

CITY OF ANN ARBOR



Parks & Recreation
CITY OF ANN ARBOR

PARKS & RECREATION OPEN SPACE PLAN



2016 – 2020



The City of Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan 2016-2020 contained herein was adopted by resolution of the Ann Arbor City Council on _____

ANN ARBOR CITY COUNCIL

Christopher Taylor, *Mayor*

Zachary Ackerman
Sabra Briere
Jack Eaton
Julie Grand
Sumi Kailasapathy
Graydon Krapohl
Jane Lumm
Chip Smith
Chuck Warpehoski
Kirk Westphal

Jacqueline Beaudry, *City Clerk*

The City of Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan 2016-2020 contained herein was adopted by resolution of the Ann Arbor Planning Commission on December 6, 2016

ANN ARBOR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Ken Clein, Chair Alex Milshteyn, Vice Chair

Sarah Mills, Secretary
Shannan Gibb-Randall
Julie Weatherbee
Scott Trudeau
Wendy Woods
Sabra Briere, City Council Representative

Sarah Mills, Secretary



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview of the Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan

The Parks and Recreation Open Space (PROS) Plan is the city's vision for parks and recreation in Ann Arbor and is officially part of the City of Ann Arbor Master Plan. The PROS Plan provides an overview of the park system, including a physical description of the city, administrative structure and budget information, and a detailed inventory of existing parks, facilities, and programs. It describes the relationship between the parks and recreation system and surrounding municipalities and recreation providers, identifies parks and recreation needs and deficiencies, and proposes major capital park projects for existing and new parks. The plan outlines the progress that has been made, as well as goals and objectives for future planning guided by input gathered through an extensive public process. It also establishes criteria to evaluate open space and natural features for optimum land use and potential parkland acquisition. The plan is updated every five years, as required by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources to be eligible for grants.

Summary of Chapters

Introduction

This section describes the relationship of the PROS Plan to the City Master Plan, and lists projects completed during the PROS Plan cycle from 2011 through 2016. Completed projects range from large new capital improvements, such as the Argo Cascades and the Ann Arbor Skatepark at Veterans Memorial Park, to projects aimed at preserving the infrastructure of the park system, such as replacing pool liners at Buhr and Fuller pools, reconstructing over a mile of the Border-to-Border Trail through Gallup Park, resurfacing tennis courts, renovating playgrounds, and repairing bridges.

Section I: Community Description

This section describes social and economic characteristics of the city, transportation planning initiatives, information about the built and natural environment, demographic data, and development characteristics by planning area. A short history of parks and recreation provides context for present and future planning, and shows the growth and development from a few parks to an extensive and complex park system.

Section II: Administrative Structure

This section explains the administration of parks and recreation and how the park system fits within the overall structure of the city. Organizational charts show the roles of staff within parks and recreation, as well as descriptions of the various boards and commissions, including the Park Advisory Commission and Recreation Advisory Commission, and those whose function is to support specific park amenities, such as the Public Market Advisory Commission. It also outlines input opportunities available to the public.

Section III: Budget and Funding

This section explains the budget process, detailing funding sources, revenues and expenditures, as well as the relationship between park millages and the General Fund. It explains, through charts and text, the percentages of funding that are utilized by each unit of the park system. The appendix contains detailed budget charts for fiscal year 2017.

Section IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

This section provides a complete inventory of the park system properties, recreation offerings, and park amenities. It also provides information about other recreation providers, such as the Washtenaw County Parks, Ann Arbor Public Schools and neighboring townships and cities. The inventory demonstrates the wealth of recreation opportunities available to residents and visitors. The extensive list of grants procured through the years highlights successful efforts to obtain additional funding, and the certifications and awards showcases award-winning parks and programs.

Section V: Land Use Planning and Acquisition

This section describes how parkland is acquired in the city as well as in the greenbelt. Information includes funding sources, a summary of land purchased, and the criteria used to evaluate land for potential acquisition. The criteria utilized by staff and the Land Acquisition Committee provides an explanation of how land is evaluated for potential acquisitions, such as method of acquisition, access, connectivity, potential operational costs, and if an area is underserved for parkland. This section also describes the various methods of acquiring land, including outright purchase, donation, or purchase of development rights. It explains parkland dedication requested of residential developers to offset the additional population, and how that request is calculated. A description of the Greenbelt Program is included, as well as how scoring criteria is used to rank applications for the program.

Section VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

This section provides in-depth details of the public process used for developing the PROS Plan. Public input for this plan relied heavily on electronic media, including a survey which garnered 1,034 responses. The survey asked questions pertaining to quality of the facilities, parks and programs, as well as maintenance and desired recreation amenities. A public meeting was held, as well as numerous focus groups including parks boards and commissions, the DDA, the Park Advisory Commission, Recreation Advisory Commission, and City Planning Commission.

Recreation supervisors and maintenance staff also provided input on infrastructure needs. Major issues that were heard in the input phase are summarized, and the focus groups, public meetings, and email responses are included and paraphrased. Additionally, task forces and study groups that met during the past few years on topics including dog parks, downtown parks and open space, the North Main/Huron River Corridor, and the Allen Creek Greenway are summarized. This input provides crucial information for future planning and helps staff to prioritize maintenance and capital improvements.

Section VII: Goals and Objectives

This section states the overriding goals for the park system, including rationale and objectives. This chapter was rewritten to reflect current city master plans and objectives for the city, including the Parks and Recreation Mission Statement and Core Values, the Sustainability Framework Plan, the city's Organizational Strategic Plan, and the Capital Improvement Plan. Five overriding goals, including provide exceptional user experience, ensure that the park system is comprehensive, inclusive and engaging, foster environmental stewardship and sustainability, provide a safe park system, and ensure financial health and stability, are followed by a series of objectives toward achieving the stated goals.

VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment

This section is a comprehensive listing of needs by recreation facility, community-wide parks, natural areas, and park amenity types, such as game courts and playgrounds, and provides a snapshot of what is needed to both maintain the existing infrastructure of the park system, as well as provide improvements to keep the system current and meet the needs and desires of the park patrons. The listing is gathered from input received from the public survey and meeting, as well as from maintenance staff and recreation facility supervisors. The list is a valuable resource guide for future renovation projects, provides justification for grant applications, and helps to prioritize capital improvements.

IX: Action Plan

The action plan explains how projects are prioritized for implementation. The process aligns with the city's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) process. The CIP is updated on an annual basis to reflect current needs and priorities. Staff from all areas of the city participates in the process, proposing and rating potential projects using criteria that reflects the values of the city, such as sustainability framework goals, master plan objectives, improving customer level of service and user experience, and addressing safety. For the park system, capital improvements are categorized to ensure that funding is distributed in a manner that addresses infrastructure needs as well as programming and citizen desires. Categories include recreation facilities, park roads and parking lots, trails and pathway repair and new construction, athletic field renovations, playground improvements, and tennis and basketball court renovations.



INTRODUCTION

The Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan and the City of Ann Arbor Master Plan

A master plan is an official document adopted by a local government to establish long-range, general policies for the physical development of the community. The City of Ann Arbor Master Plan is composed of six documents, or “elements,” that cover the city’s major geographical areas and its essential citywide facilities. These supporting documents provide a framework for preserving the city’s unique character, ensuring its diversity, supporting investment, and promoting desired change. The Master Plan elements and a description of each are provided below:

- ◆ **NATURAL FEATURES MASTER PLAN (2004)** – Provides a framework to guide the city and its citizens in their policy making and stewardship of natural features protection activities.
- ◆ **MASTER PLAN: LAND USE ELEMENT (2009)** – Provides information and guidance to residents, decision-makers, developers, and property owners about land use issues facing the city, including goals, objectives, action statements, and site-specific land use recommendations.
- ◆ **DOWNTOWN PLAN (2009)** – Sets goals, objectives, and land use recommendations for Ann Arbor’s downtown area, including the boundaries of the Downtown Development Authority (DDA). Updated as part of the Ann Arbor Discovering Downtown (A2D2) effort; a sub area of the master plan.
- ◆ **TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE (2009)** – Analyzes the opportunities and constraints for improving Ann Arbor’s major transportation corridors, such as Plymouth Road and Washtenaw Avenue, and provides design guidelines for aesthetic and transportation improvements.
- ◆ **PARKS AND RECREATION OPEN SPACE PLAN (2011)** – Provides a comprehensive inventory of Ann Arbor’s park and recreation facilities and presents issues, needs, and opportunities for the city’s park and recreation system.

- ◆ SUSTAINABILITY GOALS (2012) – Incorporates 16 [Sustainability Goals](#) into the City Master Plan.
- ◆ NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION PLAN (2014) – Outlines recommendations for improving non-motorized modes of travel in Ann Arbor.
- ◆ URBAN AND COMMUNITY FOREST MANAGEMENT PLAN (2014) – Provides a framework for the city to effectively manage the urban forest as a community asset, consistent with the values and needs of Ann Arbor residents.

Each of the city’s master plan elements has a significant relationship with the PROS Plan. Existing and future land use, transportation, and natural feature systems are essential components in assessing the parks and recreation needs and desires for any community.

Goals of the Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan

The PROS Plan is the city's vision for parks and recreation in Ann Arbor. The PROS Plan provides an inventory of existing parks and facilities, describes the relationship between the parks and recreation system and surrounding municipalities and recreation providers, identifies parks and recreation needs and deficiencies, and proposes major capital park projects for existing and new parks.

The 2016-2020 PROS Plan is intended to facilitate discussion and evaluation of major issues, problems and potentials, to set priorities for the next five years, and to identify goals and objectives that reach further into the future. The intention of the plan is to reflect tradition; to provide balance of parks, facilities, and programs; to respond to the needs of today; and to set a direction for the future. It also provides background information while delineating system needs that may qualify for state and federal grant funding. The Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) requires all municipalities applying for recreation grants to have a current plan on file with the MDNR and to update that plan every five years. This planning effort is directed toward the formal adoption of an updated PROS Plan by the Park Advisory Commission, the City Planning Commission, and the Ann Arbor City Council.

Ann Arbor has a long history of planning for parks, recreation, and open space, with plans in 1920, 1939, 1952, 1962, 1978, 1981, 1988, 1994, 2000, 2006 and 2011. Many factors necessitate the updating of the old plan, including the city's desire to retain the parks, open space, and recreational amenities that continue to attract people to Ann Arbor.

Focus of the Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan

The PROS Plan provides an overview of the Ann Arbor park system, including the physical description of the city, administrative structure and budget information, and an inventory of parks and programs provided both by City of Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation and by the Ann Arbor Public Schools Community Education and Recreation program. It also describes goals and objectives for future planning guided by input gathered through an extensive public process.

The plan, by identifying valuable natural and cultural resources, is a tool for the preservation and improvement of amenities. Natural and cultural amenities are a necessary aspect of a

balanced community and are considered a legitimate land use along with housing, business, and industry. An evaluation of open space and natural features is essential in the planning process for optimum land use and potential parkland acquisition. The plan also provides an opportunity to update relevant recreational services and facilities so they better meet the community's needs.

Other local, state, and regional agencies provide additional park and recreational opportunities for the broader community. Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation is a provider of parkland in various locations throughout the county, including County Farm Park in the city of Ann Arbor and Parker Mill just east of the city. The Huron-Clinton Metropolitan Parks Authority provides parkland near Ann Arbor along the Huron River, including Delhi, Dexter-Huron, and Hudson Mills Metroparks. The State of Michigan owns and operates the Pinckney and Waterloo recreation areas and the Chelsea State Game Area in the western half of the county. While the PROS Plan does not address the recreational needs for other entities, it recognizes common goals and linkages, including shared open space, trails, and natural features, such as the Huron River.

Projects Completed During PROS Plan Cycle 2011-2015

Numerous projects were completed during the five-year period starting in 2011. The vast majority of projects completed during this cycle were prioritized in the 2011-2015 plan. Other projects were completed because of maintenance issues or changes in identified needs.

Parks and Recreation Facility Improvements

- Bryant Community Center – reconditioned floors, installed new fencing, renovated interior.
- Buhr Park Ice Arena – cleaned and painted steel structure, replaced scoreboard at ice arena, installed new boiler, installed new pool liner.
- Burns Park – renovated senior center restrooms for barrier-free access, replaced windows, installed new roof and ceiling, constructed new storage shed.
- Cobblestone Farm – restored log cabin, replaced light fixtures in basement of house, replaced roof on barn and house, renovated bridal rooms, repainted interior of barn, replaced cedar siding and exterior doors on barn.
- Farmers Market – paved “sand lot,” installed new storage shed, repaired concrete, replaced entry doors, repaired steel columns and column bases on canopies.
- Fuller Park Pool – replaced flooring and boiler, replaced shade structures, recoated water slide bed, replaced pool liner, improved entry area including barrier-free ramp, constructed new seat wall planters, provided new bicycle parking, installed new picnic tables, refurbished the playground, improved landscaping.
- Gallup Park – renovated meeting room and barrier-free restroom, installed new landscaping, barrier-free kayak docks and fishing dock, constructed pathways and service drive, installed new park signs.
- Huron Hills Golf Course – replaced roof on maintenance barn, new lighting in club house.
- Leslie Park Golf Course – renovated office and installed new park signs.
- Leslie Science & Nature Center – insulated roof, renovated basement of Leslie House.

Introduction

- Mack Pool – updated electrical, installed new LED lights, replaced roof, replaced pool pump, replaced ventilation ducts, restored shower room, repainted pool ceiling.
- Veterans Memorial Park Pool and Ice Arena – constructed new shade structure with solar panels, replaced roof on ice arena, renovated office at ice rink, replaced cooling tower, renovated pool locker room, converted exercise room to meeting room.

Park Acquisitions

- Bryant Community Center addition.
- Braun Nature Area.
- Hamstead Lane-Kuebler addition.
- 3013 Huron River Drive nature area.
- 1240 Orkney (Bluffs addition).
- Riverview Nursing (Bluffs addition).
- South Pond addition.
- Stapp Nature Area addition.
- 220 N. Sunset (Bluffs addition).

Neighborhood Park and Playground Renovations

- Allmendinger Park – installed artwork on restroom building.
- Arbor Oaks Park – replaced playground equipment, improved landscaping.
- Bader Park – replaced playground.
- Beckley Park – replaced playground and path.
- Burns Park – renovated shelter.
- Burr Oak – replaced playground.
- Clinton Park – replaced entry path.
- Cranbrook Park – improved playground drainage and surfacing.
- Esch Park – constructed new entry paths, renovated playground and landscaping.
- Garden Homes Park – replaced lighting with energy efficient LED lights.
- Hansen Park – replaced playground barrier.
- Hunt Park – constructed new access stairway.
- Leslie Park – installed new swings in north playground, replaced entry walk on Pontiac Trail.
- North Main Park – installed new tire swings.
- Placid Way Park – replaced playground, park furniture, landscaping.
- Scheffler Park – replaced playground.
- South University Park – constructed new pathway, landscaping, picnic tables and benches.
- Ward Park – replaced playground barrier.
- Wheeler Park – renovated playground.
- Winewood Thaler Park – renovated playground and replaced path.

Community Park Renovations and New Amenities

- Argo Park and Livery – constructed Argo Cascades, renovated access at Swift Street, and installed new dock approach at livery.

Introduction

- Bandemer Park – constructed barrier-free accessible ramps to rowing docks.
- Dolph Nature Area – replaced signs.
- Gallup Park – replaced picnic shelter, replaced playground near livery, installed concrete animal sculptures along path, renovated and relocated second playground.
- Island Park – restored Greek revival shelter and pedestrian bridge, new canoe/kayak pullout along Huron River Water Trail.
- Leslie Science & Nature Center – constructed new barrier-free pathways through site, new raptor enclosure, new entry sign, renovated basement, including replacing basement windows with glass block, removed deteriorated shed, improved landscape, painted interior of Leslie House.
- Veterans Memorial Park – constructed 30,000-square-foot in-ground skatepark, painted shelter.
- West Park – restored historic pergola, replaced stairway access on Jackson and Miller.

Storm Water Improvements and Rain Gardens

- Arbor Oaks Park – installed stormwater features throughout park.
- Bluffs Park – installed stormwater feature at Sunset access.
- Burns Park – constructed rain gardens near tennis courts.
- Gallup Park – renovated rain garden at playground.
- Leslie Park Golf Course – constructed entry rain garden and major storm water project along Traver Creek.
- Veterans Memorial Park – installed rain gardens at Dexter Avenue at skatepark and at ice arena.

Landscape Plantings

- Ann Arbor Senior Center.
- Bryant Community Center.
- Buhr Park Pool and Ice Arena.
- Cobblestone Farm.
- Fuller Park Pool.
- Gallup Park Livery.
- Huron Hills Golf Course.
- Leslie Park Golf Course.
- Northside Community Center.
- Veterans Memorial Park Pool and Ice Arena.

Pathways, Parking Areas and Bridge Renovations

- Bandemer Park – constructed new barrier-free pathway to rowing docks.
- Barton Nature Area – constructed new canoe/kayak access pathway and dock.
- Beckley Park – renovated pathway through park and through Fairview Cemetery.
- Bluffs Nature Area – constructed new trail access from Sunset Road.
- Buhr Park – renovated entry drive and parking lots and completed pathway connection to pool and ice arena.

Introduction

- Gallup – reconstructed pathway to provide barrier-free access to livery and playground, and replaced path from Geddes Dam to center of park.
- Island Park – renovated historic bridge, replaced pedestrian bridge abutment.
- Veterans Memorial Park – replaced pathway along Dexter Avenue, and constructed new pathway from Dexter Avenue along skatepark, renovated pathway along Maple to Dexter corner, constructed entry pathway from Jackson to pool/ice arena, replaced and paved parking lot on Dexter Avenue.
- Winewood Thaler Park – replaced sidewalk and path through park.

Tennis Court Renovations

- Allmendinger Park.
- Clinton Park.
- Hunt Park.
- South Maple Park.
- Sugarbush Park.
- Veterans Memorial Park.
- West Park.
- Windemere Park.
- Woodbury Park.

Basketball Court Renovations

- Allmendinger Park.
- Clinton Park.
- Esch Park.
- Hunt Park.
- Wheeler Park.

Athletic Field Renovations

- Fuller Park – restored soccer field, including aerating, seeding, top dressing, and irrigation.
- Olson Park – installed deep well and upgraded irrigation system.
- Southeast Area Park - renovated baseball and softball fields.
- Veterans Memorial Park – renovated baseball and softball fields.
- West Park – renovated baseball field.

Natural Area Preservation Stewardship Activities

- Stewardship activities - inventoried plants and animals, revegetated native plants, ecological restoration, invasive species removals, native species planting, trash pickup, trail restoration, and other active volunteer coordination in 111 park areas.
- Inventoried over 200 bird species, 25 species of reptiles and amphibians, and almost 2,000 species of plants.
- Coordinated over 9,000 individual volunteers, who, together, contributed a total of almost 50,000 hours of time to restoration efforts.

Introduction

- Removed invasive species and planted native species on over 800 acres of land in 72 parks.
- Held prescribed burns in over 300 acres of parkland in 47 parks.
- Removed over 55,000 pounds of garlic mustard and other herbaceous invasive plant species from various parks.



SECTION I: COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION

The Community Description section of the PROS Plan describes the geographic boundaries, demographic composition, and physical characteristics, including the built and natural environments, to provide background and an overview of the city to assist with planning efforts.

A. Geographic Planning Boundaries

The City of Ann Arbor is located in southeast Michigan, approximately 30 miles west of the Detroit metropolitan area and 50 miles north of Toledo, Ohio. Ann Arbor is bounded primarily by roads and freeways, including M-14 on the north, US-23 on the east, Interstate-94 and Ellsworth Road on the south, and Interstate-94, M-14, and Wagner Road on the west. Ann Arbor is centrally located in Washtenaw County and is the county seat.

Both the city's *Master Plan: Land Use Element* and the *Parks and Recreation Open Space (PROS) Plan* examine geographic sub-areas of the city, referred to as the Central, South, Northeast, and West planning areas.

1. The Central Area is made up of the Central Business District of Ann Arbor, the South State Street and South University areas, and surrounding neighborhoods. This area contains the highest density of population, and has been growing rapidly in the past five years, including high-end condominiums and apartments and private student apartment high rises. Its parks are characterized as urban plazas, catering to visitors and businesses. Several parks are within walking distance to the downtown core, such as West and Wheeler parks, and green space is also provided by the University of Michigan Diag and the Community High School yard. Other types of open space in the downtown include the Dean Promenade on Main Street and the Ann Arbor Farmers Market. The Downtown Development Authority uses tax increment financing for public projects, including park projects and pedestrian improvements.

SECTION I: Community Description

2. The Northeast Area consists of a wide variety of neighborhoods, including both the oldest and newest in the city. Commercial centers are primarily located along Plymouth Road, Washtenaw Avenue, and Broadway Street. This area contains the highest amount of park acreage, partially due to the location of both municipal golf courses and significant natural areas in this sector of the city. Gallup Park, the city's most popular park, is located along the Huron River. North Campus, Nichols Arboretum (33 acres of which are owned by the city), and Mitchell Field, owned by the University of Michigan, also greatly contribute to the open space.
3. The West Area developed primarily from the 1920's to the 1960's, with historic homes typical of the "Old West Side" historic district, to multifamily dwellings, including larger apartment and condominium complexes. Commercial centers are located primarily along Stadium Boulevard, Maple Road, and Jackson Avenue. Parkland dedication with residential development provided many of the neighborhood parks resulting in most neighborhoods having some nearby parkland or school playground. The West Area includes a significant length of the Huron River as well as two of the three Sister Lakes.
4. The South Area developed primarily between the 1940's and mid 1970's, with at least 600 housing units added in the 1980's. This planning area contains the largest concentration of senior care and senior housing facilities in the city. The main commercial areas are along Packard and Eisenhower, and include Briarwood Mall. The larger parks include Mary Beth Doyle and Buhr, as well as the County Farm Park, managed by the Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation Commission.

B. Economy of the City of Ann Arbor

Ann Arbor's economy is dominated by the presence of the University of Michigan. The university is the city's largest employer, with approximately 30,000 workers, including approximately 12,000 in the medical center. Information technology industries and other high-tech services, life sciences, and business services make up a significant portion of the economy. In 2014, the City of Ann Arbor had 70,525 persons in the labor force. The closing of Pfizer's headquarters in 2007 and Borders Books in 2011 were significant losses for the local economy, however business such as Google and Toyota Technical Center that remain in the Ann Arbor area, and general growth in the tech sector, are credited with some of the greatest job growth in the county.

C. Social Characteristics of Planning Areas

Understanding the demographic and socio-economic composition within each planning area contributes to assessing park and recreational needs within each subsection of the city. It also helps to identify trends and changes. For example, the City of Ann Arbor population (about 35 percent of the county population) slightly decreased to 113,934 from 114,024 in 2010, but the number of dwelling units increased from 46,704 to 49,789. Renters increased from 17,008 to 25,997, and the number of households with children decreased from 24 percent to 19 percent.

SECTION I: Community Description

The following chart provides Census data from 2010, as well as statistics about the park system by planning area. The chart was modified slightly from the previous plan in that the non-city open space category was eliminated, and the greenbelt acreage was added. The non-city open space category was removed because accurate representative data is not available. Neither the Ann Arbor Public Schools nor the University of Michigan, for example, categorize or quantify open space versus other land use types.


STATISTICS FROM 2010 CENSUS

Planning Area	Central	Northeast	West	South	Outside City ⁽¹⁾	Citywide
Population	33,620	32,713	21,190	26,411		113,934
Number of dwelling units	11,578	14,063	10,427	13,721		49,789
Owner occupied	2,454	5,979	6,550	6,080		21,063
Renter	8,520	7,259	3,283	6,935		25,997
Average household size	2.24	2.17	2.18	2.16		2.19
Median income	35,809	63,119	79,274	54,691		58,223
Person density per acre	17	4	5	5		7.66
% of households with children	7%	22%	25%	21%		19%
Disability status - ages 5-64	8%	8%	10%	13%		10%
Disability status - ages 65 & up	37%	30%	32%	39%		35%
Minority composition - African-American	4%	7%	8%	13%		8%
Minority composition - Asian	12%	24%	4%	13%		13%
Percent student population						37%
Number of Parks	24	55	37	40	3	159 ⁽²⁾
Acreage of Parks	152.40	877.22	609.81	339.03	131.31	2109.77
Acreage parkland/1000 Residents	4.53	26.82	28.78	12.84		18.52
Greenbelt acreage					4,800	

(1) Outside city refers to the 3013 Huron River Drive, Marshall and Forest natures areas which are outside of the official city limits of Ann Arbor, but are still part of the park system as well as the Greenbelt.

(2) Includes the Ellsworth Storage Facility and the Tree Nursery in the South Planning Area, which are not open to the public.

SECTION I: Community Description



D. Physical Characteristics

This section describes the physical characteristics, including both the built and natural environment, found throughout the city of Ann Arbor and discusses their relevance to parks and recreation programming.



1. The Built Environment

- a. **LAND USE.** Ann Arbor serves as the business/economic, cultural, entertainment, and recreation center for the greater Washtenaw County area. Approximately 50 percent of the land within the city is used for residential purposes. The center of the city contains a mixture of commercial, office, residential, and public land uses, including the University of Michigan Central Campus. The combined office, commercial, and industrial land accounts for 9.9 percent of the land in Ann Arbor.

The University of Michigan owns approximately 1,700 acres of land within the city limits and an additional 1,440 acres including the botanical gardens and golf course. Roughly 485 acres are used for indoor and outdoor recreational purposes, including parkland (portions of Nichols Arboretum) and sports complexes, such as the football stadium and Crisler Arena.

The Ann Arbor park system has a significant presence in Ann Arbor, with over 2,109 acres dedicated as public park land. The park system includes pools and sport complexes such as Fuller, Veterans Memorial and Buhr parks, as well as numerous athletic fields, recreational facilities such as Cobblestone Farm, the Ann Arbor Farmers Market, golf courses, and community centers.

- b. **TRANSPORTATION.** The Ann Arbor area is heavily dependent on the automobile, however, public transit and non-motorized transportation are important means of transportation in the city, with approximately 30 percent of the workers who live in

SECTION I: Community Description

Ann Arbor choosing non-motorized or public transportation for their commute. Bus service is provided by three major public agencies: the Ann Arbor Area Transportation Authority (AAATA), the University of Michigan, and the Ann Arbor Public Schools.

An update to the City-wide Non-Motorized Plan was completed in 2014. This comprehensive plan addresses the infrastructure deficits of the pedestrian and bicycling system. Implementation of the plan includes an increase to 72 miles of bike lanes, approximately eight of which were added between 2011 and 2013, and nearly 3.5 miles of “sharrow” segments (share the road symbols). The city’s sidewalk system is relatively complete, with the exception of some gaps which occur along park frontages, some major roads, and neighborhood streets.

In June 2006, Mayor John Hieftje introduced a “Model for Mobility,” a transportation vision for the City of Ann Arbor. Key elements of this vision include alternative forms of transportation such as walking and bicycling. The vision expands on the city’s bus, rail, and train system to support a more regional mode of mobility and reduce Ann Arbor’s reliance on auto travel.

In 2009, an intermodal transportation center, named Fuller Road Station, was proposed for Fuller Park on the south side of Fuller Road where an existing surface parking lot is located. As of 2016, the city continues to seek a solution to the rail passenger access and is evaluating alternative locations, including Fuller Park, for a possible improved or new Ann Arbor Station.

Two railways traverse the city, including the Ann Arbor Railroad, running north/south, and the former Norfolk Southern Railroad, operated by the Michigan Department of Transportation since 2014, running east/west. Throughout the city, the railroad tracks cut off access to river parks. At two locations, Gallup Park and Argo Pond, the city has procured licenses from the railroad to construct non-motorized trails, however, access to these trails, especially the Border-to-Border Trail, which runs along the Huron River through Washtenaw County, is limited, as the railroad will not allow additional at-grade crossings. Challenges accessing the river and parkland safely are ongoing, as the desire to connect trails along greenways adjacent to the railroads and the popularity of these trails continues to increase. Completion of this trail system is a priority, especially as discussion of a high speed rail gains momentum, and safe railroad crossings become more important for park access.



2. The Natural Environment

The city contains a variety of landforms, the most prominent being the Huron River valley. Other natural features include steep slopes, woodlands, wetlands, meadows, fens, and seven creeksheds that flow to the Huron River.

- a. **NATURAL FEATURES PLAN.** The city's Natural Features Plan, adopted in June 2004, identifies significant natural features located within the city, including the Huron River, wetlands, floodplains and floodways, woodlands, landmark trees, native plants, and greenway linkages. The plan provides a general description of each natural feature and identifies protection measures through goals and implementation strategies.

Within the park system, as well as other city-owned land, the Natural Area Preservation Division works as stewards of the natural areas. They maintain and improve natural areas by removing invasive species, landscaping with native vegetation, and inventorying flora and fauna.

- b. **WATER RESOURCES.** The Huron River is the central natural feature of the city, running diagonally from the northwest to the southeast. The tributaries that feed into the Huron River include Allen Creek, Mallets Creek, Honey Creek, Traver Creek, Millers Creek, Fleming Creek, and Swift Run. In some parts of the city, streams have "disappeared" into storm sewer pipes beneath the surface. The Allen Creek is one such example, whereby the stream was buried during the 1920's through much of the west and south branches.

The river within the Ann Arbor area contains four dams: Barton, Argo, Geddes, and Superior. The resulting impoundments are used for drinking water as well as recreational pond activities.

Green space dominates the shores of the river through much of the city, with ownership either by the city or the university, although both single family and Multi-family developments back up to the river in several locations. Pedestrian and visual access to the Huron River is limited due in part to the railroad corridor blocking access and industrial development that was a part of the history of the river.

SECTION I: Community Description

- c. **ELEVATION AND STEEP SLOPES.** Elevations of the city range from approximately 749 feet above sea level near the Huron River to approximately 1,000 feet above sea level in areas near the water treatment plant (Sunset and Newport Roads) and near Maple Road and Liberty Street. Higher elevations within the city provide opportunities for dramatic views of the city's river valley. These areas of the city are located within parkland at several locations, such as the capped landfill at the Swift Run Service Center in the southeast area, Leslie Park in the northeast area, Cedar Bend Nature Area in the central area, Ruthven Nature Area and Huron Hills Golf Course in the northeast area, and Wurster, Hunt, and Bluffs Parks and Bird Hills Nature Area in the west area.
- d. **VEGETATION AND TREE COVER.** The city contains over 43,000 street trees, 6,900 in mowed areas of parks as well as hundreds of thousands of trees in forested urban parks.

The city's tree cover varies geographically: in the downtown, large buildings, streets, and parking lots dominate with mostly younger trees. Trees in the downtown area grow in disturbed soils under harsh conditions so that healthy growth, let alone tree survival, is difficult. In residential areas of the city, especially the older neighborhoods, tree cover is more prominent.

