



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Larry Collins, Fire Chief  
Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator  
Matt Kulhanek, Fleet and Facilities Manager  
Cresson Sloten, Acting Public Services Area Administrator

CC: Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator

SUBJECT: Council Agenda Responses

DATE: 9/6/16

---

### **CA-8 – Resolution to Adopt the 2016 Fire Services Strategic Plan**

**Question:** One goal is to “Champion a regional public safety dispatch service.” How would this differ from the existing regional police service dispatch with the Sheriff’s department and 911 coordination with HVA? Were existing regional partners consulted prior to committing to this goal? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

**Response:** This concept puts police, fire and EMS dispatchers in one room working off a single platform, where they can communicate amongst themselves to better coordinate resources during critical emergencies and with a supervisor present to direct priorities. This discussion has been ongoing with the AAPD and The County Sheriff and regional Fire Departments. Staff is uncertain as to where the fire dispatch contractor fit into these discussions. Again, the goal is to explore consolidation, not elimination, of services.

**Question:** Regarding the goal to “Enhance first responder service capabilities,” what are the documented deficiencies with existing first responder service? How would increasing first responder service affect response time for fire suppression? How would implementing an ALS paramedic system interact with existing services provided by HVA? What would the budget impacts of such a shift be? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

**Response:** The shortcomings with the current system is that AAFD has unequipped State Certified Paramedics arriving on-scene at critical care incidents ahead of the EMS contractor Medic transport units and are consequently, at times, unable to render immediate life saving care. Our level of care should increase in these incidents because the first responders getting there ahead of the EMS contractor unit will be able to initiate immediate, appropriate care in some instances. Staff is examining those direct and indirect costs right now as part of the planning process. But the initial cost to outfit an Advanced Paramedic Life Support (ALS) rig is estimated to be \$34K each. There should be no impact to existing Fire Suppression since these resources are already responding to these incidents; they just don't have ALS equipment on board to work with.

**Question:** Regarding the goal, "Create and implement a Fire Station Master Plan." Earlier in the report it discusses opening station seven. Is the goal to operate a 7-station fire department? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

**Response:** Fire Station 7 was planned many years ago to deal with projected growth in the Northeastern region of the city. There was never, to staff's knowledge, a date certain as to when it might be built, if ever. The fire station Master Plan will help us determine through data analysis of area density, activity, responses times, etc., whether or not it should be built and staffed and if so, where based on today's emergency service demands. In addition, the City's fire stations are near the end of their useful life, which today is around 50 years old, and inefficient to run. The Master Plan will provide direction for the future suggested locations, sizes, energy efficiencies, etc. of new fire stations along with suggested timelines/priorities for being built.

**Question:** On the goal to "Assure sufficient, Sustainable resources," will the follow up analysis explore the impacts of 24-hour shifts on response time (if the firefighters are allowed to sleep) or on firefighter health (if they are not allowed to sleep)? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

**Response:** Staff has no plans to alter fire department shift schedules. The science on this is somewhat inconclusive.

**Question:** It's good to see the AAFD pursuing the national accreditation through CPSE and developing an updated Strategic Plan. In reading through the draft that was attached (perhaps I missed it), I did not see mention of specific objectives or goals related to response times. Can you please elaborate on response time targets and whether in this accreditation process, targets were discussed or established for the City and how those compare with national standards? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Response times will be addressed more specifically/definitively under the Fire Station Location Master Plan Goals and Objectives as the times have a very important bearing on fire station locations. They were discussed with the focus groups during the strategic planning process and information and data is still being gathered through the accreditation process to help with this determination.

**CA-10 – Resolution to Appropriate Funds for and Approve an Agreement with Morris & McDaniel Management Consultants for Fire Services Promotional Testing Services (\$75,000) (8 Votes Required)**

**Question:** Both of these items use fund balance (General Fund for CA-10 and Fleet fund for CA-11). For CA-10, was there not any budget earmarked for testing or are we conducting more promotional tests than anticipated? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Funds were available in the FY 2016 fire budget for promotional testing. However, and owing to ongoing labor negotiations regarding this matter, we were not able to accomplish the testing in 2016. Consequently, at the end of the budget year, the budgeted funds were reverted back to fund balance until we were able to move forward on this topic. Staff is now simply asking to have the funds reinstated to our budget now that we know what the testing methodologies will be.

