\$ 49,298	\$ (336,900)	\$	183,971	\$ 6,279	\$ 125,718	\$ 146,060	\$ 279,340	\$ 297,594

Tax revenue and other sources is estimated based on 2020 levels increased as follows; 2021 (0.0%), 2022 (0.0%), 2023 (2.5%), 2024 (2.5%), 2025 (2.5%), 2026 (2.5%) * Budget expenditure amounts for 2021 thru 2026 are based on adjusted expenditures increased at 1.5% annually above the previous year's amount.

Included \$100,000 per year available from General Fund Balance in years 2023 through 2026.

-

City of Petoskey Capital Improvement Plan

Revenue and Expense Estimates Street Funds

2020 Budget	Major Street		Lo	cal Street	Ge	eneral Street	Total	
Revenues:								
Operating	\$	701,600	\$	244,000	\$	7,600	\$ 953,200	
Contributions & grants		200,000		200,000		1,455,000	1,855,000	
		901,600		444,000		1,462,600	2,808,200	
Less: Contributions/grants		200,000		200,000		1,455,000	1,855,000	
Revenues net of R.O.W. contributions	\$	701,600	\$	244,000	\$	7,600	\$ 953,200	
Expenditures:								
Total	\$	1,552,100	\$	515,700	\$	1,591,400	\$ 3,659,200	
Less:								
Construction*		950,000		160,000		620,000	1,730,000	
Expenditures net of construction		602,100		355,700		971,400	1,929,200	
Revenues net of R.O.W. contributions		701,600		244,000		7,600	953,200	****
Operating revenue funded by R.O.W.	\$	(99,500)	\$	111,700	\$	963,800	\$ 976,000	

	Actual	Actual Actual		Budget	Estimated											
	2018	2019		2020		2021		2022		2023		2024		2025		2026
Right of Way Fund:																
Property tax revenue ***	\$ 1,727,725	\$ 1,757,227	\$	1,738,200	\$	1,738,200	\$	1,738,200	\$	1,781,655	\$	1,826,196	\$1	,871,851	\$ ⁻	1,918,648
Contribution towards operating expenses**	571,148	690,096		976,000		995,520		1,015,430		1,035,739		1,056,454	1	,077,583		1,099,135
Revenue available - ROW Fund	1,156,577	1,067,131		762,200		742,680		722,770		745,916		769,743		794,268		819,513
Street Funds:																
Cash Reserves available - Capital Outlay	-	-		800,000		-		100,000		100,000		-		-		-
Revenue available-Capital Outlay	\$ 1,156,577	\$ 1,067,131	\$	1,562,200	\$	742,680	\$	822,770	\$	845,916	\$	769,743	\$	794,268	\$	819,513

There is approximately \$600,000 in 2020 ROW cash reserves that could be put towards future projects, see above.

* Construction includes street, sidewalk, forestry and engineering costs (est. \$400,000 annually). ** Total operating revenue contribution increased 2% each year from 2020 amount.

*** Tax revenue and other sources is estimated based on 2020 levels increased as follows; 2021 (0.0%), 2022 (0.0%), 2023 (2.5%), 2024 (2.5%), 2025 (2.5%), 2026 (2.5%)

**** Contributions to the General Street Fund include an annual contribution from the Electric Fund in the amount of \$250,000.

City of Petoskey

Capital Improvement Plan Revenue and Expense Estimates Tax Increment Finance Authority

		Actual		Actual	E	Budget *						Estima	ated			
		2018		2019		2020		2021		2022		2023	2024	2025	20)26
Revenues:																
Captured tax revenue	\$	370,018	\$	407,969	\$	400,000	\$	400,000	\$	400,000	\$	410,000	\$420,250	\$430,756	\$ 44	1,525
Interest income		7,692		10,716		5,000		4,000		4,000		4,000	4,000	4,000		4,000
		377,710		418,685		405,000		404,000		404,000		414,000	424,250	434,756	44	5,525
Less:		-		-		-		-		-		-	-	-		-
Total revenue	\$	377,710	\$	418,685	\$	405,000	\$	404,000	\$	404,000	\$	414,000	\$ 424,250	\$434,756	\$ 44	5,525
Expenditures																
Contracted services	\$	2.292	\$	452.652	\$	167.000	\$	10.000	\$	10.000	\$	10.000	\$ 10.000	\$ 10.000	\$ 1	0.000
Lease payment to Debt Service Fund	·	260,000	•	231,400	•	225,000	,	235,000	,	265,000	·	255,000	250,000	225,000	22	0,000
Total expenditures Total revenues		262,292 377,710		684,052 418,685		392,000 405,000		245,000 404,000		275,000 404,000		265,000 414,000	260,000 424,250	235,000 434,756	23 44	0,000 5,525
Rev. available- Capital Improvement	\$	115,418	\$	(265,367)	\$	13,000	\$	159,000	\$	129,000	\$	149,000	\$ 164,250	\$199,756	\$ 21	5,525

Tax revenue and other sources is estimated based on 2020 levels increased as follows; 2021 (0.0%), 2022 (0.0%), 2023 (2.5%), 2024 (2.5%), 2025 (2.5%), 2026 (2.5%)

PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer	Motorpool	Grants/Other	Total
STREETS AND DRAINAGE										
Miscellaneous Pavement Preservation, Paving and Repair	The purpose of this project is to replace or rehabilitate existing pavement and curb lines. Streets under consideration pending available funding include Outlook Street and portions of Harvey Street, Washington Street from Buckley to Franklin.	Right-of-Way			200,000					200,000
Miscellaneous Pavement Preservation, Paving and Repair (Pending funding through MDOT Transportation Economic Development Fund Category B Program)	The purpose of this project is to replace or rehabilitate existing pavement and curb lines. Streets to include portions of Hill Street, West Jefferson Street and Connable Avenue.	Right-of-Way			81,500				81,500	163,000
Greenwood Road Reconstruction - Sheridan Street to Charlevoix Avenue	This project will replace pavement and curb lines on Greenwood Road in conjunction with water main replacement. There has been indication that the Tribe could contribute Bureau of Indian Affairs funding.	Right-of-Way			200,000				350,000 LTBBOI	550,000
WATER AND WASTEWATER SYSTEM										
Miscellaneous Water Main Spot Repairs and Upgrades	Water main work will take place in conjunction with street resurfacing projects along with lead and copper service investigations and replacement.	Right-of-Way					100,000			100,000
Miscellaneous Sanitary Sewer Main and Lift Station Spot Repairs and Upgrades	Sanitary sewer main work will take place in conjunction with street resurfacing projects. Lift station rehabilitation will also occur.	Right-of-Way					150,000			150,000
Water - Greenwood Road - Sheridan to Charlevoix Avenue	Utility upgrade to include water main replacement along Greenwood Road.	Operating Revenue					500,000			500,000
Sanitary - Greenwood Road - Sheridan to Charlevoix Avenue	Utility upgrade to include sanitary main rehabilitation along Greenwood Road.	Operating Revenue					150,000			150,000
SIDEWALKS										
Miscellaneous Sidewalk Construction and Replacement	Sidewalk construction will take place in conjunction with Greenwood Road reconstruction as well as areas identified in the Non-Motorized Facilities Plan as a top priority.	Right-of-Way			150,000					150,000
ELECTRIC SYSTEM										
Petoskey Substation Capacitor Banks	Installation of two (2) 1200kVAR pad mount capacitor banks at Petoskey Substation to compensate for increased VAR flow on the 12.5kV distribution circuits.	Operating Revenue				150,000				150,000
Solar Array Project City Landfill	City staff is currently engaged with Harvest Solar and MPPA evaluating usable area of the City's landfill on Howard Road for a solar array project. Once sizing and energy output is determined, a constructability and interconnect analysis can be performed to establish feasibility and costs.	Operating Revenue				TBD				TBD
Residential Conversion Project - Portions of Waukazoo, Rush, Beech and Pearl Streets	Conversion of the existing overhead distribution circuit to underground within residential corridors. Removes very old overhead system, converts to more reliable underground and prepares for conversion to 7.2kV.	Operating Revenue				473,000				473,000

		2021								
PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer	Motorpool	Grants/Other	Total
Mitchell Road Substation Breaker Voltage Conversion	Conversion of the breaker trip and close coil voltage from AC to DC at Mitchell Road Substation to improve reliability.	Operating Revenue				40,000				40,000
Saville Lot Equipment Relocation	Relocation of pad mount switchgear and adjacent transformers from the Saville Lot to open space for parking structure construction.	Operating Revenue				178,000				178,000
Greenwood Road Street Lighting	Installation of street lighting along Greenwood Road from Sheridan Street to Charlevoix Avenue in conjunction with road reconstruction project.	Operating Revenue				100,000				100,000
Utility System Generation	Installation of backup generators at critical facilities including lift stations and domestic water production sites (wells).	Operating Revenue				150,000				150,000
Patrol Vehicle - Replacement	To replace patrol vehicle #442 (2014) with 2021 unit. Convert and/or replace equipment from old unit to 2021 unit. Painting and lettering required.	Operating Revenue						40,000		40,000
Patrol Vehicle - Replacement	Replace patrol vehicle #443 (2013) with 2021 model. Convert and/or replace equipment from old unit to 2021 unit. Painting and lettering required.	Operating Revenue						40,000		40,000
Staff Vehicle - Replacement	Replace Motor Pool Vehicle Unit #29 (2010).	Operating Revenue						35,000		35,000
Pickup Truck 3/4 Ton with Plow 4x4 - Replacement	Replace Streets Unit #60 (2007).	Operating Revenue						37,000		37,000
1 Ton Dump Truck - Streets - Replacement	Replace Streets Unit #63 (2004).	Operating Revenue						57,000		57,000
Flusher Truck - Streets - Replacement	To replace truck #97 (2000).	Operating Revenue						93,000		93,000
Toro Workman Rescue Cart - Public Safety - Replacement	Replace Rescue Utility Cart Unit #441 (2006).	Operating Revenue						30,000		30,000
Bobcat Toolcat with Attachments, Snow Blower, Forks, Rotating Broom & Box - Replacement	Replace Utility Vehicle Unit #124 (2006).	Operating Revenue						75,000		75,000
70 Foot Ladder Truck Refurbish	Refurbish the ladder truck #4503 (2002) to meet NFPA guidelines. Work to be performed and certified by the manufacturer, will extend the life of the unit an additional 10 years.	Operating Revenue						100,000		100,000

2021												
PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer	Motorpool	Grants/Other	Total		
DOWNTOWN AREA												
Parking Deck Engineering	Engineering of a parking deck on the Saville Lot.	Parking		300,000						300,000		
PARKS AND SPECIAL FACILITIES												
Sunset Park Improvements - Phase One	Following stair tower replacement and MDOT project, park enhancements will be made.	Operating Revenue							100,000 TIFA	100,000		
Arlington Park Design Engineering	Following US-31 realignment, redesign of Arlington Park and Lewis Street area.	Operating Revenue	10,000							10,000		
Marina Fuel System Replacement	Tanks and piping will be 25 years old and in need of replacement or reconditioning and to increase diesel storage capacity.	Operating Revenue	100,000						100,000 State Grant	200,000		
Little Traverse Wheelway Resurfacing	Resurfacing 1/3 of a mile of the LTW. Asphalt trail is deteriorating after many years.	Operating Revenue	60,000						40,000 Grant	100,000		
Solanus Beach Improvements	As identified in the 2018-2022 Parks and Recreation Master Plan, improvements to the beach area that could include an accessible boardwalk to the water, shoreline improvements and restroom/pavilion.	TIFA Grants							250,000 TIFA/Grants	250,000		
River Road Sports Complex Design Engineering	Engineering of restrooms at River Road Sports Complex.	Operating Revenue	10,000							10,000		
Grand Totals			\$180,000	\$300,000	\$631,500	\$1,091,000	\$900,000	\$507,000	\$921,500	\$4,531,000		

City of Petoskey 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Plan



PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer	Motorpool	Grants/Other	Total
STREETS AND DRAINAGE										
East Lake Street - Kalamazoo to Division	Reconstruction of East Lake Street including sidewalks and ADA ramps.	Right-of-Way			700,000					700,000
Miscellaneous Pavement Preservation, Paving and Repair	The purpose of this project is to replace or rehabilitate existing pavement and curb lines. Portions of Bridge, State, and Petoskey Streets are included in 2022 Small Urban Grant.	Right-of-Way			100,000				375,000	475,000
CBD - East Mitchell Street and Petoskey Street	To replace the concrete intersection that was removed previously and not replaced.	Right-of-Way							150,000	150,000
WATER AND WASTEWATER SYSTEM										
Water - East Lake - Kalamazoo to Division	Replacement of water mains and components in conjunction with street reconstruction.	Operating Revenue					500,000			500,000
Sanitary - East Lake - Kalamazoo to Division	Replacement of sanitary mains and components in conjunction with street reconstruction.	Operating Revenue					250,000			250,000
Miscellaneous Water Main Spot Repairs and Upgrades	Water main work will take place in conjunction with street resurfacing projects along with lead and copper service investigations and replacement.	Operating Revenue					125,000			125,000
Miscellaneous Sanitary Sewer Main Spot Repairs and Upgrades	Sanitary sewer main work will take place in conjunction with street resurfacing projects.	Operating Revenue					125,000			125,000
SIDEWALKS										
Miscellaneous Sidewalk Construction and Replacement	Sidewalk additions and replacements will take place in conjunction with East Lake Street reconstruction and other priorities established in the Non-Motorized Facilities Plan.	Right-of-Way			200,000					200,000
ELECTRIC SYSTEM Substation Recloser Replacement	Replacement of the circuit reclosers in Petoskey Substation that were installed in 2005.	Operating Revenue				120,000				120,000
East Lake Underground Conversion	Installation of new three-phase underground on East Lake Street from Division Street to Kalamazoo Avenue. Provides redundant circuit into the CBD area, converts East Lake Street to underground, and moves the circuit to the new 7.2/12.5kV system.	Operating Revenue				515,000				515,000
Bear River Valley Underground - PET1	Conversion of the overhead PET1 distribution circuit from Petoskey Substation through the Bear River Valley to lone Street equipment area. Improves reliability to critical loads including the hospital, City Hall and CBD area. Utilizes conduit system installed as part of the Bear River Corridor project.	Operating Revenue				219,000				219,000
Mitchell Road Substation Fiber Connection	Installation of fiber optic cable from DPW to Mitchell Road Substation.	Operating Revenue				50,000				50,000
Electric System GIS Database	Preparation of back-end database for Electric System GIS. Includes transfer of existing electric computer model and record drawings into database.	Operating Revenue				50,000				50,000

PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer	Motorpool	Grants/Other	Total
MOTOR POOL Patrol Vehicle - Replacement	Replace 4x4 patrol vehicle #445 (2017) with 2022 model. Painting and lettering required.	Operating Revenue						52,000		52,000
Pickup Truck - Water - Replacement	Replace Water Unit #34 (2012).	Operating Revenue						30,000		30,000
Pickup with Plow - Wastewater - Replacement	Replace WWTP Unit #38 (2012).	Operating Revenue						40,000		40,000
Bucket Truck - Electric - Replacement	Replace Unit #83 (2001).	Operating Revenue						225,000		225,000
Batwing Mower - Replacement	Replace Unit #148 (2012).	Operating Revenue						50,000		50,000
Crane Truck - Water - Replacement	To replace truck #33 (2009).	Operating Revenue						75,000		75,000
Staff Vehicle - Replacement	To replace Motor Pool vehicle #25 (2012).	Operating Revenue						30,000		30,000
Bobcat Toolcat with Attachments, Snow Blower, Forks, Rotating Broom & Box - Replacement	Replace Utility Vehicle Unit #112 (2006).	Operating Revenue						75,000		75,000
DOWNTOWN AREA Parking Lot Paving	Paving existing lot and pay station installation.	Parking		65,000						65,000
BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS City Hall Renovations	City Hall was renovated in 1990 and will continue to have repairs and modifications needed for continued efficient operations. Work will include foundation wall waterproofing repairs and HVAC system.	Operating Revenue	250,000							250,000
Curtis Avenue Department of Parks and Recreation Facility Improvements	Improvements to include cold storage facility for DPW and Parks and Recreation and service drive improvements to connect facility to DPW facility.	Operating Revenue							3,400,000	3,400,000
PARKS AND SPECIAL FACILITIES Festival Place Shelter Roof	Replace shingle roofing with metal roofing similar to Bear River pavilion.	Operating Revenue	20,000							20,000
Pennsylvania Park Upgrades	As part of the Downtown Greenway Corridor site amenities from Bay Street to East Mitchell Street, Park Avenue sidewalk widening and landscaping improvements will be constructed in accordance with design and engineering plans completed in 2018.	Operating Revenue	100,000			68,000			100,000	268,000

PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer	Motorpool	Grants/Other	Total
Riverbend Skate Park Equipment	The original skate park equipment was purchased in 2002, with additional purchases in 2008 and 2012. This project would replace the 2002 equipment, including the original wood ramps and would add new skate elements to the facility.	Operating Revenue	20,000						20,000 State Grant	40,000
Winter Sports Park Hockey Rink Improvements	Construction of a cover over the hockey rink to extend usability.	Operating Revenue							300,000 Local Grant	300,000
Bayfront Park West - Solanus Beach	Construction of public access and restrooms based on 2020 feasibility study results. May include shoreline stabilization improvements.	TIFA							500,000 TIFA and Grants	500,000
Grand Totals			\$390,000	\$65,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,022,000	\$1,000,000	\$577,000	\$4,845,000	\$8,899,000

City of Petoskey 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Plan



PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer	Motorpool	Grants/Other	Total
STREETS AND DRAINAGE Miscellaneous Pavement Preservation, Paving and Repair	This project is to replace or rehabilitate existing pavement and curb lines. Streets to be considered fall under the category of fair to poor based on PASER ratings.	Right-of-Way			200,000					200,000
WATER AND WASTEWATER SYSTEM Water - Miscellaneous Water Main Spot Repairs and Upgrades	Water main work will take place in conjunction with street resurfacing projects along with lead and copper service investigations and replacement.	Operating Revenue					350,000			350,000
Sanitary - Miscellaneous Sewer Main Spot Repairs and Upgrades	Sewer main work will take place in conjunction with street resurfacing.	Operating Revenue					150,000			150,000
Lime Kiln Well and Control Building Improvements	The Lime Kiln Well was developed 35 years ago. Improvements would include conversion from a t-vertical turbine pump system to a submersible pump system, updated chlorine feed systems and renovations to control and monitoring systems.	Operating Revenue					500,000			500,000
SIDEWALKS Miscellaneous Sidewalk Construction and Replacement	Sidewalk additions and replacement will occur in conjunction with street projects and in priority locations established in the Non-Motorized Facilities Plan.	Right-of-Way			150,000					150,000
ELECTRIC SYSTEM Petoskey Sub 46kV, PET6 & PET8 Underground	Conversion of the 46kV transmission line and circuits PET6 & PET8 to underground from Petoskey Substation to the south side of the salt shed. Improves reliability of the transmission service into the substation, prepares for voltage conversion of circuit PET8, and creates required space for expansion of the DPW Building.	Operating Revenue				522,000				522,000
Residential Conversion Project - Maple and Porter	Conversion of the existing overhead distribution circuit to underground within residential corridors. Removes very old overhead system, converts to more reliable underground and prepares for conversion to 7.2/12.5kV.	Operating Revenue				320,000				320,000
Residential Conversion Project - Morgan/Priebe/Hillcrest	Conversion of the existing overhead distribution circuit to underground within residential corridors. Removes very old overhead system, converts to more reliable underground and prepares for conversion to 7.2kV.	Operating Revenue				365,000				365,000
River Valley Underground - PET5 - McLaren/Burns	Conversion of the overhead express 7.2/12.5kV McLaren/Burns feeder to underground from Petoskey Substation through the Bear River Valley to Ione Street. Adds reliability to this express feeder serving one of the highest critical loads on the system.	Operating Revenue				219,000				219,000

PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer	Motorpool	Grants/Other	Total
MOTOR POOL										
Patrol Vehicle - Replacement	Replace 4x4 patrol vehicle #446 (2018) with 2023 model. Painting and lettering required.	Operating Revenue						52,000		52,000
Pickup Truck - CBD Water Truck - Replacement	Replace Unit #52 (2008).	Operating Revenue						30,000		30,000
Pickup Truck - Parks and Rec - Replacement	Replace Unit #53 (2010).	Operating Revenue						25,000		25,000
Pickup Truck - Streets - Replacement	Replace Unit #65 (2010).	Operating Revenue						25,000		25,000
Heavy Duty Plow Truck/Underbody - Streets - Replacement	Replace Unit #93 (2006).	Operating Revenue						180,000		180,000
Front End Loader - Streets - Replacement	Replace Unit #107 (2003).	Operating Revenue						200,000		200,000
Toro Workman Utility Cart - Parks and Rec - Replacement	Replace Unit #174 (2008).	Operating Revenue						15,000		15,000
Toro Workman Rescue Cart - Public Safety - Replacement	Replace Rescue Utility Cart Unit #541 (2008).	Operating Revenue						27,000		27,000
Batwing Groundmaster - Replacement	Replace Unit #188 (2009).	Operating Revenue						65,000		65,000
DOWNTOWN AREA										
Parking Lot Paving	Paving existing lot and pay station installation.	Parking		65,000						65,000
Construction of a Parking Deck	Construction of a deck on the Saville Lot.	TIF Bonds							3,000,000	3,000,000
BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS										
Bayfront Park Clock Tower	Refurbish tower lights and clock mechanisms.	TIFA	75,000							75,000
East Lake Street Fire Station	Paint apparatus room and radiant heat tube replacement.	Operating Revenue	42,000							42,000
Replacement of DPW Building	Existing building is 60+ years old, does not meet operational needs and is inefficient. New building to incorporate green infrastructure and rooftop solar panels.	Revenue Bonds							11,500,000	11,500,000
PARKS AND SPECIAL FACILITIES										
Washington Park Access Engineering and Construction	Washington Park currently has limited access from Petoskey Street off of Washington Street and from Petoskey Street off of Sheridan Street, with limited parking taking place primarily on the streets. Project proposes to create a turn-a- round style parking lot off of Petoskey Street on the south end of the park and provide improved access to Washington Street on the north side of the park, and create a new pedestrian access off of Emmet Street into the park area and extend sidewalks to key areas within the park.	Operating Revenue	75,000		75,000				75,000 State Grant	225,000
Pennsylvania Park Upgrades	A plaza adjacent to East Mitchell Street, where the annual tree-lighting occurs, will be created to improve the area for community gatherings.	Operating Revenue	95,000							95,000

		2020								
PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer	Motorpool	Grants/Other	Total
Winter Sports Park Building Roof	The existing Winter Sports Park building will be 31 years old in 2021. Replacement of roof will be the first phase of improvements, with siding and deck repairs in 2022.	Operating Revenue	30,000							30,000
Winter Sports Park Building Interior Renovations	The Winter Sports Park Building in 2021 will be 31 years old and interior renovations are anticipated and will include painting, concession and restroom sink and counter replacements, and replacement of the skate proof flooring on main level and door replacement at air lock entryway. These repairs are necessary and in particular the skate proof flooring. Failure of the flooring will jeopardize main level floor and underlying decking and joists.	Operating Revenues	70,000						20,000 Local Grant	90,000
Winter Sports Park Building Siding and Decking	The existing Winter Sports Park building will be 31 years old in 2021 and exterior siding and decking will be needed to maintain structure.	Operating Revenue	60,000							60,000
River Road Sports Complex	Construction of restrooms at River Road Sports Complex.	Operating Revenue	100,000						250,000 State Grant	350,000
Little Traverse Wheelway Resurfacing	Replace 1-mile segment of LTW.	Operating Revenue	130,000						130,000 State Grant	260,000
Lockwood Park Upgrades	Upgrade the basketball court.	Operating Revenue	25,000							25,000
Marina Parking Lot Resurfacing	In 2020, the parking lot will be 30 years of age and will be in need of resurfacing. The lot has been used to house marina spoils prior to disposal which accelerated the decline of the top coat. In 2010, the lot was patched to accommodate the marina expansion utilities. Grant and restricted marina funds will be used to finzance the lot resurfacing	Marina Reserve	20,000						20,000 State Grant	40,000
Grand Totals	to mance the for resultability.		\$722,000	\$65,000	\$425,000	\$1,426,000	\$1,000,000	\$619,000	\$14,995,000	\$19,252,000



PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer	Motorpool	Grants/Other	Total
STREETS AND DRAINAGE Howard Street from State Street to Jennings Avenue	This project would be dependent upon funding availability through MDOT's Small Urban Program. Primary scope of work would be to remove and replace deteriorating pavement along with spot repairs to curbs, sidewalks and storm sewers.	Right-of-Way			400,000				375,000 State Grant	775,000
WATER AND WASTEWATER SYSTEM Water - Howard Street and Miscellaneous Water Main Spot Repairs and Upgrades	Water main work will take place in conjunction with street resurfacing.	Operating Revenue					550,000			550,000
Sanitary - Howard Street and Miscellaneous Sewer Main Spot Repairs and Upgrades	Sewer main work will take place in conjunction with street resurfacing.	Operating Revenue					450,000			450,000
SIDEWALKS Miscellaneous Sidewalk Construction and Replacement	Sidewalk additions and replacement will occur in conjunction with street projects and in priority locations established in the Non-Motorized Facilities Plan.	Right-of-Way			200,000					200,000
ELECTRIC SYSTEM Residential Conversion Project - Portions of Howard, Rush, Fulton, and Pearl Streets	Conversion of the existing overhead distribution circuit to underground within residential corridors. Removes very old overhead system, converts to more reliable underground and prepares for conversion to 7.2/12.5kV.	Operating Revenue				655,000				655,000
Cemetery Road Underground	Conversion of the existing 7.2/12.5kV overhead open-wire distribution circuit to underground along a portion of Cemetery Road starting at the City limits. Converts this section of mainline circuit serving large load customers to a more reliable underground system.	Operating Revenue				293,000				293,000
MOTOR POOL Public Safety Marine Apparatus - Replacement	Replace Unit #526 (2007).	Operating Revenue						35,000		35,000
Patrol Vehicle - Replacement	Replace vehicle #447 (2019) with 2024 model. Convert and/or replace equipment from old unit; painting and lettering required.	Operating Revenue						52,000		52,000
Staff Vehicle - Public Works - Replacement	Replace Unit #26 (2015).	Operating Revenue						35,000		35,000
Staff Vehicle - Finance- Replacement	Replace Unit #21 (2015).	Operating Revenue						35,000		35,000
One-ton Dump Truck - Streets Division - Replacement	Replace Unit #62 (2008).	Operating Revenue						41,000		41,000
35,000 GVW Plow Salt/Sand Spreader Replacement	Replace Unit #96 (2007) along with salt and sand unit and plow.	Operating Revenue						200,000		200,000

		ZUZ4	Conservation	Dealára	01	El a atria	Matan 8, Causa	Matawaal	Ore at /Oth an	T-4-1
PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	vvater & Sewer	Notorpool	Grants/Other	Iotal
DPW Garage Fork Lift - Replacement	Replace Unit #114 (1991).	Operating Revenue						30,000		30,000
Outfront Mower - Parks and Rec - Replacement	Replace Parks and Rec Unit #180 (2013).	Operating Revenue						30,000		30,000
DOWNTOWN AREA										
Parking Lot Paving	Paving existing lot and pay station installation.	Parking		70,000						70,000
Engineering of a Parking Deck	Engineering of a parking deck on the City-County Lots.	Parking		400,000						400,000
BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS										
Public Safety West	The building was constructed in 2011 and it is anticipated the overhead doors will need replacement.	Operating Revenue	75,000							75,000
Public Safety West	The building was constructed in 2011 and it is anticipated the garage floor will need to be resealed.	Operating Revenue	15,000							15,000
Salt Sheds and Materials Storage Area	Existing salt sheds are 30+ years old and must be upgraded. Sheds and material storage bins would potentially be relocated to the north side of Sheridan Street as part of the DPW campus upgrades.	Operating Revenue			500,000				1,210,000	1,710,000
Community Gardens Park and Yard Waste Drop Off Area	Community gardens would be relocated to the south side of Sheridan Street in proximity of current yard waste drop off and salt shed area. Site to be upgraded to enhance Bear River Valley/Iron Bell Trail and launch area with restrooms, as well as improved yard waste drop off and community gardens.	Operating Revenue							1,307,000 State Grant TIFA Bonds	1,307,000
PARKS AND SPECIAL FACILITIES Bates Park Concession Building	Concession will be 25 years old in 2024 and in need of roofing and siding.	Operating Revenue	60,000							60,000
Downtown Greenway Corridor Extension	Construction of the corridor between Emmet Street and Washington Street following rail corridor property purchase in 2023.	Operating Revenue	150,000						50,000	200,000
Washington Park Improvements	Construction of improvements identified through a master plan process, including park amenities to follow 2023 access improvements.	Operating Revenue	150,000						150,000	300,000
Grand Totals			\$450,000	\$470,000	\$1,100,000	\$948,000	\$1,000,000	\$458,000	\$3,092,000	\$7,518,000



City of Petoskey 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Plan

PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer Motorpool Grants/Other	Total
STREETS AND DRAINAGE Miscellaneous Pavement Preservation, Paving and Repair	This project is to replace or rehabilitate existing pavement and curb lines. Streets to be considered fall under the category of fair to poor based on PASER ratings.	Right-of-Way			350,000			350,000
WATER AND WASTEWATER SYSTEM Water - Miscellaneous Water Main Spot Repairs and Upgrades	Water main work will take place in conjunction with street resurfacing projects along with lead and copper service investigations and replacement.	Operating Revenue					500,000	500,000
Sanitary - Miscellaneous Sewer Main Spot Repairs and Upgrades	Sewer main work will take place in conjunction with street resurfacing.	Operating Revenue					500,000	500,000
SIDEWALKS Miscellaneous Sidewalk Construction and Replacement	Sidewalk additions and replacement will occur in conjunction with street projects and in priority locations established in the Non-Motorized Facilities Plan.	Right-of-Way			150,000			150,000
FLECTRIC SYSTEM								
Atkins-Northmen Drive Underground Tie	Install new underground tie along McDougal Extension from Atkins Road to Northmen Drive. Provides backup circuit to school campus. Conduit installed in conjunction with 2015 road construction.	Operating Revenue				149,000		149,000
Residential Conversion Project (Morgan/Priebe/Hillcrest)	Conversion of the existing overhead distribution circuit to underground within residential corridors. Removes very old overhead system, converts to more reliable underground and prepares for conversion to 7.2kV.	Operating Revenue				404,000		404,000
46kV Metering Structure Replacement	Replacement of the 50+ year old 46kV metering structure at the River Road connection to the 46kV transmission system. Replaces aged wood pole structure at this critical system connection point.	Operating Revenue				250,000		250,000
CBD Alley Conversion to Underground	Conversion of the remaining CBD alley to underground (300 Block East Mitchell and Michigan).	Operating Revenue				125,000		125,000
NOTOR BOOL								
Patrol Vehicle - Replacement	To replace patrol vehicle #444 (2020) with 2025 unit. Painting and lettering required.	Operating Revenue					52,000	52,000
1 Ton Dump Truck - Parks and Rec - Replacement	Replace Parks and Rec Unit #61 (2012).	Operating Revenue					40,000	40,000

PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer	Motorpool	Grants/Other	Total
1 Ton Dump Truck - Streets - Replacement	Replace Streets Unit #66 (2011).	Operating Revenue						50,000		50,000
Pickup Truck with Plow - Replacement	Replace Streets Division Unit #70 (2015).	Operating Revenue						40,000		40,000
Heavy Duty Plow Truck/Underbody - Streets - Replacement	Replace Unit #98 (2012).	Operating Revenue						210,000		210,000
Heavy Duty Hydraulic Sewer Cleaner	Replace Unit #99 (2005).	Operating Revenue						240,000		240,000
Outfront Mower - Parks and Recreation - Replacement	Replace Parks and Recreation Unit #115 (2015).	Operating Revenue						35,000		35,000
Parking Lot Paving	Paving existing lot and pay station installation.	Operating Revenue		75,000						75,000
Replacement of Road Trolley	Replacement of 1999 road trolley. In 2025 the road trolley will be 26 years old and in need of replacement.	Operating Revenue		125,000						125,000
Downtown Streetscape	The streetscape will be 28 years old and should continue to be pedestrian oriented while incorporating green infrastructure and new technologies.	Operating Revenue							TBD	TBD
BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS										
City Hall	Replacement of HVAC units (1989) and other efficiency improvements identified in the energy audit.	Operating Revenue	325,000							325,000
PARKS AND SPECIAL FACILITIES										
Marina Restroom/Shower	Improvements to the Marina restrooms and showers include interior renovations to counter tops, partitions and painting. Shower renovations will include tiling and faucets.	Operating Revenue	25,000							25,000
Ed White Field	The facility was constructed in 1989 and will be in need of floor upgrades in scorers room, siding, bleachers and lighting upgrades.	Operating Revenue	155,000							155,000
Curtis Park Improvements	Implementation of the Master Plan developed in 2021.	Operating Revenue	100,000						100,000	200,000
Grand Totals			\$605,000	\$200,000	\$500,000	\$928,000	\$1,000,000	\$667,000	\$100,000	\$4,000,000



PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer Motorpo	ol Grants/Other	Total
STREETS AND DRAINAGE Full reconstruction of streets identified through PASER ratings and utility conditions	These streets are not candidates for pavement preservation. Possible candidates include Bay, Rose, Clinton and Ottawa.	Right-of-Way			800,000				800,000
WATER AND WASTEWATER SYSTEM Water - Reconstruction and Miscellaneous Water Main Spot Repairs and Upgrades	Water main work in conjunction with identified street reconstruction.	Operating Revenue					500,000		500,000
Sanitary - Reconstruction and Miscellaneous Sanitary Main Spot Repairs and Upgrades	Sewer main work in conjunction with identified street reconstruction.	Operating Revenue					500,000		500,000
SIDEWALKS Miscellaneous Sidewalk Construction	Sidewalk additions and replacement will occur in conjunction with street projects and in priority locations established in the Non-Motorized Facilities Plan.	Right-of-Way			200,000				200,000
ELECTRIC SYSTEM Residential Conversion Project - (Bay & Rose; portions of Williams and Clinton Streets	Conversion of the existing overhead distribution circuit to underground within residential corridors. Removes very old overhead system, converts to more reliable underground and prepares for conversion to 7.2kV.	Operating Revenue				604,000			604,000
Lafayette/Traverse Woods Cable Replacement	Replacement of the 30+ year old underground cable and equipment at Lafayette and Traverse Woods Apartments.	Operating Revenue				400,000			400,000
MOTOR POOL Staff Vehicle - Parks and Recreation - Replacement	Replace Unit #28 (2017).	Operating Revenue					33,000		33,000
Staff Vehicle - Public Safety - Replacement	Replace Public Safety Unit #450.	Operating Revenue					35,000	l de la constante de	35,000
Pick-up Truck 1/2 Ton 4x4 - Replacement	Replace Parks and Recreation Unit #74 (2014).	Operating Revenue					35,000	,	35,000
Pick-up Truck 1/2 Ton 4x4 - Replacement	Replace Parks and Recreation Unit #75 (2014).	Operating Revenue					35,000	I	35,000
Pick-up Truck 1/2 Ton 4x4 - Replacement	Replace Electric Division Unit #85 (2015).	Operating Revenue					35,000	I	35,000

Portable Light Towers (2) - Replacement Replace Public Works Units #102 and #104. Operating Revenue Source Listic Constraint Source	50,000
Asphalt Recycler and Hot Patch Trailer-Falcon - Replace Street Department Unit #103 (2015). Operating Replacement Revenue	29,000
Toro Workman Utility Cart - Parks and Rec - Replacement Replace Utility Cart #116 - Marina (2013). Operating 16,000 Revenue Revenue Revenue 16,000 16,000	16,000
Bobcat Toolcat with Attachments, Snow Blower, Forks, Rotating Broom, and Box-ReplacementReplace Utility Vehicle Unit #126 (2017).Operating Revenue85,000	85,000
Heavy-Duty Forklift- Replacement Replace Public Works Garage Unit #128 (2006). Operating 28,000 Revenue Revenue Revenue Revenue	28,000
Toro Walk Behind Mower Replace Parks and Rec Unit #182 (2001). Operating Revenue 6,000	6,000
Zamboni Ice Groomer - Replacement Replace Winter Sports Park Ice Rink Unit #173 (1988). Operating Revenue 30,000	30,000
DOWNTOWN AREA Construction of a Parking Deck Construction of a Deck on the City-County Lots. Parking 3,500,000	3,500,000
BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS East Lake Street Fire Station Renovations The building was remodeled into the Fire Station in 1989 and will require numerous upgrades including replacement of windows, kitchen remodel, replacement of tube heating system, training room cabinet remodel, interior apparatus area painting, HVAC rooftop unit, furnaces (2), carpet replacement, window replacement and interior lighting upgrades. Operating Revenue 243,000	243,000
Public Safety Garage - City Hall Replace radiant tube heaters. Operating Revenue 18,000	18,000
PARKS AND SPECIAL FACILITIES Construction of improvements identified through master plan process. Operating Revenue 200,000 200,000	400,000
Bayfront Park Resource Center The facility was constructed in 1984 and will be in need of front door replacement, windows, carpeting, concession stand renovations and landscaping. Operating Revenue 67,000	67,000
Grand Totals	\$7 649 000



City of Petoskey 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Plan

PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer	Motorpool	Grants/Other	Total
STREETS AND DRAINAGE Miscellaneous Pavement Preservation, Paving and Repair	The purpose of this project is to replace or rehabilitate existing pavement and curb lines. Streets to be considered fall under the category of fair to poor based on PASER ratings.	Right-of-Way			TBD					TBD
Storm Sewer System Upgrades	Projects identified in the 2018 Stormwater Asset Management Plan.	Right-of-Way			TBD					TBD
Full reconstruction of streets identified through PASER ratings and utility conditions	Streets that are not candidates for pavement preservation and will require significant funding for reconstruction. Possible candidates include Buckley, Willis, Ingalls, Jackson.	Right-of-Way			TBD					TBD
WATER AND WASTEWATER SYSTEM New Aeration Blowers/Secondary Process Improvements	New aeration blowers for optimum efficiency as well as biological nutrient removal will be needed as future upgrades for the WWTP are anticipated. These improvements would have energy and/or chemical savings associated.	Operating Revenue					800,000			800,000
Lead Service Line Replacements	New lead and copper rules dictate that any portion of a water service line that may have been in contact with lead is considered a lead service line and would need to be removed and replaced within the dwelling it serves. Rule requirements include a system wide inventory by year 2025 to determine the number of service replacements. Once determined, replacements must occur at a rate of 5% per year over a 20 year period. Service line replacements are estimated at \$7,000 per service.	Operating Revenue					TBD			TBD
Ingalls Central to Westshore Gravity Bypass	This project would help automatically transfer water between two pressure districts and provide for additional system redundancy and reliability.	Operating Revenue					50,000			50,000
Development of Wells 8 & 9	Two water wells were originally partially developed by a private developer as part of a capacity agreement near the intersection of Anderson and Intertown Road in the early 2000s. Since other wells were being developed as part of other agreements these two were never equipped. As consumption increases or as the other older wells produce less over time, these two will likely be needed in the future.	Operating Revenue					3,800,000			3,800,000

PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer	Motorpool	Grants/Other	Total
Submersible Pump Changeouts for Lift Stations	The wastewater lift stations originally installed as part of the Bay Harbor Development are nearly 25 years in age, periodic replacement will be phased in over multiple years.	Operating Revenue					250,000			250,000
Watermain Replacement - Upper District Sheridan to US-131 Tower	This is an ongoing replacement of vintage 1960s transmission water main that has been incrementally replaced through various street and infrastructure projects.	Operating Revenue					1,410,000			1,410,000
SIDEWALKS										
Sidewalk Construction and Maintenance	The City has prioritized construction of sidewalks and now has 44.3 miles to maintain.	Right-of-Way			TBD					TBD
ELECTRIC SYSTEM										
Resort Pike Tie - PET2 to PET4	Installation of #336.4 Hendrix south from Sterzik Road to the CE 138kV line, then 500kCM 15kV CU underground extending north to the existing #336.4 ACSR dead-end pole.	Operating Revenue				215,000				215,000
AMI System	Installation of a system-wide AMI (Advanced Metering Infrastructure) system. Provides for time- of-use energy sales, automatic meter reading, remote disconnects/reconnects, and outage detection.	Operating Revenue				946,500				946,500
Mitchell Road Overhead Reconductor	Reconductor overhead three-phase line on Mitchell Road from Division Road to Hill Street. Complete in conjunction with 500kCM underground cable to Kalamazoo Avenue and East Lake Street, plus overhead reconductor on Lake Street to Division Street for new/redundant 7.2/12.5kV source into CBD.	Operating Revenue				65,000				65,000
East Mitchell Street Underground Cable	Installation of 500kCM 15kV underground cable from riser pole near Lincoln Place to Kalamazoo Avenue and Lake Street.	Operating Revenue				210,000				210,000
Utility System Generators	Providing fixed generation at key utility facilities. (e.g. well houses, lift stations)	Operating Revenue				375,000				375,000
West Sheridan Street Underground Upgrade	Replace direct buried cable and rusted equipment with new cable in conduit and equipment in more protected areas. Add switchgear with fused taps to improve sectionalizing and circuit reliability.	Operating Revenue				336,000				336,000
Petoskey Substation Driveway Paving	Grading, drainage improvements and paving of the Petoskey Substation driveway.	Operating Revenue				55,000				55,000
Solar Array Installation	Installation of solar array on City properties including landfill.	Operating Revenue				TBD				TBD
Rooftop Solar Installation	Installation of solar panels on Lake Street Fire Station and other facilities.	Operating Revenue				300,000				300,000
MOTOR POOL										
Sutphen Fire Truck with Mini Tower	Replacement of Vehicle #503 (2002).	Operating Revenue						750,000		750,000
DOWNTOWN AREA										
Parking Lot and Structure Improvements	On-going maintenance of lots, meters and possible structure will be needed.	Operating Revenue		TBD						TBD

PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer	Motorpool	Grants/Other	Total
BUILDING AND GROUNDS Public Safety West	Built in 2011, building maintenance will require replacement windows, boiler upgrade, HVAC replacement and carpeting.	Operating Revenue	82,000							82,000
History Museum	Museum was built in 1971 and soffit will need replacement.	Operating Revenue	10,000						TBD	10,000
Little Traverse Wheelway - Resort Bluffs Potential Relocation	Potential relocation of the Little Traverse Wheelway from Magnus Park to East Park due to	Operating Revenue							TBD	
Bayfront Park Shoreline Stabilization	Due to on-going high water levels and resulting damage, improvements to stabilize shoreline.	Operating Revenue	7,000,000						TBD	7,000,000
Bayfront Park Marina	Upgrades to dock system to respond to fluctuating water levels.	Operating Revenue							TBD	
Bayfront Park Irrigation Extension	Install automated sprinkler system from Arboretum restroom to parking area east of Ed White Field. This area is currently partially irrigated with a manual plug-in system which provides inadequate coverage – requires manpower and must run during high use times when employees are available, which interferes with the general public.	Operating Revenue	32,000							32,000
Bayfront Park Paddlesport Improvements	Construction of paddlesport storage area and barrier-free launch.	Operating Revenue							TBD	
Lake Street Dam Improvements	Implementation of the chosen alternative from engineering study.	Operating Revenue							TBD	TBD
Little Traverse Wheelway	LTW restoration (\$48 per linear foot x 5,280 (1 mile) x 8 miles).	Operating Revenue	2,027,520							2,027,520
Downtown Greenway Corridor - Washington Street to River Bend Park	Extension of the Downtown Greenway Corridor to connect to River Bend Park.	Operating Revenue							TBD	TBD
Bear River Valley	Extending whitewater improvements to south of Bridge Street, boardwalk replacements and improvements and trail repairs.	TIFA							455,000	455,000
Magnus Park Campground Improvements	Campground and day use improvements per the Park Master Plan.	TIFA							TBD	TBD
Tennis Court Complex	The complex will be due for upper court repainting (completed every 7 years), lower court repainting (completed every 7 years), concession and restroom upgrades and lower court replacement.	Operating Revenue	150,000						150,000 PPS 50% Share	300,000
Bates Baseball Complex	Bates Baseball Complex was constructed in 1998 and will be in need of improvements to fencing, bleachers, dugout restoration, lighting, concession stand renovation and asphalt path renovation.	Operating Revenue	150,000						150,000	300,000

PROJECT CATEGORY		Funding Source	General	Parking	Streets	Electric	Water & Sewer	Motorpool	Grants/Other	Total
River Road Sports Complex	The complex will require softball field fence replacement, restroom renovations and parking lot redesign.	Operating Revenue	130,000						100,000	230,000
Dog Park	Dog park was identified as a top community project based on public feedback per the current Parks and Recreation Masterplan.	Operating Revenue	100,000						200,000	300,000
Miscellaneous	Miscellaneous replacements including park benches and picnic tables as identified.	Operating Revenue	75,000							75,000
Grand Totals			\$9,756,520	TBD	TBD	\$2,502,500	\$6,310,000	\$750,000	\$ 1,055,000	\$20,374,020



City of Petoskey

BOARD:	City Council		
MEETING DATE:	October 5, 2020	PREPARED:	September 23, 2020
AGENDA SUBJECT:	Forestry Assessment and Ma	anagement Plan I	Presentation
RECOMMENDATION:	That City Council hear pre- Director Kendall Klingelsmith	esentation from I	Parks and Recreation

Background Last fall the City applied for and received funding through the Michigan Department of Natural Resources Community Forestry Program to move forward with a tree assessment and management plan. This summer Davey Resource Group inventoried over 3,500 trees and provided a management plan to assist with identifying best practices specifically to Petoskey forestry.

The presentation will highlight some of the areas within the forestry program where the City has successes and also areas to improve. Additionally, Council will have a better understanding of department and staff responsibility with the forestry program.

Action Information only.

kk Enclosure



July 2020

TREE ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT PLAN

City of Petoskey, Michigan

Prepared for:

City of Petoskey 101 East Lake Street Petoskey, Michigan 49770 231-347-2500

Prepared by:

Davey Resource Group, Inc. 295 S. Water Street, Suite 300 Kent, Ohio 44240 800-828-8312

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Executive Summary	iv
Introduction	1
Section 1: Structure and Composition of the Public Tree Resource	3
Section 2: Functions and Benefits of the Public Tree Resource	18
Section 3: Recommended Management of the Public Tree Resource	24
Conclusion	
References	40

TABLES

1.	Inventoried tree genera in the most abundant families	6
2.	Conflicts between inventoried trees and overhead utilities	. 14
3.	Estimated budget for recommended five-year tree resource maintenance schedule	. 36

FIGURES

1.	Estimated cost and activity grand totals of five-year tree resource maintenance scheduleiv
2.	Number of inventoried sites by location and type
3.	Species distribution of trees inventoried in the ROW
4.	Genus distribution of trees inventoried in the ROW5
5.	Family distribution of trees inventoried in the ROW5
6.	Species distribution of trees inventoried in parks7
7.	Genus distribution of trees inventoried in parks7
8.	Family distribution of trees inventoried in parks
9.	Inventoried tree resource susceptibility to invasive pests that have a regional presence
10.	Condition of the inventoried tree resource
11.	Relative age distribution of the inventoried tree resource
12.	Condition of trees inventoried in the ROW by relative age class
13.	Condition of trees inventoried in parks by relative age class
14.	Estimated annual value of benefits provided by inventoried ROW trees
15.	Estimated annual value of benefits provided by inventoried parks trees
16.	Recommended removals in the ROW by size class and risk rating
17.	Recommended Removals in parks by size class and risk rating
18.	Recommended pruning in the ROW by size class and risk rating
19.	Recommended pruning in parks by size class and risk rating
20.	Seven-year Routine Pruning Cycle by size class
21.	Three-year Young Tree Training cycle by size class

APPENDICES

- A. Data Collection and Site Location Methods
- B. Invasive Pests and Diseases
- C. i-Tree Streets Methodology
- D. Suggested Tree Species for USDA Hardiness Zone 5
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project supports the City of Petoskey's mission to beautify its community with public tree conservation and improve its residents' well-being with improved urban forestry management. This *Tree Assessment and Management Plan* offers expertise in preserving and expanding urban canopy so the environmental, economic, and social benefits it provides continue for generations.