Between 2002 and 2008, the emerald ash borer decimated thousands of ash trees. A massive effort to remove and replant both street and park trees has helped to mitigate the loss; however, it will take many years to regenerate the urban forest. Because of this issue, a greater emphasis has been placed on diversifying the urban forest to prevent massive loss of single tree species.

There has also been an effort to convert lawn areas to native species, and to create and maintain prairies as well as wetlands and rain gardens. The change is a result of a growing awareness of the ecological benefits of deep-rooted plants that result in increased storm water filtration, as well as a desire to preserve the cultural heritage of the region by restoring plant communities that were common when Ann Arbor was settled. These restoration efforts include removal of invasive species as well as collection of seeds from native species.

- e. **OPEN SPACE, GREENWAYS AND LINKAGES.** The City of Ann Arbor has always prided itself in maintaining a green image through the preservation of open space, parkland, and natural features. The Huron River provides scenic views from both the water and from areas throughout the valley. The preservation of open space along some transportation corridors has contributed to the sense of openness, including Huron Parkway, Geddes Road, Fuller Road, and Glazer Way.

The city's parks play a significant role in providing open spaces through parkland acquisition and preservation. Parks also provide natural and recreational linkages. These linkages help to protect wildlife and preserve a variety of ecological systems, while recreational linkages provide greater opportunities for alternative transportation, accessibility to parks, neighborhood connections, and enhanced community participation.

SECTION I: Community Description

In 2003, an Open Space and Parkland Preservation Millage was passed to protect and preserve open space outside and within the city. The millage, discussed in detail in the chapter on Land Acquisition, has so far resulted in the protection 4,800 acres of farms and an additional 82 acres of natural areas.

E. History of the Parks and Recreation System

The City of Ann Arbor's parks and recreation system originated soon after the city's settlement in 1824. According to city records, the first park was Hanover Square, dedicated in 1836 and located at Division and Madison streets, now bisected by Packard Street. By 1905, when the first Board of Park Commissioners was appointed, the park system had grown to approximately 10 acres with the additions of Felch Park (now the University of Michigan's Power Center), Cedar Bend/Island Park, Fairview Cemetery, the city's first garden cemetery, and several scattered, small, triangular areas like "The Rock" at Washington Park located at Washtenaw Avenue and Hill Street.

In 1910, the city purchased the county fairgrounds to create Burns Park. By 1918, the system had expanded to 122 acres and included Douglas Park, Argo Bathing Beach, the Glen (the city-owned portion of Nichols Arboretum), Riverside Park, and West Park.

In 1928, markers were erected to indicate the old Native American trail through West Park and the site of the city's original settlement on Huron Street, west of Ashley. Federally-funded work programs in the 1930's resulted in improvements to West, Fuller and Riverside parks, Plymouth Parkway, lawn extensions, and several smaller projects. Demand for outdoor recreation facilities greatly increased after World War II, especially ball diamonds. Substantial acquisitions in the 1950's included Buhr Park and Veterans Memorial Park (the former county fairgrounds). The city established a tree nursery on the airport property for park and street plantings.



1915 Boat Livery on Argo Pond

In 1957, the City of Ann Arbor and the Ann Arbor Public Schools Board of Education collaborated to provide a summer recreation program. They jointly established the recreation board, which was charged with advising all city and school recreation programming issues. The Recreation Advisory Commission has functioned continuously since its inception to advise both the City Council and the Board of Education regarding public recreational concerns.

The 1960's saw continued city growth, further major expansion of the parks and recreation system, and several particularly significant events. In 1962, the City Planning Commission published Ann Arbor's first official Parks and Open Space Plan. The plan envisioned a program

SECTION I: Community Description

of acquisition and development to meet a 20-year need for parks and open space. It recommended acquiring approximately 710 additional acres of parkland, including a third golf course. The Leslie Golf Course, park and woods, and the Detroit Edison properties along the Huron River were purchased pursuant to this plan.

In April 1966, city voters approved a \$2,500,000 bond issue for park acquisition and development. With over \$800,000 in federal matching grants, about 400 acres of new park properties were obtained, three outdoor swimming pools and three artificial ice rinks were constructed, eight major parks underwent new development, and 15 more parks were improved.

In April 1971, voters approved another \$3,500,000 bond issue for parks and recreation. Of these funds, \$400,000 was spent for the Mack Swimming Pool, \$1,000,000 was anticipated for land acquisition, and \$2,100,000 for park improvements and development with emphasis on public access to undeveloped parks along the Huron River valley (e.g., Geddes, Argo, and Barton Pond areas) in addition to neighborhood parks and playgrounds (e.g., Huron Highlands, Glacier Highlands, Lansdowne, Esch, and Sugarbush). Several parks were improved or renovated through bond funds.

Since the 1962 plan, there has been a concerted effort to complete the pattern of recreational open space along the Huron River from Barton Pond to Geddes Pond. Other significant natural areas, such as Bird Hills and Marshall Woods, have been acquired. Although Ann Arbor lacks a completed system of connected natural areas, city residents take pride in the preservation of substantial open space along the Huron River (now a state-designated Country Scenic Natural River over most of its length upstream from the city).

In 1981, the Parks and Open Space Plan was updated, laying the groundwork for a 1983 millage for Park Rehabilitation and Development. This plan also established the Citizens' Park Advisory Commission.

The 1988 Park, Recreation and Open Space Plan recommended acquisition of key parcels to enhance existing parks and serve areas that were lacking in parkland. In 1988, a ½ mil for parkland acquisition was approved by city voters. Over 306 acres of parkland were acquired through this millage. Subsequent acquisition millages were approved in 1993 and 1998. Additional parkland has been acquired through the development process and via developer dedication.

In 1989, voters approved renewal of the ½ mil for park rehabilitation and development. The ½ mil that was approved for six years by the voters has allowed rehabilitation and development of neighborhood parks, as well as facilities such as the Veterans Memorial Park Arena and Pool, Cobblestone Farm, Buhr Ice Arena, and Furstenberg Park. In 1993, a .4725 mil for park maintenance and repair was approved to repair park features and facilities, catch up on deferred maintenance, protect natural areas, and increase accessibility to park and recreation resources. Voters approved a renewal of the Park Rehabilitation and Development Millage in 1995 for six more years. A major feature of the millage program was the renovation of Fuller and Buhr park pools.

SECTION I: Community Description

The 1993 millage included the addition of the Natural Area Preservation Program, tasked with developing a systematic manner in which to manage natural areas. The program has evolved over the years to include a devoted following of volunteers and park stewards, and has expanded its reach to incorporate other city-owned land.

In 2002, a four-year Park Repair and Restoration Millage was approved to address natural area preservation, forestry and horticulture in parks, and non-routine repair and restoration for the park system. The inclusion of these activities marked a recognition that the park system had grown and evolved to the point where funding for maintenance was no longer sufficient and restoring natural areas and the urban forest was given greater emphasis. In 2006, a 1.25 mil six-year Park Maintenance and Capital Improvements millage was approved, which combined the functions of the two expiring millages. In November 2012, the millage was again renewed for the six-year period, 2013-2018. Some of the major accomplishments to date of this millage include replacement of pool liners at Buhr and Fuller parks, new siding and roofs at Cobblestone Farm, renovations to the pathways and drives at Buhr Park, renovations to the Gallup Park playground, livery and pathway, development of the Argo Cascades, and construction of the Veterans Memorial Park Skatepark.

Between 2002 and 2004, the city staff was reorganized into administrative areas instead of departments. As part of this reorganization, the parks department was split into two service areas, with the planning, Natural Area Preservation, volunteer, and recreation functions being part of the community services area, and the maintenance functions being part of the public services area.

In 2008, City Council passed a resolution amending the City Charter to require voter approval for the sale of any land within the city purchased, acquired, or used for park land. A public process would need to take place prior to any parkland being placed on an election ballot.

The volunteer program was expanded in 2008 into a formal Adopt-a-Park program, and included neighborhood parks and community parks in addition to natural areas. The change resulted in many more residents becoming involved with community projects. In 2011, the Give365 Volunteer Program was established, expanding volunteerism into park facilities. The program has grown quickly, broadening the scope of volunteer opportunities and projects each year. Special events staffing, programming at facilities, Adopt-a-Park, and park maintenance and beautification work days are the major areas in which residents have become involved with park stewardship.



NAP volunteers collect prairie plant seeds

In 2015, the Huron River was designated by the National Park Service as a National Water Trail, and Ann Arbor was named a Trail Town. The water trail is a 104-mile inland paddling trail, and is a project of the Huron River Watershed Council. Several locations are designated along the

SECTION I: Community Description

trail, including Argo Park, Island Park and Gallup Park. In the same year, the Border-to-Border trail was officially incorporated into the proposed Iron Belle Trail, a new statewide hiking and bicycling trail stretching hundreds of miles through Michigan. The trail will run from Belle Isle Park in Detroit to Ironwood in the western Upper Peninsula along the border with Wisconsin.

Several new programs were introduced to the park system, including FootGolf at Huron Hills Golf Course, outdoor concerts at Burns Park, natural ice rinks in several parks, swim teams and log rolling at Mack Pool, and a Passport Program encouraging park patrons to try new activities at the recreation facilities.

Initiatives that were discussed during the last five years include the future of the Library Lot, addition of dog parks, planning for the Ann Arbor Farmers Market enclosure, master planning for a proposed Allen Creek Greenway, and completion of the Border-to-Border Trail.

Significant new park amenities include the Argo Cascades, which converted an existing mill race into a series of pools and drops, thereby eliminating a portage; a 30,000-square-foot in-ground skatepark at Veterans Memorial Park; and a third dog park located at Broadway Park. These new amenities had significant public involvement and have proven to be extremely popular additions to the park system.

SECTION II: Administrative Structure



SECTION II: ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

The provision of parks and recreation services in Ann Arbor is a collaborative effort between the City of Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation Services Unit, the City of Ann Arbor Public Works Services Unit, and the Community Education and Recreation Department of the Ann Arbor Public Schools. This chapter outlines the structure of each unit as well as how these divisions fit into the city as a whole.

A. City Administration

The City of Ann Arbor administrative structure includes five service areas covering the broad range of services provided by the city. They include the city administration services area, overseeing executive management of the city; the community services area, which includes parks and recreation, planning and development, and community development; the financial and administrative services area, overseeing the financial functions of the city; the public services area, covering the infrastructure functions of the city, such as solid waste, and street maintenance; and safety services, which includes fire, emergency management, and police. Within each service area are a number of service units which carry out specific administrative and community duties. Parks is located within two service areas: community services area - parks and recreation services unit, which houses the recreation facilities, parks customer service, Natural Area Preservation, volunteerism, and planning and administration; and the public services area - public works unit, which houses forestry and park and public space maintenance.

1. Parks and Recreation Service Unit

The parks and recreation services unit operates under provisions established in the Ann Arbor City Charter, amended and adopted by the electorate in April 1956. The Charter establishes a department as a General Tax Fund entity, administered by the community services administrator reporting to the city administrator and, ultimately, the City Council.

SECTION II: Administrative Structure

The mission of the parks and recreation services unit and the park-related units within the public works service unit focuses on several key elements: quality, efficiency, stewardship of natural resources, accessibility and affordability of programming, customer service and cooperation with other city service units and public and private organizations, volunteers, and the general public. The parks and recreation services unit includes both parks administration and recreation facilities and consists of 21 full-time employees and approximately 350 part-time and seasonal employees. Parks administration is responsible for the development of park policy, park planning and improvements, park shelter reservations, special events, and the parks and recreation boards and commissions, including the park advisory commission and land acquisition committee. The administration staff coordinates and manages the service unit while overseeing short- and long-term planning, capital projects, infrastructure improvements, and budget.


The recreation facilities, which include four pools, two ice rinks, two golf courses, two canoe liveries, two community centers, a farmers market, a senior center, a historic house, and a farm site, are managed by parks and recreation services staff.

Natural Area Preservation works to protect and restore Ann Arbor's natural areas and to foster an environmental ethic among its citizens through education, stewardship activities, and volunteer work days. Their mission involves conducting plant and animal inventories, ecological monitoring, and stewardship projects in Ann Arbor parks. These tasks are performed by four full-time and 15 seasonal staff, with over 11,561 hours of work performed by 2,939 volunteers.

In 2011, the GIVE 365 Volunteer program was established to expand volunteerism into park facilities. The program includes special event staffing, programming at facilities, Adopt-A-Park, park maintenance, and beautification work days. Give 365 has over 8,056 volunteer hours, with one full-time and seven seasonal staff.

SECTION II: Administrative Structure

ORGANIZATIONAL CHART: PARKS AND RECREATION UNIT




2. Public Works Unit

Public works is the combination of maintenance and operational divisions from across the organization. Within the public services area, forestry and public works are directly involved with park maintenance. There are 33 full-time employees responsible for park maintenance and forestry and approximately 10 - 15 seasonal staff.

- a. FORESTRY is responsible for public tree care in Ann Arbor's "urban forest" represented by more than 43,000 street trees, 6,900 in mowed areas of parks, and hundreds of thousands of trees located in forested city parks. Forestry's work includes trimming and other care to maintain health of trees, removing hazardous trees, and planting street and park trees.
- b. PARK AND PUBLIC SPACE MAINTENANCE cares for and maintains the city parks. Public works is responsible for play equipment, trails and pathways, park security, snow and litter removal, turf mowing, rest rooms and shelter care, athletic field maintenance, and assisting with recreation facility maintenance.

ORGANIZATIONAL CHART: PUBLIC WORKS



Grey indicates staff who directly work with the park system.

B. Boards and Commissions

Citizen participation occurs at many levels, ranging from individual to organized group participation. The parks and recreation service unit engages several advisory panels to assist in decision making that is representative of all citizens. It seeks informal advice from the public through daily contact and meetings with individual citizens, neighborhood associations, service clubs, and special interest groups. Thousands of other citizens are involved in volunteer activities throughout the system, including performing prairie burns, acting as docents for Cobblestone Farm, cleaning up debris from the Huron River, removing invasive species, and sprucing up the downtown parks.

Officially, four formal mechanisms exist for citizen input, including the Ann Arbor City Council, the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission, the Park Advisory Commission, and the Recreation Advisory Commission. Additionally, several boards and task forces provide guidance to parks and recreation for specific facilities and programs.

1. Ann Arbor City Council

As the policy-setting authority for the parks and recreation service unit, the Ann Arbor City Council makes all operational, development, and financial decisions after providing opportunities for public comment and hearings.

2. Ann Arbor City Planning Commission

The City Planning Commission is a group of citizens appointed by the mayor and approved by City Council that reviews the Capital Improvements Plan, including improvements by the parks and recreation services unit, as well as proposed private development projects that involve public parkland.

3. Park Advisory Commission

The Park Advisory Commission was created by a resolution of City Council on Aug. 17, 1981. The purpose of the Park Advisory Commission is to provide a consistent and formal opportunity for public involvement and perspective regarding community park and recreation services. The commission makes advisory recommendations to the City Council and to the parks and recreation service unit regarding park administration and development.

The Park Advisory Commission is composed of nine members; eight members to be appointed by the mayor with the approval of City Council. The commission is responsible directly to the mayor and City Council. Members must be residents in the city of Ann Arbor. One member of the Recreation Advisory Commission serves on the commission as an official member. Two members of City Council (to be appointed by the mayor), the manager of parks and recreation, and the assistant superintendent for community services of the Ann Arbor Public Schools or the assistant superintendent's designee, serve as ex-officio members without vote. The membership consists of representative citizens who have demonstrated their interest in Ann Arbor's parks and recreation services.

SECTION II: Administrative Structure

The Park Advisory Commission provides advisory recommendations regarding the following issues:

- a. Park rules and regulations.
- b. Community park and recreation services philosophy.
- c. Park and recreation facility policies, including, but not limited to, fees and charges, hours of operation, and scheduling.
- d. Park maintenance and forestry standards.
- e. Annual operating budget.
- f. Annual capital improvement budget.
- g. Parkland acquisitions and parkland easements or controls. A separate Land Acquisition Committee, which is a subcommittee of the whole, advises on purchases within the City.
- h. Park development/rehabilitation projects.
- i. Capital improvement and acquisition funding, including millages, bond issues, park foundation, or related programs.
- j. Major new development projects (residential, transportation, commercial, etc.) which significantly impact park and recreation services.
- k. Public information and interpretation of the total parks and recreation program to the community.
- l. Any other item which may be referred to the Park Advisory Commission by City Council or the City Administrator, or any park policy matter of concern to a commission member or community citizen.

In 2009, the Park Advisory Commission revised its bylaws to include a standing Budget Committee to facilitate communications between staff and the commission on important aspects of the parks budget and financial accounting systems. The committee makes recommendations regarding the annual operating budget, the annual capital improvement budget, and special millages for capital improvements and acquisitions. The chair of the Budget and Finance Committee is nominated by the chair of PAC, and approved by a two-thirds majority of the full commission.

4. Recreation Advisory Commission

The Ann Arbor Public Schools Community Education and Recreation (Rec & Ed) program is an integral component of recreation planning within the city. It is governed and administered by the Board of Education. The Rec & Ed program offers a number of recreational and educational opportunities to the Ann Arbor community, including team sports, camps, pre-school and child care programs, and life-long learning and

SECTION II: Administrative Structure

enrichment classes for youths and adults. Many of these programs take place in city parks and facilities.

The program serves community members who reside in the Ann Arbor Public School district. The Ann Arbor school district includes all of Ann Arbor Township, the City of Ann Arbor, the Village of Barton Hills, and portions of seven other townships including the charter townships of Pittsfield, Scio, and Superior, and the townships of Lodi, Webster, Northfield, and Salem.

The Recreation Advisory Commission (RAC) was established and modified by City Council and Board of Education resolutions of 1957. Six members are appointed by the City Council and six by the Board of Education. The purpose of the RAC is to provide a consistent forum for citizen input regarding recreation services. The commission provides advisory recommendations and serves the following roles:

- a. Assume positive leadership in formulating a philosophy of recreation suitable to this community.
- b. Consider Ann Arbor's year-round recreation needs, both immediate and long term.
- c. Serve as an advisory body to the parks and recreation service unit, the community education and recreation department, and their staffs in developing a program to meet such needs.
- d. Implement the recreation plan by recommending a budget showing the amounts financed by the city, the school board, and by the income from fee-based programs.
- e. Communicate findings relative to needs, programs, and implementation to the City Council and Board of Education.
- f. Inform the City Council and Board of Education of essential and desirable expansion of recreational facilities involving the expenditure of capital funds.
- g. Consult and cooperate with private agencies and local sports clubs in their development of recreational programs and activities.
- h. Interpret the entire recreation program to the citizens of Ann Arbor and the Ann Arbor School District.

5. Park and Facility Advisory Boards and Commissions

Several recreation facilities have boards and associations dedicated to overseeing the mission of each particular facility. These consist of the following:

- a. COBBLESTONE FARM ASSOCIATION was formed over 30 years ago and coordinates the programming and restoration efforts of the historic Cobblestone Farm property. The association integrates authentic artifacts, stories, and lives

SECTION II: Administrative Structure

which capture the spirit of mid-nineteenth century living, and hosts educational historic programs for children and adults.

- b. DEAN FUND COMMITTEE was established in 1964 to oversee the donation from Elizabeth Dean, who willed nearly two million dollars to the city. The interest income from this bequest is used to repair, maintain, and replace trees on city property.
- c. KEMPF HOUSE CENTER FOR LOCAL HISTORY is a non-profit organization dedicated to preserving, interpreting, and celebrating the Bennett-Kempf house, its garden and collections. The 1853 Greek revival house is a unique resource because of its national architectural significance, downtown location, and the contributions of the Kempf family to the musical culture of Ann Arbor. By making the house accessible to the public, the board seeks to promote understanding and appreciation of local history.
- d. PUBLIC MARKET ADVISORY COMMISSION exists to cultivate relationships among vendors, the public, local and national governmental agencies, the Kerrytown area businesses and residential neighborhood. The commission advises the market manager in advertising and promotion of the market, offers input on musical, educational, and other special events at the market, engages in strategic planning for the market, and reviews market policy.

Three park facilities are owned by the city but run by private non-profits. These organizations have boards that shape policy and direction for the organization as well as to solicit input from residents.

- a. BRYANT COMMUNITY CENTER NEIGHBORHOOD ADVISORY GROUP AND NORTHSIDE COMMUNITY CENTER – Community Action Network (CAN) programs the two parks community centers while involving the neighborhood through meetings to solicit input for programs that they oversee. CAN runs a total of four community centers in Ann Arbor and has a separate advisory council to oversee the organization as a whole.
- b. LESLIE SCIENCE & NATURE CENTER ADVISORY BOARD – The LSNC Board provides oversight and works in partnership with the staff to achieve their mission of providing environmental education and experiences for children, families, and other individuals to honor and perpetuate the legacy of Dr. and Mrs. Eugene Leslie by fostering understanding, appreciation, stewardship, and respect for the natural world.

C. Public Input Opportunities

Public input is considered an integral part of planning in parks and recreation services. These forums are a standard part of the planning for projects involving changes to a park or facility.

1. Surveys are conducted intermittently to evaluate the entire park system, as well as

SECTION II: Administrative Structure

- specific facilities and issues. This tool has become much more widely used by parks and recreation services with the availability and popularity of electronic media.
2. Public meetings are held for any capital improvement involving change of an existing facility or park. Meetings allow citizens to voice opinions and concerns directly to staff and provide an opportunity to have dialog with residents.
 3. Social networking sites, such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and GoogleBuzz, are used to advertise meetings, share information, and survey users about particular issues. These sites allow real time updates for programs and activities and facilitate citizen interaction with staff, providing forums for comments and opinions about park projects and programs. An added advantage is that the tools are free of charge and they eliminate the use of paper.

SECTION III: Budget and Funding



SECTION III: BUDGET AND FUNDING

A. Budget Process

The parks budget is one of the more complex within the city. The diversity of services and operations, the fact that the parks system is budgeted in two distinct service areas, and the mixture of funding sources and revenues, make the task of preparing the parks budget a significant endeavor.

The budget process consists of an examination of operations to determine any new initiatives, modifications, or service level changes projected to impact the budget.

B. Budget Calendar

The city operates on a July 1 to June 30 fiscal year and a two-year budget cycle; the first year is adopted by City Council, and the second year is an adopted plan. The budget process begins in the winter, with extensive staff time spent on budget preparation in January, February, and March. The city administrator submits a recommended budget to the City Council in April and the Council is required to adopt the budget by their second meeting in May.

<i>July 1, 2016</i>	Fiscal Year 2017 Begins
<i>January – March 2017</i>	Budget Preparation – Budget is entered in financial system, impact sheets and scenarios are created, and fees are evaluated. Impact sheets are shared at a working session of City Council for feedback and direction.
<i>March 2017</i>	Staff meets with members of the Budget and Finance Committee, a standing committee of the Park Advisory Commission (PAC) to review park budget information.
<i>April 2017</i>	City Administrator’s Budget submitted to City Council for review.

SECTION III: Budget and Funding

<i>April 2017</i>	PAC makes recommendation to City Council on proposed City Administrator's Budget. Opportunity for public commentary on proposed budget.
<i>May 2017</i>	City Council adopts Fiscal Year 2018 Budget and Fiscal Year 2019 Plan.
<i>June 30, 2017</i>	Fiscal Year 2017 ends.
<i>July 1, 2017</i>	Fiscal Year 2018 begins.

C. Annual Budgets

1. Parks and Recreation Services Funding Sources

Parks administration and recreation services unit consists of parks administration, Natural Area Preservation, volunteer outreach, parks planning and recreation facilities, and consists of 22 full-time employees and approximately 350 part-time and seasonal employees. Parks administration is responsible for the development of park policy, park planning and improvements, park shelter reservations, special events, and the parks and recreation boards and commissions, including the Park Advisory Commission and Land Acquisition Committee. The administration staff coordinates and manages the service unit while overseeing short- and long-term planning, capital projects, infrastructure improvements, and budget.

The recreation facilities, which include four pools, two ice rinks, two golf courses, two canoe liveries, two community centers, a farmers market, a senior center, a historic house, and a farm site, are managed by parks and recreation services staff.

The parks and recreation services budget includes five funding sources:

- Fund 10 – General Fund: the General Fund supports parks administration, along with all of the recreation facilities.
- Fund 24 – Land Acquisition Funds: Revenue results from the Open Space and Parkland Preservation Millage and is used to purchase new parkland within the city limits.
- Fund 25 – Bandemer Park Fund: this fund is designated for use specifically at Bandemer Park.
- Fund 34 – Gifts and Memorials Fund: this fund constitutes donations and developer contributions. Expenses cannot exceed revenue recognized through donations and gifts.
- Fund 71 – Parks Maintenance and Capital Improvements Millage: Revenue is generated through a millage levy that is then used to support capital projects, park planning functions, natural areas management and volunteer outreach.

SECTION III: Budget and Funding

2. **Parks – Public Works (Park Operations & Park Forestry) Funding Sources**

Public works and forestry are both parts of the public services area, and are responsible for maintenance in the parks, playgrounds, shelters, and at the recreation facilities, along with the management of parks forestry functions. There are 25 full-time employees responsible for these tasks and 10 – 15 seasonal staff .

The Public works budget includes two funding sources:

- Fund 10 – General Fund: the General Fund supports core parks maintenance functions such as mowing and snow removal. Public works activities are generally not revenue producing.
- Fund 71 – Parks Maintenance and Capital Improvements Millage: this fund supports parks, playground, and recreational facility maintenance functions, and parks forestry functions..

D. **Sources of Funding for the Parks and Recreation Budget**

The parks and recreation system is funded through a combination of General Fund dollars, millages, and revenues from recreation facility programs, grants, and donations.

1. **General Fund**

The General Fund in Fiscal Year 2017 provides 39 percent of all parks funding. The General Fund is the major source for financing the city's routine operations. The largest source of revenue for the General Fund is property tax. A small portion of the overall city General Fund revenue is from sources other than local property taxes.

Parks and recreation services generates over \$4,500,000 in revenue annually through admissions, program fees, and other revenue-generating activities. No General Fund support is available for capital improvements for park rehabilitation, development, or acquisition. Functions and activities funded from the General Fund within parks and recreation services have changed over the years with the closing of the Market Fund and Golf Courses Fund into the General Fund. For the market, this made sense due to the effect of the GASB pronouncement regarding pension liabilities, and as the market fund had expenses in excess of revenues due to increasing costs for administering food assistance programs and decreasing revenues due to a decline of parking revenue from the DDA. When the effect of the pension liability was added, it became apparent that the Market Fund could no longer function as an independent, viable fund, and therefore became part of the General Fund, as with all other parks facilities. The golf courses also moved to the General Fund for the reason that expenses exceeded revenue annually, not meeting the qualifications for being an Enterprise Fund. The General Fund for parks was increased accordingly (adding annual expenditure and revenue budgets for the market and golf) to accommodate the inclusion of these facilities, and done so in a manner not to impact existing General Fund recreation facilities. In short, funding to other

SECTION III: Budget and Funding

recreation facilities was not reduced to manage the inclusion. This also creates a consistency in how all park recreational facilities are budgeted.

With the passage of the current Parks Maintenance and Capital Improvements Millage, more public works (park operations and park forestry) functions and activities have become eligible for millage funding. With more routine maintenance activities eligible for millage funding, administrative guidelines that protect the total general fund contribution that parks receives were approved by City Council. The guidelines state that, "if future reductions are necessary in the city's general fund budget, not including the budget for safety services, during any of the six years of this millage, beginning in the fiscal year of 2007-2008, the general fund budget supporting the parks and recreation system, after subtracting the revenue obtained from fees for parks and recreation, will be reduced no greater than the average percentage reduction, for each particular year, of the rest of the city general fund budget, not including the budget for safety services, for each of the applicable six years of this millage.

	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017
General Fund: Parks and Recreation Services	\$5,273,148*	\$5,748,089	\$5,846,829	\$6,050,204
General Fund: Parks Public Works	\$2,167,600	\$2,185,446	\$2,411,022	\$2,537,561

At the end of FY 2014, the Market Fund closed to the General Fund which is illustrated by the increase in FY 2015.

2. Property Tax Millages

The parks and recreation system currently has two millages; the Park Maintenance and Capital Improvements Millage and the Open Space and Parkland Preservation Millage.

a. PARK MAINTENANCE AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS MILLAGE

In November 2012, Ann Arbor voters approved the six-year (2013-2018) Park Maintenance and Capital Improvements Millage. The millage annually levies a tax of 1.10 mills (as reduced by Headlee) on all taxable real and personal property within the city for the purpose of financing park maintenance activities in the following categories: forestry, Natural Area Preservation, park operations, park security, and recreational facilities, and for the purpose of financing park capital improvement projects throughout the park system. The annual cost to a homeowner based on a median home valuation of \$250,000 is approximated to be \$137.50 for fiscal year 2017 (or \$11.46/month).

SECTION III: Budget and Funding

Property taxes are based on taxable valuation of properties in the city and the millage rates. Consequently, revenues increase or decrease as the total taxable value of property changes.

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	EST FY2017
MILLAGE REVENUE	\$4,929,333	\$4,971,553	\$5,077,989	\$5,166,619	\$5,388,603	\$5,508,694

Ann Arbor City Council approved guidelines for the administration of the Parks Maintenance and Capital Improvements Millage for the duration of the six-year period, including the following:

- Annual allocation for maintenance is to be between 60 percent and 80 percent, and for capital improvements, between 20 percent and 40 percent, with a total annual allocation being 100 percent.
- If future reductions are necessary in the city’s General Fund budget, not including the budget for safety services, during any of the six years of this millage, beginning in the fiscal year of 2007-2008, the general fund budget supporting the parks and recreation system will be reduced no greater than the average percentage reduction, for each particular year, of the rest of the city General Fund budget, not including the budget for safety services, for each of the applicable six years of this millage.
- If future increases occur in the city’s general fund budget, not including the budget for safety services, during any of the six years of this millage, beginning in the fiscal year of 2007-2008, the general fund budget supporting the parks and recreation system will be increased at the same rate as the average percentage increase, for each particular year, of the rest of the city general fund budget, not including the budget for safety services, for each of the applicable six years of this millage.
- The millage is not subject to a municipal service charge, but is subject to appropriate information technology and fleet charges.

b. OPEN SPACE AND PARKLAND PRESERVATION MILLAGE

In November 2003, the City of Ann Arbor voters approved a ballot proposal commonly known as the Greenbelt Millage that authorized a .5 mil tax for 30 years. The millage provides funds for preservation and protection of parkland within city limits and farmland, open space, natural habitats, and city source waters by the acquisition of conservation easement or purchase of development rights within the designated Greenbelt District. Approximately one-third of the money raised by the millage is apportioned to purchasing parkland within the city limits, and approximately two-thirds are appointed to the acquisition of land outside the city limits.

