



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Milton Dohoney Jr., City Administrator

CC: Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
John Fournier, Deputy City Administrator
Raymond Hess, Transportation Manager
Nick Hutchinson, City Engineer
Josh Landefeld, Parks & Recreation Manager
Brett Lenart, Planning Manager
Sue McCormick, Interim Public Services Area Administrator
Missy Stults, Sustainability & Innovations Director

SUBJECT: June 3, 2024 Council Agenda Response Memo

DATE: May 30, 2024

CA- 7 - Resolution to Order Election, Determine Ballot Question for Charter Amendment for Approval of the Park Maintenance and Capital Improvements Millage for 2025 through 2044, and Reaffirm the Park Maintenance and Capital Improvements Administrative Millage Policy

Question: What is the rationale for maintaining the current millage level when we know that it doesn't sufficiently fund all our parks maintenance needs? (Councilmember Akmon)

Response: In initial discussions regarding the Parks millage, Parks staff were informed that the City has a limit of 20 mills that it can levy and currently the City Charter authorizes 18.425 mills. Additionally, City staff and leadership were not interested in approaching our mill limit at this time. There is still a lot of data to be gathered from the ADA and Capital Assessment studies, however, staff are confident that even if we could use the remaining mills, that the City could levy, for parks capital improvements, would still fall short of our system's current and future needs. Once we have complete data from the aforementioned studies and if additional mills become available, staff would work with council and the community to consider additional funding options, such as a Capital specific millage.

There is not a single method to fund the park system's current and future needs. The millage covers roughly 40% of the parks budget and is imperative to our ability to carry out our park operations. Based on this, the rationale of maintaining the current amount allows Parks to have a known level of funding for the duration of the millage and would allow staff to focus attention on alternative funding sources to address our upcoming needs.

The original and continued intent of this millage is to ensure that Parks can address ongoing maintenance concerns of our parks, natural areas and facilities while also addressing annual capital improvements. With a parks system as vast as ours, there are significant needs in these areas. Staff regularly evaluate ongoing and upcoming needs, requests and potential wants. Unfortunately, due to aging infrastructure and required improvements, Parks focus our efforts and funding on maintaining the expected park experience for residents.

The Parks millage funds support two components of our parks system: park maintenance and capital improvements. The majority (roughly 70%) of the current millage funds support City park maintenance activities, such as forestry, natural area preservation, park operations, volunteer outreach, equipment and facility repairs. The remaining portion (roughly 30%) of the millage supports capital improvements in the parks system. This includes addressing planned capital improvements at facilities, parks and playgrounds such as pool mechanical systems, trail improvements, playground replacements and much more.

While park maintenance costs continue to increase annually, staff feel that the millage will continue to support the expected maintenance work. This belief is based on the increases of revenue seen over the over the last millage cycle, where millage revenue increased from \$6,042,300 in 2019 to an estimate revenue of \$8,519,150 in the first year of the new millage.

However, costs related to capital needs are expected to see a significant increase in the coming years. Currently, Parks staff are gathering data related to those needs through the recently adopted ADA study in addition to the forthcoming Capital Assessment study. The ADA study has identified \$19 million in improvements and the capital assessment study will likely identify a much greater funding need.

Knowing that the millage has never fully covered our maintenance and capital improvement needs, Parks staff have leveraged outside funding, such as grants, donations, and partnerships to do more with our millage dollars. Parks aims to continue and strengthen that leverage, especially with the priorities identified in the ADA and Capital Assessment studies. Additionally, by having a long-term millage, staff can further leverage the available funds through strategic and long-term opportunities. Also, by having a longer millage, we have the option to bond against the remaining capital portion of the millage to potentially address more or larger items in a shorter period of time. In addition to the potential to bond, Parks staff will evaluate other funding opportunities such

as a parks foundation, planned giving and other significant means to address the anticipated funding gap.

Question: Please compare the terms of this new 1.10 mil Parks millage to the previous one that was first passed in 2006 and renewed (for a six-year term) in 2018? Are there advantages to a twenty-year millage? If so, what are they? Given the needs of Ann Arbor's parks and community support for maintenance and provision of universal access, was an increase in the millage amount considered? What were the reasons for renewing at the same level? (Councilmember Disch)

Response: Staff considered several different scenarios regarding the Parks millage, including but not limited to an increase, 6-year renewal and the proposed 20-year renewal. There are several reasons why staff ended up recommending the 20-year renewal.