The City of Petoskey would like to thank the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and the U.S. Forest Service for the funding it received from the Urban and Community Forestry (UCF) Grant Program. The UCF Grant Program is designed to encourage communities throughout the United States to create and support sustainable urban forestry programs and was significantly helpful to this project.

The City of Petoskey also recognizes the support of its City Council, its city staff, and the State of Michigan Registered Forester Doug Boor.



Notice of Disclaimer: Inventory data provided by Davey Resource Group, Inc. "DRG" are based on visual recording at the time of inspection. Visual records do not include individual testing or analysis, nor do they include aerial or subterranean inspection. DRG is not responsible for the discovery or identification of hidden or otherwise non-observable hazards. Records may not remain accurate after inspection due to the variable deterioration of inventoried material. DRG provides no warranty with respect to the fitness of the urban forest for any use or purpose whatsoever. Clients may choose to accept or disregard DRG's recommendations or to seek additional advice. Important: know and understand that visual inspection is confined to the designated subject tree(s) and that the inspections for this project are performed in the interest of facts of the tree(s) without prejudice to or for any other service or any interested party.

Five-Year Tree Resource Maintenance Schedule

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Petoskey's *Tree Assessment and Management Plan*, written by Davey Resource Group, Inc. "DRG", focuses on quantifying the benefits provided by the inventoried tree resource and addressing its maintenance needs. DRG completed a tree inventory for Petoskey in July 2020 and analyzed the inventory data to understand the structure of the city's inventoried tree resource. DRG also estimated the economic values of benefits provided by the inventoried tree resource using i-Tree Streets and recommended a prioritized maintenance schedule with an estimated budget for the next five years.

The inventoried tree population's environmental services provide annual benefits with an estimated total value of \$222,715. The city's 2020 Downtown Maintenance budget is \$102,400 and its 2020 Contract Forestry budget is \$325,500, making Petoskey's return on investment about 52% annually. Implementing proactive maintenance of the public tree resource is a sound long-term investment that can improve community well-being and reduce management costs over time.

Tree maintenance budgets are expected to decrease and stabilize as tree management shifts from reactive to proactive maintenance. The recommended tree resource maintenance schedule facilitates this transition by prioritizing completing all High and Moderate Risk tree maintenance in the first two years before completing all Low Risk tree removals in the third and fourth years. This allows urban forestry operations to primarily budget for routine maintenance in Year 5 and beyond.





Recommended Maintenance Types

Tree Removal

Trees designated for removal have defects that cannot be cost-effectively or practically corrected. Most of the trees in this category have a large percentage of dead crown. Total = 162 trees High Priority = 35 trees Moderate Priority = 37 trees Low Priority = 90 trees Stumps = 6



Priority Pruning

Priority pruning removes defects such as Dead and Dying Parts or Broken and/or Hanging Branches. Pruning the defected branch(es) can lower risk associated with the tree while promoting healthy growth. Total = 179 trees High Priority = 42 trees Moderate Priority = 137 trees



Routine Pruning Cycle

Over time, routine pruning of Low and Moderate Risk trees can minimize reactive maintenance, limit instances of elevated risk, and provide the basis for a robust risk management program. Total = 1,834 trees

Number in cycle each year = at least 262 trees



Young Tree Training Cycle

Young trees can have branch structures that lead to potential problems as the tree ages, requiring training to ensure healthy growth. Training is completed from the ground with a handsaw, pole pruner, or pruning shear. Total = 1,565 trees Number in cycle each year = at least 522 trees



Tree Planting

Planting new trees in areas that have poor canopy continuity is important, as is planting trees where there is sparse canopy, to ensure that tree benefits are distributed evenly across the city. Total replacement plantings = 162 trees Total new plantings = 210 trees



Routine Tree Inspection

Routine inspections are essential to uncovering potential problems with trees and should be performed by a qualified arborist who is trained in the art and science of planting, caring for, and maintaining individual trees. Total = 3,561 existing trees + 210 new trees Number in drive-by assessment cycle each year = near 3,016 trees

Number in walk-by assessment cycle each year = near 754 trees

INTRODUCTION

The City of Petoskey is home to 5,756 residents (U.S. Census Bureau 2019), who all benefit from the public trees in their community. Petoskey has been designated a Tree City USA for 2 years by establishing a tree ordinance, spending over \$2 per capita on tree maintenance, delegating responsibility for managing public trees to its Parks and Recreation Department, and annually celebrating Arbor Day with a proclamation from the Mayor. For more than 30 years, the city's Department of Parks and Recreation staff have shown continued commitment to developing a sustainable urban forestry program.

Petoskey's annual urban forestry budget draws from the city's General Fund and Right-of-Way Fund. The city regularly contracts work from a State of Michigan registered forester with ISA Certification, who also leads two trainings for Parks and Recreation staff each year. Petoskey's urban forestry program is well on its way to creating a sustainable and resilient public tree resource, and can stay on track by consistently renewing program funding and revisiting this *Tree Assessment and Management Plan*, routinely inspecting trees and updating inventory data, and regularly assessing progress towards goals.

RECOMMENDED APPROACH TO TREE MANAGEMENT

An effective approach to tree resource management follows a proactive and systematic urban forestry program that sets clear and realistic goals, prescribes future action, and periodically measures progress. A robust urban forestry program establishes tree maintenance priorities and utilizes modern tools, such as a tree inventory accompanied by TreeKeeper[®] or other asset management software.

In July 2020, the City of Petoskey worked with DRG to inventory its public tree resource and develop this *Tree Assessment and Management Plan*. Consisting of three sections, this plan considers the diversity, distribution, and condition of the inventoried tree population and provides a prioritized system for managing the city's public tree resource.

- *Section 1: Structure and Composition of the Public Tree Resource* summarizes the inventory data with trends representing the current state of the tree resource.
- *Section 2: Functions and Benefits of the Public Tree Resource* summarizes the estimated value of benefits provided to the community by public trees' various environmental services.
- *Section 3: Recommended Management of the Public Tree Resource* details and proposes a prioritized schedule of tree maintenance activities over a five-year period along with an estimated budget.

Section 1:

Structure and Composition

of the Public Tree Resource

SECTION 1: STRUCTURE AND COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC TREE RESOURCE

In July 2020, DRG arborists collected site data on trees, stumps, and planting sites in the street rightof-way (ROW) and in designated public parks for a tree inventory contracted by the City of Petoskey. Of the total 3,771 sites inventoried, 85% were collected in the ROW and the remaining 15% were collected in parks. Figure 2 breaks down the total sites inventoried by type for each location. See Appendix A for details about DRG's methodology for collecting site data.

The City of Petoskey designated nine public parks for DRG to collect site data for the tree inventory. Inventoried parks include Bayfront Park, Bayfront West Park, the Bear River Valley Recreation Area, Curtis Park, the Little Traverse Wheelway, Pennsylvania Park, Quarry Park, Riverbend Park, and the Winter Sports Park.



Figure 2. Number of inventoried sites by location and type.

Species, Genus, and Family Distribution

Increasing species and genus diversity is a crucial priority that improves the public tree population's resilience to pests and disease. The 10-20-30 rule is a common standard for the species, genus, and family distribution of a tree population, in which a single species should not represent more than 10% of the population, a single genus no more than 20%, and a single family no more than 30% (Santamour 1990). Even when the 10-20-30 standard is met, it is important for planting plans to prioritize diversity. Rather than continuing to plant abundant trees until they reach the 10-20-30 threshold, it is more beneficial to plant species that represent a smaller proportion of the population.

ROW Population Distribution

Figure 3 shows the distribution of the most abundant tree species in Petoskey's ROW population compared to Santamour's 10% threshold. Norway maple (*Acer platanoides*) is the most abundant species in the ROW representing 27% of the population, followed closely by red maple (*Acer rubrum*, 25%), both drastically exceeding the recommended threshold. Littleleaf linden (*Tilia cordata*, 12%) marginally exceeds the recommended threshold and honeylocust (*Gleditsia triacanthos*, 10%) is just reaching it, so planting either species is not recommended until their population proportions are lower. While sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*, 5%) is below the recommended threshold, planting this tree is not recommended because of the genus distribution concerns discussed on page 5.



Figure 3. Species distribution of trees inventoried in the ROW.

RESILIENCE THROUGH DIVERSITY

The Dutch elm disease epidemic of the 1930s provides a key historical the importance diversity (Karnosky 1979). The disease killed millions of American elm trees, leaving behind enormous gaps in the urban canopy of many Midwestern and Northeastern communities. In the aftermath, ash became popular replacements and were heavily planted along city streets. History repeated itself in 2002 with the introduction of the emerald ash borer into America. This invasive beetle devastated ash populations across the Midwest. Other invasive pests spreading across the country threaten urban forests, so it is vital that we learn from history and plant a wider variety of tree genera to develop a resilient public tree resource.



Ash trees in an urban forest killed by emerald ash borer.

USDA Forest Service (2017)

Figure 4 shows the distribution of the most abundant tree genera in Petoskey's ROW population compared to Santamour's 20% threshold. The only genus with a proportion greater than 20% is maple (*Acer*, 60%), but it is drastically above the recommended threshold. As mentioned earlier, for this reason it is not recommended to plant additional maple in the ROW. Other abundant genera in the ROW are linden (*Tilia*, 13%) and honeylocust (*Gleditsia*, 10%). While this is not concerning, it is worthwhile to plant tree species in less abundant genera to increase diversity and improve genus distribution.



Figure 4. Genus distribution of trees inventoried in the ROW.

Figure 5 shows the distribution of the most abundant tree families inventoried in Petoskey's ROW population compared to Santamour's 30% threshold. The overabundance of maple in the ROW significantly influences the family distribution, causing the family *Sapindaceae* (60%) to represent the same proportion of the population (60%), which is double the recommended threshold. Other abundant families are *Malvaceae* (13%) and *Fabaceae* (11%), yet they are both less than half the recommended threshold, so they should continue to be included in future planting plans. Table 1 lists all inventoried genera included in all families shown in both distribution charts.



Figure 5. Family distribution of trees inventoried in the ROW.

Family	Genus	Common Name		
Sapindaceae	Acer	maple		
	Aesculus	horsechestnut/buckeye		
Malvaceae	Tilia	linden		
Fabaceae	Cercis	redbud		
	Cladrastis	yellowwood		
	Gleditsia	honeylocust		
	Gymnocladus	coffeetree		
	Robinia	locust		
Pinaceae	Abies	fir		
	Picea	spruce		
	Pinus	pine		
Rosaceae	Amelanchier	serviceberry		
	Crataegus	hawthorn		
	Malus	apple		
	Prunus	cherry		
	Pyrus	pear		
	Sorbus	mountainash		
Ulmaceae	Ulmus	Eem		
	Zelkova	zelkova		
Juglandaceae	Juglans	walnut		
Oleaceae	Fraxinus	ash		
	Syringa	lilac		

Table 1. Inventoried tree genera in the most abundant families

Parks Population Distribution

Petoskey did not designate all public parks to be included in the inventory and only trees in maintained areas were collected, so the parks population described in this *Tree Assessment and Management Plan* is referring to inventoried parks trees. Figure 6 shows the distribution of the most abundant tree species in the parks population compared to Santamour's 10% threshold. Red maple (*Acer rubrum*, 14%) was the most abundant species, but it does not exceed the recommended threshold as drastically as in the ROW population. The only other species representing a proportion of the population above the threshold is eastern white pine (*Pinus strobus*, 13%). Despite other abundant species being below 10%, only black walnut (*Juglans nigra*, 6%) and apple/crabapple species (*Malus*, 5%) are recommended for planting, because maple and spruce have genus distribution concerns discussed on page 7.



Figure 6. Species distribution of trees inventoried in parks.

Figure 7 shows the distribution of the most abundant tree genera in Petoskey's parks population compared to Santamour's 20% threshold. The only genus with a proportion greater than 20% is maple (*Acer*, 31%), but it does not exceed the recommended threshold as drastically as in the ROW population (60%). As mentioned earlier, for this reason it is not recommended to plant additional maple in parks. Other abundant genera in parks are pine (*Pinus*, 16%) and spruce (*Picea*, 16%), which are both approaching the recommended threshold. Planting tree species in these genera is not recommended against, but increasing diversity and improving genus distribution by planting tree species in less abundant genera should be a priority of future planting plans.



Figure 7. Genus distribution of trees inventoried in parks.

Figure 8 shows the distribution of the most abundant tree families in Petoskey's parks population compared to Santamour's 30% threshold. Both Pinaceae (34%) and Sapindaceae (31%) are above the recommended threshold, though not significantly. Still, trees in both families should be substituted in future planting plans until this distribution becomes more proportionate.



Figure 8. Family distribution of trees inventoried in parks.

Species, Genus, and Family Distribution Recommendations

Increasing species and genus diversity with future planting plans is a crucial priority to improve the inventoried tree population's resilience to pests and disease that have a regional presence. The species, genus, and family distributions of all inventoried trees, and especially the ROW population, supports the recommendation to substitute maples with less abundant tree species in all future planting plans. In time the 10-20-30 distribution will become more balanced with consistent efforts to plant tree species that represent a smaller proportion of the population. Efforts to improve the species and genus distributions are a better use of short-term resources until more research is done on family diversity as a mechanism for improving system resilience.

PEST SUSCEPTIBILITY

Early diagnosis of disease and infestation is essential to ensuring the health and continuity of Petoskey's public tree resource. See Appendix B for more information about the pests listed below and websites where additional information can be found.



Figure 9. Inventoried tree resource susceptibility to invasive pests that have a regional presence.

Figure 9 shows the proportion of inventoried trees susceptible to some of the known pests in and around Michigan. It is important to remember that this figure only represents data collected during the inventory. Many more trees throughout Petoskey, particularly those in natural areas and on private property, can also host pests and disease. Both the ROW population and the parks population are most susceptible to spotted lanternfly (SLF, *Lycorma delicatula*), eastern tent caterpillar (ETC, *Malacosoma americanum*), and Asian longhorned beetle (ALB, *Anoplophora glabripennis*) because maples host all three.

ETC is a native species with fluctuating population levels only cause outbreaks once every several years; however, SLF and ALB are aggressive invasive pests that could cause massive losses to Petoskey's public tree resource if either become established in Michigan. The potential losses from ALB are great, and while quarantine efforts are ongoing, it is important to be prepared in case it spreads to Michigan. ALB has been found in Ohio, South Carolina, New York, and Massachusetts (USDA APHIS 2020).

While SLF also has several hosts, it does not cause tree mortality as directly as ALB because it feeds on tree sap rather than boring into wood. Sap has more sugar than can be readily digested by SLF, so its excrement is referred to as "honeydew" because it still has sugar content, attracting other insects to the infested tree as well as providing growth substrate to sooty molds. Sap-sucking and pest attraction cause stress that makes it difficult for a tree to withstand other environmental stress over time, which can lead to worsening condition or death. Currently, SLF has been found in Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and Delaware (USDA APHIS 2020).

Pest Susceptibility Recommendations

Excessive maple in Petoskey's inventoried tree population is a management concern because they risk greater losses in the event of a SLF or ALB invasion and provide habitat, making it easier to spread. While other genera besides maple are susceptible to both pests, they represent a much smaller proportion of the public tree resource. Maple are a preferred host of ALB, so having a large maple population makes the public tree resource more susceptible to infestation and widespread losses. ALB has not yet been detected in Michigan, but there are active populations in southern Ohio, and like emerald ash borer (EAB, *Agrilus planipennis*) it can be transported in firewood (Michigan.gov 2020). While ash (*Fraxinus*) trees are the only host of EAB, several tree genera are preferred hosts of ALB, such as horsechestnut/buckeye (*Aesculus*), birch (*Betula*), willow (*Salix*), and elm (*Ulmus*) (USDA APHIS 2020). Hopefully neighboring states will continue to quarantine ALB and other invasive pests, but planting species representing smaller proportions of the public tree resource is a proactive approach to avoid losses on the scale of EAB.

CONDITION

Several factors affecting condition were considered for each tree, including root characteristics, branch structure, trunk, canopy, foliage condition, and the presence of pests. The condition of each inventoried tree was rated by an ISA certified arborist as Good, Fair, Poor, or Dead. The general health of the tree population is characterized by the most prevalent condition rating assigned during the inventory.

Figure 10 shows most of the inventoried trees were rated Good or Fair condition. In Petoskey's ROW population, 40% of trees were rated Good condition and 52% were rated Fair condition. In the parks population, 34% of trees were rated Good condition and 50% were rated Fair condition. While only 8% of trees in the ROW were rated Poor condition and 0% were Dead, 11% of trees in parks were rated Poor condition and 5% were Dead. Petoskey generally has a low percentage of trees rated Poor condition or Dead, so the overall health of the city's tree population is Fair and appears to be approaching Good condition rather than declining.





Condition Recommendations

Tree condition can be improved by following the maintenance recommendations in Section 3. Structural pruning, or training, younger trees and routine pruning older trees is important for correcting defects that would otherwise worsen over time. This can prevent Good and Fair condition trees becoming Poor condition by when their defects worsen over time. Pruning should follow *ANSI A300 (Part 1)* guidelines (American National Standards Institute, 2017). Poor condition ratings among mature trees were generally due to visible signs of stress and decline, such as dead limbs and cavity decay. The branch failure or trunk failure of mature trees has more severe consequences, so maintenance recommendations for such trees are generally higher priority, which will be detailed in Section 3.

The health of most trees in Poor condition is unlikely to improve, even with intensive maintenance interventions, and removal is recommended as the most cost-effective management option. Since the overall condition of Petoskey's tree resource is Fair, after addressing trees that are Dead or in Poor condition, the city will transition from the reactive maintenance of those trees to proactive maintenance that maintains trees in Fair and Good condition. Over the long term, proactive maintenance can improve the overall condition of the tree population.

RELATIVE AGE DISTRIBUTION

Analysis of a tree population's relative age distribution is performed by assigning relative age classes to general size classes, offering insight into the overall maintenance needs of the city's tree resource. The inventoried tree population is grouped into the following relative age classes: young trees 0–8 inches diameter at breast height (DBH), established trees 9–17 inches DBH, maturing trees 18–24 inches DBH, and mature trees greater than 24 inches DBH.

These size classes were chosen so the inventoried tree resource can be compared to Richards' ideal relative age distribution, which holds that the largest proportion of a tree population (approximately 40%) should be young trees, while the smallest proportion (approximately 10%) should be mature trees (Richards 1983). Since tree species have different lifespans and mature at different diameters, specific tree age cannot be determined from diameter size class alone, yet size classes can be generalized into relative age classes.



Figure 11. Relative age distribution of the inventoried tree resource.

Figure 11 compares the relative age distribution of Petoskey's tree resource to Richards' ideal distribution. Petoskey's ROW population is far from the ideal relative age distribution, only having a small proportion of maturing trees (3%) and mature trees (3%) and having a large proportion of young trees (69%). Due to their large size and greater total leaf surface area, mature trees provide exponentially more benefits than younger trees. A tree population with an ideal relative age distribution produces a greater annual value than the time and money expended to maintain it. It is possible that the ROW population's relative age distribution will approach Richards' ideal over time, if young and established trees are routinely maintained so they can reach maturity.

Petoskey's parks population is close to the ideal age distribution, but the proportion of maturing trees is 12% under. Routine tree care is also vital to the parks population, so the health of young and established trees is maintained as they age and begin to mature. While the proportion of mature trees is 5% higher than Richards' ideal, they provide the most benefits because of their size. It is important to maintain mature trees until their defects are no longer cost-effective to correct or become too high of a risk for public safety.

Relative Age Recommendations

Figure 12 cross-analyzes the condition of Petoskey's ROW population with its relative age distribution, offering insight into tree stability. Only 6% of young trees were rated Poor condition or Dead, with the remainder rated Fair or Good condition about equally. Relatively few established trees were rated Poor condition or Dead. However, the proportion of trees rated Good condition is only half the proportion of trees rated Fair condition. This indicates that a significant number of trees in the ROW population have declining condition by the time they become established. Less than a third of maturing trees and hardly any mature trees were rated in Good condition, emphasizing the importance of routine tree care so their condition is maintained as they age.



Figure 12. Condition of trees inventoried in the ROW by relative age class.

Figure 13 cross-analyzes the condition of Petoskey's parks population with its relative age distribution, offering insight into tree stability. The proportion of young trees rated Poor condition or Dead is about the same as the ROW population, but the proportion of the parks population rated Good condition is much larger. While the parks population has a greater proportion of established trees rated Poor condition than the ROW population, it also has a greater proportion of mature and maturing trees rated Fair or Good condition. This shows that despite the parks population having a larger proportion of trees rated Poor condition or Dead than the ROW population, there are not only more large trees in parks but they are also in better condition. It is important to continue caring for these large trees as they age, because they provide significantly more benefits to the community than younger, smaller trees.



Figure 13. Condition of trees inventoried in parks by relative age class.

INFRASTRUCTURE CONFLICTS

In an urban setting, space is limited both above and below ground. Trees in this environment may conflict with infrastructure, such as buildings, sidewalks, utility wires, and pipes, which could pose risks to people and property. Existing or possible conflicts between trees and infrastructure recorded during the inventory include:

• *Overhead Utilities*—The presence of overhead utility lines above a site was noted; it is important to consider these data when planning pruning activities and selecting tree species for planting.

Overhead Utilities	Street Trees	Percent of Street Trees	Park Trees	Percent of Park Trees
Present and Conflicting	318	11%	1	0%
Present and Not Conflicting	209	7%	0	0%
Not Present	2,463	82%	570	100%
Total	2,990	100%	571	100%

Table 2. Conflicts between inventoried trees and overhead utilities

Table 1 shows 318 ROW trees that have overhead utilities conflicting with their crown. Of those trees, 209 (66%) are medium-growing species and 108 (34%) are large-growing species. While it is good that there are fewer large-growing species than medium-growing species, it is recommended to only plant small-growing species beneath overhead utilities. There are 209 ROW trees that have overhead utilities not conflicting with their crown. Of those trees, 86 (41%) are medium-growing species and 95 (45%) are large-growing species. While these trees may not be conflicting with overhead utilities, it is possible that they will as they grow. The remaining 2,463 ROW trees have no overhead utilities present.

There is only 1 parks tree with overhead utilities conflicting with its crown and it is a sugar maple, which is a large-growing species. There are zero parks trees that have overhead utilities not conflicting with their crown. The remaining 570 parks trees have no overhead utilities present, so conflicts are largely not a concern in parks at the time of this tree inventory.

Infrastructure Recommendations

To minimize future conflicts with overhead utility lines, DRG recommends planting only small-growing species within 20 feet of overhead utilities, medium-growing species within 20–40 feet, and large-growing trees outside 40 feet will help minimize future conflicts with utility lines. This prevents unnecessary pruning and reduces the costs of maintaining trees near overhead utilities.

STOCKING LEVEL

Stocking is a rural forestry term used to measure the spatial distribution of trees. For an urban forest, it is used to estimate the total number of sites along the street ROW that could contain trees. Stocking level is the ratio of street ROW spaces occupied by trees to the total street ROW spaces suitable for trees. Park trees and other non-ROW public property trees are excluded from this measurement. Having a fullystocked ROW maximizes the benefits received from the public tree resources, which increase over time.

Knowing the current stocking level of a tree population informs a community's planting opportunities and associated budget. Generally, this entails a planned planting program that includes replacement trees when trees or stumps are removed, new trees for vacant sites, and routine maintenance activities. In the ROW, DRG arborists inventoried 203 planting sites and 5 stumps, which should be considered potential planting sites because they will be vacant after the stumps are removed. The City of Petoskey's current stocking level is 93%, and to be fully stocked requires 208 new trees in addition to replacement trees for those recommended for removal and those lost to natural mortality.

Stocking Level Recommendations

Over the course of the five-year tree resource management schedule proposed in Section 3, a total of 162 existing trees are recommended for removal. Additionally, Petoskey's inventoried tree population is susceptible to various threats, including storms, invasive pests, and disease. Typical annual mortality rates range from 1–3% of the population. Considering the ROW population's overall condition rating of Fair to Good, Petoskey's tree resource is likely lower on the given range. Using a 1% annual mortality rate of 36 trees per year, the city can anticipate removing an additional 360 trees over a ten year period. When accounting for scheduled removals and annual mortality, DRG finds it necessary to plant 730 trees over the course of ten years in order to have a fully-stocked ROW tree population.