SECTION III: Budget and Funding

The Greenbelt Program focuses on three areas: the purchase of development rights on farmland, building 1,000-acre blocks of protected land, and protecting natural areas and open space throughout the Greenbelt District in partnership with other local agencies. While it is difficult to assign a percentage of focus of the greenbelt acquisitions as the program is dependent upon applications, the Greenbelt Program will strive to have approximately 90 percent of the funds focused on preserving blocks of land to include farmland purchase of development rights, as well as natural areas and open space within those blocks. The remaining funds will be used to focus on open space and natural areas of other value as they fit into a broader regional plan.

On May 3, 2004, the Ann Arbor City Council adopted Chapter 42 of the Ann Arbor City Code, titled "Open Space and Parkland Preservation." The Chapter establishes and defines a Greenbelt District and the criteria and selection process for purchase of development rights and other property rights within the district.

Chapter 42 of the City Code also established a nine-member Greenbelt Advisory Commission, their duties, and the relationship between the role of the Greenbelt Advisory Commission and the previously established Parks Advisory Commission. The Land Acquisition Committee of the Park Advisory Commission recommends purchasing parkland within the city limits, while the Greenbelt Advisory Commission recommends purchasing land outside the city limits.

3. Other Funding Sources

- a. Parks and recreation services charges fees for entrance to recreation facilities, rental of equipment, memberships, and programs, along with other activities, rentals, and special events. Revenue is also generated from concession sales, merchandise sales, and contract agreements. User and permit fees are evaluated as part of the budget process to make sure competitive fees are being charged, but that they also remain affordable for residents.
- b. State and federal grants have accounted for several million dollars to match local millage funds for projects. Grant programs administered by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment (MDNR) have included the Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund, which derives income from oil and gas leases and matches local funds for parkland acquisitions and park improvements, and the state income tax-supported Clean Michigan Initiative Recreation Bond, which has provided grant opportunities. Federal programs such as the Transportation Enhancement Act have contributed to projects. Major projects assisted by grants in recent years include the Gallup Park Livery renovations, the Veterans Memorial Park skatepark construction, and the Gallup Park Border-to-Border Trail renovations.
- c. Gifts, donations, and bequests also provide funding resources. Large bequests have recently funded the construction of a new picnic shelter and playground at Gallup Park, landscaping at all of the recreation facilities, and acquisition of a natural area on Huron River Drive. Donations played a large role in the construction of the Ann Arbor Skatepark, and the Rotary Club is in the process of

SECTION III: Budget and Funding

donating a significant sum for a universal access playground at Gallup Park. Gifts are also received to fund memorials for specific tree plantings and park benches. Donations from businesses and individuals help fund a scholarship program that provides access to recreation programs to Ann Arbor residents who are income eligible. Gifts and donations also contribute to publication of special brochures, maps, and presentation of special events.

- d. Developer parkland dedications and cash in lieu of dedication have provided much of the neighborhood parkland and improvements for over 40 years. The policy of requesting that developers provide parkland as part of the infrastructure to support new neighborhoods has helped the parks and recreation system keep pace with development in the city. Examples of park dedications include Cranbrook, Ward, and Foxfire Parks. Examples of cash in lieu include funding include playground equipment at North Main Park, and improvements to the tennis courts and playground at Woodbury Park.
- e. Volunteers assist through natural area stewardship, Adopt-A-Park activities, and volunteering through GIVE 365 . In addition, people volunteer by serving on committees and commissions such as the Park Advisory Commission; and serving as docents and instructors. Thousands of hours per year are graciously provided for various projects throughout the parks and recreation system.
- f. Public/Private partnerships can help defray operating expenses and increase visibility of programs and events throughout the community as well as create potential new sources of revenue.

Examples of public/private partnerships include the Leslie Science & Nature Center, which is operated by a private non-profit, and Bryant and Northside community centers, which are programmed by Community Action Network, and vending contracts with Coca-Cola.

With the exploration of partnerships, however, there is an awareness of potential associated issues. For example, cell tower companies have approached the city to discuss the feasibility of placing cell towers on park land. The proposals were reviewed by staff and shared with PAC, but it was decided that, although it would have provided a source of revenue, this was not something that the city was interested in pursuing as the visual impact on the parks was undesirable.

- g. Local matching funds continue to benefit the park system. The Ann Arbor Downtown Development Authority works with the city to accomplish a range of goals, including the enhancement of the downtown area for pedestrians. The DDA has contributed funding for design, construction, and maintenance for park properties within the DDA area including renovations to Liberty Plaza, Sculpture Plaza, and the Ann Arbor Farmers Market. This partnership remains an important collaborative relationship, and parks and recreation continues to work with the DDA to identify and develop parks open spaces and streetscapes within the downtown area as well as to maintain existing downtown park facilities.

SECTION III: Budget and Funding

E. Future Funding

The continuing growth of the area surrounding Ann Arbor has resulted in an increased demand for parks and recreation facilities . Through the dedicated park acquisition millage, the city has been able to acquire land for dedicated park, recreation and open space uses. However, the cost of developing and maintaining parkland and recreational facilities has reached a point where traditional funding means (i.e., property taxes, millages/bond issues, fees, etc.) are potentially no longer able to completely support the current and future needs of the parks and recreation system.

The current millage expires in 2018. Staff and PAC will be evaluating funding levels to determine whether the existing millage rate is adequate to maintain the current level of service, or whether an increase in the millage rate is needed to address pressing infrastructure needs. The park system includes numerous recreational facilities, buildings, and infrastructure components that are aging and in need of replacement. Additional funding will likely be required to maintain a level of service and amenities expected by the community.



SECTION IV: INVENTORY OF THE PARK, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE SYSTEM

The city's park, recreation, and open space inventory includes city-owned parks, natural areas, and recreational facilities. In addition, Ann Arbor residents have access to open space owned by the Ann Arbor Public Schools, the University of Michigan, neighboring townships, Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation, and State of Michigan land. Some of these facilities are located within the city's boundaries; others are located throughout Washtenaw County. Non-city owned parks and recreational resources accessible to the greater Ann Arbor community are important to understanding the extent of park and recreational opportunities for Ann Arbor residents; therefore, they are listed as separate inventories within this section of the PROS Plan.

A. Park Inventory Overview

As of 2016, the city's parks, recreation, and open space holdings were comprised of 159 park properties (including the tree nursery and the Ellsworth storage facility) two of which portions are leased from the Washtenaw County Water Resources Commission – Olson Park and Marybeth Doyle Park, totaling approximately 2,110 acres of active parkland. The properties include 91 structures, including the Leslie Science & Nature Center campus; 32 ball fields, including smaller neighborhood fields; 32 tennis courts; 24 soccer fields, including youth soccer fields and informal neighborhood fields; 79 playground areas; 19 picnic shelters; approximately 70 miles of multi-use paths, 21 miles of which are in parks and the remainder outside of parks, such as Huron Parkway and Fuller Road; 38 miles of nature trails; four swimming pools; two artificial ice rinks; two 18-hole golf courses; and two canoe liveries. Approximately 72 percent of the land is unstructured and serves as open space, with approximately 1,904 acres of woodland/shrubland, and 250 acres of green space, as well as wetlands,

savannas, prairies, and bogs, while some 800 acres of Huron River water surface are accessible with strategically located boat launching sites. Special facilities include a senior center, two community centers, historic houses, a farm, and a cemetery.

B. Park and Open Space Classification

The PROS Plan classifies park holdings by size, level of use, type of recreation experience, degree of naturalness, and location within the city. These classifications aid parks and recreation in determining land acquisitions, levels of maintenance, planning for amenities in the various parks, and balancing the recreation needs throughout the city.

These classifications, however, are not always clear cut, and overlap in several instances. Several community-wide parks, for example, also serve as neighborhood parks for the residents who live in close proximity. The classifications are meant as a guide for staff and the public to understand the breadth and scope of the park system.

The classification system includes the following:

1. Community-wide Parks

Community open space serves the recreational needs of the greater Ann Arbor community by offering diverse opportunities in a more natural setting. These spaces are often much larger than neighborhood parks and can accommodate greater numbers of people for a wide variety of uses. The goal is for these spaces to be accessible by non-motorized transportation and by public transportation and also provide parking facilities and other amenities such as restrooms and shelters. These open spaces are distributed as evenly as possible throughout the city. Typical amenities include scheduled softball or soccer fields, picnic shelters, playground areas, and recreation facilities within the park. Examples of community-wide parks include Fuller Park, Buhr Park, and Veterans Memorial Park.

2. Historic Sites

The purpose of labeling an area as a historic site is both to protect it and to describe its significance for interpretive programming. These facilities may be located within parks, such as the West Park Bandshell, or encompass the entire facility, such as the Kempf House. Although the facilities are historic, they often serve multiple purposes. Cobblestone Farm, for example, has both a historic house and a modern constructed barn. Although the house is used purely as a historic showcase, the barn, which was built as part of the farm, is used as a multipurpose facility for parties, meetings, and weddings. These older facilities require special care in their maintenance and daily use. The facilities are open to the public; however, some limitations are placed on their use due to their fragile nature. Additional examples of historic amenities include the Greek revival shelter at Island Park and the historic pergola at West Park.

3. Natural Areas

The classification of natural area provides for protection of the city's most significant natural resources. Natural areas are managed by the Natural Area Preservation division to improve their ecological integrity. Typical activities for this purpose include invasive plant removal, prescribed burning, and seeding or planting of native species. These activities may be performed by the city or by volunteers acting under the guidance of city staff. Wildlife inventory information about birds, butterflies, frogs, and salamanders are collected to help guide land management decisions.

Some of the natural areas that are of higher floristic quality or have sensitive ecological qualities, such as steep slopes or a rare species of plant or animal, have limitations on use. Bicycles, for example, are prohibited in Bird Hills, Furstenberg and Argo nature areas.

4. Neighborhood Parks

Neighborhood parks provide open space areas within approximately one-quarter mile of each resident. These areas are generally smaller in size and designed to attract a limited population. Parking is generally along the street. Typical amenities include a playground, basketball or tennis court, open grassy play areas, park benches and picnic tables, and a path to access the park amenities. Examples of neighborhood parks include Arbor Oaks, Bromley, Meadowbrook, and Waterworks parks.

5. Recreation Facilities

Recreation facilities serve a defined use or program which may be more specific or serve a limited segment of the population. Their use and access are generally more tightly controlled. These facilities vary in size and character depending on the intended use. Examples of these facilities include the Leslie Park and Huron Hills golf courses, the Ann Arbor Farmers Market, the pools and ice rinks, senior center and canoe liveries.

6. Urban Parks/Plazas

Urban parks and plazas provide open space and pedestrian-oriented amenities in the downtown area where the surrounding population includes high-density residential and commercial districts. These areas are defined by the presence of a significant infrastructure, a greater formality, and furniture to serve a greater density of people at peak times. The plazas are generally the smallest type of park in the system and are designed to integrate with the urban setting. Plazas are characterized by harder materials such as concrete, contained flower beds, a lack of open grassy areas and play equipment. Residents and downtown employees utilize these areas as a gathering space for eating and work breaks and often serve as a location for public art and performances. They ideally function in concert with the surrounding businesses, especially restaurants and cafes, where a cooperative effort energizes the physical


SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

space. Examples of urban plazas include Liberty Plaza, Sculpture Plaza, and Forsythe Park.


C. Planning Area Maps

The following series of maps show the park system and other open space, including public schools, university property, and county park property in the city by planning area.


SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System




SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System



SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System



SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System



D. Facility Listing

Ann Arbor Senior Center 1320 Baldwin Ave.

The Ann Arbor Senior Center is located in the Burns Park neighborhood and provides meeting space for programming that includes enrichment and educational classes, fitness programs, social programs, entertainment, rentals, and special events.

Argo Canoe Livery 1055 Longshore Drive

The facility provides canoe and kayak rentals and consists of a livery building, storage yard, and picnic shelter. Day camps are also run out of the livery and focus on river activities for teens.

Bryant Community Center 3 West Eden Court

The Bryant Community Center is a multi-use building that provides space for youth and adult programs, community meetings, health clinics, and day camps. It is managed by the Community Action Network.

Buhr Pool and Ice Arena 2751 Packard Road

Buhr Pool includes a zero-depth tot pool with spray toys and a 25-yard lap pool. The facility offers day camps, swim classes and swim teams, as well as public swim time. The ice arena is an NHL regulation size covered outdoor facility with refrigerated sub-floor, whose activities include public ice skating, drop-in hockey, league play, and rental hours. There are four separate locker rooms, a heated lobby, and vending.

Cobblestone Farm 2781 Packard Road

The farm includes an 1845 classic revival style cobblestone farmhouse and a replica barn used for special events, weddings and rentals. The site houses farm animals and volunteers provide interpretive programming. The Parks and Recreation Customer Service center is located within the barn.

Ann Arbor Farmers Market 315 Detroit St.

The market facilities include an office and meeting room as well as restrooms. There are 144 vendor stalls under the market shed structure. The market operates Saturdays the entire year, and Wednesdays from May 1 to Dec. 31. Parking is leased to the Downtown Development Authority when the market is not in operation.

Fuller Pool 1519 Fuller Road

Fuller Pool consists of a 50-meter lap pool, a zero-depth tot pool, and a water slide. There are locker rooms, a picnic shelter, and restrooms. The facility runs day camps, Masters Swimming, swim teams, swim classes, as well as public swim time.

Gallup Canoe Livery 3000 Fuller Road

The Gallup Canoe Livery rents canoes, kayaks, and pedal boats and was renovated in 2013 to provide universal access to docks and boats. A café and meeting room are located in the livery building. Camps, special events, and open hours for the public are offered at this facility.

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

Huron Hills Golf Course 3465 East Huron River Drive

Huron Hills is an 18-hole, par 67 course located along the Huron River. The facility includes adult and junior golf instruction, special events, league play, a footgolf course, a junior set of tees, and open golfing.

Kempf House 312 South Division St.

The Kempf House is a local history museum with a focus on the Victorian era (1850-1910) and Ann Arbor history. The museum offers guided tours for individuals and groups and is used for special events and monthly lectures.

Leslie Park Golf Course 2120 Traver Road

Leslie Park Golf Course is a championship 18-hole, par 72 golf course and was recently ranked by Golf Digest as the best municipal golf course in the state of Michigan. It is located along Traver Creek, in the northern part of Ann Arbor. The facility includes adult and junior golf instruction, special events, league play, and open golfing.

Leslie Science & Nature Center (LSNC), 1831 Traver Road

The center contains 50 acres of fields, woodlands and prairie, as well as the Leslie homestead, Critter House, office space, and Nature House. The LSNC became a 501c3 to afford better fundraising opportunities. Parks maintains the grounds and buildings. The Leslie homestead was donated to the city in 1976, and runs camps and events, including a raptor center and programs focusing on environmental education.

Mack Pool 715 Brooks St.

Mack Pool is connected to the Ann Arbor Open School at Mack and contains a six-lane, 25-yard pool for adults, a 30-foot by 40-foot children's pool, locker rooms, and pool office. The school uses the pool for students during school operating hours. Programs include Masters, swimming lessons, swim team, aquatic exercise classes and public swim.

Northside Community Center 809 Taylor St.

The center is managed by Community Action Network and runs programs for youth and adults. The facility contains meeting rooms, offices, and restrooms.

Veterans Park Pool and Ice Arena 2150 Jackson Ave.

Veterans Park Ice Arena contains a regulation 85-foot by 200-foot ice rink with spectator seating for 2,000, locker rooms, skate rental, concession area, and fitness room. Programs include ice hockey leagues and skating instruction, open skating, and special events. The 25-yard pool contains a waterslide and zero-depth tot pool area with spray toys. Programs include swimming lessons, lap swim, and swim teams.

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

E. Ann Arbor Parks Inventory Chart

The following chart shows the vast array of parks and activities offered by the City of Ann Arbor. It also summarizes the degree to which the parks are barrier free.

Park Inventory	Acreage	Play Area	Basketball	Tennis	Softball	Baseball	Soccer	Disc Golf Course	BMX Course	Trails	Paved Multi-use Path	Picnic Tables	Shelters	Restrooms	Drinking Fountain	Natural Area	Swimming Pool	Ice Rink	Canoe Rental	Parking	Barrier-Free Accessibility	Other	
Allmendinger	7.93	•	•	•	2					•	•			•	•					•	2		
Ann Arbor Senior Center	0.60																				•	3	
Arbor Hills Nature Area	6.29									•	•					•						1	
Arbor Oaks	3.24	•	•								•	•	•									3	
Arboretum Nature Area	28.40									•						•						4	
Argo Nature Area	25.79									•	BW	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	2	BL
Bader	1.64	•	•								•											3	
Bandemer	38.70						•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•					•	3	CD
Barton Nature Area	98.73									•	BW	•				•					•	3	CD
Baxter	2.00	•	•									•										3	
Beckley	3.17	•									•	•										2	
Belize	0.51	•									•				•							2	
Berkshire Creek Nature Area	5.32															•						1	
Bird Hills Nature Area	146.06									•						•					•	2	
Black Pond Woods Nature Area	32.21									•						•						2	
Bluffs Nature Area	41.01									•											•	1	MB
Braun Nature Area	10.42									•						•							
Broadway	3.78										•	•										4	
Brokaw Property	23.81									•						•						1	
Bromley	2.30	•										•										5	
Brookside	0.70	•									•											3	
Bryant Community Center	0.48	•												•	•							5	
Buhr	40.00	•		3	4						•			P	•		•	•			•	3	
Burns	14.23	•	•	4	2						•	•	•	•	•							3	
Burr Oak	3.31	•									•											3	
Cedar Bend Nature Area	19.03									•						•					•	2	
Churchill Downs	1.18	•	•								•				•							3	
Clinton	4.81	•	•	2	2						•			P	•						•	3	
Cloverdale	1.72	•	•								•											3	
Cobblestone Farm	3.73													•							•	5	
Cranbrook	17.87	•	•	•							•	•	•	•	•	•						4	
Crary	1.30																					2	
Creal	1.71	•	•									•			•							4	
Depot	0.07																					2	
Devonshire	1.12										•					•						4	
Dhu Varren Woods Nature Area	13.11									•						•						1	
Dicken	0.41																					1	
Dicken Woods Nature Area	9.76									•						•						2	
Dolph Nature Area	76.31									•						•					•	2	
Douglas	1.07										•											3	
Earhart	2.23															•						1	
Earhart West	0.90											•				•						1	
Eberbach Cultural Arts Bldg	1.21										•			•	•						•	4	
Eberwhite Nature Area	2.64									•						•						1	
Eisenhower	10.11															•						1	
Ellsworth	4.21	•	•									•	•	•	•							4	
Esch	4.51	•	•	•							•			p	•							4	
Evergreen	5.09	•								•						•						4	
Fairview Cemetery	8.68																					1	
Farmers Market	1.06													•	•						•	4	
Folkstone	3.17									•	•					•						1	

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

Park Inventory	Acres	Play Area	Basketball	Tennis	Softball	Baseball	Soccer	Disc Golf Course	BMX Course	Trails	Paved Multi-use Path	Picnic Tables	Shelters	Restrooms	Drinking Fountain	Natural Area	Swimming Pool	Ice Rink	Canoe Rental	Parking	Barrier Free Accessibility	Other		
Forest Nature Area	18.99										BW											1		
Forsythe	0.30																						4	
Foxfire East	3.17																						1	
Foxfire North	10.68																						3	
Foxfire South	18.96																						1	
Foxfire West	7.67																						1	
Frisinger	3.60													P									4	
Fritz	4.95																						3	
Fuller	59.22						7																4	
Furstenberg Nature Area	38.08										BW												5	
Gallup	55.13	3											2		2								5	BL
Garden Homes	11.45																						4	
George Washington (The Rock)	0.08																						4	
Glacier Highlands	1.67																						4	
Glazier Hill	1.72																						2	
Greenbrier	3.18																						3	
Hannah Nature Area	1.10																						1	
Hanover Square	0.28																						3	
Hansen Nature Area	9.55																						2	
Hilltop Nature Area	6.58																						1	
Hollywood	3.55																						1	
Hunt	6.75																						2	
Huron Highlands	1.60																						4	
Huron Hills Golf Course	117.71																						3	
Huron Parkway Nature Area	18.83																						1	
Iroquois	0.19																						1	
Island	5.64										BW		3										3	
Kelly	0.55																						3	
Kempf House	0.13																						4	
Kilburn	1.53																						3	
Kuebler Langford Nature Area	30.46																						1	
Lakewood Nature Area	7.60																						1	
Lansdowne	2.48																						4	
Las Vegas	1.75																						3	
Lawton	5.28																						3	
Leslie Park	38.82	2	2	3	2																		3	
Leslie Park Golf Course	149.54																						3	
Leslie Science Center	14.69																						3	
Leslie Woods Nature Area	23.12																						1	
Liberty Plaza	0.26																						3	
Longshore	2.27																						2	
Mack Pool	0.31																						3	
Malletts Creek Nature Area	3.40																						1	
Manchester	1.17																						2	
Marshall Nature Area	88.51																						1	
Mary Beth Doyle	80.85																						3	
Maryfield Wildwood	4.86																						3	
Meadowbrook	2.18																						3	
Mill Creek	1.09																						1	
Miller Nature Area	22.53																						1	
Mixtwood Pomona	0.34																						3	

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

Park Inventory	Acres	Play Area	Basketball	Tennis	Softball	Baseball	Soccer	Disc Golf Course	BMX Course	Trails	Paved Multi-use Path	Picnic Tables	Shelters	Restrooms	Drinking Fountain	Natural Area	Swimming Pool	Ice Rink	Canoe Rental	Parking	Barrier Free Accessibility	Other
Molin Nature Area	7.11									•						•					1	
Museum On Main	0.15																			•	3	
Mushroom	1.54	•									•										3	
Narrow Gauge Nature Area	12.92									•						•					1	
Newport Creek Nature Area	1.00									•						•					1	
North Main	0.47	•									•										3	
Northside	5.21	•	•	•	2	•					•	•	•	•							3	
Oakridge Nature Area	7.51									•						•					1	
Oakwoods Nature Area	22.44									•						•					1	
Olson	54.58	•	•				2			•	•	•	4	•	•	•				•	3	MB
Onder	4.24									•						•					1	
Pilgrim	1.38	•	•								•				•						3	
Pittsview	0.59																				2	
Placid Way	1.32	•									•	•								•	3	
Plymouth Parkway	6.02	•									•	•									3	
Postmans Rest	0.23										•										3	
Redbud Nature Area	5.11									•						•					1	
Redwood	0.54										•										4	
Riverside	9.49	•			•						•	•		P						•	4	
Riverwood Nature Area	4.71															•					1	
Rose	2.34	•									•	•								•	4	
Rose White	1.18	•									•				•						3	
Ruthven Nature Area	20.58									•						•					1	
Scarlett Mitchell Nature Area	49.37									•											2	
Scheffler	5.91	•	•		•						•			P	•					•	4	RH
Sculpture Plaza	0.09										•										4	
South Maple	9.43	•		2							•				•					•	3	PB
South Pond Nature Area	18.37									•						•					1	
South University	0.44		•								•										4	
Southeast Area	28.05	2	•		2		2			•	•	•	•	•	•	•				•	4	
Stapp Nature Area	10.04									•						•					1	
Stone School	4.62									•						•					1	
Sugarbush	30.29	2	•	2	•					•	•			P	•	•				•	4	
Sunset Brooks Nature Area	7.82									•						•					1	
Swift Run	9.86									•				P						•	3	
Sylvan	12.05	•		•						•	•					•					3	
Terhune Pioneer Cemetery	0.90																				1	
The Ponds	2.26	•									•					•					2	
Traver Creek Nature Area	5.10									•						•					1	
Tuebingen	7.13	•								•						•					1	
Turnberry	8.27	•								•	•					•					3	
Veterans Memorial	36.77	•		3	4	•				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•	4	SP
Virginia	4.94	•	•		•						•			P	•					•	3	
Ward	4.37	•								•	•										2	
Waterworks	1.48	•									•										3	
Waymarket	2.95	•									•										3	
Wellington	1.19	•									•										4	
West	23.17	•	•	3		•				•	BW	•		P	•	•				•	5	BS
Wheeler	1.93	•	•							•	•	•	•	•	•						3	T
White Oak	3.07	•								•	•					•					3	
Winchell	3.56	•			•						•			P							3	

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

Park Inventory	Acreage	Play Area	Basketball	Tennis	Softball	Baseball	Soccer	Disc Golf Course	BMX Course	Trails	Paved Multi-use Path	Picnic Tables	Shelters	Restrooms	Drinking Fountain	Natural Area	Swimming Pool	Ice Rink	Canoe Rental	Parking	Barrier Free Accessibility	Other	
Windemere	3.96	•		2							•	•									3		
Winewood Thaler	1.75	•	•									•			•	•						3	
Woodbury	2.11	•	•	2								•			•							3	
Wurster	5.91	•									•	•			•	•						3	
TOTAL ACREAGE	2109.77																						

Other Items Key:

BL = Boat Launch, BS = Band Shell, BW = Boardwalk, CD = Canoe Dock, PB = Pickleball
 MB = Mountain Bike Trails, P = Portable Restroom, RH = Roller Hockey Court, T = Track, SP = Skate Park

Barrier Free Access Key:

- 1 = none of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines
- 2 = some of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines
- 3 = most of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines
- 4 = the entire park meets accessibility guidelines
- 5 = the entire park was developed/renovated using principles of universal design

The Ellsworth storage facility and the tree nursery, totaling 22.71 acres, are park properties used for maintenance functions, and are not listed on the inventory because they are not open to the public.

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

F. Ann Arbor Public Schools Inventory

The Ann Arbor Public Schools have 32 sites, including elementary, middle, and high schools. The school grounds contain open spaces used by the public, including ball fields, play areas, and nature areas with trails.

Public School Facilities	Acreage	Play Area	Basketball	Tennis	Softball	Baseball	Soccer	Natural Area	Swimming Pool	Parking	Artificial Turf Field	Other
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SITES												
Abbot School	12.00	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•
Allen School	10.50	•	•				•			•		•
Angell School	3.00	•	•				•			•	•	•
Ann Arbor Open School at Mack	7.00	•	•	•			•		•	•		•
Bach School	7.80	•			•	•				•		•
Bryant School	7.40	•	•				•			•		•
Burns Park School	4.00	•	•				•			•		•
Carpenter School	11.00	•	•	•	•	•	•			•		•
Dicken School	10.00	•			•	•	•			•		•
Eberwhite School	42.20	•	•		•	•	•	•		•		•
Haisley Elementary School	10.00	•	•		•	•	•	•		•		•
Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School	9.96	•	•							•		•
Lakewood Elementary School	18.00	•			•	•	•	•		•		•
Lawton Elementary School	7.70	•	•				•			•		•
Logan Elementary School	9.75	•	•				•			•		•
Mitchell Elementary School	10.00	•	•		•	•	•	•		•		•
A2 STEAM at Northside	7.76	•	•		•	•	•			•		•
Pattengill Elementary School	11.33	•	•				•			•		•
Pittsfield Elementary School	4.00	•	•		•	•	•			•		•
Thurston Elementary School	24.75	•	•		•	•	•	•		•		•
Wines Elementary School	10.00	•	•		•	•	•			•		•
MIDDLE SCHOOL SITES												
Clague Middle School	23.50	•			•	•	•	•		•		•
Forsythe Middle School	26.00	•	•	•	•	•	•			•		•
Scarlett Middle School	69.70			•	•	•	•	•		•		•
Slauson Middle School	12.00				•	•	•		•	•		•
Tappan Middle School	20.00			•	•	•	•			•		•
HIGH SCHOOL SITES												
Community High School	3.20	•								•		•
Huron High School	55.50		•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•
Pioneer High School (includes Greenview)*	177.00		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Skyline High School	110.00		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Pathways to Success Academic Campus	6.50	•					•			•		•
OTHER FACILITIES												
Pre-School & Family Center			•					•		•		

*The City historically maintains walking trails and other portions of Greenview

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

1. Adjacent School and Public Park Properties

Both the city park system and the public schools system share several sites that are utilized by both the community and the students. Sites contain active recreation, such as softball fields, tennis courts, playgrounds, and natural areas.

Adjacent Public School and Park Properties

Park Name	Acreage	School Name	Acreage
Buhr	42.25	Allen Elementary	10.5
Burns	14.24	Burns Park Elementary	4
Dicken Woods Nature Area	9.76	Dicken Elementary	12.4
Earhart	2.22	King Elementary	10
Foxfire North	4.64	Site for future school	6
Hollywood	3.55	Abbot Elementary	12
Lakewood Nature Area	7.2	Lakewood Elementary	18
Lawton	5.27	Lawton Elementary	7.7
Mack Indoor Pool	N/A	Ann Arbor Open at Mack	7
Northside	5.21	A2 STEAM at Northside Elementary	2.2
Scarlett/Mitchell	49.11	Scarlet Middle/Mitchell Elementary	79.7
Stone School	4.62	Pathways to Success Academic Campus	6.5
Arbor Oaks	3.23	Bryant Elementary	10.4
Waterworks	1.48	Slauson	12

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

2. **Recreation Inventory of School and City Program Offerings**

Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation Services and the Ann Arbor Public Schools Community Education and Recreation Program jointly offer the following activities to city residents and to families and individuals residing within the Ann Arbor Public School District:

Recreation Program Inventory	Day Camps	Athletic Leagues for Adults	Cultural Arts Programs	Instructional Programs	Adapted Recreation Programs	Special Events	Athletic Activities for Youth	Exercise Classes	Senior Adult Programs	Swim Teams	Environmental Education	Historic Programs
Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation												
Ann Arbor Senior Center			•	•		•		•	•			
Argo Canoe Livery	•			•	•	•	•					•
Bandemer Park				•		•	•					
Bryant Community Center	•			•		•		•				
Buhr Pool and Ice Rink	•	•		•		•	•	•		•		
Cobblestone Farm			•	•		•						•
Farmers Market				•		•						
Fuller Park Pool	•			•		•	•	•				
Gallup Canoe Livery	•			•	•	•						•
Huron Hills Golf Course		•		•		•	•		•			
Kempf House			•			•						•
Leslie Golf Course		•		•		•			•			
Leslie Science and Nature Center	•			•		•	•					•
Mack Indoor Pool				•	•	•				•		
Northside Community Center	•			•		•						
Veterans Pool and Ice Rink	•	•		•		•	•			•		
Community Education & Recreation												
Eberbach Cultural Arts			•	•	•			•				
Public School Buildings	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

G. Other Agency Open Space Inventory

Other public and semi-public agencies provide a significant amount of public space used by the community as they are within close enough proximity that Ann Arbor residents may consider them part of the available open space/recreation landscape.

