

2023-2027 Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan

Public Comments and Changes

Section	Received From	Comment Received	Change Made
SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System	Darren McKinnon, dgmckinnon@gmail.com	Hunt Park has "Softball/Baseball" listed as an amenity. After a recent drainage project, the area is too wet for this sport. In addition, the backstop is in bad shape - consider removing this as an amenity for the park. Address drainage issue as a potential project for Hunt Park.	Added investigation of drainage problem at Hunt Park to Needs Assessment in SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN.
SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment	Terry Karnatz, Tkarnatz@med.umich.edu	Add Horseshoe Pits to Pilgrim Park and others	Added request for horse shoe pits to list of Email Comments received in SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN.
General	John Mirsky johnmirsky@gmail.com	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Consider including a list or table of the top opportunities, challenges, goals and issues in the executive summary. •Consider providing an overall cost for the future renovation/replacement of park infrastructure that is needed. •Given 1/3 of Greenbelt Program and millage funding must be allocated to new parkland acquisitions in the city and the population of the city is growing, park operations and demands on services will continue to grow and thereby likely exacerbate the current 'scissor effect" between needed and available resources and its negative impacts. •Address issues presented by the railroad, including both physical and visual access being cut off. This is a huge impediment. •Consider ways to better control the spread of invasive species. •There is a lack of downtown park areas. However, the Center of City is a poor site for many recreational activities because of the huge expanses of concrete and how it is cut up by stairwells, elevators, vehicle ramps, etc. •Consider creating a Riverfront Conservancy that would combine public and private interests and resources to collaboratively envision, implement improvements to, manage and maintain the riverfront area, including its natural features and parks, much like other conservancies across the county, including in Detroit, have done. •The concept of expanding the Treeline Trail into an expanded multi-modal Loop Trail with links to nearly all major arteries into / out of A2, most major employment centers and (close) to many parks should also be considered •Park metrics could be improved. 	Added comment summary to list of Email Comments received in SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN.

SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment and SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN.	Daniel Adams danielnicholasadams@gmail.com	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Page 92 of the document states that, on a recent parks survey, "[t]here was also low support for developing a new downtown park at the 'Center of the City' site which includes Liberty Plaza and the parking lot site known as the "library lot." This is, I believe, an accurate characterization of the survey result and an accurate reflection of public sentiment in Ann Arbor with respect to creating a new public park/plaza on that site. •With that in mind, I would suggest revisions to subpart F on page 133 that discusses the needs of "Neighborhood Parks and Urban Plazas" to make the following objectives more explicit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -That resource investments to downtown parks and urban plazas should be prioritized to established parks/plaza like Liberty Plaza. -That the Center of the City is a poor candidate for resource investments until such time as an established park/plaza is created on the site. -That there is poor public support, as measured by the recent survey, for making resource investments in Library Lot at this time. 	Added comment summary to list of Email Comments received in SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN.
SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System	Victoria Green <vkaygreen@gmail.com>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The maps show Rose White Park rather than Graydon Park 2. The park listing has a Rose White Park AND a Graydon Park. I believe the listing for Graydon Park is actually Rose Park (2+ acres) and the listing for Rose White Park is for Graydon Park (1+ acre). 	Updated labels to reflect proper park names
General	Robert Parrish <rbtnparrish@comcast.net>	Request that the Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation Department Pros Plan include compliance with the IDA's intelligent outdoor lighting principles in the PROS Plan to show support for the health of the environment and for the protection of Michigan's natural beauty.	Comments were added to list of Email Comments received in SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN. An objective was added to Goal 5 to "Implement the International Dark Sky Association lighting principles where feasible, to minimize the ecological impact of lighting."
General	Anne Marsan <amarsan@umich.edu> Park Advisory Commissioner	Consider a 1 page summary of the parks system with some basic facts about it summarized. This could include the number of total acres of parkland, and the percentage of the acreage that is natural area. Seeing a count of the number of playgrounds, basketball courts, tennis courts, and pickleball courts in the summary would also be helpful.	Added metrics to introduction
General	Chris Grant <cgrantaa@yahoo.com>	West Park bandshell is a landmark and the events are hugely popular to people like him. Hope that it can be saved for the future. Also, likes mention of additional seating in parks for the elderly.	Comments were added to list of Email Comments received in SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN.
Introduction	Nan Plummer <nplummer@thetreeline.org>	Formatting issue	Formatting issue was resolved

