

**From:** J. Letaw <[germanyjess@gmail.com](mailto:germanyjess@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 01, 2018 6:42 PM  
**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>  
**Subject:** Ward 5 resident in favor of Lockwood PUD rezoning

Hello,

I can't be at the meeting this evening, but I wanted to write in to express my strongest support for the PUD rezoning application by Lockwood. Their plans for a senior housing community on Jackson is both appropriate and timely, given that southeast Michigan's retiree population is predicted to be the fastest-growing sector over the next few decades, and Ann Arbor in particular is seeing alumni and grandparents settle in the area at increasing rates. Converting this parcel from single-family to PUD for this project is a good use of the land, and a very good location.

I am aware that some of the immediate neighbors have some concerns about the development, and as ground zero for the Gellman plume, feel especially besieged. I believe that their fears about water and traffic overflows are not borne out by the data; and their concerns about dumpster and loading/delivery locations can still be worked out with the developer.

I attended a neighborhood meeting about this development a few weeks ago, and one of the adjacent property owners noted that she was able to buy into the neighborhood only through the Habitat for Humanity program; she was grateful for a safe and pleasant place to raise her family, but noted that neighbors at that time were hostile to the 27 new Habitat homeowners, going so far as to graffiti their homebuilding materials. This homeowner said, I can't imagine denying anyone the opportunity that I've had to live here like they tried to deny me.

To me, this feels like there are always reasons to say no to new developments, but in this particular case, there are many compelling reasons to say yes, and that many of the neighbors are actually enthusiastic about having these new neighbors in their community.

I hope you will vote to allow Lockwood to rezone to PUD.

Thank you,

Jessica Letaw

**From:** Lawrence Dolph <[ldolph@rfdinsight.com](mailto:ldolph@rfdinsight.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 01, 2018 5:30 PM

**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>

**Subject:** Opposed to Lockwood development adjacent to Dolph Park

I am opposed to the Lockwood development at the northwest corner of Dolph Park. The toxic runoff from rain and snow from the roofs and drives will undo the financial investment and effort the City of Ann Arbor is making to save First Sister Lake, which is immediately adjacent to the proposed development. The proposed development contains too much building on too little land, crowds existing residential housing uncomfortably, and exposes north-facing units to the full light pollution of Varsity Ford, which will reduce the quality of life for those occupants.

Furthermore, the process of seeking approval has not met the standards of the City of Ann Arbor for such a development. Neighbors were not consulted early, as required, and then agents of Lockwood went door-to-door with threats of what will happen to the parcel if their development is not approved that have no foundation in fact.

I have a special interest here as the land for Dolph Park was a gift from my family to provide a rich natural area for the residents of the City of Ann Arbor to enjoy. The proposed Lockwood development threatens the quality of this natural area and the lives of those who would be forced to live around it.

Thank you for your attention.

Lawrence

---

Lawrence R. Dolph  
3110 Lakewood Drive  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103  
Cell: (734) 516-5841  
[ldolph@RFDInsight.com](mailto:ldolph@RFDInsight.com)  
[www.RFDInsight.com](http://www.RFDInsight.com)  
LinkedIn: Lawrence Dolph

**Lenart, Brett**

---

**From:** beth collins <rdhbeth@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 05, 2018 7:07 AM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** May 16th meeting about Master Plan

5-5-2018

To the Planning Commission,

When reviewing the City of Ann Arbor Land Use Plan on the Master Plan, I ask you to please leave my neighborhood the way it is stated now, that single family residential is the preferred use.

My name is Elizabeth Collins, and I live at 3404 Porter Rd  
WEST AREA FUTURE LAND USE  
pg 113 WEST AREA site 7

The quadrant of the SE Wagner and Jackson Rd.

We are having a problem right now with a developer, and planning staff trying to approve a rezone of a 3.5 acre parcel of single family home land, in the middle of our viable neighborhood.

I ask you, as do all of the residents who live in the Sister Lakes, to please not change the Master Plan for this area.