In initial discussions regarding the Parks millage, Parks staff were informed that the City has a limit of 20 mills that it can levy and currently the City Charter authorizes 18.425 mills. Additionally, City staff and leadership were not interested in approaching our mill limit at this time. There is still a lot of data to be gathered from the ADA and Capital Assessment studies, however, staff are confident that even if we could use the remaining mills, that the City could levy, for parks capital improvements, would still fall short of our system's current and future needs. Once we have complete data from the aforementioned studies and additional mills are available, staff would work with council and the community to consider additional funding options.

The City of Ann Arbor has had a Park maintenance millage since 1983 and the current millage since 2006. Over the last 18 years, the current millage primarily focused on park operation and on-going maintenance and has been widely supported as a way to address on-going maintenance, park operations and regular capital improvements. Each renewal cycle is unique and takes considerable staff time, resources and funding resources and time to effectively manage a millage campaign to ensure it is successful. Moving to a 20-year renewal would allow staff to use that time on identifying and securing alternative funding sources.

The larger portion (70%) of the millage covers much of the Parks maintenance expenses as well as our Natural Area Preservation and GIVE programs. The longer millage helps ensure that these critical day to day operations have a dedicated long term funding source to ensure that staff can strategically plan future operational decisions.

The smaller portion (30%) of the millage funds is dedicated to capital improvements. This includes addressing planned capital improvements at facilities, parks and playgrounds such as pool mechanical systems, trail improvements, playground replacements and much more.

Knowing that the millage has never fully covered our maintenance and capital improvement needs, Parks staff have leveraged outside funding, such as grants,

donations, and partnerships to do more with our millage dollars. Parks aims to continue and strengthen that leverage, especially with the priorities identified in the ADA and Capital Assessment studies. Additionally, by having a long-term millage, staff can further leverage the available funds through strategic and long-term opportunities. Also, by having a longer millage, we have the option to bond against the remaining capital portion of the millage to potentially address more or larger items in a shorter period of time. In addition to the potential to bond, Parks staff will evaluate other funding opportunities such as a parks foundation, planned giving and other significant means to address the anticipated funding gap.

While park maintenance costs continue to increase annually, staff feel that the millage will continue to support the expected maintenance work. This belief is based on the increases of revenue seen over the over the last millage cycle, where millage revenue increased from \$6,042,300 in 2019 to an estimate revenue of \$8,519,150 in the first year of the new millage.

The administrative millage policy tied to the ballot language has been in place since 2011. The majority of the policy is to ensure that Parks budgets including Natural Area Preservation, are protected during the entirety of the millage. This includes preventing significant decreases to Parks if budget cuts are necessary as well as the Parks Fairness resolution if the overall City budget increases at a percentage higher than Parks planned. Additionally, the funding split between maintenance and capital improvements provides the necessary funds to maintain the parks while giving flexibility each year if certain projects require more capital funding. Finally, the breakdown of millage appropriate activities helps staff utilize millage funding in a consistent manner. Parks staff believe that these policy items remain valuable for the duration of the millage renewal.

CA-8 - Resolution to Approve 416 Long Shore Drive Development Agreement (CPC Recommendation: Approval - 7 Yes, 0 No)

Question: According to the staff report, this project includes desirable Sustainability and Universal Design features. Why are these features not included in the Development Agreement? (Councilmember Disch)

Response: The sustainability and design features that the petitioner has agreed to are included on the approved site plan for the project, which will require completion unless an amendment is sought. This project includes the following elements:

- The new building will have 7,500 SF area of bio-solar roof (green roof + solar panels).
- Exceeds EV parking requirements.
- Residents will have choice to select all electric or gas appliances.
- High-efficiency appliances and interior lighting, and LED public/exterior lighting.

While some universal design features are currently being considered in the plans (e.g. elevators), the petitioner is not able to commit to them currently.

CA-9 - Resolution to Approve Entering into a Six-Month Negotiating Period for the Possible Sale of the 415 W. Washington Site

Question: The resolution references an attached letter from the development team, but I don't see it on Legistar. Can you please provide/attach it? (Councilmember Akmon)

Response: The letter has been attached to this [agenda item](#) in Legistar.