Four public agencies that provide recreation and open space opportunities in and around Ann Arbor include the University of Michigan, which owns significant acreage of open space within the city; the Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation Commission, which oversees 13 parks, including natural areas, water parks, golf courses, along with some parks within the city limits; Huron Clinton Metropolitan Authority (HCMA), which provides large-scale, regional recreation facilities outside of the city limits; and the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment, which provides a system of state parks, forests, and recreation and game areas, also outside the city limits. In addition to the list below, Washtenaw County Parks also owns 26 preserves totaling 3,147 acres.

Other Agency Parks and Open Space	Acreage	Play Area	Basketball	Tennis	Softball	Baseball	Soccer	Trails	Paved Multi-use Path	Picnic Tables	Shelters	Restrooms	Drinking Fountain	Natural Area	Swimming Pool	Ice Rink	Canoe Rental	Parking	Undeveloped	Other
Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation Commission																				
Cavanaugh Lake Park	3.00	•							•		•							•		•
County Farm Park	127.00						•		•	•			•					•		•
Independence Lake	312.00						•		•				•	•						•
Meri Lou Murray Recreation Center	*														•					•
Park Lyndon	335.00	•						•	•	•			•							•
Park Northfield	12.00	•						•	•	•	•									•
Parker Mill County Park	26.00						•	•	•	•										•
Pierce Lake Golf Course and Park	232.00						•	•	•											•
Osborn Mill	39.00												•							•
Rolling Hill County Park	151.00						•	•	•											•
Sharon Mills	12.00								•	•										•
Staebler Farm	114.00	NOT OPEN TO THE PUBLIC																		
Superior Center	1.00								•	•										•
TOTAL ACREAGE	1,364.00																			
Huron-Clinton Metropolitan Authority																				
Delhi Metropark	50.00	•				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				•		•
Dexter-Huron Metropark	125.00	•				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				•		•
Hudson Mills Metropark	1,624.00	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				•		•
TOTAL ACREAGE	1,799.00																			
Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR)																				
Pinckney Recreation Area	11,000.00	•					•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
Waterloo Recreation Area	20,500.00	•					•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				•		•
Chelsea Game Area	654.00						•													•
Gregory Game Area	3,400.00						•													•
Sharonville Game Area	3,015.00						•													•
TOTAL ACREAGE	38,569.00																			

* Meri Lou Murray Recreation Center is located within County Farm Park.

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

Other Agency Parks and Open Space	Acreage	Play Area	Basketball	Tennis	Softball	Baseball	Soccer	Trails	Paved Multi-use Path	Picnic Tables	Shelters	Restrooms	Drinking Fountain	Natural Area	Swimming Pool	Ice Rink	Canoe Rental	Parking	Undeveloped	Other
University of Michigan Properties																				
Baits Field	1.20																			
Baits Recreation Area	2.10		•	•																
Base Lake Farms	206.00																			
Diagonal Green	3.70								•											
Dow Field	36.00													•						
Elbel Field	7.00		•		•															•
Gordon Hall	70.00																			
Homer-McLaughlin	100.00													•						
Hubbard Woods	6.90													•						
Matthaei Botanical Gardens	377.00							•	•	•		•	•	•				•		•
Mitchell Field	36.00				•		•													
Mud Lake	258.00							•						•						
Murfin Playfield	2.80																			
Nichols Arboretum	58.50							•				•		•						
Palmer Field	9.20		•	•					•											
Portage Lake Observatory	147.00																			
Radrick Farms	380.00								•			•	•	•				•		•
Saginaw Forest	80.00							•						•						
Stinchfield Woods	664.00							•						•						•
University Golf Course	183.80																			•
TOTAL ACREAGE	2,629.20																			
TOTAL OTHER AGENCY ACREAGE	44,361.20																			

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

H. Neighboring Townships and Cities

Communities adjacent to and within the proximity of Ann Arbor provide open space for their residents that are also used by the local community. Trail systems connect some of these park spaces to Ann Arbor, including the Border-to-Border trail, which aims to link park systems along the Huron River through Washtenaw County.

Neighboring Townships and Cities	Play Area	Basketball	Tennis	Softball	Baseball	Soccer	Trails	Paved Multi-use Path	Picnic Tables	Shelters	Restrooms	Drinking Fountain	Natural Area	Swimming Pool	Ice Rink	Canoe Rental	Parking	Undeveloped	Other
Pittsfield Township																			
Buttonbush Swamp																			•
Lillie Park							•			•			•						•
Montibeller Park	•		•		•		•		•		•		•				•		•
P.G Palmer Park																		•	
Pittsfield Preserve	•						•		•	•			•						
Prairie Park	•								•								•		•
Firehall Park/Township Hall																			•
Township Park & Community Center	•				•				•	•							•		•
Scio Township																			
NO FACILITIES																			
Ypsilanti Township																			
Appleridge	•	•			•				•										
Big Island Park													•						
Bud and Blossom	•				•				•										
Burns	•		•		•				•										
CC Complex	•		•		•				•	•	•								•
Clubview	•		•		•		•												•
Fairway Hills																			
Ford Heritage																			
Ford Lake Park	•		•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•			•		•		•
Harris Road	•				•				•	•	•								
Hewens Creek Park																	•	•	•
Huron River Park																			
Lakeside	•								•	•	•								•
Lakeview	•				•				•										
Loon Feather Park	•								•	•	•						•		•
Nancy	•				•				•										
North Bay Park	•						•		•	•	•								•
North Hydro Park									•										•
Pines	•				•				•										•
Rambling Road	•	•			•				•										
South Hydro Park									•										•
Sugarbush	•	•			•				•										
Tot Lot	•								•										
Watertower Park	•								•										
Wendell Homes Park					•	•											•		
West Willow Park	•	•			•		•		•	•									
Southwest Park																			•

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

Neighboring Townships and Cities (continued)	Play Area	Basketball	Tennis	Softball	Baseball	Soccer	Trails	Paved Multi-use Path	Picnic Tables	Shelters	Restrooms	Drinking Fountain	Natural Area	Swimming Pool	Ice Rink	Canoe Rental	Parking	Undeveloped	Other
City of Saline																			
Brecon Park	•	•	•				•		•								•		
Canterbury Park	•								•										
Colony Park	•								•				•						
Curtiss Park	•		•		•		•		•	•			•						
Marlpool Tot Lot	•	•																	
Mill Pond Park	•					•	•		•	•			•				•		
Peoples Park		•	•						•				•				•		
Risdon Park																			•
Stonecliff Park																			•
Tefft Park	•	•	•	•					•				•	•			•		•
Wilderness Park							•											•	
City of Ypsilanti																			
Candy Cane Park	•			•	•					•									
Carrie Mattingly Lot	•																		
Charles Street Tot Lot	•								•										
Edith Hefley Park	•								•										
Frog Island Park						•													•
Gilbert Park	•				•														
Parkridge Park/Community Center	•	•	•	•					•	•									•
Peninsular Park									•	•									•
Prospect Park	•	•	•	•	•				•	•									
Recreation Park	•	•			•		•		•	•				•					
Riverside Park	•								•	•									•
Waterworks Park				•					•	•									

I. Private and Nonprofit Recreation Service Providers

The Ann Arbor area has a wealth of private recreation, arts, and fitness providers. In some cases, they offer the community a more advanced level and more intensive or frequent opportunities to participate in recreational outlets, as well as offer facilities and programs that municipal agencies do not. In many cases, the city and/or schools provide spaces for these groups. They also tend to be more expensive than the programs offered by Community Education and Recreation and Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation. The PROS Plan does not include an inventory of these private facilities.

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

J. Natural Area Inventory Data

YEAR	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Acres Burned	72	93	62	32	130
Number of Parks Burned	13	22	19	11	21
Pounds of Garlic Mustard Pulled	12,000	9,500	26,200	9,000	9,380
Volunteer Hours	10,070	9,331	8,854	9,386	11,437
Individual Birds Observed	8,462	14,839	10,251	9,873	10,144
Individual Amphibians Observed	293	395	302	477	1,018

NUMBER OF SPECIES IN ALL PARKS	
Birds	211
Plants	1,194
Amphibians	27
Butterflies	78

K. Grant Inventory

Below is a list of grants that have been received by the Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation system from the Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Clean Michigan Initiative Recreation Bond Fund, and the 1988 Recreation Bond Fund.

Project	Project Number	Application Year	Grant Amount	Project Description
Geddes Pond Development	26-00499	1973	\$150,000.00	Development of Gallup Park, including pathways, docks, park furniture
Gallup Park Pathway	26-00870	1977	\$25,191.18	Development of pathway along Huron River
Leslie Park Development	26-01023 A4	1977	\$39,247.08	Tennis courts, sidewalk, landscaping, picnic equipment, parking lot delineations
Riverside Park Redevelopment	26-01080	1978	\$22,609.79	Shoreline stabilization and restoration, play area, pathway, park furniture

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

Project	Project Number	Application Year	Grant Amount	Project Description
Hunt Park Redevelopment	26-01060 G2	1978	\$12,501.87	Play area, picnic area, pathway, drinking fountain, benches, relocate ball diamond, picnic equipment
Green/Baxter Park Development	26-01107	1980	\$15,086.00	Walkway, landscaping, game court, playground, picnic area
Johnson-Greene Parkland	TF624	1982	\$250,000.00	Acquisition of 32 acres for first phase of Bandemer Park
Gallup Park Improvements	26-01257	1983	\$58,312.00	Construction of canoe livery, interpretive displays, docks, play area, landscaping, park furniture
Island Park Improvements	26-01385	1985	\$134,556.47	Play equipment, river stabilization, walkway, shelter renovations, barrier free modifications to restroom, pedestrian bridge, park furniture
Bandemer Park Development	BF89-411	1989	\$380,000.00	Development of Bandemer Park, including pathways, picnic shelter, docks, parking area, park furniture
Veterans Park Ice Arena	BF90-371	1990	\$700,000.00	Replace ice arena slab, upgrade sound system, renovate pool and filtration system, barrier free access improvements, locker room and fitness area renovations
Hawkins Property	TF88-132	1990	\$281,250.00	Addition of 8 acres to Bandemer Park
Black Pond Woods Acquisition	TF90-373	1990	\$875,000.00	Acquisition of 32.21 acres of natural area adjacent to Leslie Science Center
Gallup Park Livery Improvements	TF11-014	2011	\$300,000.00	Improvements to the Gallup Livery, docks, meeting room, service drive and entry, fishing dock for barrier free access, landscaping
Gallup Park Universal Access Playground	TF15-0046	2015	\$300,000.00	Development of a universal access playground, including barrier free pathways, fishing dock, park furniture, landscaping, and kayak pullout

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

GRANT INVENTORY: OTHER SOURCES

Project	Application Year	Grant Amount	Project Description
Transportation Enhancement Program	1993	\$98,000.00	Construction of non-motorized path through Bandemer Park
Transportation Enhancement Program	1996	\$20,000.00	Water quality improvements under M-14 bridge at Bandemer Park
Moore Family Foundation	1999	\$65,000.00	Environmental Education Classroom Facility Leslie Science Center
MichCon Foundation	1999	\$150,000.00	Environmental Education Classroom Facility Leslie Science Center
Community Foundation for Southeastern Michigan	2001	\$25,375.00	Engineering and construction documentation for Argo Dam crossing and pathway
Community Foundation for Southeastern Michigan	2003	\$31,000.00	Development of trail over Argo Dam and bicycle path to Lakeshore Drive
Detroit Edison Foundation	2003	\$4,500.00	Huron River Day Festival
Detroit Edison Foundation	2004	\$4,500.00	Huron River Day Festival
State of Michigan	2005	\$2,252.00	Volunteer river, stream and creek cleanup
Ann Arbor Community Foundation	2005	\$1,500.00	Provided Ann Arbor area nonprofit youth groups canoe instructional program
Detroit Edison Foundation	2005	\$4,500.00	Huron River Day Festival
Detroit Edison Foundation	2006	\$4,500.00	Huron River Day Festival
Michigan Section of Public Waterworks	2006	\$1,000.00	Design and implementation of river education curriculum form Ann Arbor Public Schools middle school students
Detroit Edison Foundation	2007	\$4,500.00	Huron River Day Festival
State of Michigan	2007	\$3,896.00	Volunteer river, stream and creek cleanup
Downtown Development Authority	2007	\$30,000.00	Historic Kempf House foundation replaced

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

Project	Application Year	Grant Amount	Project Description
Transportation Alternatives Program	2014	\$447,500.00	Border-to-Border Trail from Geddes Dam to Gallup Park
Downtown Development Authority	2016	\$175,000.00	Farmers Market structure construction

GRANT INVENTORY: CUSTOMER SERVICE GRANTS

City of Ann Arbor Customer Service Grant Recipient	Application Year	Grant Amount	Project Description
Senior Center, Farmers Market, Mack and Fuller Pools	2008	\$4,611.00	Piano, signage at Farmers Market, Swim teaching tools at Pools
Buhr Park, Mack Pool, Cobblestone, Senior Center, Leslie Park Golf Course	2011	\$2,565.00	Speakers, splash day pool toys, bulletin board, Wii game, golf course speed of play
Huron and Leslie Golf Course, Cobblestone, Farmers Market, Argo and Gallup Liveries, Mack and Fuller Pools, Give 365	2012	\$3,405.00	Ball mark repair, coffeemaker, bridge card magnets, river briefing stations, outreach marketing, life jackets, fins, yoga mats, t-shirts
Golf courses, Farmers Market, Canoe Liveries, Senior Center, Buhr Ice Arena, Give 365, Leslie Science & Nature Center	2013	\$5,500.00	Divot repair tools, coat rack translation software, signage, speakers, ladders
Mack Pool, Gallup Park, West Park, Veterans Memorial Pool	2014	\$7,241.00	Bleachers, tables and shade umbrellas, interpretive signage, swimsuit dryers
Golf course, Mack Pool, Senior Center, Canoe Liveries	2015	\$5,000.00	Foot golf cups, starting blocks, bridge software, livery briefing sign

SECTION IV: Inventory of the Park, Recreation and Open Space System

L. Awards, Certifications and Designations

- Michigan Recreation and Park Association (MRPA) Park Design Award for the Argo Cascades. Annual MRPA Design Award given to MRPA member organizations for outstanding work in the areas of facility and landscape/site design in 2012.
- Ann Arbor Farmers Market named Best of Detroit Reader's Pick – Best Farmers Market in Washtenaw County – Metro Times 2012 and 2014.
- Ann Arbor Farmers Market – Top 100 Most Celebrated Farmers Market in Michigan by the American Farmland Trust in 2013.
- Argo Cascades Park in Ann Arbor, Michigan named a “Frontline Park” by the national urban park advocacy organization City Parks Alliance in 2013.
- Michigan Recreation and Park Association (MRPA) Park Design Award for the Ann Arbor Skatepark at Veterans Memorial Park in 2014.
- Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation, Citizen Pruner Program awarded the MRPA's Innovative Park Resource Award in 2015.
- Leslie Park Golf Course certified in 2012 as an Audubon Cooperative Sanctuary by Audubon International and re-certified in 2015.
- MRPA Pro-Grammy Awards Community Special Event – Trick or Treat on the River in 2015.
- Border-to-Border Trail designated part of the Iron Belle Trail through the state of Michigan in 2015.
- Huron River Water Trail designated as a National Water Trail by the National Park Service in 2015.
- Leslie Park Golf Course certified as an Environmental Steward in the Michigan Turfgrass Environmental Stewardship Program (MTESP) in 2012, and obtained Legacy Status in the MTESP in 2016.
- Leslie Park Golf Course named Current Magazine Reader's Choice Award - Ann Arbor's Favorite Golf Course, 2016
- Ann Arbor Farmers Market named Current Magazine Reader's Choice Award Best Farmers Market 2014 and 2016.



SECTION V: LAND USE PLANNING AND ACQUISITION

A. Philosophy and Guiding Principles

The city's park system has evolved over more than a century, with acquisition of park parcels gradually building a system known for its diversity, preservation of green space and recreation opportunities. This chapter outlines the philosophy and guiding principles as well as the methods used to acquire land.

Acquisition is a term that describes the various methods of bringing parcels of land under public control, including outright purchase, lease, easement, swap, or other methods. Many factors are considered when evaluating potential acquisitions, such as economic and health benefits provided by green space, consideration of when the city has enough parkland, what types of land would complement existing parks, when the loss of tax base might outweigh the benefits, and how much funding should be allocated as part of the city budget.

National standards exist, although there are wide variations in their application, for the ideal amount of park acreage per resident. The National Park and Recreation Association standard for park acreage is approximately 10 acres per 1,000 people. Ann Arbor's park system ratio is much higher, at over 18 acres per 1,000 people, but this is based on Ann Arbor residents placing parks as an important value for the community. Having a neighborhood park within one-quarter mile of every resident is a goal that is nearly achieved. This is considered a reasonable distance for pedestrian access, although there are a myriad of factors that influence that distance, including major streets that need to be crossed, other public open space, such as public schools with play areas, and amount of private green space available to residents.

In order to evaluate and prioritize how parkland is acquired, a series of criteria has been developed. These criteria are revisited according to the public input received during each PROS Plan update to reflect trends, current conditions, and park system needs.

B. History of Parkland Acquisition

Between 1988 and 2016, Ann Arbor parks and recreation acquired just over 389 acres. The land was valued at \$19,770,604, with just over \$15 million coming from acquisition millages. The

SECTION V: Land Use Planning and Acquisition

remaining \$4.7 million was generated through grants, donations and other funding sources. The table below summarizes the parcels that were acquired during this period.

Use Group	Total Acres	% of Total Acres	Total Value	% of Total Value
Natural	296.03	75.89	\$16,306,011	82.48
Active	51.37	13.20	\$ 750,978	3.80
Neighborhood	13.08	3.44	\$ 1,329,224	6.72
Museum	0.15	<.01	\$ 75,622	.38
Linkage/Access	28.58	7.43	\$ 1,308,769	6.62
Total	389.21		\$19,770,604	

The chart below is a summary of land acquired since 1988.

Completed Land Acquisition Millage Purchases

Acquired Property	Acres	Total Costs	Planning Area	Use	Amount From Millage	FY
Krause (Dolph Addition)	0.98	\$24,105	West	Access	\$24,105	88-89
Kimberly-Colony (Molin Nature Area)	7.2	\$85,113	South	Natural Area	\$45,000	88-89
Bird Hills Addition	31.25	\$622,000	West	Natural Area	\$622,000	89-90
Redwood Park	0.54	\$32,734	Southeast	Neighborhood	\$32,734	89-90
Bird Hills Addition	4.3	\$86,839	West	Natural Area	\$86,839	89-90
North Main @ Beakes (WCHS)	0.15	\$75,622	Central	Museum	\$0	90-91
Katz (SEA Park)	25.69	\$313,600	Southeast	Active	\$156,800	91-92
Black Pond Woods	26.76	\$1,211,127	Northeast	Natural Area	\$336,127	91-92
Worden (Stone School Park)	5.06	\$148,528	South	Neighborhood	\$148,528	91-92
Westover Lots (Dolph Add.)	0.55	\$32,104	West	Linkage	\$32,104	91-92
Belize Addition	0.37	\$71,000	Central	Neighborhood	\$33,401	91-92
Sias A&B (DhuVarren Woods/Traver Ck)	20.03	\$646,200	Northeast	Natural Area	\$354,514	92-93
Gunn (Huron Parkway Nature Area)	18.68	\$941,000	Northeast	Natural Area	\$464,005	93-94
Hawkins (Bandemer Add.)	8	\$675,000	River	River Access	\$393,725	93-94
Bader	1.7	\$174,570	Northeast	Neighborhood	\$174,570	94-95
WCRC Pit (NE Area Park)	24	\$150,000	Northeast	Active	\$150,000	95-96
Verle (Brown Park)	10	\$216,000	South	Natural/Access	\$216,000	95-96
S. Main (Cranbrook Add.)	1.14	\$20,000	South	Natural/Neighbor.	\$20,000	95-96
Evergreens Lots (10 Lots)	1.65	\$80,254	West	Neighborhood	\$53,540	95-96
Beechwood Lots (Kuebler-Langford)	0.89	\$70,636	West	Linkage	\$36,304	96-97
St Thomas (Bluffs)	20.01	\$1,100,000	West	Natural/Neighbor.	\$363,000	96-97
SEA Park Additions *	1.68	\$287,378	Southeast	Active	\$81,103	98-99
Hearthstone III addition to Ponds Park	0.2	\$124,839	South	Neighborhood	\$124,839	98-99
Audubon Woods (Redbud Nature Area)	4.98	\$346,722	South	Natural	\$346,722	00-01
Scarlett-Mitchell Addition	25.07	\$1,111,253	Southeast	Natural	\$486,253	00-01
Bluffs Park Addition	17.77	\$1,507,037	West	Natural/Linkage	\$1,507,037	00-01
Huron Parkway ROW	13.11	\$26,924	Northeast	Linkage	\$26,924	01-02
Sunset Brooks	7.6	\$410,000	West	Natural/Linkage	\$410,000	03-04
Stapp (Traverwod)	8.1	\$550,000	Northeast	Natural/Linkage	\$550,000	03-04
Dolph Addition	18.2	\$1,274,000	West	Natural/Linkage	\$586,040	04-05
Brookside (4 lots)	0.96	\$151,084	South	Neighborhood	\$151,084	05-06
Evergreens Lot 108	0.2	\$39,300	West	Neighborhood	\$39,300	04-05

Continued on next page

SECTION V: Land Use Planning and Acquisition

Acquired Property	Acres	Total Costs	Planning Area	Use	Amount From Millage	FY
Evergreen Lot 118	0.2	\$57,247	West	Neighborhood	\$57,247	04-05
Evergreen Lot 120	0.2	\$49,668	West	Neighborhood	\$49,668	04-05
Onder	4.75	\$489,985	Northeast	Linkage	\$489,985	06-07
Andres (Evergreen addition)	0.5	\$158,435	West	Neighborhood	\$158,435	06-07
Girl Scouts (Hilltop Nature Area)	7.75	\$2,239,249	West	Natural Area	\$2,239,249	06-07
Zion Lutheran (Eberwhite Nature Area)	2.25	\$597,664	West	Natural Area	\$597,664	07-08
Narrow Gauge Way (Narrow Gauge Nature Area)	13.5	\$1,844,376	Northeast	Natural Area	\$1,844,376	07-08
Crary (Crary Park)	1.3	\$0	Northeast	Neighborhood	\$0	07-08
Botsford (Conservation Easement)	10	\$158,900	West / Scio	Natural Area	\$158,900	08-09
219 Chapin (West Park Addition)	0.2	\$277,506	West	Neighborhood	\$277,506	09-10
Linkner (Scheffler Park Addition)	0.3	\$0		Natural/Linkage	\$0	09-10
Elks (220 N. Sunset-Bluffs Addition)	0.58	\$376,969	West	Access / Natural	\$376,969	10-11
Wes Vivian (South Pond Addition)	2	\$599,656	Northeast	Access/Nature	\$599,656	10-11
Riverview Nursing (Bluffs Addition)	1.1	\$0	West	Natural Area	\$0	10-11
Bryant Community Center Add'n	0.3	\$76,262	Southeast		\$76,262	11-12
Braun Park	10	\$0	Northeast	Natural Area	\$0	12-13
C. Clare North (Hampstead Lane-Kuebler Addition)	0.91	\$118,944	West	Natural/ Linkage	\$118,944	12-13
1240 Orkney (Bluffs Addition)	0.35	\$120,774	West	Linkage	\$120,774	12-13
Brokaw	24	\$0	West/Twp	Natural	\$0	13-14
Stapp Nature Area (Mart in donation)	2.2	\$0	Northeast	Natural	\$0	13-14
Total	389.21	\$19,770,604			\$15,218,233	

C. Proposing Land for Acquisition

Potential parkland acquisitions are identified in various ways, with a process that has been developed through staff and public input. In each scenario, land owners submit applications, after which a team of staff reviews the merits of the parcel and scores them according to criteria that were developed by staff and PAC members. PAC is then provided the property information and the staff summary review and recommendations. If the land is seen as meeting the criteria developed to evaluate land for public benefit, PAC may recommend the purchase to City Council. Three ways in which land may be brought before PAC include the following:

1. Staff periodically researches land parcels to identify sites that meet particular objectives, such as floristic quality, connectivity, or balancing needs within the system. Staff may contact landowners to provide information to them regarding the city's program if they are interested in selling their land. This is a strictly voluntary process.
2. Property owners may nominate their land to be considered for purchase.
3. Occasionally, through the city development review process, land is identified as potential parkland. Land then may be acquired through developer contribution, purchase, or a combination of several methods.

Land transfers may be at no cost or may be for considerations other than cash. All land acquisitions must have both an independent real estate appraisal report to establish fair market value and an environmental assessment before land can be purchased per City Council resolution. The city often applies for grant funding to offset the purchase price, in which case there are generally additional review requirements. All purchases and acquisition of land rights require both the Land Acquisition Committee and City Council approval.

SECTION V: Land Use Planning and Acquisition

D. Acquisition Criteria for Parkland Property within the City Limits

In 2014-2015, staff and PAC members met to develop a scoring system to rate proposed properties. The scoring system aligns closely with the process used to rank capital improvement projects, but the criteria are tailored to property acquisition. Properties score between 0-10, with discreet numbers assigned to each description. The following criteria and scoring are utilized for active park areas:

SCORING ACTIVE PARK AREA		Low ← → High			
1	Connectivity to a natural area, riparian area, park, other land with public access, existing trail system, wetland area, or a tributary of the Huron River ("defined areas")	0 Site does not provide connection to any of the defined areas	5 Site connects to one type of defined area	7 Site connects to 2 or more types of defined areas	10 Connects to one or more type of defined areas AND to the Huron River
2	Access to Subject Parcel	0 Site does not have adequate access	3 Site provides adequate street frontage (min. lot frontage or greater per underlying zoning)	5 Site provides adequate street frontage AND opportunities for barrier free access	7 Site provides adequate street frontage AND opportunities for barrier free access AND multiple points of access
3	Access to an Existing Park	0 Subject parcel DOES NOT increase access to an existing park		10 Subject parcel DOES increase access to an existing park	
4	Method of Acquisition	2 Full fair market value paid for property	5 Partial donation of property value OR cost share opportunity	8 Complete donation of property	10 Complete donation of property AND endowment/contribution by donor to cover post-acquisition costs
5	Capital Improvement Costs	2 Capital improvement costs needed to provide adequate and safe public use/access will be greater than \$100,000	4 Capital improvement costs needed to provide adequate and safe public use/access will be greater than \$50,000 but less than \$100,000	8 Capital improvement costs needed to provide adequate and safe public use/access will be between \$25,000 and \$50,000	10 Capital improvement costs needed to provide adequate and safe public use/access will be less than \$25,000
6	Operational Costs	0 No opportunity for cost sharing of operational costs or management of the site		1-10 Partnership opportunities for shared operational costs and management of the site with another City department, County, or a private organization Note: Sliding scale based on percent of cost shared where 10% =1; 20% =2, etc.	
7	Sustainability Framework Goals	0 Does not meet any Sustainability Framework goals	4 Meets 1 - 2 Sustainability Framework goals	7 Meets 3 - 4 Sustainability Framework goals	10 Meets more than 4 Sustainability Framework goals

Continued on next page

SECTION V: Land Use Planning and Acquisition

8	Site Suitability	0 Site DOES NOT meet any need identified in the PROS Plan or identified by the community	10 Site meets at least 1 need identified in the PROS Plan or identified by the community
9	Underserved Neighborhood	0 Site is NOT located in an area that is underserved for the intended use of the park as identified in the PROS plan	5 Site is located in an area that is moderately served for the intended use of the park as identified in the PROS plan
			10 Site is located in an area that is underserved for the intended use of the park as identified in the PROS plan

1. Assessing the Quality of Natural Areas:

The City of Ann Arbor makes decisions such as whether to preserve undeveloped or "natural" parkland, and how to manage it, by assessing its environmental integrity and potential to support a well-functioning native ecosystem. The city also evaluates how each natural area compares with others in terms of ecological significance, including such measures as biological diversity, presence of rare or unusual species, presence of invasive exotic species, and other factors. Once a comprehensive natural area inventory has been completed, it becomes much easier to determine how significant any particular natural area is for the City of Ann Arbor, and how to best care for it. The city has developed a natural area assessment process based on a well-established scientific protocol for evaluating plant inventory data, called the Floristic Quality Assessment System, or FQAS, coupled with an evaluation of other natural features such as birds, butterflies, and amphibians, and other scientific information relating to the potential for ecosystem restoration and sustainability.

The plant inventory and assessment system used by the city is based on a system in use in the Chicago region since the late 1970s, which was developed at the Morton Arboretum in Lisle, Illinois, by Dr. Gerould Wilhelm and others. This system uses scientific and ecological principles, and is simple enough to be used by interested citizens yet thorough enough to realistically assess the floristic or botanical significance of an area. Wilhelm's assessment system from the Chicago region has been modified and used in other areas throughout the Midwest, including by the Natural Heritage Program of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (*Michigan Floristic Quality Assessment*, Herman, et. al., 1996 and 2001). The city uses the Michigan FQAS for assessing the ecological quality of plant communities in the parks.

The FQAS is based on the principle that many plant species have evolved over time to be specifically adapted for the natural ecological conditions present in Michigan (including soil conditions, temperature, moisture, humidity, presence of fire, and faunal interactions, etc.). These species are considered to be native to Michigan, as confirmed by botanical records prior to extensive European settlement. Different plant species display varying degrees of fidelity to specific habitats and varying degrees of tolerance to disturbance. The FQAS assigns a "coefficient of conservatism" ("C") from 0-10 to each species in accordance with that species' tendency to be found in the types of natural communities that existed pre-European settlement. For example, white lady's-slipper orchid, which is a threatened species in Michigan and requires a very specific set of habitat conditions, has a C value = 10. But the more "weedy," yet still-native box elder tree, which is extremely common and grows in a wide range of habitat conditions, has a C

value = 0.

Natural areas with more plant species of higher C values tend to be far less disturbed by human activities than a site dominated by plant species with lower C values. These C values are part of the calculations used in the FQAS. To use the FQAS, we simply conduct an inventory of all plant species present in a natural area, and feed that information into a formula that takes into consideration the number of native plant species and their various C values. This generates a “Floristic Quality Index” (or FQI) which is a measure (or at least an estimate) of the ecological integrity of that site – how closely it approximates pre-European settlement conditions. The comparison of scores from a range of natural areas provides a tool for distinguishing between areas that have the right conditions to allow native species to flourish, and those areas that appear green, but have been highly disturbed and may never support a well-functioning “natural” ecosystem.

