



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Milton Dohoney Jr., City Administrator

CC: John Fournier, Deputy City Administrator
Jennifer Hall, Executive Director AAHC
Raymond Hess, Transportation Manager
Nick Hutchinson, City Engineer
Brian Steglitz, Interim Public Services Area Administrator

SUBJECT: September 6, 2022 Council Agenda Responses

DATE: September 1, 2022

CA-7 –Resolution to Approve a Grant Application to the USDOT’s Safe Streets for All Discretionary Grant Program for Systemwide Transportation Safety Improvements in Ann Arbor

Question: What City policies exist regarding prioritization of infrastructure in locations where it does not exist (i.e. ahead of locations where it already exists or would be supplemental)? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Adopted City policy, such as the [A2Zero Carbon Neutrality Plan](#) or the [Moving Together Towards Vision Zero](#) Transportation Plan identify needs and projects. There are supplemental prioritization processes that have been developed which help prioritize the work. For example, the A2Zero prioritization framework, sidewalk prioritization process, the streetlight prioritization process, and the Vision Zero implementation Strategy are just a few examples of how work gets prioritized and programmed for implementation.

Question: E.g. Recent bike lanes painted on South Main run parallel to (and just a few feet away from) multi-modal paths that more safely accommodate bicycles outside of the flow of (and separated from) car traffic. Is investment in bike infrastructure prioritized in places where it does not already exist? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: The presence of a multi-use path does not preclude the installation of a complimentary bike lane since different facilities can accommodate different types of cyclists. Much of the work to install new bike facilities is opportunistic – that is to say that if there is a resurfacing or restriping, staff look for opportunities to make safety improvements or non-motorized improvements.

Question: Is there any City policy prioritizing bike infrastructure that is more safely separated/distanced from car traffic? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Yes, the Moving Together Towards Vision Zero establishes a vision of an All Ages and Abilities Bike network. This translates to higher comfort facilities that may be separated from vehicular traffic depending on the characteristic of the roadway.

Question: Will development of the Eisenhower Park path involve any collaboration with MDOT due to its proximity to I-94? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Probably not. The Eisenhower Park path is envisioned to be a connector path between Scio Church and the Lansdowne neighborhood through Eisenhower Park and/or Churchill Downs Park. Since it is not anticipated to run on MDOT ROW, collaboration with MDOT is not necessary.

Question: What plans are anticipated in terms of separation from I-94, e.g. fencing/physical safety, or potential sound barriers? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Only a connector path is envisioned as part of the project. The alignment would be on parks land which would give it adequate separation from I-94.

Question: In planning the details of this path, would there be any additional public engagement with neighbors adjacent to this path (more than what occurred in 2021)? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Yes.

Question: Is there a tentative timeline or estimated cost to improving this path? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: There is currently no timeline as there is no funding for the project yet – which is why the grant is being pursued. For purposes of the grant, we've estimated a cost of \$150,000 for the connector path.

CA-9 – Resolution to Approve Amendment No. 1 to Professional Services Agreement with LynxDx, Inc. for Medical Diagnostic Testing for SARS-COVID-2 (\$90,000.00/year)

Question: Currently, how many City employees qualify for medical or religious exemption to our COVID vaccination policies? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Currently, 50 employees are on an approved medical or religious exemption.

C-1 - An Ordinance to Add Section 8:531 to Chapter 105 (Housing Code) of Title VIII of the Ann Arbor City Code (Right to Renew Relocation Assistance)

Question: Under Applicability (8:531(1)), does the phrase “except premises otherwise subject to regulation of rents or evictions pursuant to state or federal law” include housing units subsidized with Section 8 vouchers? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: A separate response was provided by the City Attorney’s Office.

Question: Are tenants in subsidized affordable housing units in Ann Arbor ever subject to an arbitrary non-renewal of a lease? Are tenants in subsidized affordable housing units in Ann Arbor ever subject to non-renewal of a lease under terms that aren’t already described in this ordinance as “just cause”? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: The AAHC has 10+ different state and federal (and local) regulatory restrictions on our programs and they are all different. Our initial response is that the AAHC does not engage in either practice. To the extent there are other subsidized affordable housing units not administered by the AAHC, it is possible that this occurs. To answer whether other subsidized affordable housing may engage in these practices, more research is required regarding program restrictions. (Although we can provide information on program restrictions, we do not have information on actual renewal practices by other landlords.) Staff is looking into this issue further and will supplement this response.

Question: Does the City have staff that can evaluate the effects of the changes to the Early Leasing Ordinance and Right to Renew (should it be adopted)? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: This proposed ordinance has already generated a significant amount of work for the City Attorney’s Office and we anticipate that it will continue to generate additional work and require the Attorney’s Office to analyze and advise on various situations that arise. It will also lead to additional prosecution related efforts that are time consuming. If the ordinance is challenged, which is unpredictable, it will lead to additional litigation related time and effort. Naturally, this could require reassessing available resources.

Question: Do we have staff that can adequately and appropriately assist in enforcement of these ordinances? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: At present we do not have sufficient staff to handle any type of enforcement action associated with this ordinance. It is also questionable if our staff have the proper skill sets. Building inspectors are not necessarily equipped to address issues between landlords, and tenants. The need here appears to require polished soft skills. Our current staff that go out to properties tend to possess more hard skills as their primary offering. This is not a police matter so they too would not be appropriate. Staffing and funding would need to be further evaluated.