**CA-11 – Resolution to Amend the Fleet and Facility Unit FY2017 Budget by Appropriating Funds from the Fleet Services Fund Balance and to Approve the Purchase of a 2016 Quint Fire Apparatus with a 75' Aerial Ladder from Smeal Fire Apparatus Company (RFP #971 \$659,897.00 (8 Votes Required)**

**Question:** Why does this item require 8 votes? If adequate funds were not allocated in the recent budget, why not? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

**Response:** This item requires 8 votes because funding was not included in the FY 2017 Fleet and Facility operating budget and will need to be appropriated from the Fleet Service's fund balance. Funding for the purchase of this apparatus was included in the FY 2016 Fleet and Facility operating budget but the RFP process, including evaluation of proposals, was not completed by June 30, 2016 and the budgeted funds were returned to the Fleet Services' fund balance at the end of the fiscal year.

Staff changed the type of vehicle being purchased from an Engine to a Quint, which allows the apparatus to carry longer, more appropriate 35' ground ladders (Engines only carry 24' ladders, good to the second story), plus provides 75' Aerial Ladder capability in the Northern eastern part of the city where we have numerous multi-story apartments (many 3 floors) and commercial buildings. In addition, all of the functions normally provided by an Engine Company will be included.

**Question:** Why wasn't this purchase included in the FY17 adopted budget and what is the rationale for increasing the number of units in the "reserve" fleet? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Regarding the budget part of the question, please see the response above. The Fire Department needs a second reserve fire engine. Keeping this engine as part of the reserve fleet gives a back-up to staff for major emergencies when members come in from home, and it also gives us a second spare rig when the other unit is already in use. This is happening more often as the fleet ages. Finally, this was a recommendation of

the Insurance Services Office for our department. This is the agency that grades fire departments for fire insurance rate making purposes. Consequently, it should help our insurance rating.

**CA-13 – Resolution Approving Cooperative Agreement Amendment between the United States of America Commodity Credit Corporation and the City of Ann Arbor for the Agriculture Conservation Easement Program (ACEP) and to Accept Additional Grant Funds in the Amount of \$141,120.00 for a Total Award Amount of \$522,340.00**

**Question:** Can you please provide the purchase prices and funding sources for the three Greenbelt properties referenced here? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The purchase prices of the three Greenbelt properties are:

Lloyd and Betty Guenther – East: \$792,000.00

In addition to City millage funds, the City has received a grant of ACEP funds in the amount of \$ 259,700.00 for the acquisition and Lodi Township will contribute \$500 toward the purchase price for the conservation easement.

Lloyd and Betty Guenther - West: \$352,500.00

In addition to City millage funds, the City has received a grant of ACEP funds in the amount of \$ 121,520.00 for the acquisition and Lodi Township will contribute \$500 toward the purchase price for the conservation easement.

Donald H. Drake Trust: Based on recent appraisals of similar properties in Lodi Township completed in February 2016, development rights are anticipated to be in the region of \$4,500-\$4,700 per acre. With a total acreage of approximately 72 acres, this would translate to approximately \$325,000 - \$340,000. Each property is, of course, unique, so this should only serve as a guide. The City is planning to request a contribution from Lodi Township towards the Donald H. Drake Trust property as well.

Washtenaw County will not contribute to these properties as the County prioritizes natural areas or open space properties, and the above tracts are primarily agricultural.

**CA-19 – Resolution to Approve a Services Agreement with Waste Management of Michigan, Inc. for Short-Term Operation of Ann Arbor Material Recovery Facility (MRF) and Waste Transfer Station (Estimated at \$588,734.00)**

**Question:** My understanding is that baling of unsorted recyclable material reduces the amount that can be reclaimed when it is sorted. Is this accurate? If so, why does the scope of services call for baling of recyclables? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

**Response:** Baling of recycled material does not reduce the amount of recyclables that may be reclaimed. Baling has no effect on the end amount of recyclables sorted or

reclaimed at a MRF. The amount of reclaimed material is dependent on the contamination of the collected recyclables as a whole, which is dependent on the behavior of the community and the kinds of material that are put into their recycling containers.

**Question:** The cover memo indicates the “interim” operator contract may not be in place until January of 2017-- given that, coupled with the fact that there’s a risk/extra effort required anytime we change operators, would it make more sense to just focus our efforts on expediting the process for determining the long-term operator (and not have a new “interim” operator sometime in early 2017)? How long do we anticipate it will be before we are ready to conduct the RFP process for the long-term, multi-year operator? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Through the City’s contract with CB&I, staff is working to develop strategies that optimize both the financial and environmental sustainability of the operations of the MRF and Transfer Station. This effort will include the development of documents and other materials to support the procurement of a new long-term operator. It would be difficult, and add more cost to expedite this work. The conclusion of CB&I’s final report is anticipated in April 2017, and this will be utilized in the long-term procurement at that time.

**Question:** Does the \$588K cost estimate assume the end date of January 2017 referenced in the cover memo? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Yes.