Many of the undeveloped areas within Ann Arbor have been assessed using the FQAS to identify which are of greater floristic significance than others and, thus, have a higher priority for protection or restoration. This information is valuable when considering future acquisitions of land for the park system. It is also useful for establishing various categories of natural areas, each with a different set of management practices. Natural Area Preservation (NAP) began compiling plant inventories of the park natural areas in 1994, for incorporation into city park natural area management plans. To date, they have catalogued over 1,100 species of plants in 125 city parks and other natural areas. FQI scores for natural areas in the city reveal both natural areas that are highly disturbed and those that closely resemble high quality pre-European settlement plant communities.

In addition to assessing vegetation, NAP has conducted wildlife surveys in many parks. Since 1995, data on the butterflies, breeding birds, reptiles, and amphibians that inhabit our natural areas have been compiled. Although there is no counterpart to the Floristic Quality Assessment for interpreting wildlife data, the information is useful in evaluating the wildlife value of each site, and in helping to establish a baseline of existing wildlife use in the parks. These inventories will continue into the future to help monitor the changes that occur in our natural areas.

For parkland acquisition, one goal for this inventory effort is to be able to rank and compare various natural areas based on their floristic quality, but also their value to wildlife and potential for restoration. The inventory data, including the FQI and the presence of rare species, are primarily used to evaluate the ecological quality of a site. Other important criteria that affect the ecological or recreational value of an area may include: whether the site has a wetland, serves as a wildlife corridor, provides a buffer around existing natural areas, acts as a preserve for landmark trees, or simply provides green space in an urban neighborhood. Factors that may negatively affect the value of an area may be its position relative to other highly disturbed or developed areas, such that it is landlocked or fragmented in a way that interferes with ecological function, or its past disturbance history.

Consequently, when evaluating natural areas for acquisition, the “Underserved Neighborhood” criterion is eliminated, and the following three criteria are added:

SECTION V: Land Use Planning and Acquisition

1. Existing Plant Communities

If the Floristic Quality Index is less than 20, it receives a 2, if between 20 and 40, a 5, if between 40 and 60 an 8, and if greater than 60, a 10.

2. Coverage of Invasive Plants

If coverage of invasive plants is extensive (>75 percent), a score of 0 is assigned, if moderate (between 50-75 percent) a 5, between 25-50 percent, an 8, and less than 25 percent, a 10.

3. Rare Flora and Fauna

If the site contains no rare flora and fauna, a score of 0 is assigned, if the site contains flora and fauna classified as rare locally, a 7, and if classified by the state or federal government as an endangered or threatened species or as a species of special concern, a 10.

E. Property Acquisition Options for Parkland and Greenbelt Properties

There are many tools available to secure land for public park and open space use. The following are the most common. Any single acquisition may involve more than one of these methods.

1. Outright Acquisition of Parcels

In many cases, the city may opt to purchase property outright and maintain full ownership and rights of a piece of land. Bluffs Park is an example of an outright acquisition. (This criterion is for parkland acquired in the city only.)

2. Bargain or Charitable Sale (Less Than Fair Market Sale)

A landowner may choose to sell to the city at a price less than the full market value. Marshall Park is an example of land that was sold to the city for park use at less than market value.

3. Outright Donation (Fee Simple Transfer)

Outright donation involves the provision of public land at no cost to the city. The donor may receive tax benefits in the form of federal income tax deductions, potential estate tax benefits, and relief from property taxes. Many neighborhood parks in Ann Arbor were donated as a part of the development review and approval process. Crary Park and parts of Scheffler Park are examples of park donations by individuals.

4. Donation by Will (Bequest)

A gift of land made through a will entitles the donor to retain full use of the land during his or her lifetime. The donor is responsible for real estate and income taxes for the property during his or her lifetime. The Leslie Science Center site was bequeathed to the city in Leslie's will.

5. Installment Sale

An installment sale allows an agency or organization to purchase property over a period of years. The use of the land and the responsibility for payment of property taxes until the sale is complete are negotiable terms of the agreement. The seller benefits financially by spreading the income and the taxable gains over several years.

6. Purchase of Development Rights/Conservation Easement

Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) is primarily used to protect farmland and allows owners of farmland or open space to retain their land for agricultural or open space purposes while receiving payment equal to the difference between that land's value if sold for development and if sold for agriculture. This technique has frequently been used in Michigan and is a major tool in the preservation of agricultural land and open space around Ann Arbor.

Protecting land through easements or deed restrictions may not necessarily include public access or other public uses. The landowner retains title to the property, but retains certain development rights in the property. Easements typically restrict dumping, mining, paving, and development of residential houses, while allowing traditional agriculture or open space uses of the property. The restricted land can be sold, gifted, or bequeathed to the next generation of landowners, but the restriction remains with the land to the new owner. An example of this type of conservation easement is the Botsford Property, located just outside the city limits, and was acquired in partnership with Scio Township.

7. Life Estate

A life estate is where a property is purchased, but the seller retains the right to occupy the property (usually a residence) as long as he or she is living and able to occupy the property. The drawbacks include the limited use of the property and the unknown duration of the life estate. Responsibility for maintenance, insurance, taxes, and utilities are negotiated as a part of the agreement. A life estate agreement was a part of the purchase of the Leslie Science Center site, portions of the Ann Arbor Farmers Market site and South Pond Park.

8. Scenic Easement

A scenic easement is the acquisition by purchase, dedication, or other means of the right to an unobstructed view at a particular location or over a certain area of land. This may include purchasing development rights restricting advertising signs or other obstacles at strategic locations to protect views. Scenic easements can be considered for floodplains along major rivers where the combination with flood protection reinforces their benefit to the public. Scenic easements may also be used to preserve aesthetic values of wetlands, promote recreation, preserve natural areas, and protect water quality. The Michigan Natural Rivers and Scenic Roads designations are examples where views are protected in a form of scenic easement.

F. Alternative Methods of Acquiring Property

1. Transfers of Property from Other Public Agencies

On occasion, public agencies will declare land they control to be excess and can offer it to another agency at a bargain price if it remains in public use. In other cases, the agency may decide to sell their property on the open market.

2. Exchanges of Property with Other Agencies or Individuals

The city has use agreements with other agencies to utilize under used or excess land. Examples include Mary Beth Doyle and Olson parks, leased from the Water Resources Commission, and Forest Park, leased by the city to the Washtenaw County Park and Recreation Commission.

3. Multiple, Alternating, or Sequential Uses of City and/or Other Public Properties

Examples are playgrounds on subsurface water storage sites or on County Drain Commission lands, game courts on school parking lots, street closings and relocations (as in Wheeler Park and in Sugarbush Park at Lexington), and un-built street rights-of-way (as in Placid Way Park or Tuebingen Park).

4. Tax Foreclosures

Property where the owner has defaulted on taxes may become available; however, in the Ann Arbor market, tax sale parcels that would make desirable parks are rare.

G. Parcels Donated through Dedication for Parkland within the City

The City of Ann Arbor provides park and recreation resources to enhance the quality of life and its environment for its residents. In order to achieve this mission, numerous financial and administrative "tools" are employed. One of these tools is the identification of guidelines for parkland dedication designed to help provide new neighborhoods with sufficient recreation space close to home. Dedication does not necessarily meet all neighborhood parkland needs, however, the parkland guidelines aid in providing park spaces in an equitable manner by all developers of residential property.

During the city's review of residential development plans such as a final plat of a subdivision, a planned unit development, or a site condominium, each developer is asked to dedicate land for parks and recreation purposes to serve the immediate and future needs of the residents of the development in question. These donations are not mandatory in the absence of state-enabling legislation, but rather are a discretionary contribution by the petitioners.

The 1981 PROS Plan established a rationale for dedication of land in new residential developments based on the ratio of households in the city to acres of neighborhood-scale parkland. The ratio then was 4.9 acres of neighborhood parkland for every 408 households or 1,000 new residents or .012 acres of neighborhood park per household. This amount of new parkland was felt to be the minimum amount to maintain the existing level of service for neighborhood parks. With subsequent updates of the PROS Plan, the formula for neighborhood parkland was adjusted to reflect changes in demographic and land acquisition patterns. The current formula was updated based on 2010 Census data and an average of current land values.

In December 1985, City Council adopted an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance that allowed developers to donate land for parks and still receive the dwelling unit density that would be allowed before the dedication in terms of gross lot area. This amendment effectively reduced the cost of parkland dedication to developers. Large-acreage developments could accommodate an

on-site park and still achieve a density of dwelling units as though the park did not exist. The parkland is counted as part of the open space required by the Zoning Ordinance. The amendment has made negotiating for parkland much easier as a part of larger developments. Smaller developments of under 15 acres have less flexibility in site layout and often have difficulty providing an adequate park site while still building the maximum permitted number of dwelling units. There have been some instances where the dedication of land or cash in lieu of land has been inadequate, but generally the new developments are provided parkland through this process.

1. **Formula for Land Dedication through Development**

The process used to devise the goal for neighborhood park acreage was to inventory the neighborhood parkland that exists in Ann Arbor and project that ratio forward to new development. The rationale is that future residents should be as well served in their neighborhoods as current residents, and current residents should not bear the full cost of providing neighborhood parks for future residents.

The current formula is composed of the following variables:

- 18.47 acres of parkland exist per 1,000 residents (based upon 2,109.77 total park acres divided by a population of 113,934 from the 2010 US Census).
- 639 acres is considered neighborhood parkland.
- Divide 639 acres by 113,934 residents to equal 5.61 acres per 1000 residents.
- Based on a household size of 2.2 people per dwelling unit, 450 households generate 1,000 residents.
- Total neighborhood park acreage per 1,000 population, or 450 households, is 5.61.
- The current total acreage of neighborhood parkland per dwelling unit is .0125 (5.61 acres divided by 450 dwelling units).

Therefore, to maintain the existing amount of neighborhood parkland, .0125 acres of neighborhood park/dwelling unit is needed to keep pace with the existing amount of land available.

An example of how this calculation is applied based on a hypothetical development of 120 new dwelling units would look like this:

$$\mathbf{120\ dwelling\ units\ x\ .0125\ acres\ =\ 1.5\ acres}$$

of neighborhood parkland needed to maintain ratio

The parkland calculation for group quarters such as fraternities, sororities, cooperatives, and senior citizen housing may be calculated similarly: The total number of new beds will be divided by the 2.2 persons per household to figure an equivalent number of dwelling units. Day care centers and private schools may be asked to contribute cash in lieu of land if onsite facilities and open space are not sufficient for the recreational needs of the students. For affordable housing projects, the city would waive the request for a cash or land contribution. However, staff has requested that, for these projects, developers include recreational amenities as part of the site plan, such as a playground, picnic tables, and benches for resident use, but that they also be open to the public. Because each of these proposals is unique, they need to be evaluated case by case with onsite facilities and special needs of the residents considered.

SECTION V: Land Use Planning and Acquisition

Proposed park dedication sites are conveyed to the city either by warranty or trustee's deed. The subdivider or developer is responsible for conveying good merchantable title to such sites, along with a complete legal description for the recording of said deed with the Washtenaw County Register of Deeds. The subdivider or developer is responsible for payment of all real estate taxes to the date of conveyance including any agricultural roll back taxes that might be extended or levied against such sites for any tax years or periods prior to the time of conveyance. The developer is also responsible for furnishing title insurance.

Contributions of land have included portions of Cranbrook Park, Foxfire North Park, Ponds Park and Newport Creek Nature Area.

2. Contributions in Lieu of Land - Justification for Land Cost

Land costs vary considerably. Whether they are located in the central business district or outlying neighborhoods, the suitability of the land for development, the proximity to utilities, and the quality of natural features play a role in the cost of land. In order to derive a fair land value for the purposes of cash contributions, the land costs from appraisals performed on land both in and outside of the city were averaged so that center city land cost would not unfairly raise the cost for all developers. The average over the past five years has been approximately \$12,000 per acre for greenbelt purchases, and for in-city parkland has been \$200,000 per acre. If combined, the average cost for parkland purchase is \$50,000. This number is used to calculate contributions in lieu of land. The formula then would be as follows using the example above:

$$\begin{aligned} & 120 \text{ dwelling units} \times .0125 \text{ acres} = 1.5 \text{ acres} \\ & \text{of neighborhood park land needed to maintain ratio} \\ & 1.5 \text{ acres} \times \$50,000/\text{acre} = \$75,000 \end{aligned}$$

Developer contributions have helped achieve some recent projects that would not have otherwise been possible, including recent improvements to the tennis court at Woodbury Park, and playground equipment at North Main Park.

3. Criteria for Requesting Dedication and a Cash Contribution

There will be situations in site plan subdivisions or planned unit developments (PUDs) when a combination of land dedication and a cash contribution in lieu of land are both desirable. These occasions will arise when:

- a. Only a portion of the land desired as parkland is proposed by the developer for a park. The balance can be made up through a cash contribution equal to the value of the additional amount of land that would have otherwise been dedicated.
- b. A major part of the local park or recreation site has already been acquired and only a small portion of land is needed from the development to complete the site. The remaining portions should be requested by dedication, and a cash contribution in lieu of the developer's remaining contribution should be requested.

The amount of land and cash contribution would be derived by applying the formula above to the land that is available for donation, with the balance being paid through a cash contribution.

4. Open Space, Parks and Development Contributions within the Urban Core

Parks and open spaces in downtown Ann Arbor are difficult to acquire because of high land cost and fewer available open spaces. Additionally, providing large open space areas in the downtown is not necessarily appropriate given that density is a goal of downtown planning efforts, as outlined in the City of Ann Arbor 2009 Downtown Plan. Traditionally, downtown parks have taken the shape of smaller plazas that serve employees and visitors and provide outdoor eating and resting spots. Streetscapes also serve as downtown passive recreational spaces, where both private and public entities provide sitting areas in the form of street furniture, planters, and café tables. For these reasons, the central area park acreage is lower than the rest of the planning areas of the city, and the formula for population/park acre should be adjusted to reflect differences in planning goals.

Several larger parks are located in or within walking distance to the downtown core, including Wheeler and West parks, which provides a neighborhood park within a one-quarter mile radius; one of the goals of the park planning for the city. The University of Michigan Diag is approximately 9 acres and is open to the public. This space is also located in the downtown core, and provides opportunities for unstructured games and passive recreation.

Development contributions have traditionally funded improvements to downtown parks such as Liberty Plaza and Sculpture Plaza. However, there are few existing parks to which contributions may be directed. Consequently, streetscape and plaza projects that will benefit both new and existing residents are being considered as an alternative way to provide passive recreational amenities for downtown residents and visitors.

The Downtown Development Authority has opted to participate in the development and execution of several park projects, including renovations to Liberty and Sculpture plazas and the Ann Arbor Farmers Market. They also participate in non-parkland developments, such as the Forest Street Plaza in the South University area, which would provide open space amenities for residents in the immediate vicinity. With more residential projects coming on line in the downtown, the ability to negotiate with developers for both park and non-park amenities will aid in determining what improvements would provide the greatest benefit to residents.

5. Credit for Private Open Space and Recreation Areas

When subdivisions or developers provide their own open space for recreation areas and facilities, it has the effect of reducing the demand for local public recreational services. Depending on the size of the development, a portion of the park and recreation area in subdivisions or planned unit developments may, at the option of the City Council, be provided in the form of "private" open space in lieu of dedicated "public" open space. The extent of the private recreation space to be credited should be based upon the needs of the projected residents and in conformance to the total park and recreation land for all citizens in the general area. Open space which may be required due to zoning setback and building separation regulations may not be "counted" as fulfilling parkland needs, but parkland dedicated to the city may be included in the required open space for a development.

SECTION V: Land Use Planning and Acquisition

In general, a substitution of private open space for dedicated parks will imply a substantially higher degree of improvement and the installation of recreational facilities, including equipment, by the developer as part of the contribution. Detailed plans of such areas, including specifications of facilities to be installed, must be approved by the city; and before credit is given for private recreation areas, the subdivider or developer must guarantee that these private recreation areas will be permanently maintained for such use by the execution of the appropriate legal documents. An example of this type of agreement is a playground proposed for a subdivision on Pontiac Trail, in which a playground and landscaped open space is being constructed by the developer, but will be open to the public.

6. Dedicated Park Site Preparation

The city may ask that the parkland site be rough graded per plans prepared by parks and recreation. The city reserves the right to deny parkland gifts which are not satisfactory for development of active recreational facilities, based upon needs or facility deficiencies identified in the PROS Plan.

Where appropriate, sites are requested to be dedicated in a condition ready for full service of electrical, water, sewer, and streets (including enclosed drainage and curb and gutter) as applicable to the location of the site and its proposed use.

Design considerations for dedicated neighborhood parkland shall follow the criteria developed to assess any acquisition. Generally, the idea behind requesting the dedication of land is to provide neighborhood park opportunities for residents of the new development so that they are served to a comparable level as existing neighborhoods.

In 2014, staff developed a document summarizing the park contribution request for developers to access prior to site plan submittal. The document outlines the information in this chapter of the PROS Plan and provides examples (see chart below) of amenities that may be donated in lieu of a cash contribution.

Additional pedestrian walkways that would enhance the streetscape and make additional connections or fill in sidewalk gaps in the neighborhood of the development.
Additional trees and landscaping on public property, such as a park or plaza, or as part of a streetscape.
Streetscape improvements, such as benches, picnic tables, planters, waste receptacles, decorative pavers and pavement.
Public art, such as sculptures, murals, or other permanent art installations.
Enhancements to existing parks, such as playgrounds, game courts, pathways, landscaping, park furniture.
Creation of new downtown public parks and or open spaces, such as plazas, parklets and mews.
Contribution to a fund for park maintenance activities in the downtown, such as flower plantings, landscape maintenance, and irrigation systems.

***Any public amenity shall be over and above what is required by code.**

Proposed amenities must be located within one-quarter mile of the development, or be located in a community-wide park in the region of the development. Examples could include parks such as Fuller Park, Buhr Park, Gallup Park or Veterans Memorial Park.


The developer is responsible to show how the proposed amenity is commensurate with the contribution requested. The parks and recreation services manager will make the final determination as to the donation equivalence.



H. Land Acquisition Outside of Ann Arbor City Limits: The Ann Arbor Greenbelt

In November 2003, residents of Ann Arbor approved a ballot proposal commonly known as the Parks and Greenbelt Millage. The purpose of this millage is to provide funds to preserve and protect open space, farmland, natural habitats, and the city’s water sources inside and outside the city limits. In May 2004, the Ann Arbor City Council adopted Chapter 42, “Open Space and Parkland Preservation,” of the Ann Arbor City Code, providing a framework for the purchase of conservation easements and fee simple properties within the Greenbelt District (see map below).

SECTION V: Land Use Planning and Acquisition



1. Acquisition Criteria for Greenbelt Properties

The Greenbelt Advisory Commission developed scoring criteria to rank the applications received. The scoring criterion focuses the selection of applications based on the following parameters:

- CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LAND: type of agricultural land or mature forests, parcel size, road frontage, wetlands and/or floodplain, groundwater recharge and natural features.
- CONTEXT: proximity to city limits and other protected land, adjacent zoning and land use, scenic and/or historical value, proximity to Huron River or tributary.
- ACQUISITION CONSIDERATIONS: matching funds, landowner contribution, recreation potential.

The Greenbelt’s priorities for land preservation are broken down into three major priority areas which are discussed in more detail below: 1) creating large blocks (1,000 acres or greater) of protected farmland; 2) protection of Huron River Watershed; and 3) leveraging city dollars through grants and partnerships.

SECTION V: Land Use Planning and Acquisition

FARMLAND PRESERVATION: Agricultural land traditionally has been the most threatened land by development within the Greenbelt District. This has been due not only to the sale of individual parcels for development, but also by a need for large blocks of land to sustain agricultural production. In addition, recognizing that the Greenbelt's mission and direction is solely the protection of land, the Greenbelt has identified the protection of farms that are producing foods for local markets as a priority.

HURON RIVER WATERSHED: The protection of the Huron River is another top priority for the Greenbelt Program. The Huron River is an important recreational and natural resource in the Ann Arbor area. Over the last decade, the city has focused on protection of the land along the Huron River within the city limits. The Huron River is also part of a larger effort with Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation to establish a Border-to-Border trail through the county.

PARTNERSHIPS: The Greenbelt Advisory Commission acknowledges that Washtenaw County programs and some townships within the Greenbelt that have passed millages or dedicated funds to land preservation will play a critical role in maximizing the Greenbelt impact on the land preservation. The Greenbelt Advisory Commission recognizes that these partnerships are also key to providing management for lands outside the city limits and to continuing the goal of developing a regional park, open space, and farmland system throughout Washtenaw County.

The City of Ann Arbor's Greenbelt program is a charter member of "Preserve Washtenaw," a consortium of Washtenaw County's programs focused on land preservation. Preserve Washtenaw includes all private (land conservancies) and public agencies actively protecting land in the county, through purchase (or donation) of conservation easements, or through the outright purchase of land. Active participation in Preserve Washtenaw meetings will be a key vehicle for identification of partnership opportunities to implement the objectives of the Greenbelt.

I. Charter Amendment Concerning Sale of City Parkland

The sale of parkland continues to be an important topic for the community. In August of 2008, City Council passed a resolution placing an amendment of the City Charter on the November election ballot. The ballot language asked "shall section 14.3(b) of the Ann Arbor City Charter be amended to require voter approval for the sale of any land within the city purchased, acquired or used for park land, while retaining the Section's current requirement for voter approval of the sale of any park land in the City of Ann Arbor Master Plan at the time of the proposed sale?" The City Charter amendment passed in November 2008, and section 14.3(b) now reads, "The city shall not sell without the approval, by a majority vote of the electors of the city voting on the question at a regular or special election, any city park, or land in the city acquired for park, cemetery, or any part thereof."

This charter amendment provides significant protection for parkland. Not only would parkland require a majority vote in order to be sold, but a public process would need to take place prior to any parkland being placed on an election ballot, including a Park Advisory public hearing and recommendation, a Planning Commission public hearing and action, and a City Council public hearing and majority vote.

SECTION V: Land Use Planning and Acquisition

The community has also had conversations regarding the zoning of park land and has questioned if parks should have a unique zoning designation. The current zoning of “PL” (public land) allows for multiple public uses not necessarily associated with parks, such as transportation and airports. The question of zoning is primarily in response to community concerns over the appropriate use of park land.



SECTION VI: PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROS PLAN

The planning process for the PROS Plan incorporated various methods to assist the community in assessing the park, recreation, and open space system. The plan documents the information received from the public, including public meetings, email comments, focus groups, and surveys, in addition to recreation and open space inventories to determine recreational and open space desires of the community.

A. The PROS Plan Steering Committee

A steering committee was created to draft the citizen survey, review goals and objectives, and develop an action plan. Members included a representative from the Downtown Development Authority, City Council, and two representatives from the Park Advisory Commission, in addition to staff from Planning and Development Services, Park Operations, Natural Area Preservation, and Park Administration. The steering committee met periodically to determine the course of the PROS Plan planning effort.

B. Public Notification and Involvement

Public input is essential to help determine priorities for park and recreation programs, services, capital improvements, infrastructure improvements, and land acquisitions. The public was notified of the PROS Plan planning process in a number of ways, including press releases to local media outlets; postings on the parks and recreation Facebook page and Twitter; email notifications through GovDelivery (a voluntary email subscription for citizens, which sends notifications about city events and news); postcards, fliers and posters at all recreation facilities and other city facilities; a special website for the PROS Plan; and notifications on the parks and recreation website.

PROS PLAN PROMOTION AND ENGAGEMENT:

- Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation's Facebook (www.a2gov.org/annarborparks), Twitter (www.twitter.com/a2parks) and GoogleBuzz (<http://google.com/profiles/annarborparks>)

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

accounts.

- City of Ann Arbor’s Facebook (www.facebook.com/cityofannarbor) and Twitter (www.twitter.com/cityofannarbor) accounts.
- City of Ann Arbor’s email subscription service (www.a2gov.org/subscribe) to send out general bulletins to thousands of people who voluntarily sign up to receive information about city and, more specifically, parks and recreation, news.
- An online survey tool, Survey Monkey (www.surveymonkey.com), for people to share their opinion of the parks and provide suggestions.
- Press releases to local media to share community news updates (e.g., www.annarbor.com).
- City of Ann Arbor website (www.a2gov.org).
- Web page on the parks and recreation site (www.a2gov.org/parks) specifically related to the PROS Plan (www.a2gov.org/prosplan).
- Project-specific mailbox for people to submit comments/provide feedback (prosplan@a2gov.org).

The PROS Plan planning process engaged residents, park users, city staff, advisory groups, and various stakeholders through public meetings, focus groups, individual comments, and an online survey. The findings provided significant understanding and direction necessary to evaluate and prioritize the future direction of the park and recreation system. Major findings and trends are identified below:

- **MAINTENANCE:** Survey respondents were generally more satisfied with maintenance than the previous survey. This may be a reflection of a stronger economy, and that the city’s budget has stabilized, allowing some of the previously identified issues, such as long mowing cycles, to improve. Comments reflect the desire to keep facilities modern and clean and park amenities at a high level of maintenance.
- **TAKING CARE OF WHAT WE HAVE:** Since 2010, several existing parks and facilities have been renovated, such as the athletic fields at Veterans Memorial Park, Southeast Area Park and West Park, the ice arena floor at Buhr Park, and the canoe livery facility at Gallup Park. These renovations were well received by park patrons. Placing an emphasis on maintaining current park property and facilities is an important value of Ann Arbor residents, as well as carefully evaluating merits of proposed acquisitions while weighing the cost of maintenance associated with any purchase.
- **PARK ACCESSIBILITY AND CONNECTIVITY:** Trails connecting to and through river parks as well as connecting natural areas to create hiking, mountain biking, and wildlife corridors continue to be strongly desired by the community. The desire to complete the Border to Border Trail through Ann Arbor, for example, has remained a high priority. Making sure that parks and facilities are barrier free accessible is also a high priority for the park system. Several significant projects to improve barrier free access completed during this PROS cycle include the Gallup Park Livery and dock access, Leslie Science & Nature Center pathways, and Bandemer Park rowing dock access.

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

- **COMMUNITY OUTREACH/PROGRAMMING/PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT:** Accessing information about parks, as well as obtaining input from the public, is increasingly accomplished via the web and through electronic media. Electronic surveys and questionnaires have enabled a greater number of people to participate in the public process. The survey completed for this plan had an additional 300 responses compared with the previous survey.
- **VOLUNTEER ACTIVITIES:** Volunteer activity continues to grow in the park system. In addition to natural area stewardship, many volunteers are becoming involved in programming and events, and neighborhood park stewardship. Programs to facilitate these activities have increased, with an additional volunteer coordinator and program, Give 365, designed to increase the volunteer base and type of activities in which volunteers may participate.
- **FUTURE FACILITIES:** As opposed to previous updates to the PROS Plan, there were no large groups advocating for a particular amenity, such as the skatepark or dog parks. However, several desired amenities were mentioned repeatedly, including trails for hiking and mountain bicycling, connections to and trails along the Huron River, construction of an Allen Creek Greenway, additional downtown open space, additional dog parks, especially in or near downtown, pickle ball courts, additional restrooms, more public art in parks, and more family-based activities.

1. Online Survey


The online survey was the primary tool used to gain feedback from residents and park users. It was posted online from September through October 25, 2015. A total of 1,034 surveys were completed. Survey results and additional comments from the survey will support the direction of park programs, amenities, and future initiatives. Below is a summary of the findings.

Question #1 asked how important Ann Arbor parks and recreation are to quality of life.

The overwhelming majority of respondents (over 88 percent) felt that parks and recreation was extremely important to their quality of life, almost a 10 percent increase from the 2010 survey.

How important are parks and recreation in Ann Arbor to your quality of life?				
	2010		2015	
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	Response Percent	Response Count
Extremely important	79.3%	622	88.5%	904
Somewhat important	20.3%	159	10.3%	105
Not at all important	0.4%	3	1.0%	10
<i>answered question</i>		784		1022
<i>skipped question</i>		38		12

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan



Question #2 asked in which recreation activities or programs do the respondent or family members regularly participate.


This question listed 45 recreational activities common in Ann Arbor parks. The top 10 activities listed included hiking/walking, shopping at farmers market, nature appreciation, swimming, picnicking, running/jogging, canoeing, kayaking, and playing on playground equipment. In comparison to the 2011 survey, there was a decline in the percentage of respondents participating in organized sports such as baseball, basketball, football, soccer, softball, and ultimate Frisbee, whereas there was an increase in more individual/non-team activities such as exercising with dog, walking, kayaking, mountain and road bicycling, and nature appreciation.

Other activities not listed that were added in the comments section included gardening, photography, rock climbing, snow shoeing, foraging for wild edible plants, sailing, attending concerts and plays, watching skateboarders, winter fatbiking (winter version of mountain biking) and geocaching. Comments from the 2011 survey showed a strong desire for a new skatepark facility, as well as improved athletic fields. These two areas were addressed with the construction of a 30,000-square-foot skatepark at Veterans Memorial Park, and major renovations to soccer fields at Fuller Park and Olson Park, and softball and baseball fields at Veterans Memorial Park, West Park, and Southeast Area Park.

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

What recreation activities or programs do you or members in your household REGULARLY participate in? Please keep in mind spring, summer, fall and winter activities.				
Answer Options	2010		2016	
	Response Percent	Response Count	Response Percent	Response Count
Baseball	13.0%	105	8.7%	90
Basketball	12.6%	102	8.3%	86
Bicycling - Road	53.5%	433	60.7%	626
Bicycling - Mountain	17.4%	141	28.2%	291
Canoeing	29.0%	235	31.9%	329
Dance	10.4%	84	6.0%	62
Day Camp	11.5%	93	8.8%	91
Dirt Biking/Jump Courses	2.2%	18	4.4%	45
Disc Golf	11.2%	91	9.0%	93
Exercise Classes	23.1%	187	14.8%	153
Exercise with Dog	24.7%	200	29.1%	300
Fishing	11.2%	91	8.7%	90
Football	5.3%	43	2.7%	28
Golfing	21.9%	177	11.3%	117
Hiking/Walking	71.7%	581	79.0%	814
Hockey	6.9%	56	8.1%	83
Ice Skating	19.6%	159	18.2%	188
Play in playground with children	29.6%	240	31.5%	325
Kayaking	19.9%	161	31.9%	329
Natural Area Stewardship	16.9%	137	16.5%	170
Nature Appreciation - birding, etc.	37.4%	303	54.3%	560
Picnicking	31.6%	256	33.1%	341
Rowing	5.2%	42	4.8%	50
Running/Jogging	34.1%	276	33.1%	341
Roller Skating or Blading	10.1%	82	4.5%	46
Senior Programs	5.2%	42	7.2%	74
Shop at Farmers Market	65.7%	532	64.2%	662
Skate-boarding	10.4%	84	5.8%	60
Skiing - Cross Country	21.7%	176	21.2%	219
Sledding	27.0%	219	26.7%	275
Soccer	20.7%	168	15.6%	161
Softball	12.1%	98	6.8%	70
Swimming	41.0%	332	33.9%	349
Tennis	16.4%	133	11.5%	119
Ultimate Frisbee	8.8%	71	5.2%	54
Volleyball	6.4%	52	4.7%	48
Volunteering	22.6%	183	13.3%	137
X-games	1.4%	11	0.9%	9
None	0.4%	3	0.9%	9
Are there activities in which you participate where we are lacking adequate facilities?		246		149
<i>answered question</i>		810		1031
<i>skipped question</i>		12		3

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan



Question #3 rated the overall quality of Ann Arbor parks staffed recreation facilities.