Thank you for you time and what you do for our city,

Sincerely,  
Beth Collins

**Lenart, Brett**

---

**From:** beth collins <rdhbeth@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 07, 2018 6:27 AM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Master Plan review May18th

Hello Planning Commission,

I already wrote about keeping our Wagner & Jackson SE quadrant single family residential, however I think while we update the words and scope of this area it is important to update this Jackson Rd Corridor. They say that it is all car dealerships and commercial to the west, but now we have many restaurants (the Carlisle ), movies, brewery (the Session Room) and shopping, (Miejer and Lowes, etc). To the east is not only a gas station, that is now The Songbird Cafe, and we have Zingermans Roadhouse and lovely Westgate shopping with now Maple Village shopping (Home Goods, Sierra Trading ), gourmet groceries (Plum Mkt), etc. We have yoga studios, gyms and now there is the new 2/42 Church and community center, where Industrial used to be when Gelman was there.

This area is very desirable to live, while still being in Ann Arbor, there is a feel of the outskirts, with the Dolph Nature Area and Sister Lakes. Then we have U of M Saginaw Forrest adjacent to 2/42 Church, which is another natural beauty.

Please correct the scope of this area. Yes, Jackson is a busy road, just like 4 lane Washtenaw is, and there are many viable single family neighborhoods along Washtenaw and Stadium corridors.

Thank you for your time and the work you do for our city,  
Sincerely,  
Elizabeth Collins

**Lenart, Brett**

---

**From:** Michelle Yurcak <myurcak@pesdmc.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 07, 2018 12:49 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** 3820 Varsity Drive - Marijuana dispensary

We have received the notice for the public hearing scheduled for May 16 regarding the Marijuana dispensary at 3820 Varsity Dr.

We are the tenants directly next to the Cannosair Collective and we had no problem moving in knowing that they were a growing facility.

However, since they have begun dispensing we have had a tremendous amount of traffic in our lot, garbage littered in our communal parking lot and grounds, their clientele coming into our offices looking for public restrooms and not sure where they are going. We are very uncomfortable with this and not in support of the facility dispensing their product for the length of hours that they do and not cleaning up after their clientele. We have suggested that they dispense from the building in front of us because it is a stand alone building and one of their operations. A few weeks back there was an incident of a disgruntled client of theirs who chose to pull his car right up to the front door effectively closing them down until the police arrived. This is not the type of activity I want my corporate clientele to see when they come to my establishment.

I hope my comments will be taken into consideration.

Sincerely,

Michelle Yurcak

**Premium Event Services**

734-369-6720 - Detroit/Ann Arbor Office

734-717-3551 - Mobile

[www.pesdmc.com](http://www.pesdmc.com)

**\*\*We have moved!** Our new address is 3840 Varsity Dr. Ann Arbor, MI 48108

**Lenart, Brett**

---

**From:** Laura Strowe <leksarts@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 06, 2018 10:10 AM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** 1140 Broadway

To the Planning Commission of the City of Ann Arbor:

Morningside Development is proposing to amend the conditional zoning for 1140 Broadway. Unfortunately, I cannot attend the May 16th Public Hearing on this matter, so I am writing to you with my concerns.

Back on August 1st you approved the developer's application for a change of zoning to C1A/R and accepted the developer's false claim that PUDs were cumbersome and not viable. Yet since then, at least 2 proposals have come before you for PUDs, showing that they are, in fact, viable.

The irony is that Morningside Development has ended up with essentially a PUD-lite with their C1A/R. As it has evolved, they have all the advantages of a PUD (the out-of-the-box planning, being able to build as tall, as massive, as densely packed as they want) but the public has none of the benefits that a PUD would have provided. We have almost no commercial, just a trickle of affordable housing, and little site protection. By throwing in a tiny piece of "commercial," the developer was able to justify the C1A/R zoning and evade the restrictions that residential zoning would have imposed on him, restrictions that apply to all the neighboring residential plots.

