

Ann Arbor City Council Regular Session: February 2, 2026
Email Redactions List Pursuant to Council Resolution R-09-386

Sent Time	TO	From	CC	Redactions	Reason for Redaction
10:18PM	City Council	Daniel Rubenstein		Personal Information	Privacy
7:53 PM	Erica Briggs	Jean Leverich		Personal Information	Privacy

From: [Radina, Travis](#)
To: ryanstanton@mlive.com
Subject: Full Remarks on DC-3 (MELT ICE)
Date: Monday, February 2, 2026 10:51:27 PM

Since my microphone didn't initially turn on when I started my remarks, I wanted to share my full prepared remarks with you:

First and foremost, I want to thank all of you who are here tonight to support the most vulnerable in our community and confront the lawlessness and abuses of power by the federal government.

ICE and CBP have engaged in illegal, unconstitutional, and immoral acts nationwide — from warrantless detainments & arrests, and deliberate intimidation & racial profiling to murdering people in broad daylight and on camera. These are not isolated incidents; they are systemic failures.

For those reasons, I personally support defunding and abolishing ICE and believe that accountability must extend to its leadership – with the impeachment of Kristi Noem – and I thank Congresswoman Dingell for signing onto articles of impeachment against her, for voting against DHS funding, and for taking seriously her responsibility to hold this administration accountable.

Locally, Ann Arbor has been clear and consistent in its response to civil immigration enforcement: public safety is built on trust, not fear — and not on the misuse of local government resources to carry out a federal agenda that violates human rights. Our City is committed to the safety, dignity, and rights of all residents. For that reason, Ann Arbor has long refused to cooperate with ICE and CBP on civil immigration enforcement.

Through our existing 2017 policy, and again through this expansion tonight, City Council is reaffirming a clear stand: **Ann Arbor City funds, personnel, and properties will not be used to assist civil immigration enforcement and ICE is not welcome here.**

It also confronts a deeply disturbing trend of federal immigration agents conducting operations while masked, without visible identification. That practice is dangerous, creates confusion, and invites abuse. **Tonight, we direct our City Attorney to begin drafting ordinances to ban masking and require identification by any law enforcement operating within the City.**

To those asking us to go further, I commit to continuing to work with MIRA and others in areas where we have the power to strengthen protections. But, I also believe it is incredibly important

that local officials speak honestly and transparently about how and where we can truly protect our people, and that residents can trust us when we tell them they are safe. **False assurances from government leaders put the most vulnerable among us at risk.** That’s why I’m also incredibly cautious about using the phrase “ICE-Free Zones.” Not because I don’t want them – I do – but because I worry about creating a false sense of security for targeted residents who will believe they may suddenly be safe when they may not be.

While I believe this is a meaningful step forward tonight, when ICE and CBP show up in communities, we are not safe. None of us. They don’t usually come to City Halls or County Buildings. They terrorize people at bus stops, stores and restaurants. They profile and stop people on the street, and on their way into schools & churches. Now, they are arguing they can forcibly enter our homes without valid warrants. And as we have seen in Minneapolis, they may even kill us. So, I want to be clear – I am committed to doing everything and anything within my authority to protect our residents from this federal government’s war on our people and the American dream.

But when the time comes, it will depend on all of us and what we do outside of these chambers to come together and to keep our neighbors safe. I am confident by the response tonight that Ann Arbor is ready to take a stand. Immigrants are welcome here.

—

Travis Radina
Mayor Pro Tem | Councilmember, Ward 3
(he|him|his)

[City of Ann Arbor](#)

301 E. Huron St.
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
Cell: 734.219.6551

From: [Daniel Rubenstein](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Re: Arbor South
Date: Monday, February 2, 2026 10:18:01 PM

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

To Councilmember Disch's remarks tonight, note that as I extemporized my comments, I omitted the point made below that this is paying \$1.5 million or so per affordable housing unit. My point stands - it's a bad deal, poor stewardship of property tax revenues. That is the point - not WHETHER to provide affordable housing, but HOW to FINANCE it, EFFICIENTLY.

The "but for" arguments have no basis in evidence or experience, and given what is being built around A2, they are simply not credible. I welcome you to try to provide any evidence to the contrary. Do a thorough comparison with Briarwood if you like. But please don't operate on faith alone.

And mayor Taylor, nor should citizens operate on faith that you "don't give a rip about developers," especially when they are your largest donor. Council should adopt a rule of mandatory recusal for matters involving entities that are their donors, just as progressives are working to take away regulated entities' ability to make campaign donations. That would be the truly progressive thing to do, if the mayor and others truly "don't give a rip about developers."

Daniel Rubenstein
Ward 5

On Mon, Feb 2, 2026, 9:56 PM Daniel Rubenstein [REDACTED] wrote:

Some Council members have expressed their continued opposition to the Arbor South TIF. I agree with them, but for reasons perhaps more fundamental than theirs. In light of the similar development right across Eisenhower Pkwy, in Briarwood Mall, it's clear that a developer can make a comparable *market-rate* development here "pencil out" without subsidies. That development also includes infrastructure upgrades and a parking deck. Joe Giant argues the infrastructure needs here are unique, but that's unsubstantiated until comparison with the Briarwood development is made.