The quality of the 17 staffed recreation facilities was rated, including the Ann Arbor Senior Center, Argo Canoe Livery, Bryant Community Center, Buhr Park Ice Arena and Pool, Cobblestone Farm, Ann Arbor Farmers Market, Fuller Pool, Gallup Canoe Livery, Huron Hills Golf Course, Kempf House, Leslie Science & Nature Center, Leslie Park Golf Course, Mack Indoor Pool, Northside Community Center, Veterans Memorial Park Ice Arena and Pool. These are facilities in which generally there is a fee charged for use, and where programs are offered.

For all facilities, the majority of respondents rated them as either “good” or “excellent.” The highest ratings (with over 200 respondents scoring excellent) were for the Ann Arbor Farmers Market, Leslie Science & Nature Center, Gallup Livery, Argo Livery and Cobblestone Farm. Nearly all facilities showed an improved percentage of excellent scores from the previous survey, including Cobblestone Farm, Gallup Canoe Livery, Huron Hills Golf Course, Kempf House, Leslie Science & Nature Center, and the Leslie Park Golf Course. Less than 2 percent (between .44 percent and 1.43 percent) of respondents who use the facility chose the “poor” rating.


Comments about the facilities included the following:

- The cleanliness of locker rooms at the pools and ice arenas could be improved upon.
- Upgrades to facilities were desired at the Leslie Park Golf Course club house, Northside Community Center, Veterans Memorial Park Pool and Ice Arena, Mack Pool, and the Ann Arbor Farmers Market.
- Programs and customer service at the Leslie Science & Nature Center, Fuller Pool, and Leslie Park Golf Course received praise.
- The popularity of facilities such as the Ann Arbor Farmers Market, Gallup Canoe Livery, and Argo Cascades has caused issues including shortage of parking, crowds, and long lines.

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

Below is a list of Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation Facilities. Please rate each of the facilities listed for overall quality.

Answer Options	Poor		Satisfactory		Good		Excellent		Don't use facility		Response Count	Response Count
	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015
Ann Arbor Senior Center	8	15	18	37	33	65	17	46	669	768	745	931
Argo Canoe Livery	3	8	45	64	222	307	134	297	347	281	751	957
Bryant Community Center	3	8	11	20	17	28	6	11	693	844	730	911
Buhr Park Ice Arena	2	7	35	34	144	185	45	80	508	610	734	916
Buhr Park Pool	3	9	26	36	122	154	66	97	515	615	732	911
Cobblestone Farm	0	5	29	28	187	230	154	242	363	423	733	928
Farmers Market	9	14	61	51	252	316	353	508	85	85	760	974
Fuller Pool	1	6	4	36	160	181	135	136	403	555	740	914
Gallup Canoe Livery	5	8	35	40	209	266	189	326	298	301	736	941
Huron Hills Golf Course	4	10	26	23	111	91	75	93	516	696	732	913
Kempf House	1	4	8	22	38	51	34	69	644	748	725	894
Leslie Science and Nature Center	5	9	21	27	144	201	264	381	305	323	739	941
Leslie Park Golf Course	2	5	8	12	57	56	99	102	558	723	724	898
Mack Indoor Pool	15	12	37	62	98	115	38	55	546	662	734	906
Northside Community Center	3	11	9	24	32	30	6	19	677	805	727	889
Veterans Memorial Park Ice Arena	5	9	42	58	149	144	59	101	478	600	733	912
Veterans Memorial Park Pool	6	13	42	50	154	143	65	117	456	582	723	905
Do you have a favorite facility? What is it and why? Do you have any concerns about any facilities?											400	212
<i>answered question</i>											786	1007
<i>skipped question</i>											36	27



Question #4 asked if the respondent would recommend these parks and recreation facilities to others.

Over 94 percent of respondents replied that they would recommend Ann Arbor park facilities to others.

Question #5 asked respondents to rate the quality of Ann Arbor parks and recreation system amenities.

Respondents rated the quality of parks and recreation system amenities including athletic fields, basketball courts, dog parks, picnic shelters, playgrounds, restrooms, tennis courts, and trails and pathways.

Consistent with the previous survey, the majority of respondents rated all park amenities as “good.” Trails and pathways had the greatest number of “excellent” ratings. For every asset, there was an increase in the percentage of respondents that rated the amenities as “excellent,” and an improvement in that in no categories did “poor” rate higher than “satisfactory,” which was not the case in the 2011 survey. The improvement in excellent scores for athletic fields was most likely due to extensive renovations to fields at Veterans Memorial Park, West Park, and Southeast Area Park. More frequent updating of the playground surfacing may account for the improvement in ratings for playgrounds.


Comments included the following:

- Athletic fields – Quality varies from park to park, and more consistency is needed in how fields are maintained. A number of fields were renovated and rated very highly, but follow-up maintenance needs improvement. It is important that the field surface is level for safety.
- Basketball courts – More proactive maintenance is needed, especially in many of the smaller parks.
- Dog parks – More dog parks are desired, and they should be located closer to downtown as well as in the west part of the city. Other comments include a desire for more shade and trees, water, small-dog and large-dog run areas, and better maintenance at existing parks.
- Picnic shelters – Comments included that they are very good, that they are old and tired looking, are not cleaned frequently enough, and that there needs to be more of them.
- Playgrounds – This type of amenity is viewed as a gem of the city, and while some are great, others need improvement. Many commented about the quality of maintenance, that the surfacing gets weedy and isn’t replenished frequently enough. There were comments requesting that the playgrounds be accessible for all children, be more creative, have restrooms nearby, and that parks provide a splash pad/water park, and a nature play area.
- Restrooms – Comments included that the restrooms need to be cleaner, that the composting toilets are smelly, that they should be open all winter, that there should be more of them, and that there are many that are old and dated.
- Tennis courts – Newly renovated courts are excellent, while others are in poor shape, need crack repair, and proactive maintenance.

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

- Trails and pathways – The most frequent comment was that additional trails and pathways are needed to finish the Border-to -Border trail, as well as provide missing connections, especially to and along the river. The trails need more consistent maintenance, including crack repair and plowing. Specific trails mentioned include Gallup Park trails that are in need of attention, the Fuller Road/Maiden Lane area, which is missing a crucial connection, and Wurster Park, which is in poor shape. Trails could use better signage.
- Unpaved trails for hiking and mountain biking are very much appreciated, but more pathways are needed to make connections to and between parks. Maps that show the existing mountain bike trails would be appreciated.

How would you rate the quality of the following Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation system amenities?												
Answer Options	Poor		Satisfactory		Good		Excellent		Not applicable		Response Count	Response Count
	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015
Basketball courts	16	27	83	92	122	172	18	37	480	572	719	900
Tennis courts	23	18	87	104	163	173	29	53	422	545	724	893
Athletic fields	80	37	100	106	221	283	53	119	285	380	739	925
Picnic shelters	20	29	116	155	343	415	103	152	148	176	730	927
Trails and pathways	18	42	111	144	330	404	212	329	70	37	741	956
Restrooms	64	101	203	283	316	354	52	73	98	135	733	946
Playground equipment	12	25	86	101	257	375	129	208	243	223	727	932
Do you feel that there are any deficiencies in any of the above categories? Do you have suggestions?											237	234
<i>answered question</i>											760	986
<i>skipped question</i>											62	48



SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

Question #6 asked respondents to rate their general level of satisfaction regarding maintenance at Ann Arbor parks, including cleanliness, mowing, natural area management, snow removal, trash removal, and tree trimming.


Nearly 43 percent of respondents rated all maintenance as good, with satisfactory (average 21.89 percent) slightly ahead of the excellent category (21.03 percent). The highest rating went to cleanliness, and the lowest to snow removal. Compared to the 2011 survey, excellent ratings improved in almost all categories, including cleanliness from 18 to 23 percent, mowing from 17.5 to 21.3 percent, natural area management from 29.8 to 32.2 percent, and trash removal from 17.2 to 19 percent. Two categories decreased slightly in excellent ratings, with 18.7 to 17.3 percent for tree trimming, and 15.3 to 13.28 percent for snow removal.

Many comments were about specific neighborhood parks, however some general comments included the following:

- Cleanliness – Requests were made for additional trash barrels in parks.
- Snow Plowing – Clearing of pathways is greatly appreciated. There were complaints about particular amenities, parks and/or park areas that do not get plowed, such as paths to playgrounds, and the boardwalk at West Park, as well as damage to pathways with plows that are too wide for paths or go off the edges, rutting the edges of the paths.
- Trees – There were several complaints about mowers/weed whackers damaging tree trunks, trees being planted but not watered causing trees to die, and the length of time it takes for removal of dead trees and stumps.
- Mowing –Several comments urged mowing less and naturalizing more, while others complained about not enough/consistent mowing.
- Natural Area Management – Several comments expressed appreciation for management of nature areas, including the removal of invasive species with a small staff. Many more comments were requesting less mowing and leaving additional areas “natural.”

How would you rate the current level of maintenance at City parks?													
Answer Options	Poor		Satisfactory		Good		Excellent		Not applicable		Response Count		
	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	
Cleanliness	36	32	180	202	364	483	134	223	26	25	740	965	
Mowing	140	99	173	209	280	419	131	206	26	33	750	966	
Trash removal	53	49	206	249	314	421	126	181	35	53	734	953	
Tree trimming	56	75	158	223	316	394	137	163	65	89	732	944	
Snow removal	42	93	150	213	281	344	111	125	139	166	723	941	
Natural area management	35	51	128	157	280	402	216	309	66	41	725	960	
Additional comments											183	175	
	<i>answered question</i>										756	977	
	<i>skipped question</i>										66	57	

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan




Question #7 asked if respondents generally feel safe in Ann Arbor parks.

The majority of respondents feel safe in parks, but this depended on several factors. The most frequent responses were concerns about off-leash dogs, or not feeling safe using the parks at night. There were also concerns about homeless people and drug dealing. Many commented that it depends on the park, with Liberty Plaza being most often mentioned for safety concerns, with concerns also raised about Wheeler Park, Dolph Nature Area, West Park, and Bluffs Park.

Do you generally feel safe in Ann Arbor Parks?		
	2015	
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	81.1%	819
No	1.0%	10
It depends	17.5%	177
Not applicable	0.4%	4
Please explain your answer		209
<i>answered question</i>		1010
<i>skipped question</i>		24

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan



Question #8 asked about the Open Space and Parkland Preservation Millage, and how important it is for the city to acquire certain types of parkland.

Acquisition for the creation of trails and greenways, and land along the Huron River received the highest rating of “extremely important” These were followed by natural areas, neighborhood parks, urban plazas/urban green spaces, greenbelt property, land to improve accessibility to existing parks, and lastly, for active recreation such as soccer or softball fields.


There were numerous comments advocating for more downtown parks or green spaces, specifically at the Library Lot. There were also several comments stating that the city does not need more downtown parks, and concerns that any new park space downtown will have the same problems occurring at Liberty Plaza.

Many commented about the desire for the Allen Creek Greenway to be a priority. Others commented about the need to fill in gaps along the Border-to-Border trail/Huron River Greenway.

Compared with the 2011 survey, there was an increase in the percentage of respondents who rated all types of land acquisition as “extremely important.” A new category added to this survey; "Land to Create Trails and Greenways," received the highest response for the “extremely important” category.

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

The City currently has a dedicated millage to acquire park land. How important do you feel it is for the City to purchase the following types of park land?												
Answer Options	Not important		Fairly important		Neutral		Very Important		Extremely Important		Response Count	Response Count
	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015
Active recreation such as soccer or softball fields	168	215	96	350	260	194	157	114	61	96	742	969
Neighborhood parks	87	69	106	183	118	335	332	381	109	25	752	993
Land along the Huron River	46	31	63	132	111	195	284	515	255	28	759	1001
Land to connect parks and improve access	61	80	70	240	108	335	277	278	240	55	756	988
Natural areas	82	50	49	166	139	329	275	415	209	27	754	987
Urban plazas/ urban green space	95	129	113	227	163	273	259	336	123	31	753	996
Greenbelt (property outside City limits)	187	127	89	203	184	291	167	332	113	39	740	992
Additional comments											220	215
											<i>answered question</i>	773
											<i>skipped question</i>	49
												1017
												17




Question #9 asked respondents to rate their experience with the Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation website to search for events, register for programs or camps, find facility hours, location and fees, learn about rental properties such as picnic shelters or facilities, find information about volunteer opportunities, and learn about upcoming projects and park improvements.

The majority of respondents who use the website gave a rating of “good” for all tasks related to the website. Since the 2011 survey, the website was redesigned to update the look, improve user interface, and facilitate ease of finding information. These changes resulted in a significant improvement to the level of satisfaction with the website in all categories. Additionally, there was a significant decrease in the percentage of people who don’t use the website, meaning that more people are utilizing online services to obtain information.

Categories rated “excellent” improved as follows: Searching for events from 9.7 to 11.1 percent; finding facility hours, from 20 to 23 percent, learning about rental opportunities from 9.2 to 16 percent, finding information about volunteer opportunities from 5.2 to 10.6 percent, and learning about upcoming projects, from 6.4 to 10.3 percent. The only “excellent” category that decreased marginally was registering for programs, from 12 to 11.6 percent.

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

If you have used the Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation website for any of the following, please rate your experience.												
Answer Options	Poor		Satisfactory		Good		Excellent		Don't use website		Response Count	Response Count
	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015
Search for events	31	35	97	159	174	288	69	103	336	347	707	932
Register for programs	30		69		143		84		373		699	
Register for camps	16		44		75		42		512		689	
Register for programs or camps		34		114		209		108		463		928
Facility hours, locations and fees	23	34	93	145	228	358	142	217	227	187	713	941
Rental opportunities (picnic shelters or facilities)	19	30	71	139	131	285	65	152	413	332	699	938
Volunteer opportunities	29	40	55	122	79	209	36	99	492	461	691	931
Upcoming projects and park improvements	35	68	71	152	104	223	44	96	436	396	690	935
	<i>answered question</i>										735	953
	<i>skipped question</i>										87	81




Question #10 asked where respondents currently obtain information about Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation activities.

The city website was the most frequently cited for obtaining information, followed by the Parks and Recreation Activities Guide, online searches using tools such as Google, social media such as Facebook/Twitter/Instagram, newspaper, GovDelivery email, and finally Community Television Network.

Many respondents wrote that they learned about park activities by word of mouth, from the NAP newsletter, and the Ann Arbor Observer. Other sources include MLive.com, Council members, the Michigan Mountain Biking Association, the Border-to-Border trail newsletter, neighborhood blogs, the Rec & Ed website, mailed notices, and Adopt -A-Park.

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

Where do you currently obtain information about parks and recreation activities?				
	2010		2015	
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	Response Percent	Response Count
Newspaper	38.4%	274	25.4%	246
Television (2010), CTN (2016)	2.1%	15	1.8%	17
Brochure	29.4%	210	48.6%	471
City website	63.7%	455	57.9%	561
Facebook/Twitter	10.9%	78	28.0%	271
Other internet (2010), Online Search such as Google,	29.3%	209	41.5%	402
Don't know much about Ann Arbor Parks	7.4%	53	5.0%	48
Other		171		119
<i>answered question</i>		714		969
<i>skipped question</i>		108		65



SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

Question #11 asked what, if any, new programs, activities or amenities Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation should prioritize for future implementation.

Requests for amenities that received the most comments, in order from most to least comments, were as follows:

- Trails, including for mountain biking.
- Connections to and along the Huron River and Border-to-Border Trail.
- Construction of an Allen Creek Greenway.
- Additional downtown green space.
- Additional dog parks, especially in or near the downtown.
- Pickleball courts.
- Additional restrooms.
- More public art in parks.
- More family-based activities.

Question #12 and 13 asked if the respondent or a member of their household has any mobility issues or restrictions that limit activities, such as vision, hearing, wheelchair, mobility aid, or other, and what accommodations could be made to enable use of park facilities or participate in recreation.

A total of 95 out of 1,004 responded that they have mobility issues or restrictions that limit activities. This is a slightly higher percentage of respondents than the 2011 survey.


Specific comments included:

- Desire for smoother trails and better maintenance of existing trails.
- More frequent benches and resting places with shade along trails.
- Barrier-free parking close to activity areas, and smooth transitions from parking to park activity.
- Railings and barriers at docks and some trails.
- More universally accessible playgrounds, including consideration of disabilities such as autism, where fencing around the play area helps keep children safe.

Since the 2011 survey, there have been a number of projects aimed at improving access to parks and facilities, including renovations to the docks at the Gallup Park Livery, restroom renovations at Gallup Park and the Ann Arbor Senior Center, accessible paths at the Leslie Science & Nature Center and Veterans Memorial Park, and barrier-free access to the rowing docks at Bandemer Park.

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

Does a health problem or any disability limit your activities or those of any other member of your household?				
	2010		2015	
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	8.0%	64	9.5%	95
No	92.0%	739	90.5%	909
<i>answered question</i>		803		1004
<i>skipped question</i>		19		30




Questions # 14-17 were demographic, including ZIP code, length of residency in Ann Arbor and age.

The majority of respondents were from the 48103 ZIP code, which is from the center of town to the west, followed by 48104, 48105, 48108, and 48109. Sixty-five responses recorded their ZIP code as from outside of the city limits.


Nearly half of the respondents have lived in the city for over 20 years, almost 20 percent have lived in the city between 11-20 years, 12 percent from six-10 years, 8 percent from three-five years, and 6 percent from zero-two years. Compared with the 2011 survey, there was a significant increase in the number of respondents who have lived in the city for over 21 years.

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan




How long have you lived in the City of Ann Arbor?				
	2010		2015	
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	Response Percent	Response Count
0-2 years	4.6%	37	5.8%	59
3-5 years	8.4%	68	7.8%	79
6-10 years	13.4%	109	12.1%	123
11-20 years	22.4%	182	19.1%	194
over 21 years	43.2%	350	48.2%	491
Do not live in City limits	8.0%	65	7.1%	72
<i>answered question</i>		811		1018
<i>skipped question</i>		11		16

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan



Including yourself how many people reside in your household and what are their ages?				
Answer Options	2010		2015	
	Response Percent	Number of People	Response Percent	Number of People
Ages 17 & Younger	30.2%	678	31.9%	770
18-24	6.4%	143	4.5%	109
25-40	20.4%	457	19.8%	478
41-60	31.8%	713	22.7%	549
61 or older	11.2%	252	21.1%	509
Total		2243		2415



SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

The majority of respondents were between the age of 41-60 (22.7 percent), followed by 25-40 and then 61 and older. The majority of households had between one and four residents. There was a significant increase in the number of respondents in the 61 and older category compared with the 2011 survey.

The age and length of residency suggests that the demographics of those answering the survey do not necessarily reflect the demographics of the city as a whole, and that decisions based on this information should take this information into account.

2. Focus Groups

a. Park Advisory Commission

Staff met with the Park Advisory Commission to discuss a series of questions that arise periodically in the public process.

What sort of approach should staff and commissions take regarding controversial topics about which unanimous or even majority support is highly unlikely?

- The commission agreed that a formal process should be developed that is transparent, have multiple opportunities for public participation, publicized from the outset to set public expectations, be consistent, inclusive, accessible, and broad enough to be applicable to a diverse set of issues that may arise, whether in parks and recreation or across the city. The Dog Park report that laid out a decision making process for site selection is a good example of this.
- Ultimately, there will be conflicting points of view, and it will not be possible to satisfy everyone all the time. However, it is important to be able to explain steps taken in the process, decision points throughout the process, and the rationale for the decisions.

How should parks and recreation be involved with the establishment, maintenance, and improvements to a potential future Allen Creek Greenway, especially non-park land?

- PAC members agreed that an approved master plan for the Allen Creek Greenway is critical to identify the most feasible route of the Allen Creek Greenway. The master plan should also address critical questions pertaining to the establishment and long-term use (oversight, maintenance and funding) of the Greenway that will help guide the City of Ann Arbor's parks and other partners' roles, including: Land Ownership – who will be the responsible entity to purchase and own the land? This may include multiple partners and

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

a mix of ownership types, i.e., fee-simple ownership or public access easements on privately owned property. Current land owners, including University of Michigan and the Ann Arbor Railroad, need to participate and partner with the city and other land owners on this project.

- Land Selection –If some of the land will be owned by the City of Ann Arbor parks, how would the properties be prioritized for acquisition? Do they fit into the recently developed scoring criteria developed or should a new set of criteria be developed? How are these prioritized for resources in comparison to the missing links on the Border-to-Border trail as well as access to the Border-to-Border Trail from the downtown?
- Land Management – Who will be the responsible entity for the maintenance and management? Would land management be performed by one entity or multiple land owners/agencies/private/public?

Partnerships – The establishment of the Allen Creek Greenway will inevitably require multiple partners to be involved, and will need to identify roles and responsibilities of each party. Multi-agency agreements may be necessary. The process should include finding examples of how other cities have managed similar greenways.

- Funding – Who are the likely public and private funders? Can a conservancy fund a long term endowment, as well as provide funding for acquisition.

How should parks and recreation approach use of parkland for non-park uses, such as leasing of park land for parking lots by the University or use of park space for Project Grow Gardens?

The commission agreed that there should be a series of questions asked to evaluate the merits of any given proposal, and that there should be a consistent decision making process. However, it was agreed that each situation will be different, and that some issues may merit additional steps, such as working groups and public meetings.

- Questions discussed: Would the proposed use generate revenue/in kind contribution that supports a particular facility or park?
- Would that revenue adequately offset the loss of park space (and what does adequate mean)?
- Would the proposed use take parkland away from other active uses or detract from current use?
- Would the proposed use complement other uses? (For example, leased parking could be used by park users in off times, but need to make sure that parking is available when the parks are most heavily used.)

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

- Does the proposed use detract from the aesthetics/ambience of the park?
- Does the proposal align with community goals and objectives, such as the sustainability framework?
- Does the proposal have any safety implications?
- Are other city facilities impacted that would necessitate the involvement of staff outside of parks and recreation, such as storm water, transportation, natural areas?
- Are there any other factors that merit consideration?

The extent of public involvement would be based on whether the proposal has local or citywide implications, the extent of controversy, and level of complexity. For a relatively straight-forward proposal, staff would initiate discussion of the proposal utilizing the questions as the basis, and propose recommendations to PAC. If an issue is highly controversial or complex, a working group or task force would be established, and/or opportunities for public input to provide a basis for recommendations which would then be presented to PAC.

b. Recreation Advisory Commission

Several questions were asked of the Recreation Advisory Commission about strengths and weaknesses, park system needs, and how PAC and RAC could collaborate more closely.

- Strengths of Ann Arbor park system include lots of “hidden treasures” within the park system.
- Promote connectors – small gaps could be filled and connect parks.
- The Argo Cascades have created an enormous amount of activity.
- Gallup is a gem – attracts a diverse group of people.
- NAP is doing a great job.
- It seems that if something looks tired and worn, the parks and recreation updates and repairs it.
- The outdoor ice skating has been great. Encourages people to exercise and be outside.

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

Park System Needs:

- Athletic field maintenance is inconsistent. Either poor or good quality fields can be really influential on young people who are starting to play, and can affect their desire to play more or not.
- B2B trail – needs to be widened and repaired.
- Public/Private partnerships should be explored.
- At Bird Hills Nature Area and other areas, dogs and mountain bikes are a problem – no enforcement.
- Hope to improve partnership between Rec & Ed and Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation including representation from PAC and RAC at meetings of both bodies to share information about activities, programs, issues, and ideas. Student representation and perspective is important, and RAC has a student representative from Pioneer and Huron and are seeking a representative from Skyline.
- RAC can help to identify recreational trends, such as pickleball, which is one of the fastest growing sports in the U.S.
- One of the strengths is that Rec & Ed markets to everyone with a strong focus on inclusivity.
- RAC works toward self sustaining funding, as well as working to provide a scholarship fund.

c. City Planning Commission

- The city needs to consider the cost to program and manage downtown open spaces to assure that they are successful. This could be achieved through some type of private/public partnership, but the roles and responsibilities need to be clearly spelled out. Government should be involved in the process.
- Urban open spaces do not need to provide nature downtown, as areas such as West Park, and the Huron River are within very close proximity to the downtown.
- Planning for the proposed Allen Creek Greenway needs to include discussions about ownership, programming, and costs in the same manner as any downtown open space. Many areas of the proposed greenway are not surrounded by residential or commercial establishments, especially south of downtown through university property.
- Small urban plazas and parklets need to be placed deliberately in locations adjacent to commercial and residential, not in leftover spaces that become hangouts.
- Signage in the park system should cater to the international population, using symbols for way finding and rules as much as possible.

d. Downtown Development Authority (DDA)

Comments about Survey Responses:

- A majority of respondents were over 40, with young people (under 18 years) under 1 percent. We need to make sure that people understand when interpreting the responses, that a fairly narrow demographic responded to the survey, and that it is not a representative sample of the population of Ann Arbor.

Downtown Parks and Open Space:

- There is a group of people advocating for more green space downtown. What is the nature of a downtown park? What kind of financial commitment needs to be made to make a downtown park successful?
- Need to make sure that people understand real numbers for what it takes to maintain and manage downtown open space, from utility costs, to security and programming.
- Explore flexible spaces to reflect a changing downtown. Parklets (using a parking space as a small temporary park), could provide this experiment with low cost and test for success. For example, on William Street, there is a desire to enliven the space, and this would be a good place to test if a temporary park space would attract positive use.
- The Library Lot could be used as park/open space when there are scheduled events, and remain as parking during the winter and weekdays. This would allow for revenue, and avoid an underutilized space during most of the year.
- Scalability: Size should be suited to the location. Our population has not grown. While residential is increasing downtown, it is not a large city. West Park is centrally located in the city, can more be done to call attention to this asset and connect it to downtown?
- Need to ask the question if additional downtown open space makes sense. The Diag is to the east, and West Park to the west, and there are several other park spaces within the downtown. What is actually needed?
- There needs to be common understanding about the different needs and attributes of urban vs. neighborhood and suburban parks.

Development Contributions:

- It is worthwhile acknowledging that private developments contribute financially to the downtown, and park contributions are improving park spaces. The PROS Plan should list projects that have benefitted from developer contributions.

Public/Private Partnerships:

- Need to emphasize that there are existing partnerships that are working well, such as First Martin maintaining the landscaping at Wheeler and

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

Liberty Plaza, and the Rotary Club of Ann Arbor making a major contribution to a new playground at Gallup Park. Discussion about how to acknowledge public/private partnerships. It is important for people to understand that the city benefits from private funding to help maintain parks and amenities at a higher level.

Allen Creek Greenway:

- This has been an aspirational project – a 100-year plan. Is this a need? Will it be used? What comes first, the need driving the infrastructure or hoping that the infrastructure drives the need? If the commuter train station was placed at the Liberty Street area, it could enliven pedestrian activity. The Indianapolis Cultural Trail is one example where the paths are not wide, but enriched sidewalks link together all of the museums. This may be a better model than a 14-foot-wide, non-motorized pathway.

Other:

- Downtown streets often serve as event and open space, but there is reluctance by some to recognize/embrace this.
- The trees on Main Street need funding for water and maintenance. The Dean Fund has not supported use of funding for Main Street trees, favoring other park space outside the downtown.

e. Parks staff, including recreation facility supervisors, Natural Area Preservation, and Give365

Park staff discussed ways to improve customer service, community involvement, financial health, safety, and environmental sustainability

Customer Service:

- Implement annual evaluation and implementation of customer service training for all employees, including providing for customers with disabilities.
- Evaluate and improve the online registration system.
- Provide more training and attractive employment opportunities for staff.
- Create a new citywide parks map with trails, both print and an interactive map.

Community involvement and engagement:

- Increase diversity in the hiring process, especially for entry-level positions, including attending job fairs, working with the Bryant Community Center, and reaching out to a variety of populations.
- Create several new facility offerings each year to reach a wider range of ages, abilities, and special needs.
- Evaluate all programs and facilities to assess their accessibility of all

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

kinds.

- Assess cleanliness and quality of facility amenities.
- Comply and strive to exceed ADA guidelines for accessibility to parks and facilities.

Financial Health and Stability:

- Consistent fee evaluations to ensure that Ann Arbor is in line with regional/national trends.
- Create an endowment program that promotes memorials and gifts.
- Implement a facility improvement project once every five years to improve user experience and increase revenue opportunities.
- Develop preventative maintenance schedules for facilities and equipment.

Safety:

- Foster a relationship with the Ann Arbor Police Department Community Liaison Team and encourage them to attend staff trainings, special events, and hold open hours each month.
- Create a thorough communication plan for safety that is related to issues and incidents (internal messaging, external messaging, debrief after an incident)
- Create a tool for assessing trail safety and maintenance needs
- Increase staff presence in parks that are not regularly staffed to increase positive interactions with park users.
- Continue CPR/First Aid training with all staff.
- Evaluate signage in parks, making sure that signs are consistent and keep users safe and comfortable.

Environmental Sustainability:

- Improve recycling at facilities by evaluating current processes and changing to internal park operations processes.
- Have each facility undergo an energy audit with a plan to identify two changes to improve energy efficiency.
- Implement a comprehensive recycling program with incentives in parks and facilities.
- Create children's programming that introduces parks and sustainability issues.
- Increase number of committed volunteer groups at facilities and parks to enhance physical appearance and operations (landscape design, maintenance, cleanup, etc.).

f. Park Boards and Associations

Staff met with the Kempf House Board and the Cobblestone Farm Association to discuss facility needs with these boards. Input was also solicited from the

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

Farmers Market Commission, the Leslie Science & Nature Center Board, and Community Action Network staff. The facility needs are listed in the Major Needs Assessment chapter.

3. **Public Meeting**

A public meeting was held on Wednesday, March 23 at the Ann Arbor Senior Center to gather community input for the PROS Plan. The meeting format consisted of a short presentation explaining the purpose and content of the plan, a summary of the survey input, and a discussion of goals and objectives.

