



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Milton Dohoney Jr., City Administrator

CC: Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
John Fournier, Deputy City Administrator
Brett Lenart, Planning Manager
Brian Steglitz, Public Services Area Administrator

SUBJECT: November 6, 2023 Council Agenda Response Memo

DATE: November 2, 2023

CA-1 – Resolution to Approve a Professional Services Agreement with TetraTech, Inc to complete a Feasibility Analysis of a Selection of Stormwater Projects that have been included in the City’s Capital Improvements Plan (CIP), RFP No. 23-21 (\$160,450.00)

Question: In the fee schedule, it says there’s a travel fee for meetings, project management, model analysis, and alternatives development. Why is there a travel fee? (Councilmember Harrison)

Response: The travel fee covers the costs for a key member of the project consultant team to travel from Lansing to Ann Arbor for meetings, project management, model analysis, and alternatives development. A majority of project meetings will be held virtually, but key milestone meetings will be held in person in Ann Arbor.

FEE SCHEDULE

Tetra Tech’s multiplier for these projects will be approximately 3.00 times the base rate. Our overhead rate is approximately 1.60. Base rates reflect labor rate for work done in 2023; a 3% escalation factor is included for work estimated to be completed in 2024.

Project Phases/ Tasks	Bill Rate	Staff Title (Name)													Labor	Travel	Total Fee
		Sr. Project Manager (Dan Christian)	Sr. Project Manager (Brian Rubel)	QA/QC Manager (Gary Markstrom)	Sr. Water Resource Engineer (James Brescol)	Sr. Water Resource Engineer (Justin Voss)	Water Resource Engineer (Jenna Troppman)	GIS Analyst (Darryl Albert)	Sr. Civil Engineer (John Barber)	Sr. Civil Engineer (Daniel Warren)	Civil Engineer (Shelby Byrne)	Landscape Architect (Elise Cormier)	Environmental Scientist (Patti McCall)	Admin Assistant II (Pat Christian)			
	Hours	166	30	10	10	14	266	78	12	130	120	22	8	32			
1. Meetings Project Management	124	50	24	-	-	-	24	-	-	14	-	-	-	12	\$25,858	\$1,980	\$27,838
2. Data Collection	18	2	-	-	-	-	8	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$2,600	-	\$2,600
3. Model Analysis	73	21	-	-	-	2	40	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	\$12,110	\$1,100	\$13,210
4. Alternatives Development	322	52	-	4	4	12	88	28	8	68	40	10	8	-	\$55,294	\$2,200	\$57,494
5. Cost Benefit Analysis	149	31	-	2	2	-	34	14	4	10	40	12	-	-	\$26,780	-	\$26,780
6. Report	212	10	6	4	4	-	72	28	-	28	40	-	-	20	\$32,527	-	\$32,527
Total	898	166	30	10	10	14	266	78	12	130	120	22	8	32	\$155,170	\$5,280	\$160,450

CA-18 - Resolution to Approve a Contract Not to Exceed \$500,000.00 with THRONE Labs, Inc for Installation of Public Restrooms In and Near Downtown Ann Arbor and appropriate up to \$300,000 to the General Fund (8 Votes Required)

Question #1: Does the City have an estimate for what it would cost for the City to clean and maintain public toilets? How does that compare to the Throne contract? (Councilmember Disch)

Response: The City reviewed costs of both Denver and Grand Rapids, however both were situationally specific and therefore we were unable to estimate costs based on their figures.

Question #2: Does the Throne hire local workers or bring in its own? (Councilmember Disch)

Response: Throne will bring a few staff, but most of the hiring is done locally.

Question #3: By voting for this resolution, is it correct that we are approving the contract only? (Councilmember Disch)

Response: Yes, it is the contract only.

Question #4: How will final decisions about the recommended locations for the DDA-sponsored units (see the attached report) be decided? (Councilmember Disch)

Response: Two of the units will be placed at the locations selected by the DDA. Other locations will be determined with contributing partners and based on conversations with additional stakeholders.

For the downtown locations, the DDA convened a Downtown Public Restroom Work Group. Process and details can be found here: <https://www.a2dda.org/people-friendly-streets/projects/public-restroom-pilot/>

Staff will adhere to the location criteria established by the Work Group and plan to implement at the following locations:

1. 100 block of E. Washington Street (north side) – 12-month pilot
2. 200 block of N. Fourth Ave. (west side) – 6-month pilot
3. 300 block of Maynard Street (west side) – 6-month pilot

Locations will be monitored and adjusted as needed if conditions change. Following significant concerns from the State Street District about the E. Liberty St. location, the DDA evaluated the Maynard St. location and determined that it meets the location criteria established by the Work Group. Staff are recommending this location however remain open to evaluating other locations suggested by the neighborhood.

Question: It says menstrual products will be an additional cost as an optional add-on. Is the city paying for the add-on? (Councilmember Harrison)

Response: Yes, staff will ensure menstrual products are available.