To add insult to zoning injury, the developer is planning to split off the section of this development on which the condominium building will sit. Because the zoning change to C1A/R has already been approved, this entirely residential "child parcel" as such a split-off piece is called, will be zoned "Campus Residential and Commercial" without being campus, and having absolutely no commercial component. This is an outrageous evasion of residential zoning rules!!

With this proposal that will come before you on May 16, the developer says he is merely tying the site plan to the zoning, just like PUDs do. But wait: he is not doing even that. The new conditions only tie the heights in the site plan to the zoning. Although we welcome this small concession, his claim that he is doing this because "it is the right thing to do" is disingenuous to say the least. He can still change a lot of the other details of the site plan and still be in conformity with the new zoning: for example,

the interior plans, the building materials, the amount of commercial, and worrisome of all, the distance from the creek.

The proposed development, even with this new appeasement, and the small concessions the developer has made after previous hearings, is still gargantuan, putting over 1,000 new residents on a 6.4 acre lot, a density unprecedented outside of downtown. It will forever destroy a neighborhood, change the face of the city and burden the already difficult traffic around Lowertown.

As you know, the site plan and the zoning change has already been approved by City Council, so we in the neighborhood must come to terms with a future that includes this development. What I am asking now of you, on behalf of the neighborhood, is to help guarantee that the development is not changed for the worse.

I beseech you to urge more of Morningside Development in the form of additional conditions. This offer to tie just the heights of the site plan to the zoning is like putting lipstick on a pig.

Thank you.

Laura Strowe  
1327 Broadway

## Lenart, Brett

---

**From:** Lawrence Dolph <ldolph@rfdinsight.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 04, 2018 12:10 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Preserve migratory birds and prevent acceleration of the dioxin plume; advocacy by the Ghost of Ray Dolph

Honorable Planning Commissioners:

I am writing on behalf of the Ghost of Ray Dolph, which is concerned about the hidden but socially enormous costs of the proposed Lockwood Senior Housing development being considered for a 3.5-acre parcel at the Park's northwest corner.

Ray Dolph knows a thing or two about this. The living Ray was the developer of Lakewood Subdivision after purchasing the Allmendinger Farm. As such, he embraced and protected First Sister Lake and the wetlands around it, installing a windmill to pump oxygen into the lake and then boosting its ecosystem with 10,000 fish, providing abundant sustenance for fish-eating and vegetation-eating species and controlling the insect population with natural processes. To preserve habitat for migrating and resident species, Ray installed a simple but ingenious flood control system to sustain lake levels, with a rapid emergency response should torrential rains or thaw require increasing the outflow along the natural drainage. All of this in 1928. To further protect the ecosystem, upon annexation Ray negotiated with the City of Ann Arbor to dig retention basins for the sediment of storm drains to settle before water flowed into the Lake. These proved inadequate to the explosion of development that occurred in the following six decades, but they were state of the art in 1955.

Lockwood is doing none of this. Instead, the company has invested its site plan with a retention basin to pull toxic storm water away from the Park's wetlands and Lake, but none of these engineering features, as clever as they may be, protect the Park and Lake during construction, after which it may be too late to save it. Lockwood will have made this token capital investment for nothing.

The current path of the Park and Lake is rapid eutrophication, which will be accelerated by the Lockwood construction and the natural environment poisoned by it. The result will be a bog, not a lake, with a wetland polluted by toxic runoff from piles of construction materials and debris. Dolph Park is a critical stopover for migrating songbirds and waterfowl. It is essential resting habitat for a diverse range of species from bufflehead ducks to trumpeter swans that need a lake not a bog, to a whole suite of warblers. Intact forest fragments, especially in conjunction with protected wetland habitat, are rare and essential to bird survival in the urban landscape. Dolph Park is a critical and irreplaceable refuge for protected migratory species that must cope with the urbanization east and west of Lakewood Subdivision. The Lockwood development would have an unknown impact on the quality and value of stopover habitat for thousands of migrating birds annually, as well as seasonally and annually resident bird populations. What is the cost of this? I don't know. But you are the Commissioners and must find out.