208 new trees to reach 100% stocking level + 162 existing trees recommended for removal + 360 existing trees lost over 10 years (+/- 1% annual mortality rate of 36 trees per year)

730 total trees required to achieve 100% stocking level by the end of Year 10.

To achieve a fully-stocked ROW in ten years, DRG recommends that Petoskey plants 89 trees per year.

Section 2:

Functions and Benefits

of the Public Tree Resource

SECTION 2: FUNCTIONS AND BENEFITS OF THE PUBLIC TREE RESOURCE

Trees occupy a vital role in the urban environment by providing of a wide array of economic, environmental, social, and health benefits far exceeding the investments in planting, maintaining, and removing them. Trees sequester and store carbon, reduce stormwater runoff, reduce energy use, reduce air pollution, and increase property value. Using advanced analytics, such as the i-Tree software suite, understanding the importance of trees in a community continues to expand by providing tools to estimate monetary values of the various benefits provided by trees.

Environmental Benefits

- Trees cast shade and act as windbreaks, decreasing energy use and moderating local climates.
- Trees help slow and reduce the amount of stormwater runoff that reaches storm drains, rivers, and lakes. The crowns of 100 mature trees intercept roughly 100,000 gallons of rainfall per year (U.S. Forest Service 2003a).
- Trees help reduce noise levels, remove atmospheric pollutants, produce oxygen, and absorb carbon dioxide.
- Trees can reduce street-level air pollution by up to 60% (Coder 1996). Lovasi (2008) suggested that children who live on tree-lined streets have lower rates of asthma.
- Trees stabilize soil and provide habitat to wildlife.

Economic Benefits

- When trees are on the property, residential property values and commercial property rental rates are an average of 7% higher (Wolf 2007).
- Trees moderate temperatures in the summer and winter, saving on heating and cooling expenses (North Carolina State University 2012, Heisler 1986).
- On average, consumers will pay about 11% more for goods in landscaped areas, with this figure being as high as 50% for convenience goods (Wolf 1998b, Wolf 1999, and Wolf 2003).
- Consumers also feel that the quality of products is better in business districts surrounded by trees than those considered barren (Wolf 1998b).
- The quality of landscaping along the routes leading to business districts had a positive influence on consumers' perceptions of the area (Wolf 2000).

Social Benefits

- Tree-lined streets are safer; traffic speeds and the amount of stress drivers feel are reduced, which likely reduces road rage/aggressive driving (Wolf 1998a, Kuo and Sullivan 2001a).
- Chicago apartment buildings with medium amounts of greenery had 42% fewer crimes than those without any trees (Kuo and Sullivan 2001b).
- Chicago apartment buildings with high levels of greenery had 52% fewer crimes than those without any trees (Kuo and Sullivan 2001a).
- Employees who see trees from their desks experience 23% less sick time and report greater job satisfaction than those who do not (Wolf 1998a).
- Hospital patients recovering from surgery who had a view of a grove of trees through their windows required fewer pain relievers, experienced fewer complications, and left the hospital sooner than similar patients who had a view of a brick wall (Ulrich 1984, 1986).

TREE BENEFIT ANALYSIS

TreeKeeper[®] estimates the economic value of benefits provided by individual trees, groups of trees, or an entire tree resource using the inventory data. The estimated values that TreeKeeper[®] reports are based on the science behind the US Forest Service i-Tree Tools. i-Tree Streets analyzes an inventoried tree population's structure and composition to estimate the value of the environmental services performed by trees, such as intercepting rainfall, decreasing energy use, reducing carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions, and removing atmospheric pollutants. See Appendix C for details about DRG's tree benefit methodology. The quantified benefits are described below.

- *Aesthetic/Other Benefits:* Uses leaf surface area (LSA) to estimate the increased property value resulting from the tangible and intangible benefits that trees provide.
- *Stormwater Benefits:* Estimates the annual gallons of runoff avoided from rainfall intercepted by tree leaves, which increases with total LSA.
- *Energy Benefits:* Estimates contribution of inventoried trees towards conserving energy by reducing natural gas use for heating in the winter (measured in therms [thm]) and reducing electricity use for air conditioning in the summer (measured in Kilowatt-hours ([kWh]).
- *Carbon Sequestered and Avoided:* Estimates annual reduction in CO₂ via sequestration by trees and lower emissions from power plants (measured in pounds [lbs.]) resulting from reduced energy use. The model accounts for CO₂ released as trees die and decompose and CO₂ released during the care and maintenance of trees.
- *Air Quality:* Estimates the air pollutants (ozone [O₃], nitrogen dioxide [NO2], sulfur dioxide [SO₂], particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in diameter [PM₁₀]) deposited on tree surfaces, and reduced emissions from power plants (NO₂, PM₁₀, volatile organic compounds [VOCs], SO₂) due to reduced electricity use, measured in lbs. The potential negative effects of trees on air quality due to biogenic volatile organic compounds (BVOC) emissions is also calculated.

ANNUAL RETURN ON INVESTMENT FROM THE PUBLIC TREE RESOURCE

Using the i-Tree Streets model, TreeKeeper[®] estimated the value of benefits received from the various environmental services performed by Petoskey's inventoried tree population. As shown in Figures 14 and 15, the estimated annual value of the ROW population's benefits is \$174,564 and the estimated annual value of the parks population's benefits is \$48,151, bringing the total value of the City's annual benefits to \$222,715. The City of Petoskey's 2020 Downtown Maintenance budget is \$102,400 and its 2020 Contract Forestry budget is \$325,500, making the City's return on investment (ROI) about 52% annually. This benefit data can be used to justify renewing or increasing the City of Petoskey's urban forestry program funding to elected officials.



Figure 14. Estimated annual value of benefits provided by inventoried ROW trees.



Figure 15. Estimated annual value of benefits provided by inventoried parks trees.

Quantifying the monetary values of the various benefits provided by the public tree resource makes the possibility of losses from new invasive pests more tangible, because another event the magnitude of Dutch elm disease or emerald ash borer would be enormous. It is critical to improve species and genus distribution with future planting plans so susceptibility to pests with a regional presence is minimized. It is important to remember that trees provide the most benefits when they are mature, and that they are an investment of both time and money. Therefore, routine tree care that maintains their condition is essential to maximize the ROI received from the public tree resource. It is recommended to plant large-growing tree species wherever growth space allows, because they provide the most benefits by having significantly more LSA. See Appendix D for a tree species list recommended by DRG, which is specific to Petoskey's USDA Hardiness Zone.

ENERGY REDUCTION AND PROPERTY VALUE

Trees help conserve energy in buildings, with ROW trees annually saving 254,192 kWh and 36,171 thm and parks trees annually saving 67,959 kWh and 9,341 thm, giving all inventoried trees a total estimated value of \$69,053 in annual energy savings. Parcels with trees also have higher property values, increasing with the square footage of a single year's total LSA growth. Petoskey's ROW population has estimated annual LSA growth of 280,209 ft² and the parks population has estimated annual LSA growth of 61,891 ft², which has a total estimated value of \$81,760.

AVOIDING AND SEQUESTERING CARBON

CO₂ negatively impacts people, infrastructure, and the environment by being the primary greenhouse gas driving climate change. Trees are carbon sinks, which are the opposite of carbon sources. While heavy amounts of carbon are emitted from cars and smokestacks, carbon is absorbed into trees during photosynthesis and stored in their tissue as they grow, decreasing the amount of carbon in the atmosphere. In addition to estimating the total carbon avoided by conserving energy, i-Tree Streets models the total carbon sequestered each year using simulated growth rates for each species. The 342,934 lbs. of CO₂ avoided annually and the 400,516 lbs. sequestered annually by Petoskey's ROW population, along with the 76,943 lbs. of CO₂ avoided annually and the 75,730 lbs. sequestered annually by the city's parks population, has an estimated total value of \$6,520.

CONTROLLING STORMWATER

Trees intercept rainfall with their leaves and branches, helping lower stormwater management costs by avoiding runoff. Avoiding stormwater runoff reduces the risk of flooding and combined sewer overflow, both of which impact people, infrastructure, and the environment. The 1,455,602 gals. of runoff avoided annually with Petoskey's ROW trees and the 589,537 gals. avoided annually with the city's parks trees has an estimated total value of \$55,423.

IMPROVING AIR QUALITY

Compared to rural landscapes, urban landscapes are characterized by high emissions in a relatively small area, such as sulfur dioxide (SO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), ozone (O₃), and particulate matter (PM₁₀). The 2,347 lbs. of airborne pollutants annually removed by Petoskey's ROW population and the 560 lbs. annually removed by the city's parks population has a total estimated value of \$8,959.

CANOPY FUNCTIONS



Trees perform many environmental services and provide many benefits simply by existing, such as:

- Catching rainfall in the canopy so it drips to the ground with less of an impact or flows down their trunk into the soil.
- Helping stormwater soak into the ground by slowing runoff.
- Helping stormwater move through the soil by creating more pore space with their roots.
- Cooling the surrounding landscape by casting shade with their canopy and releasing water from their leaves.
- Catching airborne pollutants on their leaves and holding them until they wash off in the rain.
- Transforming some pollutants into less harmful substances and preventing some pollutants from forming.

Section 3:

Recommended Management

of the Public Tree Resource

SECTION 3: RECOMMENDED MANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC TREE RESOURCE

During the inventory, both a risk rating and a recommended maintenance activity were assigned to each tree. DRG advises prioritizing the recommended maintenance activities for trees with a High or Moderate risk rating. Even though large short-term expenditures may be required, it is important to secure the funding needed to complete high priority tree maintenance as soon as possible, to promote public safety and reduce long-term costs. Using inventory data, a five-year maintenance schedule was developed detailing the recommended tasks to complete each year.



HIGH PRIORITY RECOMMENDED MAINTENANCE

Tree removal can be unpopular among the public and should be considered a last resort, but there are circumstances where it is the most cost-effective management option for mitigating risk. Trees fail from natural causes such as diseases, insects, and weather conditions, as well as from physical injury due to vehicles, vandalism, and root disturbances. DRG recommends that trees be removed when corrective pruning or plant health care will not adequately mitigate risk or would be cost-prohibitive. Pruning improves tree condition by correcting defects that would otherwise worsen and negatively impact tree health. Trees that decline into Poor condition often have defects that are not cost-effective to correct and can become a risk to people and property. For this reason, pruning can reduce management costs over time by decreasing the number of trees that need to be removed.

High Risk Removal Recommendations

DRG advises completing all High Risk removals as soon as possible. Performing high priority maintenance activities for the largest diameter trees (greater than 18 inches) first is important because their failure is more likely to cause damage than smaller diameter trees (less than 19 inches). Shown in Figure 16, the inventory identified a total of 6 High Risk trees in Petoskey's ROW with Remove as their maintenance recommendation. Their diameter size classes range between 4–6 inches DBH and 25–30 inches DBH, with half of the trees greater than 18 inches DBH. DRG recommends removing all High Risk ROW trees larger than 18 inches DBH in Year 1, and removing all remaining High Risk ROW trees in Year 2 of the five-year tree resource maintenance schedule.



Figure 16. Recommended removals in the ROW by size class and risk rating.

Shown in Figure 17, the inventory identified a total of 29 High Risk trees in parks with Remove as their maintenance recommendation. Their diameter size classes range between 4–6 inches DBH and greater than 43 inches DBH, with most trees smaller than 19 inches DBH. DRG recommends removing all High Risk parks trees larger than 18 inches DBH in Year 1 and removing all remaining High Risk parks trees in Year 2 of the five-year tree resource maintenance schedule. Using TreeKeeper[®] to locate High Risk trees, plan scheduled work, and keep records of completed work will improve the ease and efficiency of tree management.



Figure 17. Recommended Removals in parks by size class and risk rating.

High Risk Pruning Recommendations

DRG advises completing all High risk pruning as soon as possible. Performing high priority maintenance activities for the largest diameter trees (greater than 18 inches) first is important because their failure is more likely to cause damage than smaller diameter trees (less than 19 inches). Shown in Figure 18, the inventory identified a total of 13 High Risk trees in Petoskey's ROW with Prune as their maintenance recommendation. Their diameter size classes range between 7–12 inches DBH and 31–36 inches DBH, with most trees larger than 18 inches DBH. DRG recommends pruning all High Risk ROW trees larger than 18 inches DBH in Year 1 and pruning all remaining High Risk ROW trees in Year 2 of the five-year tree resource maintenance schedule.



Figure 18. Recommended pruning in the ROW by size class and risk rating.

Shown in Figure 19, the inventory identified a total of 29 High Risk trees in parks with Prune as their maintenance recommendation. Their diameter size classes range between 7–12 inches DBH and 37–42 inches DBH, with most trees larger than 24 inches DBH. DRG recommends pruning all High Risk parks trees larger than 18 inches DBH in Year 1 and pruning all remaining High Risk parks trees in Year 2 of the five-year tree resource maintenance schedule. Using TreeKeeper[®] to locate High Risk trees, plan scheduled work, and keep records of completed work will improve the ease and efficiency of tree management.



Figure 19. Recommended pruning in parks by size class and risk rating.

MODERATE PRIORITY RECOMMENDED MAINTENANCE

Moderate Risk Removal Recommendations

DRG advises completing all Moderate risk removals as soon as possible, because tree defects can worsen over time and increase their risk, so it is recommended to perform Moderate risk removals concurrently with High risk removals. Performing moderate priority maintenance activities for the largest diameter trees (greater than 18 inches) first is important because their failure is more likely to cause damage than smaller diameter trees (less than 19 inches). Shown in Figure 16, the inventory identified a total of 24 Moderate risk trees in Petoskey's ROW with Remove as their maintenance recommendation. Their diameter size classes range between 4–6 inches DBH and greater than 43 inches DBH, with most trees smaller than 19 inches DBH. DRG recommends removing all Moderate Risk ROW trees larger than 18 inches DBH in Year 1 and removing all remaining Moderate Risk ROW trees in Year 2 of the five-year tree resource maintenance schedule.

Shown in Figure 17, the inventory identified a total of 13 Moderate Risk trees in parks with Remove as their maintenance recommendation. Their diameter size classes range between 4–6 inches DBH and 19–24 inches DBH, with almost all trees smaller than 19 inches DBH. DRG recommends removing all Moderate Risk parks trees larger than 18 inches DBH in Year 1 and removing all remaining Moderate Risk parks trees in Year 2 of the five-year tree resource maintenance schedule.

Moderate Risk Pruning Recommendations

DRG advises completing all Moderate Risk pruning as soon as possible, because tree defects can worsen over time and increase their risk, so it is recommended to perform Moderate Risk pruning concurrently with High Risk pruning. Performing moderate priority maintenance activities for the largest diameter trees (greater than 18 inches) first is important because their failure is more likely to cause damage than smaller diameter trees (less than 19 inches). Shown in Figure 18, the inventory identified a total of 88 Moderate Risk trees in Petoskey's ROW with Prune as their maintenance recommendation. Their diameter size classes range from 4–6 inches DBH and greater than 43 inches DBH, with half of the trees larger than 18 inches DBH. DRG recommends pruning all Moderate Risk ROW trees in Year 2 of the five-year tree resource maintenance schedule.

Shown in Figure 19, the inventory identified a total of 49 Moderate Risk trees in parks with Prune as their maintenance recommendation. Their diameter size classes range from 4–6 inches DBH and greater than 43 inches DBH, with most trees larger than 24 inches DBH. DRG recommends pruning all Moderate Risk parks trees larger than 18 inches DBH in Year 1 and pruning all remaining Moderate Risk parks trees in Year 2 of the five-year tree resource maintenance schedule.

LOW PRIORITY RECOMMENDED MAINTENANCE

Low priority removals should only start after all High Risk and Moderate Risk maintenance has been completed. Instead of having maintenance addressed separately, all Low Risk pruning is included in the Routine Pruning Cycle.

Low Risk Removal Recommendations

Shown in Figure 16, the inventory identified a total of 72 Low Risk trees in Petoskey's ROW with Remove as their maintenance recommendation. Shown in Figure 17, the inventory also identified a total of 18 Low Risk trees in parks with Remove as their maintenance recommendation. DRG recommends removing all Low Risk trees in Year 3 and Year 4 of the five-year tree resource maintenance schedule.

ROUTINE INSPECTIONS

Routine inspections are crucial to detecting defects that have either already become a risk or can be corrected so they do not become a risk and should be performed by a qualified arborist. Arborists are knowledgeable about the needs of trees and can provide proper care and informed recommendations. Ideally, the arborist will be ISA Certified and hold the ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualification credential.

Routine Inspection Recommendations

All inventoried trees should be regularly inspected and attended to as needed. DRG recommends that the City of Petoskey annually inspect 3,016 trees, or 80% of the inventoried tree population, via drive-by assessment in line with *ANSI A300 (Part 9)* to identify major defects. Annually inspecting 754 trees, or 20% of the inventoried tree population, via walk-by assessment is important for completely updating inventory data in TreeKeeper[®] on a five-year cycle. Because of the overabundance of maple, a large proportion of Petoskey's public tree resource is susceptible to ALB and other pests, and routine walk-by assessments are an opportunity to detect early signs of infestation.

ROUTINE PRUNING CYCLE

Over time routine pruning helps minimize reactive maintenance and instances of elevated risk, serving as the basis for a proactive management program. The Routine Pruning Cycle includes all trees that received a Prune or Discretionary Prune maintenance recommendation and occurs concurrently with High and Moderate Risk pruning. Because High and Moderate Risk pruning will be completed concurrently with the first year of the Routine Pruning Cycle, those trees do not need to be pruned again until the final year of the cycle.

Based on Miller and Sylvester's research, DRG recommends a five-year Routine Pruning Cycle to maintain the condition of the inventoried tree resource. However, not all municipalities are able to remain proactive with a five-year cycle based on operational constraints, the size of the public tree resource, or both. In these cases, extending the length of the Routine Pruning Cycle is a viable option, but it is important to remain proactive with a three-year Young Tree Training Cycle to compensate. Tree condition declines significantly without routine training and pruning, because once minor defects have enough time to worsen, reducing tree health and potentially elevating risk.

Routine Pruning Cycle Recommendations

As shown in Figure 20, Petoskey has 1,834 with the maintenance recommendations of Prune or Discretionary Prune, which are almost all Low Risk trees. DRG recommends that the city annually prunes 262 trees on a seven-year cycle, beginning in Year 1 of the five-year tree resource maintenance schedule and increasing as new trees are planted. Figure 20 shows the size class distribution of all trees recommended for routine pruning, most of which are smaller than 13 inches DBH.

PROACTIVE MAINTENANCE



Relationship between tree condition and years since previous pruning.

(adapted from Miller and Sylvester 1981)

Miller and Sylvester studied the pruning frequency of 40,000 street trees in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Trees that had not been pruned for more than 10 years had an average condition rating 10% lower than trees that had been pruned in the previous several years. Their research suggests that a five-year pruning cycle is optimal for urban trees.

Routine inspection and pruning cycles help detect and correct most defects before they reach higher risk levels. DRG recommends two pruning cycles: a Young Tree Training Cycle and a Routine Pruning Cycle.

Newly planted trees will enter the Young Tree Training Cycle once they become established and will move into the Routine Pruning Cycle when they reach maturity. A tree should be eliminated from the Routine Pruning Cycle and removed when its condition warrants it or ages beyond its healthy lifespan.



Figure 20. Seven-year Routine Pruning Cycle by size class.

YOUNG TREE TRAINING CYCLE

Trees included in the Young Tree Training Cycle are generally 6 inches DBH or less, but also includes some larger trees that can also be pruned from the ground using a handsaw, loppers, or shears. Young trees often have branching structure that can lead to problems as they age, which was frequently observed throughout the City of Petoskey during the tree inventory, as shown in Photograph 1. Structural defects that should be corrected when a tree is young include codominant leaders, branches with included bark, crossing limbs, and multiple limbs originating from the same point on the trunk. These defects should be corrected when trees are young, because they become more difficult and costly to correct as the tree grows, and because wounds on young trees are smaller and heal faster. Clearance pruning should also be prioritized when trees are young, because branches causing conflict become more difficult and costly to remove as a tree grows. The recommended length of the Young Tree Training Cycle is three years because young trees tend to grow faster than mature trees and become too tall to prune from the ground relatively quickly.



Photograph 1. Codominant branches with included bark.

Young Tree Training Cycle Recommendations

DRG recommends that Petoskey implements a three-year Young Tree Training Cycle beginning in Year 1 of the five-year tree resource maintenance schedule. As shown in Figure 21, a total of 1,392 trees in the ROW and 173 trees in parks have the maintenance recommendation of Train, amounting to 522 trees trained annually for each year of the cycle.



Figure 21. Three-year Young Tree Training cycle by size class.

When both replacements and new trees are planted, they should enter the Young Tree Training Cycle within three years. Ideally, Petoskey will start the Young Tree Training Cycle in Year 1 of the recommended five-year tree maintenance schedule and train at least 522 trees annually, so starting in Year 4 annual training will be based on new plantings and replacements. After trees cannot be pruned from the ground anymore, they should enter the Routine Pruning Cycle.

TREE PLANTING AND STUMP REMOVAL

The Right Tree in the Right Place is a mantra for tree planting used by arborists, the Arbor Day Foundation, and utility companies nationwide. Trees come in many different shapes and sizes, and often change dramatically over their lifetimes. Before selecting a tree for planting, make sure it is the right tree—along with its form, know how tall, wide, and deep it will be at maturity.

Equally important to selecting the right tree is choosing the right site to plant it in. Blocking an unsightly view or creating some shade may be a priority, but it is important to consider how a tree may impact existing infrastructure and hardscape as it grows taller, wider, and deeper. If the tree at maturity will reach overhead lines, or conflict with sidewalks and curbs, it is best to choose either a different species or location.

Tree Planting Recommendations

Over the course of the five-year tree resource maintenance schedule, a total of 102 trees in the ROW and 60 trees in parks are recommended for removal. Additionally, tree populations have a typical annual mortality rate ranging from 1–3% of the population. Given the inventoried population's overall condition rating of Fair to Good, Petoskey's tree resource is likely to be on the low end of this range. Assuming a 1% annual mortality rate of about 36 trees per year, the city should be prepared to remove an additional 180 trees over this five-year period. When accounting for scheduled removals and annual mortality, the city must plant 342 replacement trees over the next five years to have zero net loss of its tree population.

Petoskey should also plant new trees in addition to replacements so its tree population increases and its urban canopy expands. DRG recommends planting 21 new trees each year in areas with sparse canopy and gaps in existing canopy, which will occupy all 210 vacant sites identified during the inventory in ten years. While the City of Petoskey as a whole receives value from the environmental services performed by public trees, those benefits are only distributed as evenly as the canopy is. It is important to plan future planting to promote the equitable distribution of tree canopy, so the whole community can share its benefits and enjoy its beauty.



Photograph 2. Lawnmower damage becoming worse as the tree grows.

Mulching trees is among the most beneficial maintenance activities to improve the survival rate of young trees. Not only does mulch provide nutrients and help the soil retain moisture, it also replaces grass and makes lawnmowing unnecessary. Lawnmower damage was frequently observed throughout the City of Petoskey during the tree inventory, as shown in Photo 2.

Increasing growth space can also improve the survival rate of young trees and reduce the amount of infrastructure conflicts as they mature, because trees can be planted further from hardscape and overhead utilities. Depending on the site, there are several methods available to create or increase growth space for newly planted trees:

• Install or enlarge tree wells/pits in existing sidewalks of sufficient width. Ideally, the minimum growing space of a small-sized tree is 32 square feet. On sidewalks with sufficient width and length, the city could install tree pits with enough space remaining for the sidewalk to still comply with American Disability Act (ADA) standards.
- Where lawn extensions are narrow or nonexistent, planting trees 4 feet behind a curb without a sidewalk, or 4 feet behind an existing sidewalk, can be a low-cost alternative to construction intensive methods. This can result in less damage to the sidewalk and give tree roots room to grow into the open soil.
- Re-routing the sidewalk around an area to create designated large tree sites is a relatively cost-effective method to increase growing spaces. This method can also be applied to existing large tree sites, where tree roots have already come in conflict with the sidewalk.
- A landscape bump-out/curb extension is a vegetative area that protrudes into the parking lane of a street, to provide a growing space for plants or trees. These spaces can be used quite effectively by municipalities to beautify a streetscape, provide greater storm water retention, along with the added benefit of slowing car speeds at the bump-out location.