Question: Please briefly review the advantages of pursuing a sale of this property by means of the proposed six-month negotiating period rather than by issuing an RFP. (Councilmember Disch)

Response: Several factors impacted staff's recommendation. The first and most important is the developer pursuing a unique design for the provision of power. The carbon neutral building and micro-grid are unique, the design and process has been vetted by OSI and the criteria to be carbon neutral has been established through review on another city project. The developer is local, one of the preferences of the community strongly expressed through the community engagement process leading to the Planned Unit Development, (PUD), approval. The development team is offering to develop the project with 15% of the units as 60% AMI units, not utilizing the payment in lieu, and the balance as 80%-90% AMI units, making the entire project below market rate. All of this creates a project meeting or exceeding the minimal requirements of the approved PUD and the stated desires of the community, Planning Commission and City Council throughout the process. It is staff's recommendation that there are enough unique and compelling possibilities with this offer to pursue a purchase agreement prior to releasing an RFP.

CA-13 - Resolution to Approve a Right-of-Way License Agreement with Pheenix USH LLC for the Operation of Dockless Electric Micromobility Devices in the City of Ann Arbor

Question: Regarding the renewal of the agreement with Spin, my understanding is that Spin was to provide data back to the City. Can you provide information on ROW complaints and resolution for the period of the last agreement; the level of usage; and the number of crashes involving the scooters along with their level of severity? (Councilmember Akmon)

Response: Please see the attached document.

CA-31 - Resolution to Approve Amendment 1 to the Professional Services Agreement with Elevate Energy for Administration of the Residential Rebate Program and to Authorize the Disbursement of Funds (\$4,250,000.00 in FY24-26)

Question: Is there a plan in place to enhance this City-sponsored rebate program by coordinating it with Federal government energy efficiency rebates? (Councilmember Disch)

Response: Yes. The Office of Sustainability and Innovations has been working with liaisons from the State of Michigan to help gather input into the design of federal rebates (which will flow through the States). In February we co-hosted a workshop with the state to gather feedback from contractors, energy experts, and community groups into the design and amounts of these rebates. However, the state's program is not likely to be unveiled until 2025 and will almost certainly offer the majority of available resources to income qualified households. As such, we made the decision to launch our local rebate program first so as to not delay these resources getting into the community. We are sharing our design and all lessons learned with the State to help inform their program and are prepared to make revisions, as needed, to our local program once we know what the final design of the state/federal rebates will be.

CA-13 Attachment

ROW Complaints:

City staff queried A2FixIt for tickets entered under the “abandoned scooter” and “abandoned bicycle” categories since July 1, 2021. As best as we are able to surmise, the following tickets under these categories relate to Spin e-scooters and e-bikes over the past three years:

A2FixIt Tickets for Spin e-scooters and e-bikes (7/1/21-5/28/24)		
Action Taken	#	%
No Corrective Action Required	49	39.5%
Corrective Action Required	22	17.7%
Referred to Spin to Investigate	53	42.7%
Total	124	

Additionally, Spin staff queried their customer service database and fielded 47 relocation requests in 2023 and 2024 (some of which may be duplicates of the “Referred to Spin” in the table above)

Usage Date

Spin staff queried their systems and provided the following usage data for their devices as total number of trips taken.

Trips Taken on Spin Devices (1/1/21-5/28/24)	
Year	Trips
2021	378,449
2022	184,457
2023	288,773
2024	40,102
Total	891,781

Crash Data

City staff queried crash reports generated by the Ann Arbor Police Department by the keyword "scooter" and shares the results below:

Crashes reported by AAPD (7/1/21-5/28/24)		
Date	NARRATIVE	Injury Severity
10/15/2021 9:52:00 AM	<p>UNIT #1 WAS STOPPED AT STOP SIGN AND BEGAN TO MAKE A RIGHT TURN ONTO HILL ST FROM S. 5TH AVE.</p> <p>UNIT #2 WAS RIDING A ELECTRIC SCOOTER IN THE BIKE LANE TRAVELING EAST BOUND ON THE WRONG SIDE OF THE ROAD.</p> <p>AS UNIT #1 PULLED OUT, UNIT #2 STRUCK THE FRONT PART OF UNIT #1 AND FELL TO THE GROUND INJURING HER LEFT LEFT/SIDE AREA AND HEAD.</p> <p>PEDESTRIAN WAS EVALUATED BY HVA AND REFUSED FURTHER MEDICAL ASSISTANCE ON SCENE.</p> <p>NO DAMAGE TO UNIT #2.</p> <p>NO FURTHER ACTION TAKEN.</p>	C
2/10/2022 3:14:00 PM	<p>Josiah came to the Ann Arbor Police Department to report this crash.</p> <p>He stated that he was traveling in the bicycle lane on his motorized scooter on Hill St. He stated that V1 went past him and began turning right into a parking lot. Josiah was unable to stop and collided with the front right of the vehicle. He stated the driver got out and gave Josiah his name and number. He then asked if Josiah was okay and if he could leave, and Josiah stated he was okay with that.</p> <p>The name and number provided is for "Fidel" 734 961 2585. I attempted to contact him and left a message for him to call me back.</p> <p>Josiah was unable to provide a vehicle description, other than a black SUV.</p>	O