On this Arbor South site, any brownfield remediation is minimal, or nonexistent. That means the only benefits beyond what the development right across the street provides that could warrant this subsidy are the transit upgrades and affordable housing. Are those benefits worth \$329 million?

The proposed transit upgrades are minimal (this is not a full transit station), easily borne by the city with money saved from not granting a TIF, and the affordable housing cost would come out to around \$1.5 million per unit in foregone property

tax revenue that could go to the city, county, and state. In other words, the city could take its normal property tax revenue alone - not including that which goes to other taxing entities and millages - and fund both the transit upgrades and affordable housing, with money to spare. Council should do this math first before any decision.

So my fundamental issue is not the "risk" to the city (though the lack of a firm commitment to affordable housing is troublesome). It is that, regardless, this is a bad business decision. It doesn't make financial sense. It would be extremely poor stewardship of city and county property tax revenue. This is on top of the equity issues inherent in taking money from other taxing authorities and purpose-approved millages.

The only other rationale would be "but for" - the assertion that this development wouldn't get built "but for" the TIF. That is also contradicted by the development at Briarwood. And common sense tells us that a company that has spent tens of millions of dollars to acquire property will not want to hold it unproductively on its books forever. It will either develop it or sell it to someone who will. The "but for" argument is not backed up by evidence or experience.

I hope you'll come to agree with this assessment. This is simply a bad business decision made worse by equity concerns. We would be drastically overpaying for any incremental public benefits. The county and other millages would be hurt along with the city. We don't need to give this developer this incentive in order to fulfill our goals of more housing, affordable housing, and transit upgrades. Therefore, I hope all Council members and the mayor will exercise responsible stewardship of the property tax revenue entrusted to you and oppose the Arbor South brownfield TIF. And I'll add, as I emphasized in my comments tonight, I think it's a great project. Dense where it should be, connectivity, affordable housing (maybe), union jobs. I fully support. I object to the financing, the cost for the public benefits. It's a bad deal for the city. And of course it's a public subsidy for a particular private developer who doesn't need it, giving them an unfair advantage in the market. Just look how many developments are thriving on their own merits.

Daniel Rubenstein
Ward 5

From: [Daniel Rubenstein](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Arbor South
Date: Monday, February 2, 2026 9:56:19 PM

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Some Council members have expressed their continued opposition to the Arbor South TIF. I agree with them, but for reasons perhaps more fundamental than theirs. In light of the similar development right across Eisenhower Pkwy, in Briarwood Mall, it's clear that a developer can make a comparable *market-rate* development here "pencil out" without subsidies. That development also includes infrastructure upgrades and a parking deck. Joe Giant argues the infrastructure needs here are unique, but that's unsubstantiated until comparison with the Briarwood development is made.

On this Arbor South site, any brownfield remediation is minimal, or nonexistent. That means the only benefits beyond what the development right across the street provides that could warrant this subsidy are the transit upgrades and affordable housing. Are those benefits worth \$329 million?

The proposed transit upgrades are minimal (this is not a full transit station), easily borne by the city with money saved from not granting a TIF, and the affordable housing cost would come out to around \$1.5 million per unit in foregone property tax revenue that could go to the city, county, and state. In other words, the city could take its normal property tax revenue alone - not including that which goes to other taxing entities and millages - and fund both the transit upgrades and affordable housing, with money to spare. Council should do this math first before any decision.

So my fundamental issue is not the "risk" to the city (though the lack of a firm commitment to affordable housing is troublesome). It is that, regardless, this is a bad business decision. It doesn't make financial sense. It would be extremely poor stewardship of city and county property tax revenue. This is on top of the equity issues inherent in taking money from other taxing authorities and purpose-approved millages.

The only other rationale would be "but for" - the assertion that this development wouldn't get built "but for" the TIF. That is also contradicted by the development at Briarwood. And common sense tells us that a company that has spent tens of millions of dollars to acquire property will not want to hold it unproductively on its books forever. It will either develop it or sell it to someone who will. The "but for" argument is not backed up by evidence or experience.

I hope you'll come to agree with this assessment. This is simply a bad business decision made worse by equity concerns. We would be drastically overpaying for any incremental public benefits. The county and other millages would be hurt along with the city. We don't need to give this developer this incentive in order to fulfill our goals of more housing, affordable housing, and transit upgrades. Therefore, I hope all Council members and the mayor will exercise responsible stewardship of the property tax revenue entrusted to you and oppose the Arbor South brownfield TIF. And I'll add, as I emphasized in my comments tonight, I think it's a great project. Dense where it should be, connectivity, affordable housing (maybe), union jobs. I fully support. I object to the financing, the cost for the public benefits. It's a bad deal for the city. And of course it's a public subsidy for a particular private developer who doesn't need it, giving them an unfair advantage in the market. Just look how many developments are thriving on their own merits.