Stump Removal Recommendations

The inventory identified 6 stumps, all smaller than 12 inches in diameter. The 162 trees recommended for removal and the 180 removals anticipated from natural mortality will leave behind an additional 342 stumps. Because these sites can be replanted once they become vacant, stumps should be removed as soon as possible after a tree removal, or at least before the next planting plan begins.

A list of suggested tree species is provided in Appendix D. These tree species are specifically selected for Petoskey's climate, which is in USDA Hardiness Zone 5. This list is not exhaustive, but is a useful guideline for species that meet community objectives and enhances any other lists of approved species.

MAINTENANCE SCHEDULE AND BUDGET

Using 2020 City of Petoskey tree inventory data, a five-year tree resource maintenance schedule was developed detailing the recommended tasks to complete each year. DRG made budget projections using industry knowledge and the city's feedback. A complete table of estimated costs for Petoskey's five-year tree resource maintenance schedule follows. This schedule provides a framework for completing the recommended tree maintenance over the next five years. Following this schedule can help transition the city's urban forestry program from reactive maintenance to proactive tree care.

To implement the tree resource maintenance schedule, Petoskey's urban forestry budget should be \$163,998 for Year 1 of implementation, which is the costliest year because of the high priority maintenance scheduled. Year 2 is \$30,126 less than Year 1, Year 3 is \$12,373 less than Year 2, Year 4 is \$8,413 less than Year 3, and Year 5 is \$4,081 less than Year 4. Budgets for following years should stabilize at about \$14,825 less than Year 5, because all reactive maintenance will be complete, and proactive maintenance is routine and predictable. Adequate funding for Year 1 is needed to ensure that high priority trees are expediently managed and that the Young Tree Training Routine Pruning Cycles begin. If routing efficiencies and/or contract specifications allow more tree work to be completed each year, or if this maintenance schedule requires adjustment to meet budgetary or operational needs, then it should be modified accordingly. Unforeseen situations such as severe weather events may arise and change the maintenance needs of Petoskey's inventoried tree population. If maintenance needs change, then budgets, staffing, and equipment should be adjusted to meet the new demand.
 Table 3. Estimated budget for recommended five-year tree resource maintenance schedule

A	Activity Cost			Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
Activity	Diameter	Cost/Tree	Count	Cost	Count	Cost	Count	Cost	Count	Cost	Count	Cost	Five-Year Cost
	1-3"	\$28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
	4-6"	\$58	-	-	6	\$348	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$348
	7-12"	\$138	-	-	10	\$1,380	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,380
	13-18"	\$314	-	-	8	\$2,512	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$2,512
High Risk Removals	19-24"	\$605	1	\$605	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$605
	25-30"	\$825	5	\$4,125	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$4,125
	31-36"	\$1,045	2	\$2,090	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$2,090
	37-42"	\$1,485	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
	>43"	\$2,035	3	\$6,105	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$6,105
Ad	ctivity Total(s)		11	\$12,925	24	\$4,240	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$17,165
	1-3"	\$28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
	4-6"	\$58	-	-	7	\$406	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$406
	7-12"	\$138	-	-	14	\$1,932	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,932
	13-18"	\$314	-	-	8	\$2,512	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$2,512
Moderate Risk Removals	19-24"	\$605	4	\$2,420	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$2,420
	25-30"	\$825	2	\$1,650	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,650
	31-36"	\$1,045	1	\$1,045	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,045
	37-42"	\$1,485	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
	>43"	\$2,035	1	\$2,035	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$2,035
A	ctivity Total(s)		8	\$7,150	29	\$4,850	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$12,000
	1-3"	\$28	-	-	-	-	-	-	52	\$1,456	-	-	\$1,456
	4-6"	\$58	-	-	-	-	-	-	24	\$1,392	-	-	\$1,392
	7-12"	\$138	-	-	-	-	11	\$1,518	-	-	-	-	\$1,518
	13-18"	\$314	-	-	-	-	2	\$628	-	-	-	-	\$628
Low Risk Removals	19-24"	\$605	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
	25-30"	\$825	-	-	-	-	1	\$825	-	-	-	-	\$825
	31-36"	\$1,045	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
	37-42"	\$1,485	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
	>43"	\$2,035	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
Ad	ctivity Total(s)		0	\$0	0	\$0	14	\$2,971	76	\$2,848	0	\$0	\$5,819
	1-3"	\$18	-	-	-	-	-	-	52	\$936	-	-	\$936
	4-6"	\$28	-	-	13	\$364	-	-	24	\$672	-	-	\$1,036
	7-12"	\$44	-	-	24	\$1,056	11	\$484	-	-	-	-	\$1,540
	13-18"	\$72	-	-	16	\$1,152	2	\$144	-	-	-	-	\$1,296
Stump Removals	19-24"	\$94	5	\$470	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$470
	25-30"	\$110	7	\$770	-	-	1	\$110	-	-	-	-	\$880
	31-36"	\$138	3	\$414	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$414
	37-42"	\$160	0	\$0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
	>43"	\$182	4	\$728	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$728
Ad	ctivity Total(s)		19	\$2,382	53	\$2,572	14	\$738	76	\$1,608	0	\$0	\$7,300

A	ctivity Cost			Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
Activity	Diameter	Cost/Tree	Count	Cost	Count	Cost	Count	Cost	Count	Cost	Count	Cost	Five-Year Cost
	1-3"	\$20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
	4-6"	\$30	-	-	3	\$90	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$90
	7-12"	\$75	-	-	26	\$1,950	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,950
	13-18"	\$120	-	-	38	\$4,560	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$4,560
High and Moderate Risk Pruning	19-24"	\$170	27	\$4,590	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$4,590
	25-30"	\$225	46	\$10,350	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$10,350
	31-36"	\$305	30	\$9,150	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	\$9,150
	37-42"	\$380	6	\$2,280	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$2,280
	>43"	\$590	3	\$1,770	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,770
Acti	vity Total(s)		112	\$28,140	67	\$6,600	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$34,740
Routine Inspection	Drive-by Assessment	\$1	3,016	\$3,016	3,016	\$3,016	3,016	\$3,016	3,016	\$3,016	3,016	\$3,016	\$15,080
Koutine inspection	Walk-by Assessment	\$5	754	\$3,770	754	\$3,770	754	\$3,770	754	\$3,770	754	\$3,770	\$18,850
Acti	vity Total(s)		3,770	\$6,786	3,770	\$6,786	3,770	\$6,786	3,770	\$6,786	3,770	\$6,786	\$33,930
Value Territaine	1-3"	\$20	237	\$4,740	237	\$4,740	237	\$4,740	40	\$800	40	\$800	\$15,820
Young Tree Training	4-6"	\$30	246	\$7,380	246	\$7,380	246	\$7,380	42	\$1,260	42	\$1,260	\$24,660
(3-year Cycle)	6"<	\$40	39	\$1,560	39	\$1,560	39	\$1,560	7	\$280	7	\$280	\$5,240
Acti	vity Total(s)		522	\$13,680	522	\$13,680	522	\$13,680	89	\$2,340	89	\$2,340	\$45,720
	1-3"	\$20	9	\$183	43	\$860	77	\$1,540	111	\$2,220	117	\$2,340	\$7,143
	4-6"	\$30	28	\$840	63	\$1,890	98	\$2,940	133	\$3,990	139	\$4,170	\$13,830
	7-12"	\$75	141	\$10,543	147	\$11,025	153	\$11,475	159	\$11,925	160	\$12,000	\$56,968
Develope Develope	13-18"	\$120	50	\$6,051	50	\$6,051	50	\$6,051	50	\$6,051	50	\$6,051	\$30,257
(7 year Cycle)	19-24"	\$170	13	\$2,283	13	\$2,283	13	\$2,283	13	\$2,283	13	\$2,283	\$11,414
(7-year Cycle)	25-30"	\$225	12	\$2,636	12	\$2,636	12	\$2,636	12	\$2,636	12	\$2,636	\$13,179
	31-36"	\$305	6	\$1,917	6	\$1,917	6	\$1,917	6	\$1,917	6	\$1,917	\$9,586
	37-42"	\$380	2	\$706	2	\$706	2	\$706	2	\$706	2	\$706	\$3,529
	>43"	\$590	1	\$337	1	\$337	1	\$337	1	\$337	1	\$337	\$1,686
Acti	vity Total(s)		262	\$25,496	337	\$27,705	412	\$29,885	487	\$32,065	500	\$32,440	\$147,591
Devile server (Trees	Purchasing	\$250	32	\$8,000	32	\$8,000	32	\$8,000	32	\$8,000	32	\$8,000	\$40,000
Replacement Tree	Planting & Watering	\$200	32	\$6,400	32	\$6,400	32	\$6,400	32	\$6,400	32	\$6,400	\$32,000
I faitting and Maintenance	Mulching	\$25	32	\$800	32	\$800	32	\$800	32	\$800	32	\$800	\$4,000
Acti	vity Total(s)		96	\$15,200	96	\$15,200	96	\$15,200	96	\$15,200	96	\$15,200	\$76,000
	Purchasing	\$250	21	\$5,250	21	\$5,250	21	\$5,250	21	\$5,250	21	\$5,250	\$26,250
New Tree Planting and	Planting & Watering	\$200	21	\$4,200	21	\$4,200	21	\$4,200	21	\$4,200	21	\$4,200	\$21,000
Maintenance	Mulching	\$25	21	\$525	21	\$525	21	\$525	21	\$525	21	\$525	\$2,625
Acti	vity Total(s)		63	\$9,975	63	\$9,975	63	\$9,975	63	\$9 <i>,</i> 975	63	\$9,975	\$49,875
	Tree Removal	\$605	36	\$21,780	36	\$21,780	36	\$21,780	36	\$21,780	36	\$21,780	\$108,900
Natural Mortality (1%)	Stump Removal	\$94	36	\$3,384	36	\$3,384	36	\$3,384	36	\$3,384	36	\$3,384	\$16,920
	Replacement Tree	\$475	36	\$17,100	36	\$17,100	36	\$17,100	36	\$17,100	36	\$17,100	\$85,500
Acti	vity Total(s)		108	\$42,264	108	\$42,264	108	\$42,264	108	\$42,264	108	\$42,264	\$211,320
Activit	y Grand Total		4,971		5,069		4,999		4,765		4,626		24,431
Cost	Grand Total			\$163,998		\$133,872		\$121,499		\$113,086		\$109,005	\$641,460

CONCLUSION

When properly maintained, the valuable benefits trees provide over their lifetime far exceeds the time and money invested in planting, maintaining, and inevitably removing them. The 3,561 public trees inventoried provide annual benefits with a total estimated value of \$222,715. The City of Petoskey's 2020 Downtown Maintenance budget is \$102,400 and its 2020 Contract Forestry budget is \$325,500, making Petoskey's ROI about 52% annually. Proactive tree care that maintains the condition of young trees as they age and grow may increase Petoskey's ROI over time, as more large mature trees increase the benefits provided by the public tree resource.

The proposed maintenance schedule is ambitious and is a challenge to complete in five years, but it becomes easier after all high priority tree maintenance is completed. This *Tree Assessment and Management Plan* will help the city advocate for an increased urban forestry budget to fund the recommended maintenance activities. Year 1 is the most difficult because of the higher cost, yet this significant investment early on will reduce tree maintenance costs over time.

As the urban forest grows, the benefits enjoyed by the City of Petoskey and its residents will increase as well. Inventoried trees are only a fraction of the total trees in Petoskey when including private property, which is why it is important to also incentivize private landowners to care for their trees and to plant new ones. The city's urban forestry program is well on its way to creating a sustainable and resilient public tree resource and can stay on track by setting goals and updating inventory data to check progress.



EVALUATING AND UPDATING THIS PLAN

This Tree Assessment and provides Management Plan maintenance priorities for the next five years. It is important to update the tree inventory using **TreeKeeper**® as work is completed, so the software can provide updated species distribution benefit and This estimates. empowers Petoskey to self-assess the City's progress over time and set goals to strive toward by following the adaptive management cycle. Below are some ways of



implementing the steps of this cycle:

- Prepare planting plans well enough in advance to schedule and complete stump removal in the designated areas, and to select species best suited to the available sites.
- Annually compare the number of trees planted to the number of trees removed and the number of vacant sites remaining, then adjusting future planting plans accordingly.
- Annually compare the species and genus distributions of the inventoried tree resource • with the previous year after completing planting plans to monitor changes.
- Schedule and assign high priority tree work so it can be completed as soon as possible • instead of reactively addressing new lower priority work requests as they are received.
- Make data collection, such as measuring DBH and assessing condition, and entry into TreeKeeper[®] the standard procedure for tree work and routine inspections so changes over time can be monitored.

REFERENCES

- American National Standards Institute. 2017. ANSI A300 (Part 1): Tree, Shrub, and Other Woody Plant Management—Standard Practices (Pruning). Tree Care Industry Association, Inc.
- ----. 2011. ANSI A300 (Part 9): Tree, Shrub, and Other Woody Plant Management Standard Practices (Tree Risk Assessment a. Tree Failure). Tree Care Industry Association, Inc.
- Coder, K. D. 1996. Identified Benefits of Community Trees and Forests. University of Georgia Cooperative Extension Service: Forest Resources Unit. Publication FOR96-39. Retrieved from https://nfs.unl.edu/documents/communityforestry/coderbenefitsofcommtrees.pdf
- Culley, T.M. & Hardiman, N.A. 2007. The Beginning of a New Invasive Plant: A History of the Ornamental Callery Pear in the United States. *BioScience*, 57(11): 956-964.
- Evans, E. 2012. Americans are Planting Trees of Strength. North Carolina State University College of Agriculture & Life Sciences: Department of Horticultural Science. http://www.treesofstrength.org/benefits.htm
- Heisler, G. M. 1986. Energy Savings with Trees. *Journal of Arboriculture* 12(5):113–125. Retrieved from https://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/pubs/jrnl/1986/nrs_1986_heisler_002.pdf
- Karnosky, D. F. 1979. Dutch Elm Disease: A Review of the History, Environmental Implications, Control, and Research Needs. *Environmental Conservation* 6(4): 311–322.
- Kuo, F. E., & Sullivan, W. C. 2001a. Environment and Crime in the Inner City: Does Vegetation Reduce Crime? *Environment and Behavior* 33(3): 343–367. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.644.9399&rep=rep1&type=pdf
- ---. 2001b. Aggression and Violence in the Inner City: Effects of Environment via Mental Fatigue. *Environment and Behavior* 33(4): 543–571. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/9ca8/a34eee31d42ac2235aa6d0b9b6e7a5f32386.pdf
- Lovasi, G. S., Quinn, J. W., Neckerman, K. M., Perzanowski M., Rundle, A. 2008. Children living in areas with more street trees have lower prevalence of asthma. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 62(7): 647-649. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/5401459_Children_living_in_areas_with_more_tr ees_have_lower_prevalence_of_asthma
- McPherson, E. G., Rowntree, R. A. 1989. Using Structural Measures to Compare Twenty-Two U.S. Street Tree Populations. *Landscape Journal* 8(1): 13–23. Retrieved from https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/topics/urban_forestry/products/1/psw_cufr745_structuralmeasur es.pdf
- Michigan Department of Natural Resources. 2020. Black Locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia*). Retrieved from https://www.michigan.gov/invasives/0,5664,7-324-68002_71240_73851-379779--,00.html
- Michigan.gov. 2020. Asian Longhorned Beetle. *Michigan Invasive Species*. Retrieved from https://www.michigan.gov/invasives/0,5664,7-324-68002_71241-367887--,00.html

- Miller, R. W., & Sylvester, W.A. 1981. An Economic Evaluation of the Pruning cycle. *Journal of Arboriculture* 7(4): 109–112. Retrieved from http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:VENBQXq9EmcJ:joa.isaarbor.com/request.asp%3FJournalID%3D1%26ArticleID%3D1724%26Type%3D2+&cd=2&hl =en&ct=clnk&gl=us
- Nowak, D. J., Greenfield, E. J., Hoehn, R. E., & Lapoint, E. 2013. Carbon storage and sequestration by trees in urban and community areas of the United States. *Environmental Pollution* 178: 229-236. Retrieved from https://www.fs.fed.us/nrs/pubs/jrnl/2013/nrs_2013_nowak_001.pdf
- Richards, N. A. 1983. Diversity and Stability in a Street Tree Population. *Urban Ecology* 7(2): 159–171.
- Santamour, F.S. 1990. Trees for Urban Planting: Diversity Uniformity, and Common Sense. U.S. National Arboretum: Agricultural Research Service. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/26a2/4c5361ce6d6e618a9fa307c4a34a3169e309.pdf?_ga=2.26 6051527.959145428.1587418896-558533249.1587418896
- Ulrich, R. 1984. View through Window May Influence Recovery from Surgery. *Science* 224: 420– 422. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/43df/b42bc2f7b212eb288d2e7be289d251f15bfd.pdf
- – –. 1986. Human Responses to Vegetation and Landscapes. Landscape and Urban Planning 13: 29–44. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Roger_Ulrich4/publication/254315158_Visual_Landsca pes_and_Psychological_Well-Being/links/0c96053a3fe7796728000000/Visual-Landscapesand-Psychological-Well-Being.pdf
- Ulrich R.S., R.F. Simmons, B.D. Losito, E. Fiority, M.A. Miles and M. Zeison. 1991. Stress Recovery During Exposure to Natural and Urban Environments. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 11(3): 201-230.
- USDA Forest Service. 2003a. Benefits of Urban Trees—Urban and Community Forestry: Improving Our Quality of Life. *Southern Region Forestry Report* R8-FR 71. Retrieved from http://www.sci-links.com/files/Benefits_of_Urban_Trees.pdf
- — —. 2003b. Is all your rain going down the drain? Look to Bioretainment—trees are a solution. *Center for Urban Forest Research: Pacific Southwest Research Station*. Retrieved from https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/topics/urban_forestry/products/cufr_392_rain_down_the_drain. pdf
- ---. 2020. Forest Health Highlights. Retrieved from https://www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/protecting-forest/forest-healthmonitoring/monitoring-forest-highlights.shtml

USDA APHIS. 2020. Pest Tracker. https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/resources/pests-diseases/hungry-pests/Pest-Tracker

----. 2015. Asian Longhorned Beetle: Annotated Host List. Retrieved from https://www.aphis.usda.gov/plant_health/plant_pest_info/asian_lhb/downloads/hostlist.pdf

- Wolf, K. L. 1998a. Urban Nature Benefits: Psycho-Social Dimensions of People and Plants. *University of Washington: College of Forest Resources* Human Dimensions of the Urban Forest Fact Sheet #1. Retrieved from https://www.naturewithin.info/UF/PsychBens-FS1.pdf
- ---. 1999. Grow for the Gold: Trees in Business Districts. Washington State DNR: Community Forestry Program Number 14. Retrieved from https://www.naturewithin.info/CityBiz/TreeLink.PDF
- – . 2003. Social Aspects of Urban Forestry: Public Response to the Urban Forest in Inner-City Business Districts. *Journal of Arboriculture* 29(3): 117–126. Retrieved from https://www.naturewithin.info/CityBiz/JofA_Biz.pdf
- ---. 2007. City Trees and Property Values. *Arborist News* 16(4): 34-36. Retrieved from https://www.naturewithin.info/Policy/Hedonics.pdf
- ---. 2009. Trees & Urban Streets: Research on Traffic Safety & Livable Communities. University of Washington, Seattle USDA Forest Service: Pacific Northwest Research Station. Retrieved from http://www.naturewithin.info/urban.html

APPENDIX A DATA COLLECTION AND SITE LOCATION METHODS

DATA COLLECTION METHODS

DRG collects tree inventory data using their proprietary GIS software, called Rover, loaded onto pen-based field computers. At each site, the following data fields were collected:

- Address
- Comments
- Condition
- Date of Inventory
- Maintenance
 Recommendation
- Multi-stem Tree

- Notes
- Relative Location
- Size*
- Species and Identification Confidence Level
- Utility Interference
- X and Y Coordinates
- * measured in inches in diameter at 4.5 feet above ground or diameter at breast height (DBH]).

The knowledge, experience, and professional judgment of DRG's arborists ensure the high quality of inventory data.

SITE LOCATION METHODS

Equipment and Base Maps

Inventory arborists use FZ-G1 Panasonic Toughpad[®] units with internal GPS receivers. Geographic information system (GIS) map layers are loaded onto these units to help locate sites during the inventory. This table lists these base map layers, along with each layer's source and format information.

Data Source	Data Year	Projection
		NAD 1983 2011
Shapefile	2020	StatePlane
Avineon, Inc.	2020	Michigan Central,
		International Feet
		NAD 1983 2011
Aerial Imagery	2016	StatePlane
Avineon, Inc.	2016	Michigan Central,
		International Feet

STREET ROW SITE LOCATION

Individual street ROW sites were located using a methodology that identifies sites by *address number*, *street name*, *side*, and *on street*. This methodology was used to help ensure consistent assignment of location.

Address Number and Street Name

Where there was no GIS parcel addressing data available for sites located adjacent to a vacant lot, or adjacent to an occupied lot without a posted address number, the arborist used their best judgment to assign an address number based on nearby addresses. An "X" was then added to the number in the database to indicate that it was assigned, for example, "37X Choice Avenue."

Sites in medians were assigned an address number by the arborist in Rover using parcel and streets geographical data. Each segment was numbered with an assigned address that was interpolated from addresses facing that median and addressed on that same street as the median. If there were multiple medians between cross streets, each segment was assigned its own address. The *street name* assigned to a site was determined by street centerline information.



Side Value

Each site was assigned a *side value*, including *front*, *side*, *median*, or *rear* based on the site's location in relation to the lot's street frontage. The *front* is the side facing the address street. *Side* is either side of the lot that is between the front and rear. *Median* indicates a median or island surrounded by pavement. The *rear* is the side of the lot opposite of the address street.

PARK AND PUBLIC SPACE SITE LOCATION

Park and/or public space site locations were collected using the same methodology as street ROW sites, however nearly all of them have the "Assigned Address" field set to 'X' and have the "Park Name" data field filled.

Site Location Example



Corner Lot A

Corner Lot A		<u>Corner Lot B</u>	
Address/Street Name:	205 Hoover St.	Address/Street Name:	226 E Mac Arthur St.
Side:	Side	Side:	Side
On Street:	Taft St.	On Street:	Davis St.
Address/Street Name:	205 Hoover St.	Address/Street Name:	226 E Mac Arthur St.
Side:	Side	Side:	Front
On Street:	Taft St.	On Street:	E Mac Arthur St.
Address/Street Name:	205 Hoover St.	Address/Street Name:	226 E Mac Arthur St.
Side:	Side	Side:	Front
On Street:	Taft St.	On Street:	E Mac Arthur St.
Address/Street Name:	205 Hoover St.		
Side:	Front		
On Street:	Hoover St.		

Davey Resource Group

APPENDIX B INVASIVE PESTS AND DISEASES

In today's worldwide marketplace, the volume of international trade brings increased potential for pests and diseases to invade our country. Many of these pests and diseases have seriously harmed rural and urban landscapes and have caused billions of dollars in lost revenue and millions of dollars in cleanup costs. Keeping these pests and diseases out of the country is the number one priority of the USDA's Animal and Plant Inspection Service (APHIS).

Updated pest range maps can be found at: https://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/tools/afpe/maps/ and updated pest information can be found at: https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/resources/pests-diseases/hungry-pests/Pest-Tracker

Although some invasive species naturally enter the United States via wind, ocean currents, and other means, most invasive species enter the country with some help from human activities. Their introduction to the U.S. is a byproduct of cultivation, commerce, tourism, and travel. Many species enter the United States each year in baggage, cargo, contaminants of commodities, or mail.

Once they arrive, invasive pests grow and spread rapidly because controls, such as native predators, are lacking. Invasive pests disrupt the landscape by pushing out native species, reducing biological diversity, killing trees, altering wildfire intensity and frequency, and damaging crops. Some pests may even push species to extinction. The following sections include key pests and diseases that adversely affect trees in America at the time of this plan's development. This list is not comprehensive and may not include all threats.

It is critical to the management of community trees to routinely check APHIS, USDA Forest Service, and other websites for updates about invasive species and diseases in your area and in our country so that you can be prepared to combat their attack.