<p>3/19/2022 2:45:00 PM</p>	<p>Unit #1 was eastbound through the parking lot at 726 Packard preparing to enter Packard St. Unit #1 stated that as she was exiting the lot she did not see unit #2 riding his scooter southbound on the sidewalk and struck unit #2 knocking him of his electric scooter. No injuries reported. Report was filed later on at the police station.</p>	<p>O</p>
<p>3/24/2022 7:48:00 AM</p>	<p>Vehicle 1 was leaving the Pioneer High School Parking lot preparing to make a right turn onto S/B Main St. A pedestrian on a scooter was traveling on the sidewalk, N/B approaching the private drive where vehicle 1 was preparing to exit. The pedestrian on the scooter was unable to stop in time, while vehicle 1 had pulled forward and was now blocking the sidewalk. The pedestrian crashed into the front right side of vehicle 1. The pedestrian complained of foot pain and was transported to the hospital for treatment.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>4/23/2022</p>	<p>MEADS STATED THAT HE WAS RIDING A SPIN SCOOTER SB DOWN THE SIDEWALK ON THE EAST SIDE OF W. STADIUM BLVD. AS HE WAS RIDING PAST PLANET FITNESS, A WHITE F-SERIES PICKUP TRUCK PULLED OUT OF THE PARKING LOT AND HIT HIM ON HIS LEFT SIDE. MEADS FELL TO THE GROUND AND THEN GOT UP. THE DRIVER OF THE TRUCK ASKED MEADS IF HE WAS OK AND ASKED HIM IF HE WANTED TO GET INTO HIS TRUCK TO GET OUT OF THE RAIN. MEADS SAID NO AND INSTEAD GOT INTO A DIFFERENT WITNESS' VEHICLE. MEADS DECIDED NOT TO CONTACT THE POLICE BECAUSE HE WAS TIRED AND WANTED TO GO HOME. BOTH PARTIES LEFT THE SCENE. MEADS LATER DECIDED HE WANTED TO REPORT THE INCIDENT BECAUSE HE SUFFERED FROM PAIN IN HIS RIGHT ELBOW, LEFT INDEX FINGER, AND BACK. MEADS DOES NOT HAVE ANY OF UNIT 1'S INFO EXCEPT FOR IT BEING A WHITE F-SERIES TRUCK THAT BELONGED TO AN UNKNOWN BUSINESS. MEADS COULD ONLY IDENTIFY THE OTHER WITNESS AS "COLLEEN".</p>	<p>B</p>
<p>7/8/2022 4:18:00 PM</p>	<p>Unit 1 was heading north on Hill St and came to a rolling stop at the intersection of Hill St and S Division St. Unit 2 at the same time is crossing the crosswalk heading east on S Division and gets struck the Unit 1. There were no injuries. Unit 1 did exchange information with Unit 2. This happened at 0900 hours on 07/07/2022. It was reported 07/07/2022 at 1600 hours.</p> <p>Unit 2 is a pedestrian on a scooter.</p>	<p>O</p>