Participants broke into groups and worked on developing objectives for three of the draft goals, including fostering environmental stewardship and sustainability, ensuring that the park system is inclusive and engaging, and providing a safe park system. Input included the following:

- Provide educational opportunities that inspire environmental stewardship and encourages volunteering.
- Facilitate partnerships between organizations close to parks to sustain stewardship.
- Increase recycling in parks.
- Make parks more accessible for people with disabilities.
- Add amenities such as more restrooms, drinking fountains, public art, child-oriented activities, lights at basketball courts, and rental skates at outdoor rinks.
- Inspect playground equipment regularly.
- Address issues with parks in urban areas such as Liberty Plaza.
- Enforce leash laws.
- Prioritize spending on the busier, most popular parks to make them safe and to provide amenities that are in scale with usage, such as sufficient parking.

Other comments included the following:

- Complete gaps and increase the width of the Border-to-Border Trail.
- Make sure that the planning for the Allen Creek Greenway is incorporated seamlessly into the PROS Plan, not done in silos.
- Parkland acquisitions should include funding to help facilitate access, for example, Camp Hilltop is difficult to access.

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

- Important to look at the big picture when proposing acquisitions – how do acquisitions fit in with a master plan for various greenway connections between parks.

4. Email Comments

Residents and park users were able to send individual comments to parks and recreation staff, in addition to receiving email notices for public meetings. Below is a summary of issues received via email.

- a. Pickleball should be an amenity provided by the city as there are no existing courts and the sport is growing in popularity.
- b. The Ann Arbor Senior Center should be expanded to the level of other communities.
- c. Potawatomi Mountain Bike Association PROS Plan Input:
 - Trail system map – there is no official trail system map, and a lack of general awareness of the Ann Arbor parks trail system. Trails are difficult to find and explain. An official trail system map would increase awareness, and identify possible park connectors.
 - Trail Signs – there is no unified sign system. A common template would facilitate route finding/planning throughout the city. This could include mile markers and trail rules.
 - Flow Trail – creation of a flow trail, which is a directional, bike specific, linear dirt jump or pump track that winds over and utilizes existing terrain, would be a beneficial asset. Flow trails are the fastest growing segment of mountain biking, and accommodate many levels of riders on a single trail. Pilot locations could include Kuebler Langford and Olson parks.
 - Trail Work Parties – encouraging volunteers to help build and maintain trails could help improve the quality and increase the quantity of trails in Ann Arbor.

5. Task Forces and Studies

a. Dog Park Subcommittee

In 2013, a subcommittee of the Park Advisory Commission was formed in response to public desire for additional dog parks. The subcommittee

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

researched best management practices from around the country to inform and provide guidelines for locating, developing, and maintaining dog parks. The committee met over the course of a year, and produced “Recommendations and Guidelines for Dog Park Site Selection, Design, Operations and Maintenance,” a document to help guide the process for public input and decision making. Recommendations included the formation of a task force to identify specific properties and hold public meetings for any proposed location. The final report can be found at this link: <http://www.a2gov.org/departments/Parks-Recreation/administrative/PublishingImages/Pages/Parks-Advisory-Commission/Recommendations%20and%20Guidelines%20for%20Dog%20Park%20Site%20Selection%20updated%204-10-15.pdf>

A task force was formed, and met through 2015 and 2016 to identify specific properties and guide the public process. A survey was sent out, with over 600 responses, and a public meeting was held where Broadway Park was chosen for the third dog park.

b. Downtown Parks and Open Space Committee

In 2013, a subcommittee of the Parks Advisory Commission was formed to determine whether, and what additional parks are wanted and/or needed in downtown Ann Arbor, focusing on city-owned parcels in the DDA district while also considering maintenance of properties such as Liberty Plaza and 415 West Washington. A series of recommendations was made to City Council including the following:

1. The development of any new downtown park or open space should prioritize community preferences. The most commonly expressed community-based priorities include: a central location; sufficient size for passive recreation/community gatherings; shade; and natural features.
2. New downtown parks and open space should adhere to place-making principles. Necessary criteria for a successful downtown open space include: high traffic/visibility; flexible programmable space; active use on at least three sides; the ability to provide activities desired by the community; and funding for maintenance and security.
3. Any new downtown park should enliven the downtown, complement existing parks and development, and serve the community desire for a central gathering space.
4. Any additional downtown park space should not come at the expense of the quality or maintenance of Ann Arbor’s existing parks. Downtowns parks are expected to be more costly to develop and maintain. Further, existing downtown parks are not currently utilized to their potential. Given the limits of current parks funding, the development of new parks should not be approved without an identified funding source for capital development, ongoing maintenance, and programming.

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

5. Significant capital/structural improvements to Liberty Plaza should only be made in concert with the adjacent property owner. Short-term efforts should continue to focus on smaller-scale incremental changes (removal of shrubbery) and programming opportunities (fee waiver). Future improvements should also work to create a permanent and highly visible connection between the Library Lot and Liberty Plaza.
6. The downtown could benefit from the addition of small “pocket” parks and flexible spaces. The city should work with potential developers of city-owned properties to identify opportunities, create, and maintain privately funded, but publically accessible open spaces (e.g., the Y and Kline lots). As a part of this effort, staff should develop recommendations for how development contributions can better serve to provide and improve downtown passive recreational opportunities, including proposals such as flex space (parklets), streetscape improvements, and public art.
7. The public process for downtown parks and open space does not end with these recommendations. Any additional park/open space would require robust public input regarding the design, features, and proposed activities.
8. Based on the aforementioned criteria, the Downtown Parks Subcommittee recommends that a park/open space be developed on the Library Lot that takes advantage of the flexibility offered through temporary closures of Library Lane. The size of this space should exceed the proposed allocated open space in the Connecting William Street study (5,000 square feet). However, the subcommittee is strongly in favor of a mixed-use vision for the Library Lot that utilizes the city’s investment in development-ready foundation and infrastructure. Development of the site and adjacent parcels, including the accompanying increases in activity, is essential for the future success of this site. In order to adequately address issues of safety and security, the Ann Arbor District Library must also be strongly represented in the planning process.

Concurrently with this project, the Downtown Development Authority was working on a Connecting William Street study to consider open spaces and a development vision along and connected to William Street that helped inform the Downtown Parks and Open Space recommendations. The final report can be found at this link: <http://www.a2gov.org/departments/Parks-Recreation/administrative/Documents/pac/Park%20Advisory%20Commission%20%28PAC%29%20Downtown%20Parks%20Subcommittee%20Report%20-%20Final.pdf>

North Main Huron River Corridor Vision Task Force

In 2013, a task force made up of staff, community members and organizations, PAC and Planning Commission and Council members formed to create a vision for the North Main Street corridor. Goals for the task force included exploring options to provide a direct connection to the Border-to-Border Trail, to beautify

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

the corridor, and create better pedestrian and bicycle connections across the railroad tracks to the park system. A specific design for the 721 North Main property was developed, and grants were applied for, but were not successful. A subcommittee of this task force evaluated the former MichCon site to determine how green space could best be utilized.

A concept was developed including parking, a path along the river, a secondary canoe livery/boat storage area, and a bridge connecting to the Argo Cascades. The future of this site is still undetermined. The full report can be found at this link: http://www.a2gov.org/departments/planning-development/planning/Documents/North%20Main/NMVTf%20report%209-3-13_FINAL.pdf

d. Allen Creek Greenway Master Plan Committee

On May 18, 2015, City Council passed a resolution to adopt the FY 2016 budget which includes \$200,000 for consulting services for development of a master plan for the Allen Creek Greenway. The Allen Creek Greenway Master Plan process will explore improvement options that balance the needs and desires of a variety of users and considers the significant resources within the study area. To develop this plan, City of Ann Arbor staff recommended a planning process to engage stakeholders, community leaders, and residents in shaping the scope, content, and direction of the master plan. The [team organization chart](#) shows the various groups that are involved in the process, including a project management team, technical advisory committee, citizen advisory committee, and stakeholders/community at large. Information about the planning process and updates are available at this link:

<http://www.a2gov.org/departments/systems-planning/Transportation/Pages/Allen-Creek-Greenway-Master-Plan-Project.aspx>

6. Approval Process

The approval process for the PROS Plan is determined by Michigan Public Act 33 of 2008. This Michigan Planning Enabling Act states how various planning procedures are done, and contains a single set of procedures for all entities of government to follow. The city requires these procedures to be followed for the plan to become an element of the official City of Ann Arbor Master Plan. It is also determined by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources Grant Management that outlines the format that the plan must follow in order to be approved by the state and enable the city to apply for grants.

A 42-day approval period must be provided for governing agencies, such as the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments, the Washtenaw Area Transportation Study, Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation, neighboring communities, and utility companies within the jurisdiction of the plan.

SECTION VI: Planning Process for the PROS Plan

The plan is also made available to the public through posting on the city's website, and hard copies at the libraries and city facilities.

After the public review period is over, the Park Advisory Commission, the City Planning Commission and City Council must all hold public hearings prior to approval of the plan.

SECTION VII: Goals and Objectives



SECTION VII: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The City of Ann Arbor parks, recreation and open space system exists to serve the needs and desires of the residents of the city and the Ann Arbor community by providing a full spectrum of recreational opportunities, preserving the natural environment, and enhancing the visual quality of neighborhoods and the city as a whole. The PROS survey showed that nearly 90 percent of respondents felt that Ann Arbor's parks, recreation and open space system is extremely important to their quality of life. A primary goal of the city is to maintain or improve upon this percentage, as it reflects how well the parks mission statement is being met.

CORE VALUES & MISSION STATEMENT

In 2012, parks and recreation staff developed a set of core values reflecting the desire to provide high quality, inclusive, and enjoyable recreational experiences for the entire community. These values should inform operations and focus staff's energy on areas of importance while striving to achieve the parks mission statement: Together we enrich life by cultivating exceptional experiences.

- a. Stewardship: Responsibly manage and care for natural, cultural, and physical resources for current and future generations.
- b. Exceptional Customer Service: Interact with all people in a professional, friendly, and respectful manner, while striving to exceed expectations.
- c. Innovative Improvements: Foster an environment that supports and encourages innovation and dynamic creative solutions.
- d. Integrity: Build trust and maintain accountability by doing the right thing.
- e. Community: Work collaboratively to include and engage the full diversity of our community.
- f. Excellent Parks and Spaces: Provide safe environments, beautiful spaces, and a welcoming atmosphere.
- g. Fun: Have fun!

SECTION VII: Goals and Objectives

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goals and objectives for the Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation system reflect the values of staff and the public, and provide direction for priorities to meet the expectations of the Ann Arbor community. The goals and objectives were developed from a number of sources, including the parks and recreation mission statement and core values, the Sustainability Framework Plan, the city's organizational strategic plan, the capital improvement plan rating criteria, the PROS survey, and public comment from various meetings, surveys, task forces, and focus groups.

GOAL 1: Provide Exceptional User Experience

Rationale: The core values developed by staff, the city's strategic plan, and the capital improvements plan criteria all contain as a goal to strive to provide the highest quality customer experience and exceed expectations for the greatest number of users.

Objectives

- a. Continuously assess and strive to improve the cleanliness and quality of parks and facility amenities.
- b. Support and encourage innovative and creative solutions that beautify and enhance the park system.
- c. Preserve the unique historic and cultural amenities within the park system by allocating sufficient resources for maintenance and restoration.
- d. Strive to improve the on-line registration system and web-based interactions.
- e. Annually evaluate and implement customer service and other training opportunities for staff to ensure that employees provide exceptional customer service.

GOAL 2: Ensure that the Park System is Comprehensive, Inclusive, and Engaging.

Rationale: Providing opportunities for all and engaging the full diversity of the community is a core value developed by staff, and a goal of the Sustainability Framework Plan and of the city's organizational strategic plan.

Objectives

- a. Assure that recreational opportunities are balanced throughout the park system, including passive and active, winter and summer, daytime and evening, structured and non-structured, natural areas, and developed parks.
- b. Renovate and maintain parks and facilities so that they comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act, while striving for Universal Accessibility.
- c. Provide diverse cultural, recreational, and educational programming for all, regardless of age, socio-economic status, and physical ability by providing affordable and accessible programs.
- d. Increase diversity of employees in the hiring process, especially for entry-level positions, by reaching out to a variety of populations, attending job fairs, and working with the community centers.
- e. Utilize surveys, social media, public meetings, and other input forums to identify potential areas for improvement in how services are provided, diversity of program and amenity offerings, and maintenance of parks and facilities.

SECTION VII: Goals and Objectives

- f. Foster development of volunteer opportunities to enhance appreciation of and connection to natural, historic, and cultural resources as well as to assist with park beautification, maintenance, and programs.

GOAL 3: Foster Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability

Rationale: The Sustainability Framework Plan, the park staff core values, and the capital improvements plan all emphasize the importance of being environmental stewards and encouraging sustainable practices.

Objectives

- a. Conduct energy audits and implement energy-efficient designs for lighting, heating, and cooling when constructing new park structures or renovating existing ones.
- b. Use best practices for storm water management, including minimizing impervious surfacing, providing rain gardens, bioswales, filtration, and porous pavement where practical and fiscally responsible when renovating existing parks or building new structures or amenities.
- c. Promote the provision of local food by supporting the Ann Arbor Farmers Market, providing space for community gardens and edible plants, and offering economic incentives for lower income individuals to purchase produce at the market.
- d. Encourage recycling at parks and facilities by providing recycling containers and minimizing use of disposable products.
- e. Conduct plant and animal inventories, provide ecological monitoring, and maintain natural areas to increase biodiversity and restore damaged ecosystems.
- f. Continue the construction of non-motorized and pedestrian path systems to encourage use for commuting and exercise. Prioritize development of linear parks and greenways and links between parks throughout the city.

GOAL 4: Provide a Safe Park System

Rationale: Protecting the health and safety of park users is a capital improvements plan criteria and a goal of the city's strategic plan.

Objectives

- a. Promptly address safety concerns, eliminate hazards, and address code compliance issues.
- b. Perform preventative maintenance and renovations to maintain safe infrastructure at all parks.
- c. Regularly inspect and maintain playgrounds to ensure they meet current safety guidelines.
- d. Create a safety checklist for each facility, and regularly inspect all facilities for code compliance and safety regulations.
- e. Create a tool to evaluate, prioritize, and repair trails, paved paths, and game courts to provide a safe walking/riding/playing surface.
- f. Provide police/staff presence in non-staffed parks to provide a welcoming and safe environment, and encourage the Ann Arbor Police Department Community Liaison Team to regularly attend staff meetings, special events, and open hours at facilities.
- g. Train staff to increase safety and identify hazards, including certification for CPR and first aid, to identify issues with physical amenities such as playground safety inspections, and driving responsibly.

SECTION VII: Goals and Objectives

GOAL 5: Ensure Financial Health and Stability

Rationale: Assuring a firm financial basis for the park, recreation, and open space system is a goal of the city strategic plan and a criterion of the capital improvements plan.

Objectives

- a. Achieve savings by researching innovative ways to reduce energy and increase maintenance efficiencies to maintain and operate park facilities, grounds, and amenities.
- b. Pursue opportunities such as grants and partnerships to leverage funding for capital improvements, land acquisition, programming, and scholarships.
- c. Create innovative programming opportunities and new recreation experiences that generate additional revenue.
- d. Pursue joint purchasing opportunities to create efficiencies and provide savings.
- e. Evaluate fees for programs and activities to ensure that Ann Arbor's programs are in line with regional/national trends, are competitive, and fair.
- f. Develop and implement preventative maintenance schedules for facilities, park amenities, and equipment to increase the lifespan of park assets, and decrease the frequency of major renovations.



SECTION VIII: MAJOR PARK AND RECREATION SYSTEM INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The purpose of this section is to provide a comprehensive listing of the park system needs incorporating public and staff input that was gathered through the survey, focus groups, public meetings, email, letters, and comments described in the public process section. This overview reflects both needs that will help preserve the life of amenities, such as resurfacing game courts, to providing space and structure for new programming opportunities. Documenting needs in the plan assists to prioritize future improvements.

A. Facilities Needs Assessment

Several existing recreation facilities have been renovated in recent years, however, much remains to be accomplished. The intensive maintenance required includes repair of aging buildings and mechanical systems, compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and restoration of historic structures.

1. Recreation Facilities General Infrastructure Needs

- The City of Ann Arbor is committed to building facilities that are in full compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act standards. All new facilities are built to meet or exceed ADA standards. Older facilities are brought into ADA compliance as they are renovated. The city will continue to renovate facilities so that all park and recreation facilities are fully accessible.
- Mechanical, heating and cooling systems have ongoing infrastructure needs. A comprehensive assessment of the pool and ice arena infrastructure was completed in 2012 and work is ongoing to renovate aging infrastructure.

SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment

- Environmental sustainability is a high priority. Increasing energy efficiency, improving recycling efforts, and reducing impacts on the storm water system are considered when facilities are renovated.
- Renovations at facilities are needed to accommodate changing trends and to facilitate innovative programming.

2. Recreation Facilities Infrastructure Needs

Recreation supervisors, as well as staff and board members from Cobblestone Farm, the Leslie Science & Nature Center, Kempf House, and the Ann Arbor Farmers Market provided input about the condition of the facilities, improvements that would help the operation and ease of maintenance of the facility, remove barriers to accessibility, facilitate programming that reflects trends, modernize the facility, and increase energy efficiency.

a. Ann Arbor Senior Center

- Parking lot renovations, including parking lot restriping, would help organize space.
- Entrance and exit improvements would facilitate access for persons with disabilities.
- Coat room is neither heated nor cooled and is uncomfortable for users.
- Refinishing wood floors in the large program room would help aesthetics.
- Tile floors are outdated and mismatched and need replacement.
- Updates to kitchen would better accommodate rentals.
- Exterior siding trim paint is in poor condition.
- Repair exterior doors for energy efficiency.
- Explore improvements to ventilation system.
- Accordion doors between gallery room, lobby and middle room need to be replaced, as they are difficult to operate.
- Update lighting for energy efficiency and better user experience during programming.

b. Argo Canoe Livery

- Restrooms are in poor condition and require constant maintenance. Consider space for changing rooms.
- The existing unpaved parking lots are dusty and require renovations. Reconfiguring the existing north parking lot would increase capacity and better organize parking. Paving the south lot, potentially with porous paving, would facilitate drainage, eliminate pot holes, and control dust.
- Pathway to access the livery is difficult to find.
- Grassy space is lacking sitting areas, including benches and picnic tables for customers.

SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment

- On busy days, the current layout makes it difficult to operate efficiently. Reorganization of the space outside the livery building would help organize patron lines.
- Existing programming could be enhanced if the yard area was increased in size.
- Consider moving public boat launch from north Argo parking lot to another park, such as Bandemer Park.
- If DTE property becomes available, a pedestrian bridge, additional parking, and a satellite facility would help spread out users, providing better experience for visitors.

c. **Bryant Community Center**

- The addition to be constructed 2016/17 will help address programming needs if funding allows for the entire design to be implemented, including teen programming, barrier-free upgrades, a coffee shop in the teen center, and renovated restrooms. Any aspects of the project that cannot be completed as part of the renovations should be programmed and funded in future years.
- Renovate building siding that is in poor condition on both existing structures.
- Storage sheds on the south side of the house are in poor shape and need to be repaired or replaced.
- The backyard floods after rain, making the space unusable for camps and after-school programs.

d. **Buhr Park Pool and Ice Arena**

- The pool gutter grating needs replacement.
- Repair trip hazards in the entry area.
- The front counter is outdated and worn, and forms a poor first impression of the facility.
- Existing Halogen lights are energy inefficient. LED lights inside the ice arena would improve efficiency.
- Locker room tiling and flooring throughout the facility is 20 years old and needs to be considered for replacement.
- Opportunities for barrier-free access improvements into the facility need to be addressed, such as automatic door openers.
- Consider pool lights to allow for night time pool rentals, as currently the pool lights do not light the pool interior.

e. **Cobblestone Farm Historic Site**

- The elevator does not provide adequate access for motorized wheelchairs, is undersized, and needs repair.
- Existing restroom stalls do not meet current ADA standards (existing stalls were grandfathered in).
- The historic brick house needs to be tuck-pointed to protect infrastructure.

SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment

- Plaster is cracking throughout historic house and needs to be repaired.
- Windows in the historic house are in poor condition and need to be reglazed.
- Consider way-finding signs for the site.
- Historic interpretation of the site with signage would enhance the visitor experience and increase awareness of the historic significance of the site.
- Creating a path around the north side of the barn to the parking lot could increase safety for visitors and provide an alternative access route.
- Consider providing signage and/or speed bumps along the entry road to slow down traffic.
- Barrier-free access improvements to the historic house would facilitate tours of the museum.

f. Ann Arbor Farmers Market

- The parking lot requires renovation.
- The market office doors are heavy and difficult to open. An automatic door opener for the market office would improve access for anyone with mobility issues or with a cart, wheelchair, or stroller.
- Consider adding amenities that provide shade.
- The gutter system is in need of repair. Replacing the existing gutters with seamless gutters that properly slope to downspouts would help prevent issues of water overflow in vendor areas.
- The wood paneling in the office and hallway is outdated and in poor condition.
- The existing counter top in the office is uneven and does not match other surfaces. Replacing the counter would provide a cohesive and even surface for staff to work and interact with customers.

g. Fuller Park Pool

- Parking lots require renovation.
- The pool light poles should be upgraded possibly with solar-powered lights to improve energy efficiency.
- Large area on northeast side of the facility is underutilized. Providing new amenities such as a splash pad and a sand sensory area would serve a wide array of customers, especially those with disabilities.
- The picnic shelter is undersized for the number of parties and the growing day camps. An additional shelter would help accommodate the growth.
- The former concession stand turned day camp is out of date and does not meet the needs of the current day camps. New windows and a better layout would improve the function of the space.

SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment

h. Gallup Park Canoe Livery

- The exterior restrooms do not currently comply with ADA and should be renovated.
- The roof on the livery building needs to be replaced.
- A parking shortage for the livery exists and alternative solutions, such as utilizing satellite locations, need to be explored.
- Patio furniture needs replacement.
- Sections of the wood dock and the stairs to the fishing dock are worn and should be replaced.
- ADA dock is difficult to use. Modifications could improve access.
- Energy efficiency could be improved at the facility through evaluating windows, lighting, and insulation.

i. Huron Hills Golf Course

- Maintenance equipment requires replacement in the near future, and consideration should be given to moving it to the Fleet Fund or something similar so that funds are available for future replacements.
- Maintenance barn needs renovations.
- Site needs a chemical storage facility for use by golf course and Natural Area Preservation staff.
- Parking lot needs to be renovated.
- Cart paths are needed in strategic locations around the golf course.
- A new shelter/pavilion could accommodate rentals, programs, and events.

j. Kempf House

- The irrigation system should be upgraded.
- The front porch decking needs to be renovated and painted.
- On the second floor, wallpaper needs to be replaced.
- The plaster on the second floor is cracked and needs to be repaired and painted.
- The brick at the foundation needs to be tuck pointed.
- The front door is not historically accurate and should be replaced.
- The exterior of the house is starting to show wear and will need to be painted.

k. Leslie Park Golf Course

- There is inadequate space to accommodate events, programs, and rentals. A pavilion/patio/banquet hall, as well as deck for food and beverages overlooking the third green, could provide opportunities for these initiatives.

SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment

- Maintenance equipment requires replacement in the near future, and consideration should be given to moving it to the Fleet Fund or something similar so that funds are available for future replacements.
- Florescent lights at clubhouse are inefficient and should be replaced with LED.
- The maintenance barn needs to be painted.
- Some cart paths on the course need to be extended and curbed, and existing paths need to be repaired and seal-coated.
- Parking lot surfacing is in poor shape and needs to be repaired.

I. Leslie Science & Nature Center

- Site issues, including erosion, barrier-free access, and way finding, make the site difficult for patrons to access.
- Entry pathway is in poor condition, and needs to be reconstructed.
- Lighting in the parking lot is not energy efficient. Consider LED lighting.
- The parking lot needs to be renovated to address drainage and erosion issues.
- Additional space, including an outdoor classroom, would facilitate programming.
- An interpretive master plan was completed, and implementation should be prioritized.

An architectural assessment of the site structures was completed in 2015, and priorities for renovations to meet code and eliminate safety issues are the highest priority. Some of the highest priorities include:

- Caretaker house roof, siding, windows, and entrance need renovations for safe accessibility and structural integrity.
- The grey water bed in the Nature House needs to be vented properly.
- Sink and piping needs to be replaced in the kitchen to eliminate freezing pipes.
- The floor in the kitchen of the Leslie house needs replacement.
- The entry stairs and ramp to the Leslie house need to be repaired to improve access and comply with the ADA standards.
- Windows and some doors are rotting and are not energy efficient and need to be replaced.

m. Mack Pool

- Lockers should be replaced.
- Consider upgrading the party room to attract more users.
- To separate the public from school children, the office should be reconfigured, and the entrance should be moved to the pool deck.

SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment

- Pool deck and locker room tiles have loosened causing trip hazards and issues for bare feet. Replacement with an alternative material, such as textured concrete, would decrease slipperiness and tripping hazards.
- Explore installing a UV filter.
- Consider enclosing the patio adjacent to the pool deck so it could be used for a party room, lifeguard classes, a small school break day camp, or for additional storage. It would also be helpful for swim meets and equipment storage.
- Walls of the pool deck are not insulated and leak heat, increasing energy costs.
- Evaluate walls of pool deck for structural integrity.
- Evaluate opportunity for adding a family changing room.

n. Northside Community Center

- Flooring is in poor condition because of high wear in the entry, kitchen, and main room areas, and needs to be replaced.
- Walls and baseboards need drywall patching and painting.
- The kitchen is outdated, including deteriorating cabinets and the lack of an oven, which would assist with the food program as well as other programming.
- The exterior of the building is showing age and needs to be painted.
- There is currently insufficient seating space for food program operations.

o. Veterans Memorial Park Pool and Ice Arena

- Arena flooring is worn and needs to be replaced.
- Arena lights are inefficient. Consider high-efficiency LED lighting.
- The pool liner needs replacement in the next few seasons.
- Gutters need replacement.
- Improve ventilation in the locker rooms.
- Plumbing upgrades are needed in locker rooms three and four, including urinals, sinks, and tile.
- Rink board system needs to be evaluated for replacement.
- The rink stands and score box should be replaced or rebuilt.

B. Community-wide Parks

a. Buhr Park

- A new picnic pavilion could provide additional rental and programming opportunities.
- Continue implementation of the goals and elements as identified in the Buhr Park Storm Water Management Plan.

SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment

b. Fuller Park

- The Border-to-Border trail connection to Riverside Park would improve safety and provide a desired linkage.
- Parking lots are in poor condition and need to be repaved.
- A picnic pavilion could provide additional rental and programming opportunities.

c. Gallup Park

- Some pathways in Gallup Park are in poor condition, and should be widened where possible and repaired.
- Way-finding signage and historic interpretive signage would help to direct people to amenities throughout the park, and provide interesting information about the history of the park.
- The boat launch and corresponding parking area are in poor condition. The shoreline is eroded in this area of the park and could use improvements, including riprap and native plantings.
- Development of a water trail or canoe trail with interpretation/stopping areas/resting areas for canoes would provide a desired amenity.
- The service road and parking lots are in poor condition and need renovations.
- Explore creating additional parking areas along the north service drive and expanding the eastern most parking lot.
- The existing lighting system is not energy efficient and is not sufficient for park patrons attending meetings at night.

d. Island Park

- The bridge connecting to Fuller Park is in need of repair and upgrades.
- The historic bridge concrete is spalling and needs to be repaired to maintain the integrity of the structure.

e. Olson Park

- The mountain bike trail network is extremely popular and could use improvements. Encouraging a relationship with a core group of local mountain bike rider volunteers could aid in developing and maintaining trails.
- Vegetation management and controlling invasive species continues to be a challenge, and ongoing maintenance is needed.
- The dog park surfacing gets muddy, and there is a desire to introduce additional amenities.

SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment

f. Riverside Park

- The non-motorized path and drive entry is in poor condition. Reconfiguring the entry would help create separation between path and road and improve safety.
- The existing parking lot floods after rain events, and is located in the floodway. Consider eliminating the parking lot, as there is sufficient parking off site.
- The Huron River shoreline is overgrown to where it is difficult to see the river. Selectively removing vegetation and restoring native vegetation along the river would improve visibility.
- The boardwalk connection to Broadway Park and the Argo Cascades needs to be renovated.
- A link connecting from Broadway Street across the old channel would improve access to Broadway Park.

g. Southeast Area Park

- Explore feasibility of extending a trail connection along the northern boundary of the University Townhouses residential property and I-94 toward the existing pedestrian overpass bridge at I-94 to Mary Beth Doyle Park.

h. Veterans Memorial Park

- Consider paving the parking lot serving the skatepark and baseball fields off of Maple Road to improve functionality and appearance.
- The existing picnic shelter needs to be replaced. This is a very popular area that would be frequently rented if the picnic shelter was replaced.
- The restrooms in the existing picnic shelter no longer are functional and need to be replaced and moved to a location in between the skatepark and renovated athletic fields.
- The slag path through the park is eroding and needs to be repaired, or eliminated.
- Issues of erosion around the skatepark need to be addressed.
- Consider a permanent seating plan for the skatepark. A seating plan would help organize the space and provide a much-needed amenity for skaters as well as visitors observing the skatepark.

i. West Park

- The bioswales and prairie areas are overgrown and have significant invasive species. A plan to maintain the plantings is needed to preserve the integrity of the design.
- Interpretive signage for storm water features, including the burial of

SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment

Allen Creek, would help explain the history of the park and how the stormwater features operate.

- The Native American Trail needs restoration.
- If the playground is replaced, construct a creative play area to reflect the history of the park and the storm water theme.
- Monitor the condition of the band shell foundation, as cracks are appearing.
- Consider adding benches along the boardwalk.

C. Natural Areas

- For newly acquired natural areas, resources should be identified to start ecological stewardship activities where appropriate.
- Where city-owned natural areas are adjacent to natural areas under different ownership, it would be helpful to develop and implement complementary management plans.
- Enhancing management of city-owned nature areas by continuing to extend ecological stewardship activities to areas adjacent to high-functioning ecosystems.
- Identify areas appropriate for construction or alteration of trail systems to facilitate greater connections to a system-wide trail network.
- Establish and enhance wildlife corridors to provide greater habitat.
- Where the Huron River and tributaries lack native vegetation, buffers should be established and enhanced.
- Develop a tool to assess unpaved trails through natural areas. This would help to establish a plan for regular maintenance.

D. Parkland Acquisitions

- Acquisition criteria should be used to rate all potential park acquisitions.
- Any parkland acquisitions should consider the additional burden on park system maintenance.
- Purchase property to increase both visual and physical access to existing parks.