<p>General</p>	<p>Daniel Rubenstein <dan.rubenstein@chinaint.net></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The description of The Central Area exaggerates how well it is served by parks today. •The city charter indicates that the Center of the City is an urban park and therefore should be part of the City's Park inventory. •Park metrics are inconsistent with population and acreage data listed in the report. Acquisition methods do not include a mention of City Charter amendment by ballot. •The library lot is still zoned as "Downtown Core" instead of "Public Land" as is typical for all other city-owned parks. •Developer contribution formula could be re-evaluated to reflect different conditions in the Downtown and other areas of the City. •Statements summarizing the outcome of the PROS Plan survey may not reflect broader community support and other public input from different plans should be incorporated as well. •The demographic discussion should also mention that data was not collected on which planning area respondents resided in. •The area referred to as the "Library Lot" should not be described as a parking lot but instead as a "public park and commons" per the City Charter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Comments were added to list of Email Comments received in SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN. •Census data was provided by planning area, even though "planning areas" are no longer the method that the City is using for planning as of the 2009 Land Use Element plan. •The Center of the City was added to all relevant park maps and clarifying language was added to SECTION IV: INVENTORY OF THE PARK, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE SYSTEM in section G. Other Agency Open Space Inventory as well as under the History of the Parks and Recreation System under SECTION I: COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION
<p>General</p>	<p>Kitty B. Kahn <kittybkahn@gmail.com></p>	<p>The Center of the City should be designated as a city park and included in the city's PROS Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Comments were added to list of Email Comments received in SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN. •The Center of the City was added to all relevant park maps and clarifying language was added to SECTION IV: INVENTORY OF THE PARK, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE SYSTEM in section G. Other Agency Open Space Inventory as well as under the History of the Parks and Recreation System under SECTION I: COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION
<p>General</p>	<p>Anton Reznicek <reznicek@umich.edu></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There is no mention of deer population impacts on natural areas and their management in the plan and it should be included, along with solutions explored. •Consider opportunities to plant trees to provide shade, shelter, and respite along park pathways. •Parks should consider climate change's impact on the resilience of plant communities as well as increased usage and more people in parks. •MDOT is studying the Barton Drive/Whitmore Lake Rd M-14 interchange at the river, and I see in the news that the City is interested in taking over the MDOT Business 23 Corridor. Ann Arbor should be proactive in working with MDOT to make sure that access and connectivity to Parks is improved, valuable habitats are protected, and parkland is dedicated to the city, etc. 	<p>Comments were added to list of Email Comments received in SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN.</p>