Daniel Rubenstein
Ward 5

From: [Beverly I Strassmann](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Reasons to Vote against the Dean Spot Rezoning in Germantown
Date: Monday, February 2, 2026 8:01:26 PM

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Dear Members of the City Council,

I was not allowed to speak tonight at the public hearing on the "Dean."

Therefore I am sharing my concerns by email and ask that you enter this email into the public record. "The Dean" is a plan to "spot rezone" several parcels on S. 5th Ave, S. 4th Ave, and E. Madison street in Ann Arbor. I ask you to vote again this spot rezoning from R4C (multifamily) to D1 (skyscraper) for the following reasons:

1. Under city policy, you do not have the authority to approve the construction of new residential structures in the designated floodway in Ann Arbor. Firststreet is the site that has the best track record on what is floodway: <https://firststreet.org/https://firststreet.org/>. One parcel is "SEVERE" flood risk and the remaining parcels are "MODERATE" flood risk. It is well known that this area floods from the Allen Creek and there are many photos of these parcels and adjacent streets under water. Climate change is only making the flooding worse.
2. The city is in the process of developing a Comprehensive Plan that will determine whether this area will be a transition zone, downtown HUB, or something else. That process is the prelude to more comprehensive zoning for the entire city. Cherry picking this site for D1 rezoning leapfrogs over that process without due input from the public.
3. The site is a poor candidate for the development known as the Dean, for which the spot zoning is catering. The Dean is a 14 story tower that will loom over the neighboring two story craftsman houses. It will create hazardous traffic gridlock, as the streets were designed for much lower density. Both S. 4th and S. 5th avenues dead end at the Athletic campus. Building a high rise right at that juncture will aggravate the existing problem of traffic jams in Ann Arbor, which is especially problematic when there are sports events.
4. The City Planning Commission falsely represented the Dean as serving the interests of the University. As a professor who has students in the marching band, I strongly advise against approving D1 zoning for this site without a safety plan conducted by the University. To my knowledge, the University did not approve this rezoning or the Dean and has not yet investigated what risks the Dean might present for the students in the marching band who practice across the street. When people enter the Michigan Stadium (Big House), they are screened to make sure that they pose no threat. That will not be the case for the Dean. I do not think it is a good idea, in this age of horrific gun violence, to build a skyscraper that overlooks the practice field for the Michigan Marching Band. Maybe I am being paranoid, but at the very least the University should do a study to evaluate whether a building that looms over the marching band is a tangible risk.

In sum, for the above reasons, I ask that you vote against this spot rezoning.

Sincerely,

Beverly Strassmann
Germantown Neighborhood Association, President

From: [Jean Leverich](#)
To: [Briggs, Erica](#)
Subject: Re: Please pass DC-1
Date: Monday, February 2, 2026 7:53:26 PM

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Hi Erica,

I know that the meeting has started I meant you won't get this message until after work, but I strongly agree that I would rather the City fund AATA than a hotel.

Amanda Carlisle of WHA sent out an email this afternoon asking for advocacy for the 209 affordable units, which made me soften toward the project.

Ideally, I would want a better development without a massive public subsidy that offered affordable housing AND also a walkable neighborhood with easy access to transit.

Thanks for all you do on our behalf,
Jean

On Mon, Feb 2, 2026, 5:55 PM Briggs, Erica <EBriggs@a2gov.org> wrote:

Hi Jean:

Thanks for the message.

To be clear, our Brownfield policy requires affordable housing. The developer has created a plan that is not financially viable for them without a massive public subsidy for 30 years. For example, I do not feel it is necessary for the residents of A2 to be subsidizing a hotel for thirty years at the expense of AAATA. And, in this case, a hotel that will utilize our wastewater capacity and potentially block more housing in the area. The developer could revise and bring back a plan (it would still be brownfield that does not put in these either/or positions.

--

Erica Briggs

5th Ward Council Member

Cell: 734-355-3931

Visit www.ericafora2.com to sign-up for my Ward newsletter

From: Jean Leverich [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 2, 2026 4:38 PM
To: City Council <CityCouncil@a2gov.org>
Subject: Please pass DC-1

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

■
Hello!

I'm writing on behalf of the Washtenaw Housing Alliance to request that Ann Arbor City Council vote to pass DC-1, which will provide 209 affordable housing units managed by Ann Arbor Housing Commission.

I think it is unfortunate that the project features three large parking garages that will be financed and owned by the City of Ann Arbor, as that does not support our City's vision for sustainability and create opportunities for walkable neighborhoods, public transit, and non-motorized transportation.

I just want to say that I think it's unfortunate that somehow this got pitched as an either/or and that in order to have more affordable housing at this site, the City needs to disregard its sustainability goals. I do think that this is a false choice and that creative solutions are available, but I understand that this is the choice that we apparently have.

Sincerely,
Jean Leverich
Ward 5