



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Milton Dohoney Jr., City Administrator

CC: Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
Nick Hutchinson, City Engineer
Josh Landefeld, Parks & Recreation Manager
Marti Praschan, CFO
Mariah Walton, Deputy City Administrator

SUBJECT: March 2, 2026 Council Agenda Response Memo

DATE: February 26, 2026

CA-7: Resolution to Approve a Professional Services Agreement with Agency Landscape + Planning, LLC for Development of the 2028-2032 Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan (RFP #25-51) (\$443,000.00)

Question #1: What are the anticipated outcomes and practical uses of the 2028–2032 PROS Plan that would result from this contract? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: This PROS Plan will move beyond a descriptive snapshot – as in past PROS Plans – and function as an active planning and decision-support tool for both near-term actions and long-range investments.

The anticipated outcomes and practical uses of the 2028–2032 PROS Plan are to provide a comprehensive, actionable framework to guide Parks & Recreation decision-making over the next five years and beyond. With a robust community engagement strategy supported by recent Parks initiatives, such as the Asset Management Plan and ADA Transition Plan, this revamped PROS plan will look to create clear investment priorities, policy direction, and implementation strategies for the department.

Question #2: How will the upcoming 2028–2032 PROS Plan deviate from previous PROS Plans? In particular, how will this plan support future investment prioritization, policy development, or resource allocation in ways that are not currently available through existing planning documents? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: Historically, the PROS plan was completed primarily to meet Michigan Department of Natural Resources requirements in order to remain eligible for state grant funding, while also offering an opportunity for public engagement to understand community priorities and desires. Prior PROS Plans functioned largely as a snapshot of the current parks system. It documented the existing state of Ann Arbor Parks & Recreation, provided historical context, defined policies, summarized the budget, included a park inventory and identified known capital needs.

Since completion of the 2023–2027 PROS Plan, Parks & Recreation has completed both an ADA Transition Plan and an Asset Management Plan. These plans identify significant capital needs that will heavily influence future investments across the parks system. Additionally, approval of the 2024–2044 Parks Maintenance Millage has provided a much clearer understanding of long-term financial needs and available revenue.

The 2028–2032 PROS Plan will be significantly more comprehensive and will be intentionally developed as a decision-supporting tool to guide and prioritize future investments. At the conclusion of this process, the PROS Plan will provide actionable recommendations, including priority opportunity sites for improvements and enhancements throughout Ann Arbor’s parks and recreation system.

At a minimum, the PROS Plan will include recommendations across the following topic areas, as well as others identified through the planning and engagement process:

- Organizational Excellence
- Administration and management recommendations
- Maintenance and operations recommendations
- Park Fund strategies and balanced investment recommendations
- System Planning and Growth
- Policy and planning recommendations
- Park classification and park design standards
- Park and Recreation facility deferred maintenance and reinvestment recommendations
- Parkland acquisition and development recommendations
- Experience, Sustainability and Innovation
- Recreation programs and service delivery recommendations
- Sustainability and environmental resilience recommendations
- Technology and innovation recommendations

Question #3: How will this PROS Plan differ from other recent/current plans, such as the asset management plan? What types of decisions or information will the PROS Plan address that the asset management plan does not to avoid duplicative efforts? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: The Asset Management Plan and ADA Transition Plan were completed by professional consultants using national standards and current codes to evaluate all park assets. Together, they provide a significantly more accurate and holistic understanding of capital needs across the parks system. They will serve as significant supporting documents for the 2028–2032 PROS Plan. A more comprehensive PROS Plan approach

will ensure that the information gathered in these plans will be fully integrated in future decision making.

This PROS Plan will define a capital project plan and investment priorities for the next five years, ensuring that decisions are guided by a cohesive approach. It will be coordinated with planned park projects, the Parks Asset Management Plan, and the ADA Transition Plan to align investments with system needs, accessibility goals, and long-term departmental priorities. This strategic approach will help the City make informed, equitable, and sustainable capital decisions that maximize the impact of available resources.

Question #4: My understanding is that previous PROS Plans were completed in-house at the City, likely at lower cost. Does staff anticipate that this more comprehensive consultant-supported process will become the standard approach for future PROS Plan cycles? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: This is correct. Historically, the five-year PROS Plan has been completed in-house using a template that has remained largely unchanged for more than 20 years. The current 2023–2027 PROS Plan follows this long-standing model.

Prior PROS plan iterations that were done in house required significant staff time to develop, manage, implement, produce, and submit the documents for approval. Unfortunately, this often meant that other park projects were delayed.

The intent of this more comprehensive, consultant-supported process is to establish a new and more robust PROS Plan framework that can be updated and refined in future cycles. While future PROS Plans may still require consultant support, staff does not anticipate that each update would involve a full overhaul of the plan.

Question #5: Does staff expect that the enhanced scope and analysis within this PROS Plan will strengthen the City’s ability to secure new or additional funding for the parks system, such as through improved competitiveness for state or federal grants, or increased opportunities for outside, philanthropic, or partner funding? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: Yes. Staff expect that this PROS Plan process will strengthen Ann Arbor Parks & Recreation’s long-term financial sustainability. The project includes a review and analysis of the current financial outlook, followed by identification of potential future funding opportunities to support system improvements, program growth, and long-term sustainability.