<p>9/8/2022 8:00:00 AM</p>	<p>UNIT 1 was eastbound Plymouth Rd. Unit 2 was a pedestrian on an electronic scooter, eastbound Plymouth Rd in the bicycle lane. Unit 1 turned right onto Beal Ave, failed to yield to Unit 2 and caused a crash.</p> <p>Unit 2 scooter pedestrian had a scraped knee, medical refused.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>8/18/2022 4:48:00 PM</p>	<p>UNIT 1 TRAVELING WB ON HILL ST FAILED TO NEGOTIATE THE CURVE AT CAMBRIDGE RD. UNIT 1 STRUCK THE CURB LEFT THE ROADWAY AND STRUCK A TRAFFIC SIGN AND ELECTRICAL POLE.</p> <p>DRIVER STATED SHE WAS DISTRACTED BY A PERSON RIDING A SCOOTER AND LOOKING OUT THE PASSENGER WINDOW.</p> <p>FRONT AIRBAGS DEPLOYED NO INJURIES.</p>	<p>O</p>
<p>11/16/2022 7:17:00 PM</p>	<p>UNIT 1 DRIVER STATED SHE WAS DRIVING SOUTH AND TURNING EAST ON PAULINE. UNIT 1 STATED SHE NEVER SAW UNIT 2 WHEN THEY COLLIDED.</p> <p>-</p> <p>UNIT 1 PASSENGER STATED HE SAW UNIT 2 AS THEY WERE TURNING AND UNIT 2 WAS DRIVING FAST WITH NO LIGHTS ON THE SCOOTER.</p> <p>-</p> <p>UNIT 2 OPERATOR STATED HE WAS HEADING NORTH AND BELIEVED HE HAD HIS SCOOTER LIGHT ON. UNIT 2 STATED HE WENT TO TRY AND MAKE IT NORTH THROUGH THE YELLOW LIGHT WHEN UNIT 1 TURNED IN FRONT OF HIM CAUSING THE COLLISION.</p> <p>-</p> <p>UNIT 2 OPERATOR WAS TRANSPORTED TO U OF M BY HVA 81-24 ON COMPLAINT OF RIGHT LEG PAIN. UNIT 2 ALSO HAD A BLOODY NOSE.</p> <p>-</p> <p>WITNESS ADVISED SGT PETERLE THAT SCOOTER WAS IN LANE OF TRAVEL N/B. WITNESS DID NOT SEE LIGHT ON SCOOTER. SCOOTER HIT FRONT RIGHT OF CAR TURNING. SCOOTER FLEW BACKWARD AND DRIVER WENT FORWARD.</p>	<p>B</p>

<p>10/29/2022 1:25:00 PM</p>	<p>Unit 1 and 2 were traveling S/B on Observatory St approaching Washington Hts. Unit 1 was in a vehicle and behind unit 2 who was a pedestrian on a scooter. Unit 2 stopped in the intersection of Washington Hts to turn left and unit 1 struck unit 2.</p> <p>Functional damage to unit 1, no injuries. Unit 2 complained of slight hip pain and was evaluated by HVA but declined transport to hospital.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>5/8/2023 3:38:00 PM</p>	<p>A 4-YEAR-OLD PEDESTRIAN WAS RIDING A SCOOTER NEAR THE CROSSWALK AT THE STOP SIGN AND WAS STRUCK BY UNIT 1. THE CHILD SUSTAINED SUSPECTED MINOR INJURIES BUT FAMILY REFUSED MEDICAL.</p> <p>UNIT 1 HAD JUST BACKED OUT OF HIS PARKING SPACE AT 2615 BRAEBURN CIRCLE AND WAS APPROACHING THE STOP SIGN NEAR THE MANAGEMENT OFFICE. HE STATED THAT HE WAS TRAVELING ABOUT 5 MPH WHEN HE HEARD SOMETHING HIT THE FRONT RIGHT SIDE OF HIS VEHICLE. UNIT 1 STATED THAT THE CHILD WAS SO SMALL THAT HE WAS UNABLE TO SEE HIM NEARING THE STOP SIGN.</p>	<p>B</p>
<p>6/2/2023 8:38:00 PM</p>	<p>UNIT 1 WAS TRAVELING ON AN ELECTRIC SCOOTER HEADING WB ON S UNIVERSITY AVE, JUST WEST OF E UNIVERSITY AVE.</p> <p>UNIT 2 WAS TRAVELING EB ON S UNIVERSITY AVE APPROACHING E UNIVERISTY AVE.</p> <p>UNIT 1 LOST CONTROL OF THE SCOOTER DUE TO HIS IMPAIRMENT FROM ALCOHOL AND COLLIDED WITH UNIT 2.</p> <p>UNIT 1 WAS TAKEN TO THE UOFM HOSPITAL BY HVA FOR OBSERVED/APPARANT HEAD TRAUMA. UNIT 2 REFUSED MEDICAL TREATMENT.</p> <p>UNIT 2 SUSTAINED HEAVY DAMAGE TO FRONT FENDER AND WINDSHIELD DAMAGE AFTER THE DRIVER OF UNIT 1 WAS THROWN ONTO THE VEHICLE AFTER THE INITAL VEHICLE CONTACT. UNIT 2 WAS TOWED TO BREWERS TOWING.</p>	<p>A</p>