**PH-1/B-1 – An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Zoning), Rezoning of 53.61 Acres from TWP (Township District) to R4A (Multiple – Family Dwelling District), Woodbury Club Apartments, Southeast Corner of Nixon Road and M-14 (CPC Recommendation: Approval – 7 Yeas and 1 Nay) (Ordinance No. ORD-15-13) (8 Votes Required)**

**Question:** How can you make sense of R4A multi-family zoning for a parcel designated in the PROS plan as park?

(Councilmember Kailasapathy)

**Response:** The PROS Plan does not designate the Woodbury Club parcel as a park. This section of the plan recommends a linkage between parks along Traver Creek and Oakwoods and Sugarbush parks. The petitioner is providing a public access easement through the built portion of the site to land on the east side of the site proposed as parkland which is consistent with the recommendation of the PROS Plan. The site plan and zoning are being reviewed as a single development site. Once the City acquires the eastern portion of the site as parkland, the City will initiate the rezoning of the site to PL (Public Land). This process is consistent with previous park acquisitions and dedications. The Future Land Use Element of the City’s Master Plan recommends

residential uses for this property at a gross density of up to 10 dwelling units per acre, which is consistent with the R4A District.

**Question:** The Development Agreement (P-17) states that the developer can't request certificates of occupancy until October 30, 2017, but it also includes the language "after the reconstruction of the intersection is substantially complete". What if (for whatever reason) the intersection reconstruction is not 'substantially complete' on October 30, 2017 – is the city still obligated to issue the certificates of occupancy at that time? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Yes. The City is obligated by the Nixon Farm Traffic Mitigation Agreement to complete the intersection on, or before, January 1, 2018, except for the occurrence of something beyond the City's control. The City plans to construct the intersection improvements in the 2017 construction season, so it is expected that most of the work will be completed by October, 2017.

**Question:** Also regarding timing of occupancy certificates, a response to a Q for the January 19, 2016 meeting stated that "The city's CIP has the intersection improvement scheduled for 2018 and the Developer has agreed not to request certificates of occupancy until the end of that construction season." That would be the fall of 2018, not the fall of 2017 – what am I missing or has something changed? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The reconstruction of the Nixon/Green/Dhu Varren intersection was moved to 2017 to align with construction of the Nixon Farms developments. Construction is expected to begin in spring of 2017 and is scheduled to be completed by the end of the year.

**Question:** In response to another question at the January 16, 2016 meeting, it was indicated that the project conforms to the old WCWRC rules, but not the new WCWRC rules. Presumably, that's permitted because the project proposal commenced prior to the new rules, but given the lengthy delays in this project, shouldn't the new rules be applied? Is there a time limit on how long a project can be delayed before the new rules kick in or could this go on indefinitely? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** In accordance with Chapter 63, 5:655(1) of City Code, the review authority for the Woodbury Club proposal was that of the Washtenaw County Water Resources Commissioner (WCWRC). Decisions on which set of rules are to be followed by the Woodbury Club proposal are made by the WCWRC. According to the WCWRC, extensions are fairly typical, especially if the project has remained active with the other units of government and the site design has not significantly changed. In the case of the Woodbury Club proposal, the WCWRC would anticipate continuing to grant extensions, if needed, as long as the site design is not significantly modified.

**Question:** In the last resolved clause of the proposed amended resolution, condition 4) states that “the two parcels are combined or the eastern parcel is acquired by the City.” Is approval of the site plan contingent on the developer selling the 25.67 acres for \$277,000 to the City or not? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Site plan approval is contingent on the developer either combining the two parcels or selling the east parcel to the City as parkland. The developer could choose to combine the two parcels and be compliant with the approval without sale of the east parcel.

**Question:** It’s my understanding that with the current site plan proposal there is no bus turnaround area and as a result, no public transit serving the development north of Nixon/DhuVarren. I also understand AAATA has indicated they would need to study the possibility of a turnaround and that the current 5-year improvement plan does not include service to the area. Can you please confirm if that’s correct and if so, given our priority on access to mass transit, why wasn’t this raised as an issue earlier and resolved with the developer and AAATA? Also, can staff please comment on whether it believes it would be worthwhile to postpone approval to work through this new issue? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** City Staff provided AAATA with a copy of the proposed site plan for review. AAATA did not request a turnaround area for the Woodbury Club site plan. Bus turnaround areas are not a site plan requirement. Existing AAATA bus routes are located near the Nixon/Green/Dhu Varren intersection (approximately ¼ mile south of the site). Public sidewalks will be provided to the bus stops. AAATA staff recently met with neighborhood representatives and provided City Staff an email clarifying its position on the Woodbury Club Site Plan. The email indicated that, “AAATA has no position relative to the approval of the Woodbury development. AAATA reviews site plans as part of the City’s planning process, and would have communicated with City Planning staff at that time if we had comments about the proposal. AAATA has no plans to extend service on Nixon Rd., north of Dhu Varren, and so our review of the site plan was limited to insuring that there would be pedestrian access to the closest current AAATA routes near the intersection of Nixon at Green and Dhu Varren.” Staff does not support a postponement to allow AAATA to evaluate a new bus turnaround at the Woodbury Club property. AAATA conducted their review and did not request one.