SPOTTED LANTERNFLY

The spotted lanternfly (SLF, *Lycorma delicatula*) is native to China and was first detected in Pennsylvania in September 2014. SLF feeds on a wide range of fruit, ornamental, and woody trees, with tree-of-heaven being one of its preferred hosts. SLF is a hitchhiker and can be spread long distances by people who move infested material or items containing egg masses.

If allowed to spread in the United States, this pest could seriously impact the country's grape, orchard, and logging industries. Be sure to inspect for the pest. Egg masses, juveniles, and adults can be on trees and plants, as well as on bricks, stone, metal, and other smooth surfaces. Also thoroughly check vehicles, trailers, and even the clothes you are wearing to prevent accidently moving SLF.

Symptoms of SLF are plants oozing or weeping with a fermented odor, buildup of a sticky fluid called honeydew on the plant or on the ground underneath them, and sooty mold growing on plants. The following trees are susceptible to SLF: almond, apple, apricot, cherry, maple, nectarine, oak, peach, pine, plum, poplar, sycamore, walnut, and willow, as well as grape vine and hop plants.



Pinned spotted lanternfly.

Photograph courtesy of PA Dept of Agriculture



Pinned spotted lanternfly nymph with wingspan open.

Photograph courtesy of USDA APHIS

ASIAN LONGHORNED BEETLE

The Asian longhorned beetle (ALB, *Anoplophora glabripennis*) is an exotic pest that threatens a wide variety of hardwood trees in North America. The beetle was introduced in Chicago, New Jersey, and New York City, and is believed to have been introduced in the United States from wood pallets and other wood-packing material accompanying cargo shipments from Asia. ALB is a serious threat to America's hardwood tree species.



Adult Asian longhorned beetle.

Adults are large (3/4- to 1/2-inch long) with very long, black and white banded

Photograph courtesy of New Bedford Guide (2011)

antennae. The body is glossy black with irregular white spots. Adults can be seen from late spring to fall depending on the climate. ALB has a long list of host species; however, the beetle prefers hardwoods, including several maple species. Examples include: box elder (*Acer negundo*); Norway maple (*A. platanoides*); red maple (*A. rubrum*); silver maple (*A. saccharinum*); sugar maple (*A. saccharum*); buckeye (*Aesculus glabra*); horsechestnut (*A. hippocastanum*); birch (*Betula*); London planetree (*Platanus × acerifolia*); willow (*Salix*); and elm (*Ulmus*).

EASTERN TENT CATERPILLAR

Eastern tent caterpiller (*Malacosoma americanum*) was first observed in the United States in 1646. In spring, caterpillars make nests in the forks and crotches of tree branches. Caterpillars do not feed within the nest; they leave the nest to feed up to 3 feet from nest, and return to rest and take shelter in wet weather. Large infestations may occur at 8- to 10-year intervals. Egg masses overwinter on twigs. Trees are rarely killed by eastern tent caterpillar, but health is compromised that year and aesthetic value is decreased.

Easter tent caterpiller have a wide range of hosts, including apple (*Malus*) and cherry (*Prunus*).



Eastern tent caterpillar nest.

Photograph courtesy of Prairie Haven (2008)

EUROPEAN GYPSY MOTH

The gypsy moth (GM, *Lymantria dispar*) is native to Europe and first arrived in the United States in Massachusetts in 1869. This moth is a significant pest because its caterpillars have an appetite for more than 300 species of trees and shrubs. GM caterpillars defoliate trees, which makes the species vulnerable to diseases and other pests that can eventually kill the tree.

Male GMs are brown with a darker brown pattern on their wings and have a 1/2-inch wingspan. Females are slightly larger with a 2-inch wingspan and are nearly white with dark, saw-toothed patterns on their wings. Although they have wings, the female GM cannot fly.

The GMs prefer approximately 150 primary hosts but feed on more than 300 species of trees and shrubs. Some trees are found in these common genera: birch (*Betula*); cedar (*Juniperus*); larch (*Larix*); aspen, cottonwood, poplar (*Populus*); oak (*Quercus*); and willow (*Salix*).



Close-up of male (darker brown) and female (whitish color) European gypsy moths.

Photograph courtesy of USDA APHIS (2019)

THOUSAND CANKERS DISEASE

A complex disease referred to as Thousand cankers disease (TCD) was first observed in Colorado in 2008 and is now thought to have existed in Colorado as early as 2003. TCD is considered to be native to the United States and is attributed to numerous cankers developing in association with insect galleries.

TCD results from the combined activity of the *Geosmithia morbida* fungus and the walnut twig beetle (WTB, *Pityophthorus juglandis*). The WTB has expanded both its geographical and host range over the past two decades, and coupled with the *Geosmithia morbida* fungus, *Juglans*



Side view of a walnut twig beetle.

Photograph courtesy of the USFS (2011)

(walnut) mortality has manifested in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Washington. In July 2010, TCD was reported in Knoxville, Tennessee. The infestation is believed to be at least 10 years old and was previously attributed to drought stress. This is the first report east of the 100th meridian, raising concerns that large native populations of black walnut (*J. nigra*) in the eastern United States may suffer severe decline and mortality.

The tree species preferred as hosts for TCD are walnut.

OAK WILT

Oak wilt was first identified in 1944 and is caused by the fungus Ceratocystis fagacearum. considered invasive While an and aggressive disease, its status as an exotic pest is debated since the fungus has not been reported in any other part of the world. This disease affects the oak genus and is most devastating to those in the red oak subgenus, such as scarlet oak (Quercus coccinea), shingle oak (Q. imbricaria), pin oak (*Q. palustris*), willow oak (*Q. phellos*), and red oak (Q. rubra). It also attacks trees in the white oak subgenus, although it is not as prevalent and spreads at a much slower pace in these trees.



Oak wilt symptoms on red and white oak leaves. **Photograph courtesy of the USFS (2011a)**

Just as with DED, oak wilt disease is caused by a fungus that clogs the vascular system of

oak and results in decline and death of the tree. The fungus is carried from tree to tree by several borers common to oak, but the disease is more commonly spread through root grafts. Oak species within the same subgenus (red or white) will form root colonies with grafted roots that allow the disease to move readily from one tree to another.

HEMLOCK WOOLY ADELGID

The hemlock woolly adelgid (HWA, *Adelges tsugae*) was first described in western North America in 1924 and first reported in the eastern United States in 1951 near Richmond, Virginia.

In their native range, populations of HWA cause little damage to the hemlock trees, as they feed on natural enemies and possible tree resistance has evolved with this insect. In eastern North America and in the absence of natural control elements, HWA attacks both eastern or Canadian hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis*) and Carolina hemlock (*T. caroliniana*), often damaging and killing them within a few years of becoming infested.

The HWA is now established from northeastern Georgia to southeastern Maine and as far west as eastern Kentucky and Tennessee.



Hemlock woolly adelgids on a branch.

Photograph courtesy of Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, Bugwood.org (2011)

EMERALD ASH BORER

Emerald ash borer (*EAB*) (*Agrilus planipennis*) is responsible for the death or decline of tens of millions of ash trees in 14 states in the American Midwest and Northeast. Native to Asia, EAB has been found in China, Japan, Korea, Mongolia, eastern Russia, and Taiwan. It likely arrived in the United States hidden in wood-packing materials commonly used to ship consumer goods, auto parts, and other products. The first official United States identification of EAB was in southeastern Michigan in 2002.

Adult beetles are slender and 1/2-inch long. Males are smaller than females. Color varies but adults are usually bronze or golden green overall with metallic, emerald-green wing covers. The top of the abdomen under the wings is metallic, purplish-red and can be seen when the wings are spread.

The EAB-preferred host tree species are in the genus *Fraxinus* (ash).



Close-up of an emerald ash borer.

Photograph courtesy of USDA APHIS (2020)

REFERENCES

- Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, Bugwood.org. 2011. *Hemlock woolly adelgid* (Adelges tsugae). Retrieved from https://www.invasive.org/browse/ detail.cfm?imgnum=3225077
- Cranshaw, W. 2004. *Garden Insects of North America: The Ultimate Guide to Backyard Bugs* (pp. 114, 118). Princeton University Press.
- DiOrio, A. 2011. Volunteers Needed for Asian Longhorned Beetle Survey. New Bedford Guide. Retrieved from http://www.newbedfordguide.com/volunteers-needed-for-asian- longhornedbeetle-survey/2011/03/30
- Indiana Department of Natural Resources. 2019. *Sudden Oak Death*. Entomology and Plant Pathology. Retrieved from http://www.in.gov/dnr/entomolo/4532.htm
- Miller, F. 2016. 2016 Illinois Forest Health Highlights. The Morton Arboretum. Retrieved from http://www.mortonarb.org/files/2016-FHH-Final-Version-12-28-16-Submitted.pdf
- University of Georgia. *Invasive Species*. Center for Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health. Retrieved from www.bugwood.org
- USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. 2019. *Hungry Pests: Your Move Gypsy Moth Free.* Retrieved from https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/resources/pests-diseases/hungry-pests/thethreat/gypsy-moth-free
- USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. 2019. *Pest Alert: Spotted Lantern Fly* (Lycorma delicatula). Retrieved from https://www.aphis.usda.gov/publications/ plant_health/alert-spotted-lanternfly.pdf
- USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. 2020. *Plant Pests and Diseases: Emerald Ash Borer.* Retrieved from https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/planthealth/plant-pest-and-disease-programs/pests-and-diseases/emerald-ash-borer/emerald-ash-borer
- USDA Forest Service. 2013. *Pest Alert: Thousand Cankers Disease*. Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry, NA–PR–02–10. Retrieved from https://www.fs.usda.gov/naspf/sites/default/files/thousand_cankers_disease_print_res.pdf

APPENDIX C i-TREE STREETS METHOLOGY

i-Tree Streets regionalizes the calculations of its output by incorporating detailed reference city project information for 16 climate zones across the United States. The City of Petoskey falls within the Midwest Climate Zone. Sample inventory data from Minneapolis represent the basis for the Midwest Reference City Project for the Midwest Community Tree Guidelines. The basis for the benefit modeling in this study compares Petoskey's inventory data to the results of Midwest Reference City Project to obtain an estimation of the annual benefits provided by Petoskey's public tree resource.

Growth rate modeling information was used to perform computer-simulated growth of the existing tree population for one year and account for the associated annual benefits. This "snapshot" analysis assumed that no trees were added to or removed from the existing population. Calculations of carbon dioxide (CO₂) released due to decompositions of wood from removed trees did consider average annual mortality. This approach directly connects benefits with tree-size variables such as diameter at breast height (DBH) and leaf-surface area. Many benefits of trees are related to processes that involve interactions between leaves and the atmosphere (e.g., interception, transpiration, photosynthesis); therefore, benefits increase as tree canopy cover and leaf surface area increase.

For each of the modeled benefits, an annual resource unit was determined on a per-tree basis. Resource units are measured as megawatt-hours of electricity saved per tree; therms of natural gas conserved per tree, pounds of atmospheric CO₂ reduced per tree; pounds of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), particulate matter (PM₁₀), and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) reduced per tree; cubic feet of stormwater runoff reduced per tree; and square feet of leaf area added per tree to increase property values.

Prices were assigned to each resource unit using economic indicators of society's willingness to pay for the environmental benefits trees provide. Estimates of benefits are initial approximations as some benefits are difficult to quantify (e.g., impacts on psychological health, crime, and violence). In addition, limited knowledge about the physical processes at work and their interactions make estimates imprecise (e.g., fate of air pollutants trapped by trees and then washed to the ground by rainfall). Therefore, this method of quantification provides first-order approximations. It is meant to be a general accounting of the benefits produced by urban trees—an accounting with an accepted degree of uncertainty that can, nonetheless, provide science-based platform for decision-making.

A detailed description of how the default benefit prices are derived, refer to the *City of Minneapolis, Minnesota Municipal Tree Resource Analysis* (McPherson *et al.* 2005) and the *Midwest Community Tree Guide: Benefits, Costs, and Strategic Planning* (McPherson *et al.* 2009). i-Tree Streets' default values from the Midwest Climate Zone were used for air quality and stormwater benefit prices and local values were used for energy usage, aesthetics, and other benefits.

Benefits	Price	Unit	Source
Electricity	\$0.00759	\$/Kwh	Xcelenergy 2004
Natural Gas	\$0.0098	\$/Therm	Centerpoint Energy
CO ₂	\$0.0075	\$/lb	US EPA 2003
PM_{10}	\$2.84	\$/lb	US EPA 2003
NO ₂	\$3.34	\$/lb	US EPA 2003
O3	\$3.34	\$/lb	US EPA 2003
SO ₂	\$2.06	\$/lb	US EPA 2003
VOCs	\$3.75	\$/lb	Ottinger and others
Stormwater Interception	\$0.0046	\$/gallon	McPherson & Xiao
Aesthetic Value	\$218,000	Average Midwest Housing Price	TreeKeeper®

Benefit Prices Used by i-Tree Streets in the Analysis of Petoskey's Tree Inventory

Using these prices, the magnitude of the benefits provided by the public tree resource was calculated based on the science of i-Tree Streets using DRG's TreeKeeper[®] inventory management software. For a detailed description of how the magnitudes of benefit prices are calculated, refer to the *Midwest Community Tree Guide: Benefits, Costs, and Strategic Planning* (McPherson et al. 2009).

APPENDIX D SUGGESTED TREE SPECIES FOR USDA HARDINESS ZONE 5

DECIDUOUS TREES

Scientific Name	Common Name	Cultivar
Acer rubrum	red maple	Red Sunset®
Acer nigrum	black maple	
Acer saccharum	sugar maple	'Legacy'
Aesculus flava*	yellow buckeye	
Betula nigra	river birch	Heritage®
Carpinus betulus	European hornbeam	'Franz Fontaine'
Castanea mollissima*	Chinese chestnut	
Celtis occidentalis	common hackberry	'Prairie Pride'
Cercidiphyllum japonicum	katsuratree	'Aureum'
Diospyros virginiana*	common persimmon	
Fagus grandifolia*	American beech	
Fagus sylvatica*	European beech	(numerous exist)
Ginkgo biloba	ginkgo	(male trees only)
Gleditsia triacanthos inermis	thornless honeylocust	'Shademaster'
Gymnocladus dioica	Kentucky coffeetree	Prairie Titan [®]
Juglans regia*	English walnut	'Hansen'
Larix decidua*	European larch	
Liquidambar styraciflua	American sweetgum	Cherokee™
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	'Fastigiatum'
Maclura pomifera	osage-orange	'White Shield','Witchita'
Magnolia acuminata*	cucumbertree magnolia	(numerous exist)
Magnolia macrophylla*	bigleaf magnolia	
Metasequoia glyptostroboides	dawn redwood	'Emerald Feathers'
Nyssa sylvatica	black tupelo	
Platanus × acerifolia	London planetree	'Yarwood'
Platanus occidentalis*	American sycamore	
Quercus alba	white oak	
Quercus bicolor	swamp white oak	
Quercus coccinea	scarlet oak	
Quercus ellipsoidalis	northern pin oak	

Large Trees: Greater than 45 Feet in Height at Maturity

Scientific Name	Common Name	Cultivar
Quercus frainetto	Hungarian oak	
Quercus imbricaria	shingle oak	
Quercus lyrata	overcup oak	
Quercus macrocarpa	bur oak	
Quercus montana	chestnut oak	
Quercus muehlenbergii	chinkapin oak	
Quercus phellos	willow oak	
Quercus robur	English oak	Heritage®
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	'Splendens'
Quercus shumardii	Shumard oak	
Quercus texana	Texas oak	
Styphnolobium japonicum	Japanese pagodatree	'Regent'
Taxodium distichum	common baldcypress	'Shawnee Brave'
Tilia americana	American linden	'Redmond'
Tilia cordata	littleleaf linden	'Greenspire'
Tilia tomentosa	silver linden	'Sterling'
Ulmus parvifolia	Chinese elm	Allée®
Zelkova serrata	Japanese zelkova	'Green Vase'

Large Trees: Greater than 45 Feet in Height at Maturity (continued)

Medium Trees: 31 to 45 Feet in Height at Maturity

Scientific Name	Common Name	Cultivar
Aesculus × carnea	red horsechestnut	
Cladrastis kentukea	American yellowwood	'Rosea'
Eucommia ulmoides	hardy rubbertree	
Koelreuteria paniculata	goldenraintree	
Ostrya virginiana	eastern hophornbeam	
Parrotia persica	Persian parrotia	'Vanessa'
Phellodendron amurense	amur corktree	'Macho'
Prunus maackii	amur chokecherry	'Amber Beauty'
Prunus sargentii	Sargent cherry	
Quercus acutissima	sawtooth oak	
Quercus cerris	European turkey oak	
Sorbus alnifolia	Korean mountainash	'Redbird'

Scientific Name	Common Name	Cultivar
Acer buergerianum	trident maple	Streetwise®
Acer campestre	hedge maple	Queen Elizabeth™
Acer cappadocicum	coliseum maple	'Aureum'
Acer ginnala	amur maple	Red Rhapsody™
Acer griseum	paperbark maple	
Acer pensylvanicum*	striped maple	
Acer truncatum	Shantung maple	
Aesculus pavia*	red buckeye	
Amelanchier arborea	downy serviceberry	(numerous exist)
Amelanchier laevis	Allegheny serviceberry	
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	
Cercis canadensis	eastern redbud	'Forest Pansy'
Chionanthus virginicus	white fringetree	
Cornus kousa	Kousa dogwood	(numerous exist)
Cornus mas*	corneliancherry dogwood	'Spring Sun'
Corylus avellana	European filbert	'Contorta'
Cotinus coggygria*	common smoketree	'Flame'
Cotinus obovata*	American smoketree	
Crataegus phaenopyrum	Washington hawthorn	Princeton Sentry [™]
Crataegus viridis	green hawthorn	'Winter King'
Franklinia alatamaha*	Franklinia	
Halesia tetraptera	Carolina silverbell	'Arnold Pink'
Magnolia × soulangiana*	saucer magnolia	'Alexandrina'
Magnolia stellata*	star magnolia	'Centennial'
Magnolia tripetala*	umbrella magnolia	
Magnolia virginiana*	sweetbay magnolia	Moonglow®
<i>Malus</i> spp.	flowering crabapple	(disease resistant only)
Oxydendrum arboreum	sourwood	'Mt. Charm'
Prunus subhirtella	Higan cherry	pendula
Prunus virginiana	common chokecherry	'Schubert'
Styrax japonicus	Japanese snowbell	'Emerald Pagoda'
Syringa reticulata	Japanese tree lilac	'Ivory Silk'

Small Trees: 15 to 30 Feet in Height at Maturity

Note: * denotes species **not** recommended for use as street trees.

CONIFEROUS AND EVERGREEN TREES

Scientific Name	Common Name	Cultivar
Abies balsamea	balsam fir	
Abies concolor	white fir	'Violacea'
Chamaecyparis nootkatensis	Nootka falsecypress	'Pendula'
Cryptomeria japonica	Japanese cryptomeria	'Sekkan-sugi'
Ilex opaca	American holly	
Picea omorika	Serbian spruce	
Picea orientalis	Oriental spruce	
Pinus densiflora	Japanese red pine	
Pinus strobus	eastern white pine	
Pinus sylvestris	Scotch pine	
Psedotsuga menziesii	Douglas fir	
Thuja plicata	western arborvitae	(numerous exist)
Tsuga canadensis	eastern hemlock	

Large Trees: Greater than 45 Feet in Height at Maturity

Medium Trees: 31 to 45 Feet in Height at Maturity

Scientific Name	Common Name	Cultivar
Chamaecyparis thyoides	Atlantic whitecedar	(numerous exist)
Juniperus virginiana	eastern redcedar	
Pinus bungeana	lacebark pine	
Pinus flexilis	limber pine	
Thuja occidentalis	eastern arborvitae	(numerous exist)

Small Trees: 15 to 30 Feet in Height at Maturity

Scientific Name	Common Name	Cultivar
Ilex × attenuata	Foster's holly	
Pinus aristata	bristlecone pine	
Pinus mugo mugo	mugo pine	

Dirr's Hardy Trees and Shrubs (Dirr 2013) and *Manual of Woody Landscape Plants* (5th Edition) (Dirr 1988) were consulted to compile this suggested species list. Cultivar selections are recommendations only and are based on DRG's experience. Tree availability will vary based on availability in the nursery trade.



BOARD:	City Council	
MEETING DATE:	October 5, 2020	DATE PREPARED: October 1, 2020
AGENDA SUBJECT:	Downtown-Area Special	Assessment Report
RECOMMENDATION :	That the City Council a proposed resolution tha hearing to receive com special assessments to services in 2021	accept and review this report and adopt a at would schedule an October 19 public ments concerning the proposed levying of b finance downtown area programs and

<u>Report</u> At its September 15 and September 18, 2020 meeting, the City's Downtown Management Board reviewed its proposed budget for downtown-area programs and services for 2021 and recommends that the City Council:

- 1. Levy a special assessment against all eligible, non-residential properties within the Management Board's jurisdictional territory, the proceeds from which would be used to finance costs of such programs and services.
- 2. Increase the amount by 2% for the proposed special assessment compared to assessment-levy amounts that were used in 2020.

The Management Board's budget proposal will be included within the City's recommended 2021 Annual Budget, but the timeline of the special assessment process requires that the process be initiated annually by City Council in advance of the City's annual budget discussions.

Action At the October 5 City Council meeting, the Council will be asked to:

- 1. Adopt a proposed resolution which has been included with the report, that would:
 - a. Confirm that costs of proposed downtown-area programs and services would be offset by special-assessment revenues, and
 - b. Designate the special-assessment district, and
 - c. Approve the recommended special-assessment formula, and
 - d. Schedule an October 19 public hearing to receive comments concerning the proposed programs and services.

A second public hearing to receive comments concerning the proposed special-assessment roll is tentatively scheduled for November 16.

sb Enclosures



City of Petoskey

WHEREAS, the City Council in 1994 appointed members of the City's Downtown Development Authority Board as a "Downtown Management Board" under provisions of Act 120 of the Public Acts of Michigan of 1961, as amended by Act 146 of 1992; and

WHEREAS, at its September 15 and September 18, 2020, meetings, the Downtown Management Board discussed the need to continue to provide certain programs and services that are believed to be beneficial to the City's principal shopping area; and

WHEREAS, the Downtown Management Board has developed a recommended formula by which properties within the Board's district could be specially assessed as a means of obtaining revenues to offset costs of the Board's proposed programs and services for the year 2021; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has reviewed a report dated September 30, 2020, by the City Manager that lists those proposed programs and services as recommended by the Downtown Management Board and the proposed roll that would spread special assessments against properties within the Management Board's district:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Petoskey City Council does and hereby determines that a portion of the expense of these proposed programs and services shall be defrayed by special assessments upon those properties especially benefited; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the nature of these proposed programs and services shall include such activities as events, economic enhancement, beautification, marketing and promotions, and administration for costs estimated at \$186,200; that all portions of such costs shall be paid by special assessments and other related revenues, without a general obligation of the City; that such special-assessment revenues shall be collected in a single-installment payment; and that such assessments shall be levied in a district with boundaries that are to be coterminous to those of the Downtown Management Board's jurisdictional territory; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council does and hereby sets forth the basis of this special assessment by use of a formula that has been recommended by the Downtown Management Board to increase the amount by 2% for the proposed special assessment compared to the recommended 2020 formula and that has been calculated by the City staff based upon square footage of useable, non-residential building area and vacant properties, which the City Council has determined to be the most equitable to the greatest number of property owners concerned; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council does and hereby schedules a public hearing for 7:00 P.M., Monday, October 19, 2020, to receive comments concerning these proposed programs and services; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council does and hereby directs the City staff to notify all property owners within the proposed assessment district of potential property assessments and the October 19, 2020, public hearing to receive comments concerning these proposed programs and services.



City of Petoskey

Report Concerning the Request of the City's Downtown Management Board that the City Council Implement Special Assessments to Finance Costs of Downtown-District Services and Programs for 2021

Prepared for Presentation to the City of Petoskey City Council by Robert Straebel, City Manager, Petoskey, Michigan, September 30, 2020

SUMMARY

The Petoskey City Council is being asked by the City Manager and the Downtown Management Board to implement annual special assessments within the Board's district to produce needed revenues for programs and services. This is the 27th consecutive year that assessments have been levied since the formation of the Downtown Management Board (DMB). The DMB is requesting to increase the special assessment-levy amount for the proposed 2021 special assessment compared to amounts that were used in 2020.