<p>7/1/2023 7:10:00 PM</p>	<p>UNIT 1 WAS ON A SPIN SCOOTER TO CROSS FROM THE NORTHSIDE OF THE CROSSWALK ON S. DIVISION ST. TO THE SOUTHSIDE.</p> <p>UNIT 2 WAS TRAVELING WESTBOUND ON PACKARD RD. AND HAD A GREEN LIGHT. UNIT 1 DISREGARDED THE CROSSWALK TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE AND CROSSED IN FRONT OF TRAFFIC. UNIT 2 WAS UNABLE TO STOP QUICK ENOUGH, CAUSING COLLISION.</p> <p>UNIT 1 HAD MINOR INJURIES AND WAS TRANSPORTED TO UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN FOR FURTHER TREATMENT. UNIT 2 HAD NO INJURIES AND FUNCTIONAL DAMAGES. UNIT 1 LISTED AS MOTOR VEHICLE AS SPIN SCOOTERS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDED.</p>	<p>B</p>
<p>6/27/2023 11:40:00 AM</p>	<p>Unit 1 was stopped at the intersection of N First St and E Ann (traveling n/b). Unit 2 was crossing in the crosswalk on a SPIN scooter. Unit 2 had crossed in front of Unit 1 and Unit 1 began to move forward. Unit 1 failed to observe that Unit 2 had not cleared the crosswalk and Unit 1 struck the back tire of Unit 2. When Unit 1 collided with Unit 2's tire, the passenger on Unit 2 fell off.</p> <p>*Diagram: the diagram did not have a scooter option under vehicle, the person figure has been placed in the area that the scooter was.</p>	<p>B</p>
<p>07/08/2023 11:38:00 PM</p>	<p>Unit #2 was going west on Hill when the rider of a Bird scooter (#6GC1321C9F3309) Seth Sugar came into unit #2 lane of travel, causing a crash. The Sugar was ejected onto the windshield of unit #2 and thrown onto the pavement. Sugar was transported to UofM ER with life-threatening injuries that later became fatal.</p>	<p>K</p>
<p>7/15/2023 1:54:00 AM</p>	<p>UNIT ONE: Fled the scene prior to AAPD arrival.</p> <p>UNIT TWO: UNIT TWO stated he was on his bicycle heading eastbound on Liberty within the closed pedestrian / construction area. UNIT TWO stated he was attempting to maneuver around two barricades as UNIT ONE approached heading westbound. UNIT TWO advised that as he attempted to avoid the barricades UNIT ONE did the same and they struck head on. UNIT TWO advised that UNIT ONE then fled the area.</p> <p>Per UNIT TWO the other individual was an unknown B/M on a spin scooter.</p>	<p>B</p>

8/14/2023 2:41:00 PM	UNIT 2 (ELECTRIC SCOOTER) WAS WB ON THE SIDEWALK OF WASHTENAW AVE, CROSSING PLATT RD, WHEN UNIT 1 STRUCK UNIT 2. UNIT 1 WAS NB ON PLATT RD, TURNING ONTO EB WASHTENAW AVE.	B
9/30/2023 8:39:00 PM	<p>REPORT: UNIT 2 WAS TRAVELING SOUTH ON S STATE ST COMING UP TO THE INTERSECTION OF S STATE ST AND E HOOVER AVE. UNIT 2 WAS CROSSING THE ROAD ON A MOTORIZED SCOOTER. UNIT 2 WAS IN THE BIKE LANE AT THE TIME. UNIT 2 WAS STRUCK BY UNIT 1.</p> <p>UNIT 1 WAS TRAVELING NORTH ON S STATE ST COMING UP TO THE INTERSECTION OF S STATE ST AND E HOOVER AVE. UNIT 1 ATTEMPTED TO MAKE LEFT TURN ONTO E HOOVER AVE. UNIT 1 STRUCK UNIT 2.</p>	O
9/15/2023 3:35:00 PM	<p>Unit 1 and 2 were traveling S/B on Packard St (unit 2 was a motorized scooter in the bike lane). Unit 1 began turning right (W/B) onto Granger Ave and struck unit 2 who was going straight.</p> <p>Minor injuries to unit 2, no injuries to unit 1. Minor damage to both vehicles.</p> <p>Unit 2 hit their head and had shoulder/side pain. Evaluated on scene by HVA but declined transport (wife arrived on scene shortly after and transported to UM ER).</p> <p>Witness stated unit 1 was turning and hit the scooter who was going straight. The crash sent unit 2 up onto the hood of unit 1.</p> <p>Unit 1 stated she did not see unit 2 and might have been in her "blind spot". Unit 1 also could not recall what color the light was (unit 2 said it was green).</p>	C
9/14/2023 10:26:00 PM	<p>UNIT 1 WAS AN ELECTRIC SCOOTER THAT WAS S/B ON GRANGER IN THE BIKE LANE WHEN IT STRUCK THE CURB. DRIVER 1 SUFFERED A HEAD INURY AND WAS TRANSPORTED TO U OF M HOSPITAL FOR FURTHER TREATMENT.</p> <p>THE SCOOTER WAS TAKE BY DRIVER ONE'S FRIEND, RYAN COMRIE.</p> <p>CRASH SLIP ISSUED.</p>	B