**Question:** The cover memo mentions that paragraph P-7 has been revised to clarify that the developer is exempt from special assessments for the intersection. Was that included in the Nixon Farms development agreements as well and is there any time limit to the exclusion? Also, while the language in P-7 seems to say that the developer agrees to be included in any other improvements to Nixon Rd. can you please confirm that’s the case? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The Nixon Farm development agreements include an exception for special assessments related to intersection improvements, and reference the separate Traffic Mitigation Agreement that discusses those intersection-specific improvements. There is not a time limit to the exclusion. All agreements reference the potential for future

special assessments related to additional improvements to the roads adjacent to their respective sites.

**Question:** We had been informed awhile back that there may be a federal grant for the Nixon/Green/Dhu Varren intersection improvement that would reduce the city share of the project cost from \$1 million to \$250,000. What is the status of the grant and is the total cost assumption still \$2M? Also, if that grant is received, is there anything precluding using the \$750,000 for other Nixon Corridor Traffic Study recommendations? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The City was able to apply for CMAQ grants after an additional grant cycle was added prior to the commencement of the project. The City was recently notified of the award of FY17 CMAQ funding for the project, making the funding breakdown for the project as follows:

Developer Contribution:	\$1,025,000
CMAQ Grant:	\$783,000
City Share:	\$245,000

The final estimate for the cost of the intersection project has not yet been determined; therefore, the current estimate of approximately \$2.05 million is still the most current. Any money that was budgeted for the intersection project that is not used due to the grant will return to the Street Millage fund balance for use on other projects. The recommendations from the Nixon Road Corridor Study have not yet been determined, and thus there is no cost estimate at this time for budgeting purposes. Once the recommendations are made, a project will be created for prioritization in the CIP planning process.

**Question:** It is also my understanding that AAPS has discontinued bus service in this area. Given the large number of new residences (Nixon Farms and Woodbury Club) and the fact that restored school bus service could reduce traffic in peak AM hours, has AAPS been contacted about the possibility to restore service? If not, does staff believe reaching out to AAPS would make sense? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** AAPS continues to provide bus service to the area. The AAPS website, which was updated on August 26, 2016, provides a list of bus routes to the area for Logan, Clague, and Huron. Bus AA76 for Logan provides stops at Birchwood Dr. at Foxway Dr and Dhu Varren Rd at S. Foxridge Ct. Three bus routes provide service to the area for Clague Middle School (AA35, AA76, and AA98) with 4 stops in the area: Green Rd at Kilburn Park Circle, Green Rd at Windwood Dr., Dhu Varren Rd at S. Foxridge Ct, and Birchwood Dr. at Foxway Dr. Route AA34 provides a bus stop at Clague School for students going to Huron High. AAPS can modify routes based on where new neighborhoods are established.



**Question:** A resident has also raised questions about ADA compliance and accessibility for those with disabilities. Can staff please confirm there are no ADA compliance or accessibility issues associated with the site plan as proposed, but if there are, please provide detail on the issues/concerns and how they are addressed?  
(Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** ADA compliance internal to the site is the responsibility of the developer. When the public sidewalk adjacent to Nixon Road is designed and submitted for construction approval/permitting, staff will ensure it meets City and ADA requirements for accessible sidewalks. As to the interior of the site, there is a note on the site plan that indicates “all internal sidewalks will be a minimum of 5’ wide and meet ADA standards.”

### **C-1 – An Ordinance to Add a New Chapter 72, Idling Reduction, to Title VI and to Amend Section 1:17 of Chapter 1 of Title 1 of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor**

**Question:** The accompanying memo mentions that the City already has a policy that prohibits unnecessary idling of all vehicles in the City’s fleet and that UM Plant Operations have idling guidelines. Are these policies being adhered to and how do we know? Also, are City and UM vehicles considered Commercial Vehicles?  
(Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** City policies are typically adhered to, although we occasionally hear from the public about idling city vehicles. Public Works has been working with staff to limit unnecessary idling. Staff will examine and determine whether or not City and/or UM vehicles are considered Commercial vehicles by Second Reading.

**Question:** The ordinance restricts idling in designated “no idling” zones, but does not list where those would be – only that they will be “designated by the Administrator”. Please provide a list of the “no idling” zones that have been identified or are being considered and if that’s not available, please elaborate on what’s envisioned as criteria for the “no idling” zones. (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** A list of “no idling zones” has not been developed. It is anticipated that this list will be developed if the ordinance is enacted and would include loading areas and other areas of high commercial vehicle activity (e.g., Hands On Museum).