INTRODUCTION

On September 15, 2020, following its routine, annual procedure, the City's Downtown Management Board provided the City Manager the Management Board's proposed budget to be included within the City's approved 2021 Annual Budget, and on September 18, 2020 conducted a special meeting and recommended that the City Manager recommend that City Council implement the special assessment increase for 2021.

The following is a report that reviews Downtown Management Board functions, the Management Board's proposed programs and services and their financing requirements for 2021, and the special-assessment process as recommended by the City Manager in accordance with various provisions of State statutes, the City Charter, and the City Code.

HISTORY

Under authority of Public Act 120 of the Public Acts of Michigan of 1961, known as the "Redevelopment of Principal Shopping Areas Act," municipalities are permitted to establish boards of management that can provide for improvements of streets; regulation of traffic and parking; construction and operation of public facilities; and provision of maintenance, promotion, security, and continued operations. Amendments to the 1961 general-enabling legislation, through Act 146 of 1992, clarified and expanded uses of special-assessment financing, by methods that are devised by local governmental units, on behalf of such boards of management for such programs and services. Using provisions of a 1975 State statute, the City Council, in 1993, had established the Downtown Development Authority, and subsequently, in 1994, appointed its nine-member board as the City's Downtown Management Board, using provisions of the 1992 amendments to Public Act 120 of 1961. These State laws grant similar powers to downtown development authorities and boards of management, but downtown development authorities and boards of management, but downtown development of tax increments; boards of management, using local procedures, may specially assess for purposes that are deemed beneficial to their districts.

PROGRAMS AND SERVICES FINANCING

<u>Budget</u>. The Downtown Management Board on September 15 considered a programs-andservices budget that had been proposed by the Downtown Director for 2021. Included within the recommended budget were expenditures within line-item activities in general categories that again included DMB events, collaborating events, economic enhancement, marketing and promotions, beautification, and administration for a total of \$186,200, compared with \$192,800 in 2020. Costs provided for 2021 were proposed to be offset by \$186,282 in revenues, compared with \$193,175 budgeted for 2020, from assessments, interest, penalties, and other sources. Following a review of estimated revenues and expenditures for 2020 and proposed 2021 figures based on that experience, the Downtown Management Board proposed to increase the 2021 formula rate in order to maintain certain programs and services while at the same time allocating additional funds for future events and parking improvements.

<u>Assessments</u>. Since the inception of the DMB in 1994, the Downtown Management Board increased the assessment formula for each of its three rate categories in 2003 and again in 2011 by 10%. These increases did not necessarily reflect the provision of additional programs and services, but were intended to accommodate existing expenditures that were affected by rising costs. In 2019, the DMB budgeted for an increase that reflected the annual CPI for the years 2014 forward. At that time the Board determined that a more reliable schedule of small increases would be preferable to an occasional large increase and directed staff to include an annual 2% increase in the assessment in ensuing years in order to provide for inflation and increasing costs of goods and services. This increase is included in the special assessment for 2021.

The DMB is recommending for 2021 that non-residential properties be assessed \$0.1836 per square foot for useable first-floor area, \$0.0459 per square foot for floors other than first floors, and \$0.0561 per square foot for vacant, unimproved lots.

<u>Breakdowns</u>. Eligible, non-residential, first-floor area within the Downtown Management Board's district has been estimated at 438,145 square feet. At \$0.1836 per square foot, special assessments that have been recommended for first-floor space would yield \$80,443. Combined areas of eligible, second, third, fourth, and basement floors would total 384,982 square feet; and, assessed at \$0.0459 per square foot, would yield \$17,670 in revenues. Vacant, buildable property, assessed at \$0.0561 per square foot of lot area, which totals 93,852 square feet, would provide \$5,265. Therefore, the proposed 2021 downtown-area special assessment would produce \$103,379 or \$1,779 more than the 2020 assessment revenue that totaled \$101,600.

<u>Process</u>. According to State law, this proposed special assessment would be imposed by the City Council on behalf of the Downtown Management Board. Property owners would receive notices of public hearings that would be conducted by the City Council, first to receive comments about programs and services and, later, special assessments. If implemented, the City staff would invoice property owners for payments of their assessments within 30 days. The City staff again would manage financial accounts on behalf of the Management Board.

ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE

<u>Roll</u>. Enclosed is the proposed special-assessment roll that includes each non-residential downtown property that has been recommended for assessment. The assessment roll is prepared by street (although the Downtown Management Board's district includes portions of Division Street and Emmet Street, those streets do not contain assessable properties that have address numbers on those streets) and lists property owners' names, property addresses, square-footage areas, and proposed assessment costs for each non-residential-building floor and vacant property, and total proposed assessment amounts. A special-assessment-district map is also enclosed.

<u>Resolution</u>. After its review of this report, the City Council will be asked at its October 5 meeting to adopt the enclosed proposed resolution that would:

- 1) Determine that costs of proposed programs and services as recommended by the Downtown Management Board should be defrayed by a single special assessment;
- 2) Designate the Management Board's jurisdictional territory as the assessment district;
- 3) Approve the recommended assessment formula, which as proposed would increase the 2020 formula; and
- 4) Schedule a public hearing for 7:00 P.M., Monday, October 19, in conjunction with the City Council's regular meeting, that would permit the City Council to receive comments concerning proposed downtown-area programs and services for 2021.

<u>Notices</u>. If the City Council adopts the enclosed proposed resolution that would schedule the requested October 19 public hearing, the City staff then would notify all potentially-affected downtown-area property owners of the public hearing and provide them with information about proposed downtown-area programs and services and amounts of special assessments that have been recommended to be levied against downtown-district properties. Following the October 19 public hearing, the City Council then could decide whether to direct the City staff to prepare the special-assessment roll, and whether that roll should be modified in any way based upon comments that had been received.

<u>Assessments</u>. Following completion of the final special-assessment roll, the City Council then would be asked to schedule a second public hearing to receive comments concerning any adjustments to the final-assessment roll. Following that hearing, the City Council then could decide whether to proceed with the proposed special assessments on behalf of the Downtown Management Board. If the City Council decided to implement the proposed special assessments, invoices then could be issued to individual property owners within 30 days. This proposed special-assessment process is the same process that has been used for this downtown-district program for the last 27 years.

sb Enclosures

CITY OF PETOSKEY Downtown Management Board 2021 Programs & Services Budget DRAFT

	2019	2020 Dudaat	2020	2021
	Actual	Budget	Projected	Proposed
REVENUE		404.000		404.000
Downtown Assessments	91,400	101,600	101,600	101,600
2% Increase				2,032
Interest Income	115	1,000	100	1,000
Penalties & Interest	600	4,000	1,000	3,000
Carry Over			0	-
Holiday Parade Sponsors	4,050	7,000	7,000	7,000
Title Sponsor \$3,000				
Other sponsors \$2,000				
PAVB \$2,000				
Petoskey Rocks/Downtown Live	3,400	5,625	0	3,200
0 Carriage Rides				
6 stage sponsors @200 each/\$1,200				
PAVB \$2,000				
Friday Night at the Movies	-		-	1,200
4 Movie Sponsors @ \$300/\$2,000				
Winter Carnival Income/sponsors	3,498	9,000	6,500	6,800
15 Ice Sculpture Sponsors @ \$225/\$3,375				
0 Ice Bar Sponsors				
5 Park Display Sponsors @ \$500 each/\$2,500				
30 Ghost Walk @ \$15/\$450				
0 Ice Bar Drink revenue				
PAVB \$500				
DT Trick or Treat/Wicked Weekend	775	3,400	0	1,400
0 Drink tent revenue		,		,
0 Drink tent sponsors				
Ghost Walk Tickets \$900				
Wagon Ride sponsor \$500				
Summer Open House	3.581	4.800	0	2.300
0 Drink tent revenue	-,	.,		_,
Ghost Walk \$300				
PAVB \$2 000				
Trolley ads & sponsorship	8 000	8 000	0	8 000
Gallery Walk	3,000	3,500	0	3 500
May Getaway	-	0,000	0	-
Friday the 13th Ghost Walks	400	1 000	0	1 000
Shon Man Ads	10 000	12 000	6 000	12 000
New Marketing Activities	-	12,000	0,000	
Holiday Catalog	2 345	7 250	8 500	7 250
Sidewalk Sales	2,040	7,200	0,000	,,200
Presenting sponsors		25 000	10,000	25 000
10 @ \$2 500		20,000	10,000	20,000
Total Revenue	131 164	193 175	140 700	186 282
	101,104	100,110	140,700	100,202

-

-

-

-

EXPENSES					-
DMB Events					
Summer Open House	7,552	13,300	0	12,000	headliner music, children's activities, street performers
Sidewalk Sales	3,097	7.000	0	7.000	TV ads. DJ or musicians
DT Trick or Treat/Wicked Weekend	6 192	11,000	2 000	7,000	carver children's activities music
Holiday Parade	5 772	7 000	7,000	7,000	
Christmas Open House	380	1,000	2,000	2,000	
Winter Corpivel	17 054	14,500	2,000	11 400	
	17,054	14,500	14,000	11,400	
15 Ice Sculpture Sponsors @ \$225/\$3,375					
10 Park Display Sponsors @ \$500 each/\$5,000					
Advertising \$3,000	40.000				
Petoskey Rocks/Downtown Live	12,020	34,000	0	20,000	children's activities, street performers
Friday Night at the Movies	-		0	2,000	
Gallery Walk	3,106	3,000	0	3,000	-
Shopping Scramble	0	-	0	-	-
Ladies Opening Night	3,426	4,000	6,000	5,000	-
May Getaway	-	4,000	0	5,000	
Tent/Sound System Expenses	-	5,000	0	4,000	
	58,599	104,300	31,000	85,400	
Collaborating Events	,	,		,	
Concerts in the Park Pledge	2 500	2 000	2 500	2 500	
Fourth of July Pledge	800	800	_,000	1,000	
Santa's Visit	200	200	0	200	
Postaurant Wook Plodgo	500	500	0	500	
Fostivel on the Pay Pledge	1 500	1 500	0	500	
Festival on the Bay Fledge	1,500	1,500	1 000	1 000	
Faimers Market Fleuge	500	500	1,000	1,000	
	6,000	5,500	3,500	5,200	
Economic Enhancement					
Business Recruitment	445	300	500	500	
Business Retention	1,018	1,000	1,000	1,000	
	1,463	1,300	1,500	1,500	
Marketing & Promotions					
Image Campaign	26,335	30,000	40,000	31,000	
Image Campaign Additions	-	-	-	-	
Shop Map	7,166	9,000	8,000	9,000	
Ghost Walk	0	300	0	300	
New Marketing Activities/DT Social	0	-	0	1,500	
Staycation	0		5,000	5,000	
Holiday Catalog	9.289	11.000	11.000	11,000	
, ,	42,790	50,300	64,000	57,800	
Beautification	,	,		,	
Flowers	6.537	9.000	9.000	9.000	
Holiday Decorations	11,545	11,500	11,000	11,500	
Fall Decorations	738	600	500	500	
	18 820	21 100	20 500	21 000	
Administrative	10,020	21,100	20,000	21,000	
Insurance & Bonds		200	200	200	
Other		100	100	100	
Capital Outlay	253	10.000	19 000	15 000	
2021 DT Lighting Project \$15 000	200	10,000	13,000	10,000	
2020 DT Lighting Project Consultant \$40,0002					
2020 Undete redection many #0.000?					
2020 Opdate pedestrian maps \$9,000	252	10 200	10 200	15 200	
	203	10,300	19,300	15,500	
Total Expenses	127 672	192 800	139 800	186 200	
I otar Expenses	121,012	192,000	155,000	100,200	
Excess Revenue over Expenditures	3,492	375	900	82	

CITY OF PETOSKEY DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT BOARD 2020 DOWNTOWN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ASSESSMENT

						AREA /	AND COST	PER FLOOR					
	FIRS	T FLOOR	SECON	D FLOOR	THIRD	FLOOR	FOURT	TH FLOOR	BAS	SEMENT	VACA	NT LAND	TOTAL
STREET	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	COST
Bay Street	26,305	\$ 4,829.60	12,774	\$ 586.33	5,417	\$ 248.64	-	\$-	3,240	\$ 148.72	-	\$ -	\$ 5,813.28
Division Street	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Howard Street	70,662	12,973.54	20,309	932.18	-	-	-	-	20,554	943.43	-	-	14,849.15
Lake Street	93,147	17,101.79	51,771	2,376.29	8,273	379.73	-	-	45,481	2,087.58	-	-	21,945.39
Lewis Street	15,360	2,820.10	12,590	577.88	12,590	577.88	3,922	180.02	8,711	399.83	-	-	4,555.71
Michigan Street	21,766	3,996.24	300	13.77	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,324	354.78	4,364.78
Mitchell Street	173,384	31,833.30	55,064	2,527.44	14,375	659.81	-	-	88,526	4,063.34	87,528	4,910.32	43,994.22
Park Avenue	5,756	1,056.80	860	39.47	-	-	-	-	4,939	226.70	-	-	1,322.98
Petoskey Street	22,309	4,095.93	4,692	215.36	3,672	168.54	-	-	3,314	152.11	-	-	4,631.95
Rose Street	4,428	812.98	3,608	165.61	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	978.59
Waukazoo Street	5,028	923.14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	923.14
TOTALS	438,145	\$ 80,443.42	161,968	\$ 7,434.33	44,327	\$ 2,034.61	3,922	\$ 180.02	174,765	\$ 8,021.71	93,852	\$ 5,265.10	\$ 103,379.19

Description	Rate
First Floor	\$0.1836
Non-First floor	\$0.0459
Unimproved	\$0.0561

10/1/2020

CITY OF PETOSKEY DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT BOARD 2020 DOWNTOWN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ASSESSMENT BAY STREET

			AREA AND COST PER FLOOR										
PROPERTY	,	PROPERTY ADDRESS	FIRS	T FLOOR	SECOND FLOOR		THIRD FLOOR		FOURT	H FLOOR	BAS	EMENT	TOTAL
NUMBER	PROPERTY OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	COST
06-226-001	CITY OF PETOSKEY	BAY STREET		\$-		\$-		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	\$ -
06-226-002	CITY OF PETOSKEY	BAY STREET											-
06-226-003	PETOSKEY LAND & CATTLE	322 BAY STREET	5,893	1,081.95	3,086	141.65							1,223.60
06-200-011	MCGRAW, VAUGHN TRUST	319 BAY STREET	1,476	270.99									270.99
06-200-006	WINE GUYS HOLDINGS, LLC	321 BAY STREET	1,763	323.69	1,433	65.77							389.46
06-200-007	KONDZIELA, PAUL TRUST	327 BAY STREET	821	150.74									150.74
06-200-008	LANDIS CONNIE - residential	329 BAY STREET	0	-	-	-							-
06-200-009	BAY STREET REAL ESTATE HOLD	I 331 BAY STREET (HOWARD STREET)	1,228	225.46	888	40.76							266.22
05-101-017	NATIONAL CITY BANK MI/ IL	401 BAY STREET (HOWARD STREET)	3,436	630.85	930	42.69					1,209	55.49	729.03
05-101-062	TIP OF MIT WATERSHED	426 BAY STREET (PARK AVENUE)	2,590	475.52	1,020	46.82							522.34
05-104-101	BANK OF NORTHERN MICHIGAN	406 BAY STREET	5,190	952.88	5,417	248.64	5,417	248.64					1,450.16
05-105-101	HOWARD PROPERTY PARTNERS	400 BAY STREET, UNIT 1	802	147.25									147.25
05-105-102	HOWARD PROPERTY PARTNERS	400 BAY STREET, UNIT 2	1,354	248.59							744	34.15	282.74
05-105-103	HOWARD PROPERTY PARTNERS	400 BAY STREET, UNIT 3	1,752	321.67							1,287	59.07	380.74
		TOTALS	26,305	\$ 4,829.60	12,774	\$ 586.33	5,417	\$ 248.64	-	\$ -	3,240	\$ 148.72	\$ 5,813.28

CITY OF PETOSKEY DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT BOARD 2020 DOWNTOWN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ASSESSMENT DIVISION STREET

		AREA AND COST PER FLOOR											
PROPERTY	PROPERTY ADDRESS	FIRS	FIRST FLOOR		SECOND FLOOR		THIRD FLOOR		FOURTH FLOOR		SEMENT	TOT	ΓAL
NUMBER PROPERTY OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	CO	ST
05-101-021 EMMET COUNTY	200 DIVISION STREET		\$ -		\$ -		\$-		\$-		\$-	\$	-
05-101-046 EMMET COUNTY	DIVISION STREET												-
05-101-048 EMMET COUNTY	DIVISION STREET												-
	TOTALS	-	\$-	-	\$ -	-	\$-	-	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$	-

CITY OF PETOSKEY DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT BOARD 2020 DOWNTOWN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ASSESSMENT HOWARD STREET

							A	AREA AND COST PER FLOOR								
PROPERTY		PROPERTY ADDRESS	FIRST FLOOR		SECON	D FLOOR	THIRD I	LOOR	FOURT	H FLOOR	BASE	MEN	Т	٦	OTAL	
NUMBER	PROPERTY OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA	С	OST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	CC	DST	(COST
05-101-067	CRC HOLDINGS LLC	107 HOWARD STREET	3,780	\$	694.01		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$	-	\$	694.01
05-101-011	SELDEN CARS, LLC	113 HOWARD STREET	1,306		239.78	852	39.11									278.89
05-101-015	117 HOWARD STREET, LLC	117 HOWARD STREET	2,280		418.61	788	36.17									454.78
05-101-022	ORAHAM, WALT/GENEVA TRUST	203 HOWARD STREET	4,786		878.71											878.71
05-101-024	HOWARD PROPERTY PARTNERS	209 HOWARD STREET	1,630		299.27	756	34.70									333.97
05-101-025	PHILLIPS, JUDY L. TRUST	215 HOWARD STREET	1,500		275.40	1,500	68.85									344.25
05-101-059	SYMONS, CHANDLER/LYNN TRUS	217 HOWARD STREET	900		165.24											165.24
05-101-036	SECOND EDITION INVEST. CO.	303 HOWARD STREET (EAST LAKE STREET)	1,425		261.63	1,425	65.41									327.04
05-101-047	SUMMIT POINT II LLC	307 HOWARD STREET	2,057		377.67											377.67
05-101-049	LAKE HOWARD LLC	309 HOWARD STREET (PARK AVENUE)	1,114		204.53	1,114	51.13									255.66
05-101-050	VIGNEAU, PAUL	311 HOWARD STREET (PARK AVENUE)	1,857		340.95	897	41.17									382.12
05-151-001	SEL WAYS, LLC	411 HOWARD STREET	2,886		529.87											529.87
05-151-008	MUNSON, THOMAS	415 HOWARD STREET	1,560		286.42											286.42
05-151-010	PERLINS, JONATHON & SONJA	417 HOWARD STREET	3,666		673.08											673.08
05-151-012	PERLINS, JONATHON & SONJA	421 HOWARD STREET	1,881		345.35											345.35
06-226-041	PETOSKEY LAND & CATTLE	200 HOWARD STREET	5,247		963.35											963.35
06-226-042	SECOND-HALF PRODUCTIONS	206 HOWARD STREET	1,903		349.39							1,903		87.35		436.74
CITY OF PETOSKEY DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT BOARD 2020 DOWNTOWN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ASSESSMENT HOWARD STREET

						A	REA AND	COST F	ER FLOO	OR					
PROPERTY		PROPERTY ADDRESS	FIRS	ST FLOOR	SECON	ND FLOOR	THIRD	FLOOR	FOURT	H FLOOR	BAS	EME	NT	٦	OTAL
NUMBER	PROPERTY OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	(COST	(COST
06-226-006	T.J.B. PROPERTY HOLDINGS LLC	208 HOWARD STREET	1,755	\$ 322.22		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$	-	\$	322.22
06-226-007	HOWARD PROPERTY PARTNERS	210 HOWARD STREET	2,888	530.24							2,888		132.56		662.80
06-226-019	WJ & C, LLC	216 HOWARD STREET	2,400	440.64											440.64
06-226-027	HOWARD & LAKE LLC	300 HOWARD STREET (LAKE STREET)	1,975	362.61							1,964		90.15		452.76
06-226-028	ANDREWS PROPERTIES LLC	306 HOWARD STREET	1,250	229.50	877	\$ 40.25									269.75
06-226-030	HOWARD PROPERTY PARTNERS	308 HOWARD STREET	1,165	213.89	-	-									213.89
06-226-031	HOWARD PROPERTY PARTNERS	310 HOWARD STREET	2,500	459.00	-	-									459.00
06-226-037	MANTHEI, CORA TRUST	314 HOWARD STREET	5,000	918.00	5,000	229.50					4,832		221.79		1,369.29
06-226-040	BANK ONE	324 HOWARD STREET (MITCHELL STREET)	7,100	1,303.56	7,100	325.89					7,100		325.89		1,955.34
06-277-054	PROSPECT GROUP PROPERTIES	410 HOWARD STREET	1,867	342.78							1,867		85.70		428.48
06-277-021	MSKS LLC	418 HOWARD STREET (MICHIGAN STREET)	2,984	547.86											547.86
PROPERTY		PROPERTY ADDRESS	VACA	ANT LAND											
NUMBER	PROPERTY OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA	COST											
05-151-015	PERKINS, JONATHON & SONJA	425 HOWARD STREET	PARI	KING LOT											-
		TOTALS	70,662	\$ 12,973.54	20,309	\$ 932.18	-	\$ -	-	\$ -	20,554	\$	943.43	\$ 1	4,849.15

CITY OF PETOSKEY DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT BOARD 2020 DOWNTOWN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ASSESSMENT LAKE STREET

							AREA AN	ND COST P	ER FLOOF	२			
PROPERTY		PROPERTY ADDRESS	FIRST	FLOOR	SECON	ID FLOOR	THIRE	D FLOOR	FOURT	"H FLOOR	BAS	EMENT	TOTAL
NUMBER	PROPERTY OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	COST
06-227-015	MDC JACKSON LLC	215 EAST LAKE STREET	5,212	\$ 956.92	686	\$ 31.49		\$-		\$ -	4,176	\$ 191.68	\$ 1,180.09
06-226-008	SHORTER, MARIETTA TRUST	301 EAST LAKE STREET (PETOSKEY STREET)	3,325	610.47	3,325	152.62					1,325	60.82	823.91
06-226-009	M.E.M. PROPERTIES	305 EAST LAKE STREET	1,750	321.30							1,750	80.33	401.63
06-225-101	LONGFIELD FARM LTD PARTNERS	307 EAST LAKE ST, UNIT 1	2,030	372.71							2,346	107.68	480.39
06-225-102	MAGER PETOSKEY LTD PARTNER	307 EAST LAKE ST, UNIT 2	2,084	382.62							1,681	77.16	459.78
06-226-012	SHORTER PROPERTIES, LLC	311 EAST LAKE STREET	1,238	227.30	1,238	56.82					1,238	56.82	340.95
06-226-013	TESKA, MICHAEL & LINDA	313 EAST LAKE STREET	675	123.93									123.93
06-226-014	WARD, DONALD & JENNIFER TRU	315 EAST LAKE STREET	1,225	224.91									224.91
06-226-015	SUMMERHILL ESTATES, LLC	317 EAST LAKE STREET	2,075	380.97	1,775	81.47					2,045	93.87	556.31
06-226-016	NORWOOD GROUP, LLC	319 EAST LAKE STREET	2,000	367.20							1,976	90.70	457.90
06-226-017	WOLF INVESTMENT OF MICHIGAN	321 EAST LAKE STREET	4,050	743.58	4,050	185.90							929.48
06-226-018	SPLASH PROPERTIES, LLC	325 EAST LAKE STREET	4,000	734.40	4,000	183.60					4,000	183.60	1,101.60
06-226-020	WJ & C, LLC	329-331 EAST LAKE ST. (HOWARD STREET)	4,065	746.33	4,065	186.58	4,065	186.58	i		3,911	179.51	1,299.02
06-226-021	SCOTT FAMILY TRUST	306 EAST LAKE STREET (PETOSKEY STREET)	5,323	977.30	625	28.69							1,005.99
06-226-022	HAAS, THERESA	312 EAST LAKE STREET	2,295	421.36	1,275	58.52							479.88
06-226-023	ROBINSON, GEORGE & BARBARA	314 EAST LAKE STREET	2,015	369.95									369.95
06-226-024	HOWARD PROPERTY PARTNERS	316 EAST LAKE ST.	4,603	845.11	-	-							845.11
06-226-025	HOWARD PROPERTY PARTNERS	320 EAST LAKE STREET	3,344	613.96	1,500	68.85							682.81

