



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, City Administrator

CC: Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
John Fournier, Assistant City Administrator
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Raymond Hess, Transportation Manager
Nick Hutchinson, City Engineer
Josh Landefeld, Deputy Parks Manager

SUBJECT: November 5, 2020 Council Agenda Responses

DATE: October 29, 2020

CA-2 – Resolution to Approve a Contract with All Star Power Excavation L.L.C. to Renovate the Pathway Near the Boat Launch at Gallup Park (\$245,209.00)(ITB 4638)

Question: Q1. It's good to see this Gallup Park project on the agenda. There were other Gallup Park-related projects that have been mentioned including repaving the pathway from the Gallup vehicle bridge to Mitchell Field (B2B trail) as well as replacing the vehicle bridge. What is the status of those (and any other) Gallup Park projects? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: We will be seeking to re-pave the section of Border-to-Border trail pathway from the Gallup vehicle bridge to the Mitchell Field bridge in the fall of 2021. The Gallup vehicle bridge will be replaced in the next few years and the City is currently undergoing a community engagement process to develop a concept design for the replacement bridge. An [electronic public meeting](#) will be held on Wednesday, November 12th at 7 p.m.

Question: Q2. This RFP went out right about the time the new contractor reporting requirements were being adopted. Was this bid conducted under the new or old reporting requirements and can you please provide an update on impacts (if any) you've seen or is it too early to draw any conclusions on whether potential bidders may be choosing not to participate? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: ITB# 4638 was published using the older bid document and it is slightly premature to determine what the changes instituted by Council in late July will have on the City's applicable bid process and number of bid responses received.

Question: Q3. What is the expected construction schedule for this project? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The work will begin in the spring after the frost laws are lifted and will take approximately 8 weeks, weather-permitting, with an aim to be complete by early June.

CA – 3 – Resolution to Approve an Agreement with the Michigan Department of Transportation for the Huron Parkway RRFB Project

Question: Q1. Regarding CA-3, I'm a bit confused about costs and sharing. If the HSIP grant pays 90% of the RRFB costs, that means the cost for the lighting is about \$85K – is that correct (just seems like a lot)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The \$85K includes the lighting and all of the concrete work for the project as well. In addition, the project had to bore new electrical conduit which added to the cost of the streetlights.

Question: Q2. The City is paying for the lighting and since the purpose of the positive contrast lighting is for pedestrian safety, shouldn't the Alternative Transportation Fund (or county millage proceeds allocated to pedestrian safety) pay these costs rather than the Street and Sidewalk Millage Fund? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: When lighting upgrades are associated with a capital project, those costs are paid for by the project, which in this case is funded by the Street, Bridge, and Sidewalk Millage under Major Midblock Crossing Improvements.

Question: Q3. Are any other pedestrian safety improvements beyond these RRFB's planned for Huron Parkway and/or the Huron High School area? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The project itself includes improved ADA ramps, pavement markings, RRFBs, and positive contrast lighting. Beyond this project, there are no additional pedestrian safety improvements scheduled for this area at this time.

Question: Q4. Also, can you please provide an update on the UM's Dean Road Vehicle facility off of Baxter Road – is it on hold like other U-M projects and is there a projected start date? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: City staff does not have any new information on this project.

CA- 4 - Resolution to Approve the Purchase of 75 Streetlight Fixtures for replacement, 80 enclosures and miscellaneous electrical supplies for traffic signal maintenance and installations from Graybar Electric Company, Inc. through the Michigan Delivering Extended Agreements Locally (MIDEAL) (\$62,354.03)

Question: Regarding CA-4, the cover memo indicates that the fixtures are compatible with “smart city” sensors that could be added later. What is the status of plans to implement smart city sensors in Ann Arbor? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The DDA has incorporated “smart city” sensors as part of the streetlights that are being installed on the First/Ashley project. Staff will pilot this technology there to see if it meets expectations and delivers on operational needs. If this solution is found to be acceptable, it can be scaled to other areas of the City which have “smart city” capable streetlights.

DC-1 - Resolution to Further Appoint Members to the Council of the Commons

Question: Regarding DC-1, are the appointments for the two organizations (Community Commons Initiating Committee and Library Green Conservancy) names that have been put forward by the groups? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Staff is unaware of any names at this time.

DC-2 – Resolution Regarding Traffic Calming Process

Question: What are the potential implications of these changes and expanding the “project area” of the traffic calming program? (Mayor Taylor)

Response: Everyone within the project area would be treated like the residents on the street; this includes participation in the petition process (50% of addresses in project area must sign petition), they would be mailed all materials (initial survey, meeting invitations, updates, draft plans, etc.) and would be eligible to participate in final polling. The final polling qualification criteria is % support based on responses received. So, if additional addresses are added to the project area it could substantially affect the outcome. Ultimately, this may make it more difficult for a neighborhood to qualify for traffic calming and/or get approval for the final concept if those who do not live on the street are counted in the process.

This sentiment is also captured in the [Glenwood Meeting #2 discussion summary](#) (see summary excerpt below). Those who do not live on the street may be the people speeding down that street, and likely the ones opposed to traffic calming device installation. They are not the ones experiencing speeding vehicles in front of their property. To expand the project area could dilute the voices of those most affected, i.e., those on the street who experience the pros and cons of device installation. This discussion played out with the Traffic Calming Task Force in 2018.

The Traffic Calming Program was recently updated in 2018. During the public engagement process for the update, support was expressed to keep the voices of residents and property owners on the petitioned street elevated because they are most likely to experience the negative effects of speeding on the street as well the impacts of the traffic calming device installation. Those who travel on the petitioned street, but do not have property frontage along the area of concern, do not experience the speeding concerns to the same extent, and tend not to recognize the perceived value and quality of life improvements, as seen by those who live on the street.