<p>8/30/2023 1:32:00 PM</p>	<p>UNIT ONE (ELECTRIC SCOOTER) WAS ON THE EAST SIDE OF PONTIAC TRAIL, SOUTH OF BURTON DR, STOPPED AT A RED TRAFFIC LIGHT. WHEN THE LIGHT TURNED GREEN, UNIT ONE ATTEMPTED TO CROSS BARTON DR ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF PONTIAC TRAIL. UNIT ONE STATED THE WITNESS ATTEMPTED TO TURN LEFT FROM PONTIAC TRAIL TO EAST BOUND BARTON. UNIT ONE SAID THE WITNESS FAILED TO YIELD, CAUSING HIM TO BE STRUCK. UNIT ONE STATED THE WITNESSES VEHICLE HIT THE SCOOTER AND DID NOT HIT HIS BODY AT ANY POINT.</p> <p>WITNESS STATED SHE TURNED LEFT FROM PONTIAC TRAIL TO EAST BOUND BARTON DR. THE WITNESS SAID SHE DID FAIL TO YIELD UNIT ONE, BUT DID NOT MAKE CONTACT WITH HIM OR THE SCOOTER. THE WITNESS STATED SHE OBSERVED UNIT ONE DIVE OUT OF THE WAY OF HER VEHICLE AND NEVER HEARD OR FELT THAT ANY CONTACT WAS MADE.</p> <p>THERE WAS NO EVIDENCE OBSERVED THAT ANY CONTACT WAS MADE BY THE WITNESSES VEHICLE WITH UNIT ONE OR HIS SCOOTER, AFTER CLOSELY EXAMINING AND COMPARING UNIT ONE'S ELECTRIC SCOOTER, WITNESSES VEHICLE, AND UNIT ONE'S SUSTAINED VISIBLE INJURY.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>10/4/2023 10:15:00 AM</p>	<p>THIS CRASH WAS INVESTIGATED AT THE SCENE.</p> <p>UNIT #2 WAS CROSSING E. STADIUM N/B ON A SPIN SCOOTER. UNIT #1 WAS W/B ON E STADIUM IN THE NUMBER 2 LANE. UNIT #1 FAILED TO YIELD FOR THE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING LIGHTS AND STRUCK UNIT #2.</p> <p>UNIT #2 SUFFERED MINOR INJURIES AND WAS SEEN BY HVA. HE WAS A JUVENILE SO HIS MOTHER, KENDYL FRITTS, RESPONDED TO THE LOCATION AND TOOK HIM TO ST. JOES.</p> <p>UNIT #1 WAS ISSUED ULC#23AA01724 FOR FAILURE TO YIELD.</p>	<p>B</p>