CITY OF PETOSKEY DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT BOARD 2020 DOWNTOWN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ASSESSMENT LAKE STREET

							AREA AN	D COST PE	r floor				
PROPERTY		PROPERTY ADDRESS	FIRS	T FLOOR	SECON	ID FLOOR	THIRD	FLOOR	FOURT	H FLOOR	BAS	EMENT	TOTAL
NUMBER	PROPERTY OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	COST
06-226-026	PHILLIPS, JUDY L. TRUST	322-340 EAST LAKE ST.	12,002	\$ 2,203.57	10,355	\$ 475.29		\$-		\$-	2,550	\$ 117.05	\$ 2,795.91
05-101-035	SYMONS, CHANDLER T JR TRUST	401 EAST LAKE STREET (HOWARD STREET)	1,590	291.92	1,590	72.98					1,590	72.98	437.89
05-101-058	CIPIO LLC	403 EAST LAKE STREET	1,500	275.40	1,500	68.85					1,500	68.85	413.10
05-101-027	MASONIC ASSOCIATION	405 EAST LAKE STREET	4,208	772.59	4,208	193.15	4,208	193.15			2,800	128.52	1,287.40
05-101-028	NORTH HARBOR GROUP, LLC	409 EAST LAKE STREET	1,945	357.10	975	44.75					1,945	89.28	491.13
05-101-070	AMERICAN SPOON FOODS INC	411 EAST LAKE ST. (PARK AVENUE)	3,568	655.08									655.08
05-101-031	EMMET COUNTY	321 ELK AVENUE											-
05-101-037	SECOND EDITION INVEST. CO.	406 EAST LAKE STREET	3,611	662.98	3,611	165.74							828.72
05-101-040	WINE GUYS HOLDINGS LLC	432 EAST LAKE STREET	7,434	1,364.88	3,175	145.73					7,411	340.16	1,850.78
05-101-041	SASS INVESTMENT CO	434 EAST LAKE STREET	1,475	270.81									270.81
05-101-042	PETOSKEY LAND & CATTLE	438 EAST LAKE STREET	3,237	594.31	2,550	117.05					3,237	148.58	859.94
05-101-043	CITY OF PETOSKEY	EAST LAKE STREET											-
05-101-044	CITY OF PETOSKEY	EAST LAKE STREET											-
05-101-045	EMMET COUNTY	454-456 EAST LAKE ST.											-
05-101-038	APPLE PIE PROPERTIES, LLC	410 E. LAKE ST. (formerly 300 Park Ave.)	1,268	232.80	1,268	58.20							291.01
		TOTALS	93,147	\$ 17,101.79	51,771	\$ 2,376.29	8,273	\$ 379.73	-	\$ -	45,481	\$ 2,087.58	\$ 21,945.39

CITY OF PETOSKEY DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT BOARD 2020 DOWNTOWN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ASSESSMENT LEWIS STREET

			AREA AND COST PER FLOOR										
PROPERTY		PROPERTY ADDRESS	FIRST	FLOOR	SECON	D FLOOR	THIRD	FLOOR	FOURT	H FLOOR	BAS	EMENT	TOTAL
NUMBER PROPE	ERTY OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	COST
05-101-060 MS LO	DGING LLC	100 LEWIS STREET	15,360	\$ 2,820.10	12,590	\$ 577.88	12,590	\$ 577.88	3,922	\$ 180.02	8,711	\$ 399.83	\$ 4,555.71
		(ROSE & BAY STREETS)											

CITY OF PETOSKEY DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT BOARD 2020 DOWNTOWN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ASSESSMENT MICHIGAN STREET

		AREA AND COST PER FLOOR											
PROPERTY	PROPERTY ADDRESS	FIRS	T FLOOR	SECON	ID FLOOR	THIR	D FLOOR	FOUR	TH FLOOR	BAS	SEMENT		TOTAL
NUMBER PROPERTY OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COS	Т	COST
06-277-022 CITY OF PETOSKEY	MICHIGAN STREET (PETOSKEY STREET)		\$-		\$-		\$ -		\$ -		\$	-	\$-
06-277-019 CITY OF PETOSKEY	MICHIGAN STREET												-
06-277-020 CITY OF PETOSKEY	MICHIGAN STREET												-
05-151-011 CLARK, DENNIS & ANGELA	411 MICHIGAN STREET	2,400	\$ 440.64										440.64
05-151-002 PERKINS JONATHON & SONJA	407 MICHIGAN STREET	10,428	1,914.58										1,914.58
05-151-003 BURRELL, JACKLYN	413 MICHIGAN STREET	4,318	792.78										792.78
05-151-004 BLDG AUTH CITY OF PETOSKEY	417 MICHIGAN STREET												-
05-151-006 CITY OF PETOSKEY	MICHIGAN STREET												-
05-151-013 445 MICHJIGAN LLC	445 MICHIGAN	1,531	281.09	300	13.77							-	294.86
05-156-001 425 MITCHELL ST CONDO ASSOC	406 PENNY'S ALLEY	-	-		Condo prop	erty asses	sed to units	- Penny's	Alley				-
05-156-101	406 PENNY'S ALLEY #1	-	-		Residential	garage							-
05-156-102 OFFIELD SUSAN MARION TRUST	406 PENNY'S ALLEY #2	-	-		Residential	garage							-
05-156-103 484 BENNAVILLE LLC	406 PENNY'S ALLEY #3	175	32.13										32.13
05-156-104 484 BENNAVILLE LLC	406 PENNY'S ALLEY #4	682	125.22		restaurant s	storage?							125.22
05-156-105 484 BENNAVILLE LLC - restaurant food court portion below	406 PENNY'S ALLEY #5	2,232	409.80										409.80
PROPERTY	PROPERTY ADDRESS	L	AND										
NUMBER PROPERTY OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA	COST										
05-156-105 484 BENNAVILLE LLC - food court	406 PENNY'S ALLEY #5	6,324	\$ 354.78										354.78
Restaurant portion above													
	TOTALS	21,766	\$ 3,996.24	300	\$ 13.77	-	\$ -	-	\$ -	-	\$	-	\$ 4,364.78

CITY OF PETOSKEY DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT BOARD 2020 DOWNTOWN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ASSESSMENT MITCHELL STREET

						A	AREA AND	COST PE	R FLOOF	र					
PROPERTY	,	PROPERTY ADDRESS	FIRS	T FLOOR	SECO	ND FLOOR	THIRD	FLOOR	FOURT	TH FLOOR	BAS	EMENT		TOTAL	
NUMBER	PROPERTY OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST		COST	
06-226-038	FRANKHOUSER JOHN & MARY LC	01301 EAST MITCHELL ST. (PETOSKEY STREET)	3,120	\$ 572.83		\$-		\$-		\$-		\$ -	\$	572.	.83
06-226-039	REID, JAMES III	307 EAST MITCHELL	6,141	1,127.49	5,808	266.59					5,696	261.4	5	1,655.	.52
06-226-033	HOWARD PROPERTIES PARTNER	311 EAST MITCHELL	6,308	1,158.15	5,390	247.40					5,390	247.4	С	1,652.	.95
06-226-034	PAUL KRECKE	317 EAST MITCHELL ST.	5,050	927.18	-	-								927.	.18
06-226-043	HOWARD PROPERTIES PARTNER	8:319 EAST MITCHELL ST.	5,050	927.18										927.	.18
06-226-044	DUSE, MARNIE	323 EAST MITCHELL ST.	1,700	312.12							1,625	74.5	9	386.	.71
06-277-001	BETTY SMITH FARLEY	202 EAST MITCHELL ST. (EMMET STREET)	2,640	484.70										484.	70
06-277-003	GRAIN TRAIN NATURAL FOOD CO	220 EAST MITCHELL ST.	6,571	1,206.44										1,206.	.44
06-277-050	MIGHTY FINE PIZZA & DELI	222 EAST MITCHELL ST.	480	88.13										88.	.13
06-277-004	C4 HOLDINGS, LLC	224 EAST MITCHELL (PETOSKEY STREET)	3,388	622.04	3,482	159.82								781.	.86
06-277-052	HOWARD PROPERTIES PARTNER	R: 300 EAST MITCHELL ST. (PETOSKEY STREET)	10,181	1,869.23	5,529	253.78					10,181	467.3	1	2,590.	.32
06-277-007	HOWARD PROPERTIES PARTNER	R: 316 EAST MITCHELL ST.	6,640	1,219.10	4,410	202.42	4,410	202.42			4,410	202.4	2	1,826.	.36
06-277-008	PHILLIPS, JUDY L TRUST	320 EAST MITCHELL ST.	1,750	321.30										321.	.30
06-277-009	PETOSKEY LAND & CATTLE CO	322 EAST MITCHELL ST.	3,375	619.65	1,890	86.75								706.	.40
06-277-010	SAM'S GRACES CAFÉ LLC	324 EAST MITCHELL ST.	1,684	309.18										309.	.18
06-277-053	JORGENSEN FAMILY TRUST	326 EAST MITCHELL ST.	2,935	538.87							2,625	120.4	9	659.	.35
06-277-013	PETOSKEY COMMUNITY CORP.	330 EAST MITCHELL ST. (HOWARD STREET)	2,734	501.96	2,734	125.49								627.	.45

CITY OF PETOSKEY DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT BOARD 2020 DOWNTOWN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ASSESSMENT MITCHELL STREET

						A	AREA AND	COST PE	r floof	R				
PROPERTY	,	PROPERTY ADDRESS	FIRST	f floor	SECON	ND FLOOR	THIRD	FLOOR	FOURT	'H FLOOR	BAS	SEME	ENT	TOTAL
NUMBER	PROPERTY OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	(COST	COST
05-101-039	GEMINI LAND CO.	421 EAST MITCHELL ST. (EAST LAKE STREET)	8,250	\$ 1,514.70		\$ -		\$-		\$ -	8,250	\$	378.68	\$ 1,893.38
05-101-051	REUSCH JOHN TRUST	427 EAST MITCHELL	2,839	521.24										521.24
05-101-057	PETOSKEY LAND & CATTLE CO LI	435 EAST MITCHELL ST.	6,495	1,192.48	4,623	212.20								1,404.68
05-101-052	PETOSKEY LAND & CATTLE CO	441 EAST MITCHELL ST.	6,892	1,265.37										1,265.37
05-101-053	PETOSKEY LAND & CATTLE CO	443 EAST MITCHELL	13,800	2,533.68							9,660		443.39	2,977.07
05-101-054	CITY OF PETOSKEY	451 EAST MITCHELL ST.												-
05-101-055	CROOKED TREE ART COUNCIL	461 EAST MITCHELL ST. (DIVISION STREET)	9,432	1,731.72	700	32.13	-	-	-		9,952		456.80	2,220.64
05-100-001	HOWARD PROPERTY PARTNERS	408 EAST MITCHELL ST. (HOWARD STREET)	10,108	1,855.83	10,108	463.96					10,108		463.96	2,783.74
05-100-151	DRSKOPLAND LLC	416-A EAST MITCHELL ST.	1,656	304.04							1,632		74.91	378.95
05-100-152	HOWARD PROPERTY PARTNERS	416-B EAST MITCHELL ST.	5,610	1,030.00							5,556		255.02	1,285.02
05-100-004	PETOSKEY LAND & CATTLE CO	418 EAST MITCHELL ST.	5,390	989.60	5,390	247.40	5,390	247.40			5,390		247.40	1,731.81
05-100-006	SYMON CHANDLER JT TRUST	426 EAST MITCHELL ST.	2,500	459.00							2,350		107.87	566.87
05-100-007	ROCHON ELAINE TRUST	430 EAST MITCHELL ST.	2,500	459.00							2,500		114.75	573.75
05-100-008	FIVE WILDERS INC	434 EAST MITCHELL ST.	5,000	918.00	5,000	229.50								1,147.50
05-100-009	PETOSKEY LAND & CATTLE CO	436 EAST MITCHELL ST.	2,500	459.00										459.00
05-100-010	PETOSKEY LAND & CATTLE CO	438 EAST MITCHELL ST.	2,375	436.05										436.05

CITY OF PETOSKEY DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT BOARD 2020 DOWNTOWN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ASSESSMENT MITCHELL STREET

						AREA AND	COST PE	r floor	1					
PROPERTY	PROPERTY ADDRESS	FIRS	Г FLOOR	SECON	ID FLOOR	THIRD	FLOOR	FOURT	H FLOOR	BAS	EMENT		T	OTAL
NUMBER PROPERTY OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COS	ST	С	COST
05-100-011 PETOSKEY LAND & CATTLE CO	440 EAST MITCHELL ST.	2,825	\$ 518.67		\$ -		\$ -		\$-		\$	-	\$	518.67
05-100-012 ERIC & LORRAINE KASPER	442 EAST MITCHELL ST.	2,650	486.54											486.54
05-100-013 AMBITIOUS BEE PROPERTIES LL	C 444 EAST MITCHELL ST.	1,625	298.35											298.35
05-100-014 PETOSKEY LAND & CATTLE CO	446 EAST MITCHELL ST. (WAUKAZOO AVENUE)	4,380	804.17											804.17
05-154-101 DAVID & MELISSA MEIKLE	422 EAST MITCHELL ST #1	Third floor	unit - residenti	al										-
05-154-102 SUSAN OFFIELD TRUST	422 EAST MITCHELL ST #2	Third floor	unit - residenti	al										-
05-154-103 484 BENNAVILLE LLC	422 EAST MITCHELL ST #3	Second flo	or unit - comm	ercial		2,279	104.61							104.61
05-154-104 484 BENNAVILLE LLC	422 EAST MITCHELL ST #4	Second flo	or unit - comm	ercial		2,296	105.39							105.39
05-154-105 484 BENNAVILLE LLC	422 EAST MITCHELL ST #5	1,875	344.25	First floor	unit - comm	nercial - inclu	ides basem	nent		697	3	1.99		376.24
05-154-106 484 BENNAVILLE LLC	422 EAST MITCHELL ST #6	2,318	425.58	First floor	unit - comm	nercial - inclu	ides basem	nent		2,108	9	6.76		522.34
05-101-064 CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	401 EAST MITCHELL ST.	2,617	480.48							396	1	8.18		498.66
PROPERTY NUMBER PROPERTY OWNER	PROPERTY ADDRESS (ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	VAC AREA	ANT LAND COST											
06-227-016 PETOSKEY GRAND LLC	MITCH/ PETOSKEY/ LAKE	87,528	\$ 4,910.32	•	Replaces 8	previous pa	rcels @ 10	,941 sq ft					4	4,910.32
		87 529	\$ 1 010 22											
		07,528	φ 4,910.32	:										
	TOTALS	173,384	\$ 31,833.30	55,064	\$ 2,527.44	14,375	\$ 659.81	-	\$-	88,526	\$ 4,06	3.34	\$ 43	3,994.22

CITY OF PETOSKEY DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT BOARD 2020 DOWNTOWN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ASSESSMENT PARK AVENUE

			AREA AND COST PER FLOOR													
PROPERTY		PROPERTY ADDRESS	FIRST	FLOOR	SECO	ND FLO	OR	THIRE	D FLOC	R	FOURT	H FLOOR	BAS	EME	ENT	TOTAL
NUMBER PROPERTY	OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA	COST	AREA	CO	ST	AREA	CO	ST	AREA	COST	AREA		COST	COST
05-101-030 WILLIAM & -	AMMY THOMPSON	216 PARK AVENUE	2,901	\$ 532.62		\$	-		\$	-		\$ -	2,861	\$	131.32	\$ 663.94
05-101-033 PETOSKEY	LAND & CATTLE LLC.	222 PARK AVENUE	1,188	218.12									1,188		54.53	272.65
05-101-034 PETOSKEY	LAND & CATTLE, LLC	224 PARK AVENUE	807	148.17									890		40.85	189.02
05-101-038 APPLE PIE	PROPERTIES, LLC	300 PARK AVENUE moved to 410 E Lake St														-
05-101-063 CIPIO LLC		214 PARK AVE	860	157.90	860	3	39.47									197.37
		TOTALS	5,756	\$ 1,056.80	860	\$ 3	39.47	-	\$	-	-	\$-	4,939	\$	226.70	\$ 1,322.98

CITY OF PETOSKEY DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT BOARD 2020 DOWNTOWN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ASSESSMENT PETOSKEY STREET

			AI				AREA A	ND COST PE	R FLOO	R					
PROPERTY	/	PROPERTY ADDRESS	FIRS	T FLOOR	SECON	D FLOOR	THIRD) FLOOR	FOURT	H FLOOR	BAS	EMENT		Т	OTAL
NUMBER	PROPERTY OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COS	бT	(COST
06-226-032	REID, JAMES III	313 PETOSKEY STREET	676	\$ 124.11		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$	-	\$	124.11
06-277-018	CITY OF PETOSKEY	PETOSKEY STREET													-
06-277-022	CITY OF PETOSKEY	PETOSKEY STREET (MICHIGAN STREET)													-
06-226-045	BEAR RIVER REALTY LLC	1 PETOSKEY STREET	3,672	674.18	3,672	168.54	3,672	168.54							1,011.27
06-277-015	HARRIS, DANIEL & AMY	410 PETOSKEY STREET	2,262	415.30											415.30
06-227-001	LAMBERT, MICHAEL T & HELEN T	202 PETOSKEY STREET	4,024	738.81											738.81
06-227-004	MOLCOR LLC	214 PETOSKEY STREET (EAST LAKE STREET)	3,285	603.13							3,314	152	2.11		755.24
06-277-017	REED, PAUL W & KATHLEEN A	414 PETOSKEY STREET	2,010	369.04											369.04
06-278-005	ALM, MARIE C TRUST	418 PETOSKEY STREET	1,128	207.10											207.10
06-278-008	HARRIS PROFESSIONAL PROPER	1424 PETOSKEY STREET (MICHIGAN STREET)	1,820	334.15	1,020	46.82									380.97
06-226-029	BEIER FAMILY REAL ESTATE CO.,	309 PETOSKEY STREET	3,432	630.12											630.12
		TOTALS	22,309	\$ 4,095.93	4,692	\$ 215.36	3,672	\$ 168.54	-	\$ -	3,314	\$ 152	2.11	\$	4,631.95

CITY OF PETOSKEY DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT BOARD 2020 DOWNTOWN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ASSESSMENT ROSE STREET

							AREA AN	ND COST PI	ER FLOOI	R				
PROPERTY		PROPERTY ADDRESS	FIRS	Γ FLOOR	SECON	d floor	THIRI	D FLOOR	FOUR	TH FLOOR	BAS	SEMENT	Т	ΓΟΤΑL
NUMBER F	PROPERTY OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA COST A		AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	ſ	COST
05-101-002 N	MS LODGING LLC	410 ROSE STREET	4,428	\$ 812.98	3,608	\$ 165.61	-	\$-	-	\$-	-	\$-	\$	978.59

CITY OF PETOSKEY DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT BOARD 2020 DOWNTOWN PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ASSESSMENT WAUKAZOO STREET

			AREA AND COST PER FLOOR														
PROPERTY	/	PROPERTY ADDRESS	FIRS	T FLC	OOR	SECO	ND FLC	DOR	THIRD	FLOOR	FOUR	TH FLOOF	BAS	EMEN	Г	Т	OTAL
NUMBER	PROPERTY OWNER	(ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE)	AREA	С	OST	AREA	CO	ST	AREA	COST	AREA	COST	AREA	CO	ST	C	COST
05-151-007	CRESS ENTERPRISES INC.	414 WAUKAZOO STREET	0	\$	-	-	\$	-	Residenti	al begin [Dec 2016	\$ -		\$	-	\$	-
05-151-009	CRESS ENTERPRISES INC.	418 WAUKAZOO STREET	1,932	\$	354.72	-		-							-		354.72
05-151-014	1ST CHURCH CHRIST SCIENTIST	420 WAUKAZOO STREET	3,096	\$	568.43	-		-							-		568.43
		TOTALS	5,028	\$	923.14	-	\$	-	-	\$ -	-	\$-	-	\$	-	\$	923.14



DDA Boundary Approved 10-7-2013



City of Petoskey

BOARD:	City Council	
MEETING DATE:	October 5, 2020	PREPARED: September 30, 2020
AGENDA SUBJECT:	Downtown Dining Decks Season Extension	
RECOMMENDATION:	That the City Council approv 2020	e extending season until November 15

Background In May of this year, in a group of several other recommendations that would help businesses during COVID, the DMB recommended to City Council that dining decks be allowed in parking spaces as a special accommodation during the coming summer. Council approved this action unanimously as a part of a resolution allowing for temporary measures to assist Downtown businesses with compliance with social distancing requirements of the Governor's executive Orders. That resolution is set to expire on October 15, 2020.

The locally issued dining deck permit was tied to a special outdoor dining license that is issued by the State. The State had initially set a termination date of October 30 for this outdoor dining license, but has since extended its termination date until November 30.

DMB staff has now had a request from a restaurant owner asking the City to extend the allowance of dining deck platforms in parking spaces to match the State termination date of November 30. There are complications involved with allowing the dining decks to be out in cold weather that involve heat sources and, potentially, snow removal. The concept of tenting the decks was initiated by the restaurant owner, however fire and other safety issues involving tents have not been thoroughly investigated. With safety issues in mind, and in an attempt to support local businesses, City staff has agreed that they would be able to accommodate leaving the dining decks out another 30 days with a removal date of November 16.

Because of the time sensitivity of this decision, the DMB held a special meeting on September 29 for the purpose of deciding whether to recommend to City Council that the October 15 date named in the original resolution be extended to November 15 with the decks to be removed from the streets by November 16. A motion to support recommending the extension, providing that no tents or sheltering coverings be added to them and that any heat sources be of commercial grade and inspected by appropriate personnel, passed 5 - 0 at that meeting.

Future Direction for Dining Decks The DMB and the restaurant owners understand that the use of the dining decks in parking spaces was a special accommodation meant to assist small businesses and granted only for the summer season of 2020 due to COVID-19 social distancing requirements. The possibility of allowing dining decks in parking spaces as amenity to downtown ambience has been discussed quite often over the years at the DMB level. These decks are quite common in fine downtowns around the State and the opportunity to use them on a trial basis has been valuable. Going forward, an agenda item regarding allowing the use of seasonal dining decks permanently is being prepared for the DMB October regular meeting. All downtown businesses are being surveyed and information is being gathered directly from the restaurants who chose to take advantage of the dining deck opportunity this summer.

There is the potential that a recommendation will come from the DMB to Council to change the ordinance and allow dining decks in parking spaces on a permanent, seasonal basis. If the DMB decides to recommend this change, staff will be asking the DMB to also consider a fee schedule for the decks and a specific set of design guidelines.

<u>Action</u> The action being requested by the DMB from Council at its October 5, 2020 meeting is approval of its recommendation to extend the time period that dining decks will be allowed on City streets until November 15, 2020 with the understanding that no tents or sheltering coverings be added to them and that any heat sources be of commercial grade and inspected by appropriate personnel.

bg



BOARD:	City Council	
MEETING DATE:	October 5, 2020	PREPARED: October 1, 2020
AGENDA SUBJECT:	Consideration to Approve a Resolution Authorizing a Closed Sessior Pursuant to Section 8(a) and 8(h) of the Michigan Open Meetings Act	
RECOMMENDATION:	That the City Council adopt the proposed resolution	

City Council will be asked to adopt the enclosed proposed resolution that would authorize to recess to a closed session pursuant to Section 8(a) and 8(h) of the Michigan Open Meetings Act, to consider a periodic personnel evaluation of the City Manager and consider material exempt from disclosure.

Closed session will be conducted in-person at City Hall in the Community Room. It is anticipated that City Council, after the closed session may approve a final annual evaluation for the City Manager and no further business is scheduled for this meeting.

sb Enclosure



WHEREAS, the City Manager has requested that the City Council recess to a closed session, pursuant to Section 8(a) and 8(h) of the Michigan Open Meetings Act, to consider a periodic personnel evaluation of the City Manager and to consider material exempt from disclosure, at the City Council's regular meeting of October 5, 2020:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council does and hereby authorizes to recess to a closed session, to consider a periodic personnel evaluation of the City Manager and consider material exempt from disclosure.