**Question:** It has been mentioned that school zones could be “no idling” zones. Assuming that’s still a possibility, has the AAPS taken an official position on this proposed ordinance? And if not, has it been reviewed with AAPS and are we planning to solicit their input/feedback? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The AAPS has not taken an official position on the ordinance. The AAPS will be engaged as the no idling zones are developed.

**Question:** The accompanying memo indicates the costs to implement include (1) signage at designated no-idling zones (2) outreach to residents and fleets (3) additional outreach to in areas where idling is both prevalent and problematic (e.g. elementary schools and downtown loading areas). What is the rough estimate of the costs (and staff time) for each? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The cost for signage is approximately \$40/sign. No cost estimate has been developed for staff time for implementation, outreach, or enforcement.

**Question:** Section 1:17 of the ordinance includes a long list of city employees who would be authorized to issue citations for violations. Is there any precedent in the City for such a broad range of employees being authorized to issue citations? Will training be provided? What criterion was used in developing this list of authorized citation issuers? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The only changes to enforcement powers are contained in section 1:17(3)(b). Apart from the police, only Police Service Specialists and Community Standards Officers are authorized to enforce the new Chapter 72 Idling Reduction Ordinance.

**Question:** The accompanying memo states that idling reduction laws have been passed at the local, county, and state, levels. Can you please provide a list of those who have laws similar to what Ann Arbor is considering with this ordinance? Also, the memo lists a couple Michigan cities that “appear” to limit idling – can you please clarify that as well? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The link in footnote 8 of the memo provides a list of idling laws nationwide: [http://www.atri-online.org/research/idling/ATRI\\_Idling\\_Compndium.pdf](http://www.atri-online.org/research/idling/ATRI_Idling_Compndium.pdf) The Michigan cities listed all limit idling in some fashion, however some do not contain purpose statements, so we cannot state with certainty that all of them limit idling for air quality/health reasons as opposed to noise concerns, for example.

**Question:** Section 6:505 states that the minimum fine for each violation is \$100, but there’s no maximum identified. Isn’t it more typical to list the maximum fine amount rather than leave it open-ended? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** A maximum fine can be added, if desired.

## **DB-2 – Resolution to Approve South Pond Village Site Plan and Development Agreement, 3850 East Huron River Drive (CPC Recommendation: Denial – 1 Year and 7 Days)**

**Question:** The cover memo indicates there are 16 properties on Chalmers that would be included in the special assessment if Chalmers is improved, but Attachment A to the

Sep. 1, 2016 Development Agreement lists 17 Chalmers addresses/parcels. Can you please reconcile the difference? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The cover memo that references 16 parcels did not include 2008 Chalmers, a City-owned parcel. Currently, there are 16 privately-owned parcels along the possible Chalmers improvement section. The City-owned parcel is considered a “City share non-recoverable parcel,” and would not be assessed in a special assessment. Including the City-owned parcel (the 17th parcel) would enable that parcel to be included should it ever be sold and become assessable.

**Question:** What is now proposed with regard to Chalmers improvements is 1) identify the impacted parcels 2) establish an equal special assessment for each impacted parcel 3) Ask the developer to pay a portion of the costs for some of the impacted parcels, but not all of them. Three questions on that process – first, is there any precedent for the City doing this (having a developer selectively pay for costs for some parcels, but not all of them once the assessment amounts are determined and are equal)? Second, is this selective paying for some parcels, but not all a recognized planning principle or best practice? Finally, is there any State law or guideline prohibiting selectively assisting some property owners, but not all property owners in a special assessment project where all the property owners benefit equally? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** A special assessment district and the apportionment of the assessments for each district is not set by the assessor until the time of the special assessment. All current calculations are based on a projected assessment amount and district which is subject to change. Any special assessment must reflect a reasoned approach to assigning cost based on benefit. Depending on the type of project and area, this could likely be accomplished from numerous approaches (e.g. a per parcel assessment, a frontage-based assessment). The payment arrangement was specifically requested by Council and is not based on best practices or any recognized planning principle, and staff is not aware of the City doing this in the past. The City will be following its normal assessment procedures consistent with state law. Once the assessment is made, the City will use the funds provided to credit the accounts of the identified parcels consistent with the terms of the agreement.

**Question:** Since MDOT has jurisdiction over Washtenaw, can staff please check with MDOT to see if they have any traffic data on the Chalmers/Washtenaw intersection? If so, can that please be provided to Council? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Attached is traffic count data from MDOT and SEMCOG that staff was able to locate.