General	Jeff Crockett <jeffcrockett8@gmail.com>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There is no current data breaking down acreage parkland/1000 across different areas in the city, and the ratio of parkland/acres for the Central area is 4.53, quite a discrepancy from the city ratio of 18.52. Noting this wide discrepancy becomes a strong argument for adding park acreage at the Center of the City. •The boundaries of the Center of the City as delineated in Prop A should be included on the Central Planning Area map. •Specify that the Council of the Commons is carrying out the mandate of the city charter amendment, Proposition A, passed by the citizens of Ann Arbor in November 2018. •Delete the paragraph that refers to low support for developing a new downtown park at the Center of the City, as only about 30% of the respondents were “unsupportive” and the survey results may be an indication that respondents are unaware of what’s possible at this site. •List who and how many people participated in the Downtown Focus Group. •The Center of the City should be listed under the urban plaza section of the Park Inventory. •The text relating to Development Contributions within the Urban Core omits a vision for an urban plaza, and the Center of the City should be mentioned in this section. •In Section VIII: Major Park And Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment, there are no references for open spaces and urban plazas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Comments were added to list of Email Comments received in SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN. •Census data was provided by planning area, even though “planning areas” are no longer the method that the City is using for planning as of the 2009 Land Use Element plan. •The Center of the City was added to all relevant park maps and clarifying language was added to SECTION IV: INVENTORY OF THE PARK, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE SYSTEM in section G. Other Agency Open Space Inventory as well as under the History of the Parks and Recreation System under SECTION I: COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION
General	Sally Oey <msoey@umich.edu>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Consider adding an objective to Goal 1 to implement dark-sky principles to enhance safety, user experience, and minimize ecological impact. •Consider adding an objective to Goal 5 to implement dark-sky principles in stewardship activities •Consider adding language that newly acquired natural areas should have resources dedicated to the implementation of dark-sky practices to encourage prompt removal of non-compliant existing lighting. •Consider adding language to the needs assessment for park roads that lighting also need to be updated to meet dark-sky specifications. 	Comments were added to list of Email Comments received in SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN. An objective was added to Goal 5 to "Implement the International Dark Sky Association lighting principles where feasible, to minimize the ecological impact of lighting."
General	Borgsdorf Steve <Steve.Borgsdorf@us.bosch.com> , Park Advisory Commissioner and Council of the Commons Member	Various formatting, grammar, and spelling comments	Many of these comments were incorporated
General	Council of the Commons	Provided formal statement about the Center of the City from this Advisory body to City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Comments were added to list of Email Comments received in SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN. •Census data was provided by planning area, even though “planning areas” are no longer the method that the City is using for planning as of the 2009 Land Use Element plan. •The Center of the City was added to all relevant park maps and clarifying language was added to SECTION IV: INVENTORY OF THE PARK, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE SYSTEM in section G. Other Agency Open Space Inventory as well as under the History of the Parks and Recreation System under SECTION I: COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION

General	Alan Haber <megiddo@umich.edu> Council of the Commons Member	Various comments related to incorporating the Center of the City in the PROS Plan that generally follow the Council of the Commons statement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Census data was provided by planning area, even though “planning areas” are no longer the method that the City is using for planning as of the 2009 Land Use Element plan. •The Center of the City was added to all relevant park maps and clarifying language was added to SECTION IV: INVENTORY OF THE PARK, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE SYSTEM in section G. Other Agency Open Space Inventory as well as under the History of the Parks and Recreation System under SECTION I: COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION
General	Alice J. Ralph <ajralph@comcast.net> Council of the Commons Member	Various comments related to incorporating the Center of the City in the PROS Plan that generally follow the Council of the Commons statement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Census data was provided by planning area, even though “planning areas” are no longer the method that the City is using for planning as of the 2009 Land Use Element plan. •The Center of the City was added to all relevant park maps and clarifying language was added to SECTION IV: INVENTORY OF THE PARK, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE SYSTEM in section G. Other Agency Open Space Inventory as well as under the History of the Parks and Recreation System under SECTION I: COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION
General	Rita Mitchell <ritalmitchell@gmail.com> Council of the Commons Member	Various comments related to incorporating the Center of the City in the PROS Plan that generally follow the Council of the Commons statement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Census data was provided by planning area, even though “planning areas” are no longer the method that the City is using for planning as of the 2009 Land Use Element plan. •The Center of the City was added to all relevant park maps and clarifying language was added to SECTION IV: INVENTORY OF THE PARK, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE SYSTEM in section G. Other Agency Open Space Inventory as well as under the History of the Parks and Recreation System under SECTION I: COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION
General	Daniela Kister <daniela.kister@gmail.com>	The PROS Plan does not adequately represent the desire for additional dog exercise opportunities and there was no question relating to dog ownership in the online survey.	Added comment summary to list of Email Comments received in SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN.
General	Catherine Riseng <criseng@umich.edu>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Census table on page three shows the acreage of parkland per1,000 residents but does not show how that is distributed throughout the city by districts as past PROS plans have. •If the objective to "Collect and analyze data to ensure that access to parks, park facilities & amenities, and programming, is equitably distributed throughout the park system" is indeed being done, why not share it in the PROS plan so the public can see and assess? •I am very dissatisfied that even though voters showed strong support for a city center park, virtually nothing has been done to create such a park except by citizens. •Plans and programming for the Center of the City need to be considered in conjunction with the Downtown Park and Open Space Subcommittee report. Gaps in neighborhood park service (for residents that do not have a neighborhood park within one-quarter mile or where they need to cross a busy street) exist in several areas of the City and should be considered in the acquisition process. Certainly including a need for a central area park with all the new development should be a high priority. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Census data was provided by planning area, even though “planning areas” are no longer the method that the City is using for planning as of the 2009 Land Use Element plan. •The Center of the City was added to all relevant park maps and clarifying language was added to SECTION IV: INVENTORY OF THE PARK, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE SYSTEM in section G. Other Agency Open Space Inventory as well as under the History of the Parks and Recreation System under SECTION I: COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System and SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment	Pat Jessup <jessup@gmail.com>	The Sister Lakes Association has requested amenities at Dolph Park including a gathering space near the dock by First Sister Lake at the base of Lakeview, a neighborhood park in the Westover Hills neighborhood, an accessible and safe walk along Parklake, and the acquisition of the property at 3365 Jackson Rd in order to protect that area as part of Dolph Park. Section IV's list of park amenities in Dolph Park may not be accurate.	Added comment summary to list of Email Comments received in SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN.
General	Laurence O'Connell <lpoconnell12@gmail.com>m, Park Advisory Commissioner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Continue to invest in all the parks along the river, including fishing access points. •Look for ways to connect the Border to Border trail to economically diverse neighborhoods and consider reaching out to groups like CAN and Peace Neighborhood Center to assist. • Measure the usage of parks and activities, and invest most where usage justifies the investment. Also strongly support investing in natural greenspaces and historic areas. •Concern about how parks can coexist with unhoused population and the impact on urban parks. •Concern about enclosing farmers market. •Would like to encourage more outside groups to volunteer with parks. 	Added comment summary to list of Email Comments received in SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN.
SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment and SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN.	Larry Deck <ldeck1@aol.com> Huron Waterloo Pathways Initiative	<p>The four Huron River Greenway maps that were in the 2016 PROS plan are missing from the 2023 draft PROS plan and need to be added. These maps show important projects that have been planned for decades. Though some of these projects may not be feasible in the short term, many are feasible now and are vital to system connectivity.</p> <p>The link to the Border to Border Trail site on page 123 of the draft and the overview map on page 124 are not an adequate substitute. The portions of those maps showing Ann Arbor are incomplete and inaccurate and lack important long-planned trails, including Border to Border Trail segments where there are currently annoying and treacherous gaps in the trail.</p>	<p>Replaced the Border to Border map with two updated maps from Washtenaw County Parks & Recreation Commission showing the current status of the Border to Border Trail.</p> <p>Updated language under section I.f. to reflect language from Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation Commission to highlight current status of the Border to Border Trail, including desired connections and sections that are remaining to be designed and built.</p>
SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan			Made adjustments to language that described the results of the online survey with assistance from community engagement specialists
SECTION V: Land Use Planning & Acquisition			Removed references to the Preserve Washtenaw program because that doesn't exist anymore.
SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment and SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN.			Added section I.g. 10-Minute Walk Campaign information including a walk map that shows coverage of city-owned parkland within a 10-minute walk.
SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment and SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN.			Under section B.h. Veterans Memorial Park, added line item regarding the heavy use of the skatepark, and to consider finding additional opportunities for skating.
SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment and SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN.			Under section 2.I. Leslie Science and Nature Center, edited timeline for the solar panel project, and added the desire for a new convening pavillion and outdoor classroom.