



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Milton Dohoney Jr., City Administrator

CC: Alison Heatley, Solid Waste Manager
Nick Hutchinson, City Engineer
Paul Matthews, Public Works Manager
Marti Praschan, CFO
Jordan Roberts, Public Services Area Administrator
Mariah Walton, Deputy City Administrator

SUBJECT: December 15, 2025 Council Agenda Response Memo

DATE: December 11, 2025

CA-3 - Resolution to Approve a Construction Contract with Doan Construction Co. for the Manhole Raising Project (\$1,400,000.00; RFP 25-42)

Questions:

1. The memo in CA-3 explains that RFP 25-42 was issued to locate, expose, and raise approximately 160 sanitary and storm manholes to grade, both under and outside of the road pavement, to allow access to inspect and maintain the sanitary and storm sewer systems.
 - a. Can staff explain how these manholes became buried and inaccessible in the first place? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: It is unknown how the manholes in question were buried. It is most likely the result of final grading and/or land balancing from historic projects or developments. Current inspections and review processes are in place to prevent future occurrences.

- b. At what point in time did the approximately 160 manholes become buried? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: No records exist noting when these manhole structures became buried.

- c. How do we know where these 160 manholes are buried? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: Field staff have used historic documents, locating equipment and pipeline televising equipment to determine validity of existence and the specific locations. Ground penetrating radar may also be used in this project to determine potential surface locations for remaining structures that cannot be located using other resources.

- d. Are existing, modern-day manholes at risk of becoming buried? Asked another way, is this an ongoing or past problem we are attempting to rectify with this resolution and project? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: The intent of the project is to raise the existing known buried manhole structures to surface. Additional manhole structures requiring raising may be identified in the future, yet current record resources and inspection operations have been designed to eliminate the issue in the future.

CA-7: Resolution to Approve Amendment Number 2 to the Professional Services Agreement with Baker and Associates for the 2024-2025 Bridge Inspection Program (\$11,839.92 increase; Total \$167,329.88)

Questions:

1. The staff memo on this item states that a special fracture critical bridge inspection for the Bandemer Park Bridge is needed. This special inspection is a requirement for all truss bridges every two years and is enforced by the Michigan Department of Transportation for compliance with the National Bridge Inspection Standards (NBIS).
 - a. Does this mean the city will need to pay approximately \$12,000 to inspect the Bandemer Park Bridge every two years? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: Yes. That will be the approximate fee, but the actual fee will depend on the selected bridge inspection consultant's fee schedule. The RFP for these services is issued every two years.

- b. Does that \$12,000 cost account for just inspection costs or any maintenance costs as well? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: The \$12,000 is just for inspection costs. It is higher than other bridge inspections due to the various special requirements for this type of

structure. For example, a special ropes team needs to access the underside of the bridge at arm's length.

- c. How many times has the Bandemer Park Bridge been inspected in the past? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: The total number of times it has been inspected historically is unknown, but the special fracture critical inspection has been performed a total of 2 times, in 2023 and now. This is because in 2023, the Bandemer Park Bridge was incorporated into the National Bridge Inspection Standards inventory for the first time.

- d. How many truss bridges do we have in the city? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: This is the only truss bridge in the City of Ann Arbor. It is our understanding that there are less than 100 vehicular truss bridges still left in the State of Michigan.

CA-13 - Resolution to Adopt the Board of Review Guidelines for Poverty Exemptions from Property Taxation of Principal Residence Pursuant to MCL 211.7u

Question #1: Can staff explain what prompted this proposed change? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response:

- a. 90% of the applicants that apply for poverty are one-and two-family households.
- b. During the last three years 2023 through 2025 several lower income families of 1-2 people were denied poverty because the income limits were too low.
- c. Adopting the use of 50% of area median income levels will allow the city to grant poverty exemptions to those families that were previously denied and potentially grant assistance to additional households.
- d. Adopting the use of 50% area median income levels is consistent with low-income programs used by Washtenaw County and the Ann Arbor Housing Commission.

Question #2: Is staff able to provide the number of residents that took advantage of this exemption in previous years? As well as dollar amount exempted? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: Six-year review of Poverty attached 2020 – 2025:

Year	2025							
Month	Count	Granted	% Granted	Denied	TV pre Pov	TV post Pov	TV Loss	Loss in revenue
Total POV	111	100	90%	11	\$12,826,342	\$ 5,418,109	\$7,408,233	\$ 131,187.21
Year	2024							
Month	Count	Granted	% Granted	Denied	TV pre Pov	TV post Pov	TV Loss	Loss in revenue
Total POV	106	88	83%	18	\$11,472,455	\$ 4,466,850	\$7,005,605	\$ 117,051.75
Year	2023							
Month	Count	Granted	% Granted	Denied	TV pre Pov	TV post Pov	TV Loss	Loss in revenue
Total POV	88	70	80%	18	\$ 8,810,896	\$ 4,533,752	\$4,277,144	\$ 75,740.95
Year	2022							
Month	Count	Granted	% Granted	Denied	TV pre Pov	TV post Pov	TV Loss	Loss in revenue
Total POV	72	63	88%	9	\$ 6,490,376	\$ 3,009,357	\$3,481,019	\$ 58,161.91
Year	2021							
Month	Count	Granted	% Granted	Denied	TV pre Pov	TV post Pov	TV Loss	Loss in revenue
Total POV	82	73	89%	9	\$ 7,573,013	\$ 3,889,339	\$3,683,674	\$ 61,964.92
Year	2020							
Month	Count	Granted	% Granted	Denied	TV pre Pov	TV post Pov	TV Loss	Loss in revenue
Total POV	88	64	73%	24	\$ 7,488,997	\$ 4,883,989	\$2,605,008	\$ 40,694.13

Question #3: With these new proposed guidelines, is it possible to model the potential change in number of residents impacted and the dollar amount impacted? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response:

- a. It is unknown how many more applicants will apply with the revised income levels proposed.
- b. A review of the received 2025 poverty applicants indicate that an additional 5 households would have been granted some relief for poverty by adopting the use of 50% of area median income levels.
- c. A review of the received 2024 poverty applicants indicates that an additional 3 households would have been granted some relief for poverty by adopting the use of 50% area median income levels.
- d. A review of received 2023 poverty applicants indicates that an additional 4 households would have been granted some relief for poverty by adopting the use of 50% area median income levels.

C-1 - An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 26 (Solid Waste Management) of Title II of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor

Question: Does this revised ordinance mostly clarify current terms of solid waste service? Does it add any significant new features either to service or to provision for evaluating compliance with City solid waste regs? (Councilmember Disch)

Response: The main purposes of the ordinance revision are to update current definitions in coordination with the Solid Waste Regulations, update sections where necessary to reflect current practices, and reformatting to align more closely with the Regulations. There are no significant new features to service or compliance evaluation.