**Question:** In terms of having two access points for fire emergencies (International Fire Code standard), can staff please explain how they have concluded the Woodcreek Boulevard access meets that requirement when both sides of the Boulevard (whether incoming or outgoing from Woodcreek) lead to one intersection at Woodcreek and Chalmers? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Each side of the boulevard entrance at Chalmers Drive has a width sufficient to accommodate two-way traffic in the event an emergency occurs on either side of the boulevard meeting the intent of IFC.

**DB-4 – Resolution to Approve Participation Agreement with Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation for the Purchase of the John R. Pringle and Beverly S. Mitchell Property in Scio Township, and Appropriate Funds, Not To Exceed \$258,000.00 from the Open Space and Parkland Preservation Millage Proceeds (8 Votes Required)**

**Question:** With the County taking the lead on this Greenbelt purchase of development rights, does that mean the County is paying for the due diligence costs and the endowment related to this PDR (costs the Greenbelt typically absorbs) and that the total city cost is the \$258K? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Yes, the City’s contribution is completely allocated to the purchase price for the property. All due diligence and closing costs are the responsibility of Washtenaw County as purchaser. The City will be participating in the purchase of the fee title to this property, not the development rights.

**MDOT - Bureau of Transportation Planning**  
**Annual Average Daily Traffic Report**

**Selection Criteria:** Year between 2010 and 2016, CS#= 81072, CS MP between 3.537 and 3.812

<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Section #</b>	<b>CS #</b>	<b>BMP</b>	<b>EMP</b>	<b>AADT</b>	<b>CAADT</b>	<b>DHV%</b>	<b>DF</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Class</b>
<b>Year</b> 2010											
<b>Route</b> BR - 94											
HURON PARKWAY	JCT US-23	6061	81072	3.54	4.18	42780	396	8.0	58	Y	
<b>Year</b> 2011											
<b>Route</b> BR - 94											
HURON PARKWAY	JCT US-23	6061	81072	3.54	4.18	41924	389	8.0	58		
<b>Year</b> 2012											
<b>Route</b> BR - 94											
HURON PARKWAY	JCT US-23	6061	81072	3.54	4.18	42637	394	9.0	58		
<b>Year</b> 2013											
<b>Route</b> BR - 94											
HURON PARKWAY	JCT US-23	6061	81072	3.54	4.18	36324	403	9.0	58	Y	
<b>Year</b> 2014											
<b>Route</b> BR - 94											
HURON PARKWAY	JCT US-23	6061	81072	3.54	4.18	37196	557	9.0	58		
<b>Year</b> 2015											
<b>Route</b> BR - 94											
HURON PARKWAY	JCT US-23	6061	81072	3.54	4.18	38386	566	9.0	58		

**MDOT - Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Hourly Count Report**

<b>County</b>	Washtenaw	<b>Station</b>	1688	<b>CS #</b>	81072	<b>CS MP</b>	3.58
<b>Route Desc</b>	I-94BL WASHTENAW	<b>PR #</b>	1427706	<b>PR MP</b>	2.81		
<b>Station Desc</b>	100 FEET SOUTHEAST OF HURON PKWY.			<b>City</b>	ANN ARBOR		
<b>Direction</b>	South-East	<b>Year</b>	2010				

0100	0200	0300	0400	0500	0600	0700	0800	0900	1000	1100	1200	1300	1400	1500	1600	1700	1800	1900	2000	2100	2200	2300	2400	24 Hour Total	Day
<b>06/15/2010 Tuesday</b>																									
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1286	1543	1326	1487	1549	1528	1492	1381	1103	965	680	452	377	<b>20399</b>	15169
<b>AM High</b>		<b>1286</b>		<b>AM High Hour</b>				<b>12:00</b>				<b>PM High</b>		<b>1549</b>		<b>PM High Hour</b>				<b>16:00</b>					
<b>06/16/2010 Wednesday</b>																									
269	187	119	74	57	131	370	899	1019	975	1130	1285	1498	1376	1502	1557	1445	1531	1347	1128	998	710	509	366	<b>20453</b>	20482
<b>AM High</b>		<b>1285</b>		<b>AM High Hour</b>				<b>12:00</b>				<b>PM High</b>		<b>1557</b>		<b>PM High Hour</b>				<b>16:00</b>					
<b>06/17/2010 Thursday</b>																									
254	164	139	76	65	138	361	951	1046	908	1099	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	5201
<b>AM High</b>		<b>1099</b>		<b>AM High Hour</b>				<b>11:00</b>				<b>PM High</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>PM High Hour</b>									

**MDOT - Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Hourly Count Report**

<b>County</b>	Washtenaw	<b>Station</b>	1688	<b>CS #</b>	81072	<b>CS MP</b>	3.58
<b>Route Desc</b>	I-94BL WASHTENAW	<b>PR #</b>	0	<b>PR MP</b>	0.00		
<b>Station Desc</b>	100 FEET SOUTHEAST OF HURON PKWY.			<b>City</b>	ANN ARBOR		
<b>Direction</b>	North-West	<b>Year</b>	2010				