<p>10/18/2023 4:17:00 PM</p>	<p>Unit 2 was traveling E/B on W Liberty St and was turning Right into the driveway of 1035 W Liberty when Unit 1 struck the Right-side front passenger door of their vehicle.</p> <p>Unit 1 was traveling on a motorized scooter E/B on W Liberty St in the bike lane. Unit 2 had already established the turn into the driveway when Unit 1 struck their vehicle.</p> <p>Unit 1 was thrown from the moped and had a possible serious injury. Unit 1 was transported by HVA to U of M ER for further evaluation. Unit 2 was not injured.</p>	<p>A</p>
<p>9/24/2023 11:38:00 AM</p>	<p>Unit 1 was traveling southbound on Fernwood Ave. Unit 2 (electric scooter) was traveling Westbound on Norwood St.</p> <p>As unit 1 came up to the stop sign at the intersection of Fernwood Ave and Norwood St, Unit 1 failed to stop (rolling stop) and struck Unit 2.</p> <p>The driver of Unit 2 was complaining about rib pain. The driver was evaluated on the scene by HVA, and transported to</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>10/27/2023 11:59:00 AM</p>	<p>Unit 2 was traveling S/B on S Fourth Ave through the intersection of E William St with a green light.</p> <p>Unit 1 was traveling W/B on E William St through the intersection of S Fourth Ave on a SPIN scooter.</p> <p>Unit 2 struck Unit 1 as they tried to cross the street on a red light causing an angel crash. Unit 2 had no injuries and functional vehicle damage. Unit 1 has suspected minor injuries and was transported to UofM ER for further evaluation.</p> <p>An independent witness stated that they were standing on the sidewalk waiting to cross in the same direction as Unit 1. The witness stated that the light was green for N/B and S/B traffic and that East to West traffic had a red light and a no crossing sign when Unit 1 entered the roadway.</p>	<p>C</p>

12/27/2023 2:45:00 PM	On 12/27/2023 at 2:45 pm, Unit 1 was at the intersection of Burton Rd and Packard St. Unit 1 was on Burton Rd facing S/B making a right turn to head W/B on Packard St. Unit 2 was a motorized scooter that was approaching Burton, heading W/B. As Unit 1 was turning right onto Packard St, Unit 2 entered the intersection on Burton and struck Unit 1 on the driver side fender. Unit 1 did not sustain any damages. Unit 2 did not sustain injuries from the contact. Unit 1 fled the scene 30 seconds after the initial incident.	O
3/4/2024 8:39:00 AM	<p>UNIT 1 was riding a motorized scooter in the bike lane, NB on Packard St. UNIT 2 was NB on Packard St. turning right onto Independence Blvd.</p> <p>Both witnesses on scene advised they were traveling at 30 MPH behind UNIT 2. Both witnesses stated UNIT 1 passed them in the bike lane and they saw UNIT 2 slowing down with the blinker on, making a right turn onto Independence Blvd.</p> <p>The driver of UNIT 1 failed to yield and collided with the side of UNIT 2 as it was turning. The driver of UNIT 1 had suspected minor injuries and was transported to UofM hospital per HVA.</p> <p>No injuries were reported from UNIT 2.</p>	B
5/14/2024 5:34:00 PM	<p>Both Units one and two were in the turn S/B onto Packard St from E. Stadium Blvd. As unit two approached the E/W crosswalk, two children on electric scooters quickly entered the crosswalk and crossed the street. Unit two braked, yielding to the pedestrians. Unit one was unable to stop in an assured clear distance, rear ending unit one.</p> <p>No injuries were reported on scene.</p>	O
5/15/2024 9:01:00 PM	<p>UNIT 2 STATED SHE WAS LEAVING 2401 PLYMOUTH RD AND AS SHE WAS SLOWING DOWN TO STOP UNIT 1 STRUCK THE RIGHT SIDE OF HER VEHICLE. UNIT 1 WAS ON AN ELECTRIC SCOOTER AND UNIT 2 STATED WAS ALSO ON HER PHONE. UNIT 2 STATED SHE SAW UNIT 1 JUST BEFORE SHE STRUCK HER AN WAS UNABLE TO STOP IN TIME.</p> <p>MCL 257.660 USE OF ELECTRIC SCOOTERS IS PROHIBITED ON SIDEWALKS.</p> <p>UNIT 1 COMPLAINED OF LEG PAIN AND WAS TRANSPORTED BY HVA TO U OF M MOTT.</p>	O

BOTH PARTIES WERE PROVIDED AN AAPD CFS.

Additionally, Spin staff queried their customer support team and provides the three crash events reported to them by their users:

Crashes reported by Spin (7/1/21 – 5/28/24)		
Date	Injury Severity*	Location
8/6/21	O	Plymouth Rd
10/7/21	O	1140 South University
11/22/22	B	Fletcher by Diag

*K= Fatal injury; A=Suspected Serious Injury; B=Suspected Minor Injury; C=Possible Injury; O=No Injury