Recommendations will focus on enhancing revenue stability, diversifying funding sources, and aligning financial strategies with community priorities and departmental goals. At a minimum, recommendations will include exploration of the following:

- Options for Fees and Charges
- Endowments
- Non-Profit Opportunities
- Sponsorships
- Private/Public and Public/Not-for-Profit Partnerships
- Dedicated Funding Sources
- Development Agreements
- Earned Income Options
- Land/Facility Leases
- Grant Opportunities

CA-10: Resolution to Approve a Construction Contract with Toebe Construction LLC for the East Huron River Retaining Wall Replacement and Road Reconstruction Project (RFP 26-02; \$711,959.00)

Question #1: Is the proposed reconstruction of the retaining wall on Huron River Dr. considered a long-term fix? Does staff foresee any future work or required improvements to the retaining wall beyond this project? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: Yes, the new retaining wall is expected to be a long-term fix. The only future work we anticipate would be routine maintenance on the wall.

Question #2: If known, is staff able to estimate when the existing failing retaining wall was first built? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: What is in place currently was constructed by the Washtenaw County Road Commission in the 2010's before turning over jurisdiction of the road to the City. The existing structure, which is not even truly a retaining wall, was not adequately constructed to act as a long-term solution.

Question #3: The City recently conducted a study on the feasibility of constructing a new sidewalk to fill missing gaps along Huron River Drive between Huron Parkway and East Huron River Service Drive. Noting that such a sidewalk project is only in a very early conceptual planning phase at this time (plus is contingent on many factors, including funding), and the retaining wall project at hand is urgent and planned only for a small stretch of Huron River Drive between Chalmers Drive and Riverside Drive: Is it possible to replace this retaining wall and reconstruct the section of Huron River Drive in a way that plans for or takes into account the possibility of a sidewalk project along this stretch in the future? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: Because of the steep slope on the north side of the road in this area, widening the road to accommodate a sidewalk would make the retaining wall much larger and much more expensive. Because of this geographic constraint, it is likely that a future sidewalk along E. Huron River Drive in this area will be located on the south side.

Question #4: Several residents living near the proposed project have noted the challenges of turning from Chalmers Dr. onto Huron River Drive due to the hill and curve obscuring oncoming traffic when looking left/west before turning. Is this project an opportunity to reconstruct the section of Huron River Dr above the retaining wall in a way that somewhat alleviates these challenges – whether lowering the hill or straightening the curve to allow better sight lines when turning from Chalmers onto Huron River Dr? (Councilmember Mallek)

Response: This project is not a complete reconstruction of E. Huron River Drive – the only portion of the road itself that is being rebuilt is the north side of the road adjacent to the retaining wall. Therefore, there is not an opportunity as part of this project to either horizontally or vertically realign the roadway.

CA-12 – Resolution to Approve a Contract with the Michigan Department of Transportation for the Packard Street Improvements Project (25-5688) and Appropriate \$2,470,213.00 in Contributing Funds (8 Votes Required)

Question #1: This is a Tier 1 safety corridor in our transportation plan. Can staff articulate the specific issues that put it in this category and how those issues are being addressed through design elements in this project? (Councilmember Akmon)

Response:

- Packard St. from Main St. to State St. was designated as a Tier 1 safety corridor in the 2021 high injury network analysis and continues to be a Tier 1 corridor in the 2024 high injury network analysis. The intersection of Packard St. and State St. is a Tier 2 focus intersection in the 2024 high injury network analysis.
- The high injury network, Tier 1 and Tier 2 corridors and intersections, represent locations that experience the highest level of crash injuries. Detailed information can be found in A2 Moving Together (<https://www.a2gov.org/engineering/ann-arbor-moving-together-towards-vision-zero/>). Specific information about the high injury network can be found in Appendix D (<https://www.a2gov.org/media/vetlo4x2/2024-tier1-2-methodology-appendix-update.pdf>).
- The corridor has experienced 98 crashes in the last five years (2020-2024); 78 of those crashes were property damage only crashes with Rear End being the most common crash Type.
- The corridor experienced 20 injury crashes in the last five years, only 3 of the crashes has injuries significant enough to be considered “suspected serious injury” or level A crashes. However, the injury crashes have an overrepresentation of vulnerable road user crashes, 50%, with 35% of injury crashes involving cyclists.
- The design responds to these crashes through enhanced cyclist design.

Question #2: On the project page, it says it will "Make permanent, the quick build bike lane installations." Can staff describe the permanent elements, which I understand to be

different than the plastic posts, which are a quick build/non-permanent solution?
(Councilmember Akmon)

Response: Packard St. between Main St. and State St. received quick-build treatments through several projects including the Hill St. to State St. patching program and the first deployment of quick build projects after A2 Moving Together was adopted. Staff, with support from the consulting team, have evaluated those designs, determined what objectives they are currently meeting, and determined new improvements to be incorporated as part of this project. The project will continue to use a painted buffer for the bike lanes and will add vertical elements to the buffer consistent with the elements used on State St. The project team determined that concrete islands would not be appropriate for this location while working within the existing curblines.

Question #3: Staff notes in the agenda item that one thing the reconstruction will do is reduce vehicle speeds. "Also, upon detailed study during the design phase, the corridor speed limit was reduced to 25 MPH by the City prior to the project." Please describe which elements will contribute to the design speed of 25mph. (Councilmember Akmon)

Response: Staff evaluated the speed limit for this corridor during the design of the project to determine what level of speed management would be needed as part of the project. The evaluation showed that the existing travel speeds on this section of Packard were low enough to complete the speed limit reduction prior to the project. The new posted speed limit of 25 mph was installed in August 2025. While the most recent speed data show strong compliance with the posted speed limit, the introduction of vertical elements (delineators) in the bike lane buffer will reinforce the need for lower speeds.