0100	0200	0300	0400	0500	0600	0700	0800	0900	1000	1100	1200	1300	1400	1500	1600	1700	1800	1900	2000	2100	2200	2300	2400	24 Hour Total	Day
<b>06/15/2010 Tuesday</b>																									
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1811	1833	1866	2023	1762	1687	1852	1823	1287	1284	838	659	320	<b>28760</b>	19045
<b>AM High</b>		<b>1811</b>	<b>AM High Hour</b>				<b>12:00</b>	<b>PM High</b>				<b>2023</b>	<b>PM High Hour</b>				<b>15:00</b>								
<b>06/16/2010 Wednesday</b>																									
189	135	70	84	115	497	1352	2023	2085	1656	1509	1658	1787	1808	1926	1745	1698	1698	1709	1292	1101	898	651	372	<b>27474</b>	28058
<b>AM High</b>		<b>2085</b>	<b>AM High Hour</b>				<b>09:00</b>	<b>PM High</b>				<b>1926</b>	<b>PM High Hour</b>				<b>15:00</b>								
<b>06/17/2010 Thursday</b>																									
173	135	82	84	104	464	1297	1943	1874	1446	1529	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	9131
<b>AM High</b>		<b>1943</b>	<b>AM High Hour</b>				<b>08:00</b>	<b>PM High</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>PM High Hour</b>												

**MDOT - Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Hourly Count Report**

09/06/2016  
Page 3 of 6

<b>County</b>	Washtenaw	<b>Station</b>	1688	<b>CS #</b>	81072	<b>CS MP</b>	3.58
<b>Route Desc</b>	I-94BL WASHTENAW	<b>PR #</b>	1427706	<b>PR MP</b>	2.81		
<b>Station Desc</b>	100 FEET SOUTHEAST OF HURON PKWY.			<b>City</b>	ANN ARBOR		
<b>Direction</b>	South-East	<b>Year</b>	2013				

0100	0200	0300	0400	0500	0600	0700	0800	0900	1000	1100	1200	1300	1400	1500	1600	1700	1800	1900	2000	2100	2200	2300	2400	24 Hour Total	Day
<b>06/11/2013 Tuesday</b>																									
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	876	1008	1177	1399	1321	1382	1555	1573	1592	1379	1102	953	757	519	362	<b>20194</b>	16955
<b>AM High</b>		<b>1177</b>		<b>AM High Hour</b>				<b>12:00</b>		<b>PM High</b>			<b>1592</b>		<b>PM High Hour</b>				<b>18:00</b>						
<b>06/12/2013 Wednesday</b>																									
273	169	134	87	78	138	379	887	1094	886	155	1157	1411	1300	1385	1539	1587	1599	1355	1114	966	767	534	361	<b>19346</b>	19355
<b>AM High</b>		<b>1157</b>		<b>AM High Hour</b>				<b>12:00</b>		<b>PM High</b>			<b>1599</b>		<b>PM High Hour</b>				<b>18:00</b>						
<b>06/13/2013 Thursday</b>																									
260	155	122	83	81	144	388	891	1106	894	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>1041</b>	4271
<b>AM High</b>		<b>1106</b>		<b>AM High Hour</b>				<b>09:00</b>		<b>PM High</b>			<b>0</b>		<b>PM High Hour</b>										



**MDOT - Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Hourly Count Report**

09/06/2016  
Page 4 of 6

<b>County</b>	Washtenaw	<b>Station</b>	1688	<b>CS #</b>	81072	<b>CS MP</b>	3.58
<b>Route Desc</b>	I-94BL WASHTENAW	<b>PR #</b>	0	<b>PR MP</b>	0.00		
<b>Station Desc</b>	100 FEET SOUTHEAST OF HURON PKWY.			<b>City</b>	ANN ARBOR		
<b>Direction</b>	North-West	<b>Year</b>	2013				

0100	0200	0300	0400	0500	0600	0700	0800	0900	1000	1100	1200	1300	1400	1500	1600	1700	1800	1900	2000	2100	2200	2300	2400	24 Hour Total	Day
<b>06/11/2013 Tuesday</b>																									
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1340	1219	1340	1531	1474	1437	1548	1445	1619	1302	1117	1013	627	412	307	<b>22810</b>	17731
<b>AM High</b>		<b>1340</b>	<b>AM High Hour</b>				<b>10:00</b>	<b>PM High</b>				<b>1619</b>	<b>PM High Hour</b>				<b>18:00</b>								
<b>06/12/2013 Wednesday</b>																									
165	82	86	81	101	388	1076	1506	1594	1287	130	1354	1539	1482	1429	1555	1456	1628	1299	1127	1005	626	408	301	<b>21718</b>	21705
<b>AM High</b>		<b>1594</b>	<b>AM High Hour</b>				<b>09:00</b>	<b>PM High</b>				<b>1628</b>	<b>PM High Hour</b>				<b>18:00</b>								
<b>06/13/2013 Thursday</b>																									
176	85	81	86	99	394	1059	1522	1590	1276	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>1399</b>	6491
<b>AM High</b>		<b>1590</b>	<b>AM High Hour</b>				<b>09:00</b>	<b>PM High</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>PM High Hour</b>												

