

Bowden (King), Anissa

From: Beaudry, Jacqueline
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2012 5:27 PM
To: Bowden (King), Anissa
Subject: FW: Agenda Item - Ann Arbor Station

[Add to the Legistar file.](#)

Jacqueline Beaudry, City Clerk

City Clerk's Office | Guy C. Larcom City Hall | 301 E. Huron, 2nd Floor · Ann Arbor · MI · 48104
734.794.6140 (O) · 734.994.8296 (F) |
jbeaudry@a2gov.org | www.a2gov.org



Think Green! Please don't print this e-mail unless absolutely necessary.

From: Lumm, Jane
Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2012 9:59 AM
To: Larry Baird; Hieftje, John; Kunselman, Stephen
Cc: Beaudry, Jacqueline
Subject: RE: Agenda Item - Ann Arbor Station

Thank you very much, Larry. Appreciate your taking the time to so thoughtfully weigh-in on this important matter. I share your well-articulated concerns, and agree with you on your views of the critical issues you raise.

Since you were unable to speak, I requested last evening that the Clerk add your remarks to the record.

Thanks very much, Larry. Your views are very important, insightful, and very deserving of consideration.

Jane

From: Larry Baird [<mailto:lfbaird@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Mon 10/15/2012 6:48 PM
To: Hieftje, John; Lumm, Jane; Kunselman, Stephen
Subject: Fw: Agenda Item - Ann Arbor Station

Dear Mayor & City Council Members:

I am listed as the first alternative speaker tonight, so here is what I was going to say.

A number of existing city council members, as well as incoming council members have voiced support for a public vote on building a train station on public parkland at Fuller Park, so I am glad it is finally being formally introduced at council tonight. However, the resolution is a request for two separate issues.

Issue #1 is a budget request to amend the 2012-2013 budget and spend more money on a transportation planning project.

With all the other transportation planning projects currently underway (WALLY, Connector, county wide transit, Washtenaw)

how much have all these combined projects cost the taxpayers of Ann Arbor so far and how much would they all cost to fund in the future? Trying to fund every one of these projects would be near impossible without significant tax increases (over and above those proposed by the Washtenaw Ride).

I would also like to see a review of why we appear back to square one on this project, with a lot of money spent and none of it qualifying as a local match? Something is not right here.

Issue #2 is whether to build a train station on public parkland. Every other local city who choose to move their train stations, first actively engaged their citizens in a thorough alternative site review process. From day one, this vital step was been completely skipped and probably helped contribute to the disallowing of local match funding for federal grant purposes. The vote is the best first step for this vital "do over".

I also do not like the appearance of a trade-off built within in this resolution - enough said.

So please do the right thing and vote on these two items seperately and after more time has been spent clarifying the specifics and what if's. Such as timing the vote prior to spending more money. Why not place it on the upcoming ballot with the county wide transit vote. Then if it passes, you can move forward. If it does not pass why risk wasting even more money on this project?

You are the financial stewards and fiduciaries of the city. If you agree to ask the citizens to decide, then the prudent thing to do would be to wait to spend anymore money.

Fiduciaries must follow the prudent man rule, spending more money without first getting approval on the final project is not prudent management of the city's financial affairs.

Thank you for your consideration and taking the time to read this,

Lawrence Baird