C-3 - An Ordinance to Amend Sections 5.17.4 and 5.18.6 of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor (Premiums, D1 and D2 Floor Area Ratio) CPC Recommendation: Approval (7 Yeas, 0 Nays)

Question: How many private developer subsidized affordable housing units have been created in the downtown since the enactment of the 2019 premiums ordinance? (Councilmember Akmon)

Response: Two affordable units have been constructed since 2019 in the downtown area by private developers and there are 33 more under construction because of the premium options. All of these were realized under the premiums ordinance in place prior to 2019.

C-4 – An Ordinance to Amend Sections 5.10.2 and 5.17 of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor (TC1 Front Setback) (CPC Recommendation: Denial, 5 Yes, 3 No)

Question #1: Re: setbacks in TC1: Is the granting of easements part of staff and/or planning discussion when new development proposals come forward? (Councilmember Akmon)

Response: This is often discussed on a case-by-case basis. The City does ask for such easements when desired.

Question #2: I appreciated the following in the staff report: "Given the traffic volume on specific corridors, a minimum lane requirement often includes two general-purpose lanes and a turn lane, which is roughly 30 feet. Adding two 1-foot transit lanes in each direction, for example, pushes that minimum to 54 feet. Dedicated facilities like cycle paths would also require more road space. The "excess space" in the road quickly evaporates. It's imperative to plan for and anticipate the goals of Ann Arbor's key corridors before accepting to alter their curb-to-curb widths."

For context, can did staff capture any measurements along any of the corridors from curb to curb? (Councilmember Akmon)

Response: Here are some average measurements that are approximated from City map information (not verified survey data):

- North Maple (Dexter to West Stadium) - 62'
- South Maple (West Stadium to Pauline) - 41'
- West Stadium (Maple to Pauline) - 64'
- Eisenhower (South Main to railroad) - 112'
- South State (Oakbrook to Eisenhower) - 73'
- South State (Eisenhower to I-94) - 121'
- Plymouth (Upland to US-23) - 62'
- Washtenaw (West Stadium to Huron Parkway) - 66'
- Washtenaw (Huron Parkway to Pittsfield) - 161' (includes service drive/parking area)
- Washtenaw (Pittsfield to Yost) - 70'

Question #1: Staff notes that adopting these amendments to TC-1 (minimum front setback of 18 feet and a maximum of 28 feet measured from the street curb) means that in some areas across TC-1 new development will actually be required to be built closer to the street because currently setbacks are measured from the property line. While some of these examples were mentioned in planning staff presentation, they aren't noted in the planning report. Can you please provide a few examples in corridors currently zoned TC-1 and in areas under consideration for rezoning? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: Where the distance between the curb and property line is less than 18 feet (the proposed minimum front setback), new buildings will be set back further under the proposed scheme compared to the current setback scheme. Example: the distance between curb and property line at 2060 West Stadium (former automobile dealership) is 7 feet. Currently a new building needs to be between 0 and 15 feet from the property line, or 7 to 22 feet from the curb. As proposed, the new building needs to be between 18 to 28 feet from the curb which is more than both the current minimum and maximum.

Where the distance between the curb and property line is more than 18 feet but less than 28 feet (the proposed maximum front setback), new buildings will be closer to the property line than currently required. Example, 2950 South State Street (Dahlman Commerce Building) has 20 feet between the curb and property line. Currently a new building needs to be between 0 and 15 feet from the property line, or 20 to 33 feet from the curb. Since 33 feet exceeds 28 feet, the new building would be at least 5 feet closer to the property line than currently.

Where the distance between the curb and property line is more than 28 feet (the proposed maximum front setback), new buildings will no longer have a permitted front setback range and must be placed at the property line with zero setback. Example, 325 East Eisenhower Parkway (Burlington Office Building) has 50 feet between the curb and property line. A new building must be at the property line, or 50 feet from the curb.

Question #2: The planning staff report provides exceptional guidance on how these amendments help us better realize the goals of TC-1 by creating "*comfortable street space with room for large street trees, transit infrastructure and other public amenities and infrastructure.*" However, some have suggested that the curb line should be moved to accommodate these amenities. I'd like to explore this idea further. The planning staff report provides some feedback on why this might be challenging. However, one topic not discussed is the special needs for transit on the roadway. One measurement not provided in the staff report is the dimensions needed for enhanced transit operations. Since our long-term vision for these corridors is significantly higher residential density supported by strong transit, preserving space in the public ROW for transit-only lanes seems advisable. According to NACTO, center-lane transit for example, needs 22-24 feet of lane space + more at stops. If my math is correct, providing for enhanced transit service, bike accommodations, and pedestrian-friendly amenities would be seriously challenged (if not impossible) if we moved the curb line and also redeveloped with zero-foot setbacks. Is this consistent with staff's analysis as well? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: Planning staff agrees that moving curbs could challenge space for other modes to grow, especially via dedicated facilities (ex: transit lanes/stops, in-street bikeways). There is not a single minimum measurement to offer for transit operations, because depending on the type of transit service and features offered, roadway facility needs may change. Any reconfiguration of a road would need to be carefully analyzed and considered, as it is impractical to broadly assume and/or generalize how a reconfiguration would impact serviceability to transit, vehicles, and non-motorized users.