**MDOT - Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Hourly Count Report**

<b>County</b>	Washtenaw	<b>Station</b>	1688	<b>CS #</b>	81072	<b>CS MP</b>	3.58
<b>Route Desc</b>	I-94BL WASHTENAW	<b>PR #</b>	1427706	<b>PR MP</b>	2.81		
<b>Station Desc</b>	100 FEET SOUTHEAST OF HURON PKWY.			<b>City</b>	ANN ARBOR		
<b>Direction</b>	South-East	<b>Year</b>	2016				

0100	0200	0300	0400	0500	0600	0700	0800	0900	1000	1100	1200	1300	1400	1500	1600	1700	1800	1900	2000	2100	2200	2300	2400	24 Hour Total	Day	
<b>05/09/2016 Monday</b>																										
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1264	1461	1344	1489	1693	1651	1699	1485	1230	943	692	529	374	<b>21189</b>	15854	
<b>AM High</b>		<b>1264</b>		<b>AM High Hour</b>				<b>12:00</b>				<b>PM High</b>		<b>1699</b>		<b>PM High Hour</b>				<b>18:00</b>						
<b>05/10/2016 Tuesday</b>																										
244	138	106	59	58	143	421	999	1128	960	1079	1240	1447	1407	1438	1675	1672	1760	1422	1086	904	759	524	355	<b>20989</b>	21024	
<b>AM High</b>		<b>1240</b>		<b>AM High Hour</b>				<b>12:00</b>				<b>PM High</b>		<b>1760</b>		<b>PM High Hour</b>				<b>18:00</b>						
<b>05/11/2016 Wednesday</b>																										
246	145	94	71	73	153	442	962	1172	976	966	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	5300	
<b>AM High</b>		<b>1172</b>		<b>AM High Hour</b>				<b>09:00</b>				<b>PM High</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>PM High Hour</b>										

**MDOT - Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Hourly Count Report**

09/06/2016  
Page 6 of 6

<b>County</b>	Washtenaw	<b>Station</b>	1688	<b>CS #</b>	81072	<b>CS MP</b>	3.58
<b>Route Desc</b>	I-94BL WASHTENAW	<b>PR #</b>	0	<b>PR MP</b>	0.00		
<b>Station Desc</b>	100 FEET SOUTHEAST OF HURON PKWY.			<b>City</b>	ANN ARBOR		
<b>Direction</b>	North-West	<b>Year</b>	2016				

0100	0200	0300	0400	0500	0600	0700	0800	0900	1000	1100	1200	1300	1400	1500	1600	1700	1800	1900	2000	2100	2200	2300	2400	24 Hour Total	Day	
<b>05/09/2016 Monday</b>																										
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1319	1493	1445	1414	1467	1408	1308	1310	1077	908	632	535	315		<b>22369</b>	14631
<b>AM High 1319</b>			<b>AM High Hour 12:00</b>				<b>PM High 1493</b>			<b>PM High Hour 13:00</b>																
<b>05/10/2016 Tuesday</b>																										
156	74	60	82	103	436	952	1586	1747	1345	1197	1324	1394	1421	1389	1513	1250	1414	1338	986	802	629	422	288		<b>22046</b>	21908
<b>AM High 1747</b>			<b>AM High Hour 09:00</b>				<b>PM High 1513</b>			<b>PM High Hour 16:00</b>																
<b>05/11/2016 Wednesday</b>																										
154	102	42	98	97	468	1016	1652	1730	1343	1174	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	7876
<b>AM High 1730</b>			<b>AM High Hour 09:00</b>				<b>PM High 0</b>			<b>PM High Hour</b>																

ROADNAME	DIRECTION	LIMITS	COMMUNITY	YEAR	AADT
Washtenaw	WB	East Of Huron Pkwy	Ann Arbor	2002	20 422
Washtenaw	SEB	100 Feet Southeast Of Huron Pkwy.	Ann Arbor	2010	19 042
Washtenaw	EB	East Of Huron Pkwy	Ann Arbor	2002	18 160
Washtenaw	NWB	100 Feet Southeast Of Huron Pkwy.	Ann Arbor	2010	26 169

Source: <http://semcog.org/traffic-counts>, 6-SEP-2016