E. The Huron River and Other Greenways

- The Huron River Impoundment Management Plan identifies challenges and opportunities for access improvements to the Huron River and river parks. Many recommendations have been implemented, and the plan should continue to be referenced.
- Several important path connections are missing from the Huron River Greenway/Border-to-Border Trail, such as the connection from Bandemer Park to Barton Park, and from Fuller Park to Riverside Park, that compromise safety and way finding.
- Renovate segments of the B2B trail that are in poor condition and widen where feasible. The trails do not currently meet AASHTO standards. The North Main Task Force Report identified non-motorized deficiencies along

SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment

the North Main Street corridor including connections to river parks and makes recommendations for future planning that should be considered.

F. Neighborhood Parks and Urban Plazas

- Gaps in neighborhood park service (for residents who 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.
- Liberty Plaza would benefit from increased programmed activities to make it a more desirable destination. Staff and PAC support an increased effort in programming prior to any investment in redesign and reconstruction; and PAC passed a resolution in support of this. PAC and Council also passed a resolution waiving rental fees for Liberty Plaza to encourage more activities; and some success has been seen in this approach, for example POP-x art.
- Incorporate place-making principles and the recommendations from the PAC Downtown Park and Open Space Subcommittee for development, redesign, and programming of downtown open space.
- Work with the Downtown Development Authority in any planning for renovation or acquisition of downtown open space.

G. General Infrastructure Needs

a. Athletic Fields/Ball Fields

- Fields need to be rested on a regular schedule, and preventative maintenance needs to be performed such as aeration and overseeding.
- Evaluate athletic fields and identify those that need to be completely renovated.

b. Game Courts

- Regular preventative maintenance is needed at game courts, including periodic crack repair, resurfacing, and color coating.
- Game courts develop cracks and pavement deteriorates over time. Develop a system to evaluate and prioritize repairs at all game courts.
- Vegetation on fencing surrounding game courts compromises the court surfacing, causing cracks and a poor playing surface. Vegetation needs to be cleared regularly and mow strips installed to prevent regrowth.

c. Park Security

- Safety is a concern for parks in and close to the downtown. Park staff should continue to work closely with the police department to make sure that parks are kept safe.

SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment

- Dogs off leash are an issue in many parks – evaluate signage and enforcement.

d. Play Areas

- Existing play areas that are aging and out of compliance with safety regulations do not adequately meet ADA standards and need to be renovated or replaced.
- Continue regular playground inspections and train additional staff to be certified playground safety inspectors.
- Wood fiber playground surfacing decomposes and gets weedy. Surfacing needs to be weeded and replenished on a regular basis to maintain a safe depth and clean surfacing conditions.

e. Restrooms

- Heavily used restroom facilities are more difficult to keep clean and maintain and need to be cleaned and repaired on a frequent basis.
- Restrooms that are outdated should be upgraded on a rotating/as-needed basis for energy efficiency, cleanliness, barrier-free compliance, and aesthetics.
- Prioritize construction and/or renovations of restrooms in heavily used parks or regional park facilities.

f. Signage

- Interpretive signs at locations such as West Park, Cobblestone Farm, and Gallup Park would enrich the understanding of the history and natural environment of these parks.
- Rule signs need to be consistent throughout the park system and to explain appropriate uses of parks and natural areas.
- Entry signs in parks are not consistently designed and are not all easily read from the street. Replace entry signs to neighborhood parks to be consistent and explain rules.

g. Non- Motorized Pathways

- Pathways in poor condition need to be repaired/replaced to maintain safety and usability.
- The Non-motorized Transportation Plan from 2014 details desired trail connections to connect parks and greenways throughout the city. This plan should be consulted when renovating streets and pathways.
- Coordination with other city departments to repair or replace deteriorated pathways in conjunction with street improvements should be a priority.
- Many pathways do not comply with AASHTO standards. When renovating existing pathways or constructing new pathways, these

SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment

standards should be followed where feasible.

- Work to secure and increase safety at railroad crossings that access parks. As the discussion to make the MDOT rail line in to a high-speed corridor, securing these public crossings is crucial.

i. Mountain Bicycle Trails

- There is no official trail system map and, therefore, there is a lack of general awareness of the Ann Arbor parks mountain bike trail system. An official trail system map would increase awareness, and identify possible park connectors.
- There is no unified sign system. A common template would facilitate route finding/planning throughout the city. This could include mile markers and trail rules.
- Creation of a flow trail, which is a directional, bike specific, linear dirt jump or pump track that winds over and utilizes existing terrain, would be a beneficial asset. Pilot locations could include Kuebler Langford and Olson parks.
- Encouraging volunteers to help build and maintain trails could help improve the quality and increase the quantity of trails in Ann Arbor. NAP should be heavily involved in any such improvements so that preservation of the natural areas is considered.

j. Trash Pickup

- Trash barrels in several parks are different styles. Old-style barrels should be replaced with uniform, attractive trash containers throughout park system. All new barrels should be designed to easily remove the liner, secure the container in place, and be attractive.
- Placement of trash barrels should facilitate ease of trash pickup as well as ease of use and access.
- Strive to expand recycling in all parks by providing recycling containers and coordinating regular pickup.

H. Volunteer Programs

- As volunteer programs continue to grow, it is important to maintain or increase staffing levels. A horticulturist position would be beneficial to consult with the volunteer program to restore and maintain recreation facility plantings.
- Form a team dedicated to special events as well as to create new programs and events.
- Dedicate a park maintenance team to work on beautification projects, such as facility landscaping, park and river cleanup, invasive plant removals, tree

SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment

plantings, and maintaining trails outside of natural areas. In conjunction with this new programming, new resources, such as a second truck, computers and storage space would be beneficial.

- Two programs would benefit from staff volunteer coordinators, including the citizen pruner program, and the rain garden program. Staffing to maintain the proliferation of rain gardens in the city has not been adequate. A crew to maintain rain gardens would help improve the quality and aesthetics and minimize invasive species.

I. Potential New Recreational Facilities and Park Amenities

a. Additional Dog Parks

- The two off-leash dog parks are currently located in the north and south part of Ann Arbor at Swift Run Park and at Olson Park. A third dog park was located at Broadway Park in 2016. Requests have been made for one or more dog parks to be located on the west side of the city.

b. Pickleball Courts

- Pickleball is a fast-growing sport, and currently no dedicated courts exist in city parks to serve the recreation trend. The tennis courts at South Maple Park have been striped for both tennis and pickleball as a start, but dedicated pickleball courts have been requested. Consider repurposing Leslie Park tennis courts to pickleball.

c. Allen Creek Greenway

- On May 18, 2015, City Council passed a resolution to adopt the FY 2016 budget which included \$200,000 for consulting services for development of a master plan for the Allen Creek Greenway. The Allen Creek Greenway Master Plan process will explore improvement options that balance the needs and desires of a variety of users and considers the significant resources within the study area. To develop this plan, City of Ann Arbor staff implemented a planning process to engage stakeholders, community leaders and residents in shaping the scope, content and direction of the master plan. Public meetings are ongoing for this project.

d. Other Trail and Greenway Connections

- Westside greenway - Allen Creek to West Park with eventual connection to an Allen Creek greenway. This branch of the Allen Creek runs west through many of the existing city parks. A natural/wildlife corridor runs along the ravine in Hannah Park and Maryfield Wildwood Park.

SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment

- South spur along Malletts Creek. A Malletts Creek Restoration Plan was completed in April 2000 and outlines land to be preserved along the length of the creek as well as action items to improve the water quality and erosion issues. A potential greenway along Malletts Creek could include a spur from Gallup Park through the South Pond Nature Area, Huron Parkway Park, and Malletts Creek Park along Huron Parkway to provide both wildlife and pedestrian corridors. A better connection from Packard at Malletts Creek to Redbud Park and Scheffler Park could be provided through acquisitions and public access easements. A parallel connection through County Farm Park, Buhr Park, and Mary Beth Doyle Park would provide alternative trail corridors. Tying in Swift Run Park with the corridor would provide connection opportunities further east to the Scarlett Mitchell Nature Area. Exploring opportunities to improve the pedestrian and non-motorized trail between Southeast Area Park and Lillie Park in Pittsfield Township would provide a connection with the trails to the Pittsfield Preserve and Rolling Hills Park outside the city.
- West spur connecting Bandemer Park to Traver Creek at Leslie Park. This trail would follow the abandoned Huron Parkway right-of-way connecting the Huron River at Bandemer Park with Leslie Park. This is already a heavily used corridor by pedestrians and mountain bicyclists and would provide the connection with the Huron River greenway. Land needs to be acquired to complete the trail both to the river as well as continuing north. At Leslie Park there is a three-way split. The north trail would follow Traver Creek to Olson Park through the existing public path easement on the Food Gatherers property. A spur further north is desired to connect the natural areas adjacent to proposed developments along Pontiac Trail. The south trail needs an improved connection between Leslie Park and the path along Plymouth Road to the Traver Creek trail crossing Broadway to Island Park. This entire section should be formalized as an identifiable park space with signage, way finding, and clearly marked trails.
- Northeast spur from Leslie Park along Traver Creek would extend through portions of Foxfire South, Placid Way, and Foxfire East Parks, along and across Nixon Road to the pond east of Nixon, and on to Oakwoods and Sugarbush parks.
- Dolph Nature Area and Honey Creek. Connecting Third Sister Lake in the University of Michigan's Saginaw Forest to Dolph Nature Area has been a long-term goal. Making this connection would add significantly to the greenway that runs between Dolph Park at Wagner Road to Liberty Road through Lakewood Woods and along Honey Creek Pond, owned by the Water Resource Commission.
- Millers Creek and Swift Run Creek have no trail improvements planned at this point; however, adding to the public corridor along

SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment


these tributaries will be sought as land is developed in these areas. A restoration plan for the Millers Creek watershed was completed in April of 2004. The mission is "to establish and implement socially, environmentally, and economically sustainable watershed management standards and practices that will improve the quality of the Millers Creek Watershed." Goals include improving recreational opportunities in and around the creek.

e. **Huron River Greenway Maps (Border-to-Border Trail)**


The following maps illustrate the pathway connections that are envisioned to complete the Border-to-Border Trail, as well as to connect greenways throughout the city. This effort is being coordinated with the Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation Commission, who recently completed a master plan for the Border-to-Border Trail through Washtenaw County.

Huron River Greenway


Proposed Acquisitions
&
Improvements




SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment



SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment



SECTION VIII: Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment





SECTION IX: ACTION PLAN

Numerous projects are completed in city parks every year including capital improvements requiring large amounts of funding, renovation projects completed by city staff, and special or ongoing projects completed by volunteers. As demonstrated in Section VIII (Major Park and Recreation System Infrastructure Needs Assessment), there are far more projects than can be completed over the course of this PROS Plan cycle, and it is a challenging task to determine priorities. Making matters more complicated, unanticipated projects arise that must be completed to maintain the operation of a facility or to assure safety of citizens.

In order to provide flexibility while addressing park system needs, projects in the capital improvements plan are identified in categories rather than as specific park projects. For example, maintenance of existing trails and pathways is a high priority for residents, however there is also a desire to complete path systems such as the Border-to-Border trail. Consequently, two categories were developed to address both repair of existing and construction of new trails. Trail projects are prioritized based on the amount of use they receive, their condition, and safety. These are then reviewed each year to determine how much can be accomplished given the budget allocation.

A balance must also be achieved between maintaining existing facilities, keeping current with trends, and providing desired new amenities. For example, every year, several recreation facilities, such as a pool or an ice arena, receive some upgrade or modernization to improve customer experience, increase energy efficiency, provide barrier free access, and maintain the viability of the resource. Basic infrastructure, such as parking lots and restrooms, must also be repaired and updated and require significant financial resources. Additionally, larger new amenities, such as the skate park, built in 2014, are periodically constructed to eliminate deficiencies within the park system. To provide a balance, the capital budget is divided between the different types of resources to assure that the entire system is addressed at some level. The

exhaustive list provided in the previous chapter helps staff to identify priorities stated during the public process while developing the Capital Improvements Plan.

A. Staff Projects

Staff projects include replacing, renovating or repairing amenities such as drinking fountains, restrooms, and park furniture. These projects are completed on a rotating basis to keep facilities updated and to improve barrier-free accessibility. Larger projects, such as constructing stairs or boardwalks, playground renovations, and building renovations, are also periodically performed by staff.

B. Volunteer Projects

Three volunteer programs engage individuals and groups in the park system. Natural Area Preservation, Adopt-A-Park and GIVE 365 are three volunteer programs within the parks and recreation services unit that offer a variety of projects and support the park system. Volunteers include diverse groups, such as service organizations, schools, fraternities and sororities, and individuals who complete diverse tasks.

- Adopt-A-Park – Neighbors volunteer to plant flowers at park signs, help to spread woodchips surfacing at playgrounds, mulch around trees, and advocate for their local park. Some groups plan work days for the neighborhood while other volunteers work individually with the support of Ann Arbor parks and recreation staff.
- GIVE 365 - Established in 2011, the program incorporates volunteers into programming and special events, coordinates park and facility maintenance and cleanup efforts, maintains flower beds, clears overgrown brush, collects trash along the river and provides for other park maintenance needs. GIVE 365 also supports and staffs the Adopt-A-Park program.
- Natural Area Preservation – Staff and volunteers work to improve the quality of natural areas by removing invasive plants, planting native species, performing controlled burns, and inventorying flora and fauna to better understand the condition of natural areas. Eagle Scouts often partner with NAP to do construction projects that complete their badge requirements. Projects have included boardwalks, signs, small bridges, pathways, and building of benches.

C. Capital Projects

The City of Ann Arbor's Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) provides a starting point for the capital projects portion of the budget. Every two years, the complete six-year plan is reviewed, modified, and updated. Projects considered to be capital improvements are generally large, require a level of funding outside the scope of operational budgets, and relatively permanent in nature.

SECTION IX: Action Plan

The city staff and the City Planning Commission initiated changes to the CIP process to develop a new model to prioritize projects. In 2009, city teams were formed to identify capital needs associated with the various categories of infrastructure assets, such as streets, water treatment, and parks. A tool was developed to help prioritize needs and was customized within each service area to make it more pertinent to the type of asset being evaluated. These were then tied to availability of funding and capacity of staff to perform the projects.

Each year, staff meet to propose and rate projects to be included in the CIP, as well as to ensure that efficiencies are gained by coordinating between service areas.

D. Capital Projects Criteria

Using the PROS Plan as the starting point, potential projects are evaluated and prioritized according to myriad factors including the condition of the facility, community desires for amenities, and adherence to codes. Other factors, including ability to maintain an amenity and its financial impact, are important in rating projects. Playgrounds, for example, are scheduled to be replaced if there are components that cannot be repaired or if they no longer meet safety or ADA guidelines. A heavily used asphalt path that is badly cracked would rank higher than a lower-use path. Construction of new facilities that will create additional maintenance burden have in recent years ranked lower because of the emphasis on taking care of existing parks.

The following chart outlines how proposed projects are scored and then prioritized.

SECTION IX: Action Plan

SCORING		Low ← → High				
1	Sustainability Framework Goals	0 Contributes to meeting 1 or less of the City's Sustainability Framework Goals	3 Modestly contributes to meeting two to three of the City's Sustainability Framework goals	7 Significantly contributes to meeting two or three of the City's Sustainability Framework goals OR modestly contributes to meeting four of more of the City's Sustainability Framework goals	10 Significantly contributes to meeting 4 or more of the City's Sustainability Framework goals	
2	Safety/Compliance/Emergency Preparedness	0 Does not address safety or emergency preparedness considerations	2 Contributes to meeting public safety, but is not required for compliance	5 Will assist in ability to continue governmental services during emergencies	8 Necessary to meet recommended compliance OR will maximize public safety opportunities	10 Contributes to mandatory compliance OR will prevent potential injury to staff OR is necessary to assure continuance of governmental services during emergencies
3	Funding	0 Has no potential funding	2 Has uncertain funding source(s) (e.g., Special Assessment, General Fund)	6 Funding available from standard City funding sources (e.g., utility rates, road millage, etc.)	8 Has high probability of funding from low-interest loan source (e.g., DWRP, SRF, Energy Fund, etc.) OR partial project funding (<80%) from outside source(s)	10 Has high probability of receiving substantial (≥80%) project funding from outside sources (e.g., grant funding, developer, Township financed)
4	Coordination with Other Projects	0 There are no other planned projects that should be coordinated with this Project	5 Costs can be modestly reduced by performing project with another project	8 Schedule is driven by other improvements (e.g., street reconstruction, adjacent utility replacement) resulting in significant (>33%) opportunity cost if project is not completed concurrently with adjacent work	10 Schedule is driven by other high-priority improvements that must be completed within the next two fiscal years	
5	Master Plan Objectives	0 Does not contribute to meeting any of the City's master plan or other strategic planning document goals	3 Modestly contributes to meeting one of the City's master plan or other strategic planning document goals	6 Significantly contributes to meeting one of the City's master plan or other strategic planning document goals OR modestly contributes to meeting two or more of the City's master plan or other strategic planning document goals	10 Significantly contributes to meeting two or more of the City's master plan or other strategic planning document goals	
6	User Experience (Level of Service)	0 Will reduce the quality of the User Experience (Level of Service)	2 Will not affect Level of Service	4 Modestly improves existing Level of Service	10 Significantly improves existing Level of Service OR provides a new service which is requested by the community	

SECTION IX: Action Plan

7	Innovation	0 Does not include any innovative measures or items	3 Modestly promotes or incorporates multiple known innovative techniques, funding strategies, materials or BMP's	7 Significantly promotes or incorporates multiple known innovative techniques, funding strategies, materials or BMP's on a small scale	10 Significantly promotes or incorporates multiple known innovative techniques, funding strategies, materials or BMP's on a large scale
8	Economic Development/Retention	0 Will not have any effect on economic development/retention	5 Will have modest effect on economic development/retention	10 Will have significant effect on economic development/retention	
9	Partnerships	0 Does not provide opportunity for partnerships	3 Promotes regional or interagency planning and coordination OR public/private partnership	10 Promotes regional or interagency planning and coordination OR public/private partnership AND provides for shared staffing resources	
10	System Influence/Capacity	0 Does not contribute to larger system network or user demand	3 Meets future user demand	6 Addresses immediate user demand that benefits a portion of the user population	10 Addresses immediate user demand that benefits entire user population
11	O&M (Operations & Maintenance)	0 Will cause increase in O&M costs	2 Has a neutral effect on O&M costs	6 Makes modest contribution to O&M cost reduction	8 Makes modest contribution to O&M cost reduction AND creates opportunities to improve operational flexibility/use of technology, or extends asset life
12	Energy	0 Will cause increase in energy costs	2 Has a neutral effect on energy costs	5 Makes modest contribution to energy cost reduction	8 Makes modest contribution to energy cost reduction AND creates opportunities to improve operational flexibility/use of renewable energy
					10 Makes significant contribution to energy cost reduction AND creates opportunities to maximize operational flexibility/use of renewable energy

E. Major Categories of Capital Project Improvements

In order to prioritize projects and assure that funding is distributed in a manner that addresses infrastructure needs as well as programming and citizen desires, staff from recreation facilities, operations and maintenance, planning and administration, meet annually to evaluate needs identified in the PROS Plan. A potential list of projects is then compiled that furthers the goals of the PROS Plan. The general categories listed below help ensure that the broad scope of needs within the park system are addressed.

1. Recreation Facility Renovations – With the number and variety of facilities in the park system, there are multiple renovations that are needed to maintain infrastructure, provide for programming opportunities, and update appearance. An example is that major renovations were completed at Gallup Park to provide universal access at the livery, including the boat docks, entry pathways, fishing pier, and restrooms.

2. Park Roads and Parking Lots – Several of the community-wide parks and facilities contain entry roads and parking lots that are in need of renovation. In order to maintain safety and provide a positive user experience, these surfaces need to either be replaced or repaired, depending on their condition. An example is that the entire system of roads, parking lots and paths was upgraded at Buhr Park.

3. Trails and Pathways: Repair and Reconstruction – With of the extensive network of trails and pathways in the park system, it is important to implement renovations for safety by eliminating trip hazards, to comply with code for barrier-free access, and to meet current traffic standards. An example is the replacement of a mile of pathway on the Border-to-Border trail in Gallup Park.

4. Trails and Pathways: New Construction – The PROS Plan as well as the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan outline trail connections to complete the Border-to-Border Trail, provide desired greenway connections, and provide connections to and through parks. These improvements are of high importance to the community as shown though the public input received. An example is the new section of the Border-to-Border trail added along the Argo Cascades.

5. Athletic Field Renovations – The park system contains multiple athletic fields, including baseball and softball fields that have deteriorated over the years from heavy use. Rebuilding and renovating fields are important for safety and to improve user experience. An example includes athletic field renovations at Fuller, Veterans, Southeast Area and West parks.

6. Playground Improvements – Federal guidelines that determine design of playground equipment change periodically, and consequently, playgrounds must be updated or replaced. Replacement may also occur if equipment requires such significant change that it is more cost effective to install new equipment. Playgrounds are generally replaced on an approximately 15-20 year cycle. Examples of playgrounds that were replaced include Gallup, Arbor Oaks, Burr Oak and Scheffler parks.

7. Tennis and Basketball Court Renovations – In order to maintain the quality of the surface and safety of play, the surfacing, as well as other court amenities such as basketball hoops, tennis posts and nets, are replaced and/or repaired. Examples include the reconstruction of courts at Hunt, Allmendinger, Clinton, Veterans Memorial, and Windemere parks.

8. Community-wide parks – Infrastructure includes picnic shelters, restrooms, landscaping, lighting, signage, pathways, parking lots, as well as proposed new elements. Major new amenities include the skatepark at Veterans Memorial Park, and the construction of the Argo Cascades.

9. Historic Preservation Projects – The structural integrity of historic structures, such as the Kempf House and the historic house at Cobblestone Farm, is undermined over time due to weather, wildlife, and vandalism. These structures are renovated periodically to preserve them for future generations to enjoy. Projects included restoration of the Greek revival shelter at Island Park, and replacement of the Cobblestone house roof.


10. Park Bridge Repair – Bridges throughout the park system along the Huron River and tributaries deteriorate over time and need to be repaired or replaced for safety. Projects included renovation of two of the Island Park bridges.

F. Capital Improvements for 2016-2020

Each fiscal year, projects from the categories listed above will be assigned a budget based on the needs identified and prioritized by staff outlined in the needs assessment chapter. The projects will be rated using the capital improvements criteria with input from parks and recreation staff as well as staff from other departments where there may be overlap and efficiencies, such as construction or replacement of a pathway in the right of way where a street renovation project is planned, allowing for savings in funding, as well as reducing impact on residents.


APPENDIX SECTION A: **Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Charts**

**Parks and Recreation Services
General Fund
FY 2017 Revenue Budget
Total \$4,595,924**




This chart shows the Parks & Recreation Services General Fund revenue budget for FY 2017. Revenues are tied to the facility that generates the revenue. For example, Buhr Park Pool revenue is comprised of fees collected for season passes, daily swimming admission, swim lessons, swim team registrations, day camp registrations, and concessions. Revenue collected in Administration is generally not program specific – for example, fees collected for the lease of parking spaces to the University of Michigan is recognized in Administration.

**Parks and Recreation Services
General Fund
FY 2017 Expenditure Budget
Total \$6,050,204**




This chart shows the Parks & Recreation Services General Fund expense budget for FY 2017. Expenses are tied to the appropriate facility. For example, Buhr Park Pool expenses are comprised of full-time staff and fringe benefits, seasonal staff, utility and water costs, materials and supplies, pool chemicals, information technology charges, and other operational expenses. Administration expenses include staff, significant medical retiree costs, insurance premiums, storm water charges, information technology charges, and other operating costs.

**Parks and Recreation Services
All Funds
FY 2017 Revenue Budget
Total \$9,419,662**




This chart shows the Parks & Recreation Services revenue budget for all six funds for FY 2017.

**Parks and Recreation Services
All Funds
FY 2017 Expenditure Budget
Total \$9,720,570**




This chart shows the Parks & Recreation Services expense budget for all six funds for FY 2017.

**Park Operations
General Fund
FY 2017 Revenue Budget
Total \$31,560**




The Park Operations General Fund Revenue budget consists of a few minor items, such as fees collected from the Ann Arbor Public School system for field preparation.

**Park Operations
General Fund
FY 2017 Expenditure Budget
Total \$2,410,655**




The Park Operations General Fund Expense budget pie chart shows how the General Fund is used for a number of essential functions such as mowing, snow and ice maintenance, and administrative costs that includes medical retiree, and debt service for the Parks portion of the Wheeler maintenance center.

**Park Operations and Park Forestry
Park Maintenance & Capital Improvement Millage Fund
FY 2017 Revenue Budget
Total \$3,228,097**




The Park Operations Millage revenue fund pie chart shows the level of millage revenue recognized in FY 2017.

**Park Operations and Park Forestry
Park Maintenance & Capital Improvement Millage Fund
FY 2017 Expenditure Budget
Total \$3,248,258**




The Park Operations Millage expense fund pie chart shows how the millage-generated revenue supports two primary maintenance functions: forestry operations in the parks, and maintenance across the parks and recreation facilities.

**Park Operations and Park Forestry
All Funds
FY 2017 Revenue Budget
Total \$3,259,657**




This chart shows how Park Operations generates and receives revenue from two funds.

**Park Operations and Park Forestry
All Funds
FY 2017 Expenditure Budget
Total \$5,785,819**




This chart shows how Park Operations expenditures are budgeted in two funds. It also demonstrates the importance and necessity of the millage for supporting ongoing operations within the parks system.

**Total Parks System
FY 2017 Revenue Budget
Total \$12,736,819**



This chart shows the parks revenue budget for all funds for FY 2017. The chart demonstrates the complexity of the Parks and Recreation Services budget, and the number of different funds. Revenues are tied to the specific fund or activity that generates the revenue. For example, the General Fund for Parks and Recreation Services includes all revenue generated at General Fund Recreation Facilities through admissions, program registrations, lessons, concession, merchandise, and other revenue-generating programs.

**Total Parks System
FY 2017 Expenditure Budget
Total \$15,564,025**



- | | |
|---|---|
| A ■ 0010 General Fund - Parks & Recreation Services | B ■ 0010 General Fund - Park Operations and Park Forestry |
| C ■ 0024 Open Space & Park Acquisition Millage - Parks & Recreation Services | D ■ 0025 Bandemer Fund Parks & Recreation Services |
| E ■ 0034 Parks Memorials & Contributions Parks & Recreation Services | F ■ 0041 Open Space Endowment Parks & Recreation Services |
| G ■ 0055 Elizabeth R. Dean Trust Fund Park Operations and Park Forestry | H ■ 0071 Park Maintenance & Capital Improvement Millage - Parks & Recreation Services |
| I ■ 0071 Park Maintenance & Capital Improvement Millage - Park Operations and Park Forestry | |

This chart shows the entire parks system expense budget for all funds for FY 2017. The chart demonstrates the complexity of the Parks and Recreation Services budget, and the number of different funding sources. Expenses are tied to the appropriate fund or activity.

APPENDIX SECTION B: **Resolutions**

RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE 2016-2020
PARKS AND RECREATION OPEN SPACE PLAN

Whereas, The Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan (PROS) will expire on March 30, 2017, and the updated PROS Plan must be approved by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources by April 1, 2017;

Whereas, The Michigan Department of Natural Resources requires that the PROS Plan be updated every five years, and that the City must provide an updated plan to be eligible to apply for grants;

Whereas, The PROS Plan is an important guiding document for all future planning for the Ann Arbor Park System and part of the City master plan;

Whereas, A Citywide email survey, focus groups, public meeting, and public hearings, as well as other input processes, were completed as part of preparing the 2016-2020 Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan;

Whereas, Public review of the draft plan has been completed including all surrounding municipalities, townships, Washtenaw County, and public utilities as required to incorporate the PROS Plan as part of the City of Ann Arbor's Master Plan; and

Whereas, A comprehensive list of facility improvements, recreation needs, and park improvements was developed to provide the basis for millage renewals and capital improvements as a result of the public input;

RESOLVED, That the Park Advisory Commission recommends approval of the 2016-2020 PROS Plan.

Park Advisory Commission
November 15, 2016

*On a voice vote in addition to a show of hands – PAC Recommended Approval
of the 2016 – 2020 Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan*

CITY OF ANN ARBOR MASTER PLAN
CITY OF ANN ARBOR PARK AND RECREATION OPEN SPACE PLAN 2016-2020
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, The City Planning Commission and City Council are authorized by the Michigan Planning Enabling Act (P.A. 33 of 2008 as amended), to make and adopt a master plan for the City; and

WHEREAS, The City of Ann Arbor Master Plan: Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan, 2016-2020 will serve as a guide for decisions and recommendations regarding future planning, physical development, acquisition, programming and maintenance of the park system and for the implementation of related plans, policies and programs; and

WHEREAS, The City of Ann Arbor Master Plan; Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan, 2016-2020 includes maps, appendices, descriptive and other matter contained therein as required by the Michigan Planning Enabling Act (P.A. 33 of 2008, as amended); and

WHEREAS, The City of Ann Arbor Master Plan; Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan, 2016-2020, will replace the Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan, 2011-2015; and

WHEREAS, The City Planning Commission held a public hearing on December 6, 2016 to gather input regarding the City of Ann Arbor Master Plan; Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan, 2016-2020;

RESOLVED, That City Planning Commission hereby adopts the City of Ann Arbor Master Plan; Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan, 2016-2020, now on file with the City Clerk, as an element of the City Master Plan.

RESOLVED, The City Planning Commission recommends that City Council adopt the City of Ann Arbor Master Plan; Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan, 2016-2020, as an element of the City of Ann Arbor Master Plan.

Planning Commission
December 6, 2016

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR PARKS AND RECREATION OPEN SPACE PLAN, 2016-2020

Whereas, the Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan (PROS) is the guiding document for future planning for the Ann Arbor Park System;

Whereas, The Michigan Department of Natural Resources requires that the PROS Plan be updated every 5 years and that the City must provide an updated plan to be eligible to apply for grants;

Whereas, The PROS Plan expires on December 31, 2017 and must be renewed by April 1, 2017;

Whereas, An extensive public input process was implemented, including a City-wide email survey, focus groups, public meetings, and a steering committee as part of preparing the Plan;

Whereas, Public review of the draft plan was completed including all surrounding municipalities, townships, Washtenaw County, and public utilities as required to incorporate the PROS Plan as part of the City of Ann Arbor Master Plan;

Whereas, A comprehensive list of facility, recreation and park improvement needs was developed to provide the basis for millage renewals and capital improvements as a result of the public input; and

Whereas, The Park Advisory Commission and City Planning Commission approved the Draft Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan, 2016-2020 for inclusion in the City Master Plan consistent with State law;

RESOLVED, That City Council approve the Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan, 2016-2020 as part of the City of Ann Arbor Master Plan

Submitted by: Parks and Recreation

Date: _____