I hope that I am not presumptuous in observing a commitment by many on the Planning Commission to social causes, about which I believe you know a great deal. Commissioners recognize a need for more senior living facilities as "the second largest population in history" ages. Lockwood's design is for luxury retirements, for which there is no shortage of facilities now and will not be in the future. The market never disappoints the



wealthy. But what of the not-so-wealthy? Many of the first third of the Baby Boomers made serious money. The majority of the following two-thirds did not, and many have very little in retirement resources. Lockwood's reduced but fixed resident fee is not providing for this pending crisis as existing income-challenged retirement facilities tie monthly fees to a reasonable percentage of income. And the requirement of Lockwood's "affordable units" expires just as the second-phase Baby Boomers, who will need them most, will enter the market.

The minor number of "affordable units" Lockwood proposes doesn't require a large groundbreaking project; their inventory could be doubled or tripled at existing or new facilities with no expiration date of a commitment to affordable retirement. A more honest commitment to affordable retirement housing could be put in places currently zoned for that and fees tied to income, all without Lockwood's level of unreasonable risk to Dolph Park and to Ann Arbor's drinking water, which is discussed below.

I totally support every Commissioner who will work tirelessly to solve the lack of affordable housing in this city. Ann Arbor needs to attract and house young creative people to keep it vibrant and a center of enterprise, and also to repair its wiring and its computers, do its taxes, write its poems, paint its murals, wait its tables, tend its bars, unplug its toilets, clean its public buildings, put out its fires and police its streets. But, seriously, twenty senior "affordable units" expiring in fifteen years is not a serious solution to a serious problem.

Now what do we know about the hidden costs and unanticipated problems associated with the Lockwood proposal? Almost nothing.

There are several ironies to this situation. The Planning Commission held its Lockwood hearing on May 1, 2018 in a City Hall named for Guy C. Larcom, who encouraged the City to acquire every acre of parkland it could afford. To honor him, or just acknowledge that he was right, perhaps the Commissioners should really consider acquiring the 3.5-acre dramatic overlook to the unique natural area that is Dolph Park rather than surrendering it to Lockwood. I visited the tract recently and found wild turkeys roaming its grassland. These birds think it is already part of the Park.

The Commission met that night sitting above an arm of the Gelman Dioxin Plume, and this is far more disturbing. Lockwood's development would sit above the main flow of dioxin. Lockwood's engineering plan diverts snowmelt and storm runoff to a centralized filtering and collection basin. This will have the effect of flushing pulses of water directly into the dioxin plume, accelerating its flow both towards Barton Pond, the source of 85 percent of Ann Arbor's water, and eastwards from its current reach under the City's historic downtown towards an unknown location. Before you dismiss this, remember that chaos theory began with the study of unpredictable water flow. Could this 100-year future drinking water crisis be compressed into a 20-year crisis? Shouldn't you find out? One does not need a PhD in water resource management or anything else to understand that not knowing is not good.

The Gelman Dioxin Plume should be an "all-hands" emergency response to a life-threatening problem, not to mention a future collapse of property values if nothing effective is done. I would argue that Lockwood's development should be seriously considered only if the company makes some meaningful eight-figure capital contribution towards mitigating the dioxin problem instead of accelerating it. Given the enormity of the problem, a lesser contribution would be meaningless. Dioxin is deadly stuff and arrives in cancer-causing traces before it can be detected. That's what happened to the residents with wells along the Westover and Ferry neighborhood: they were dying by the time dioxin contamination was identified. To provide a token 95 senior residential units for an aging population of 78 million, in a future trade-off of rapidly spiking cancer rates across our city, is not a reasonable or human calculation. With a Lockwood approval, the sons, daughters

and grandchildren of these seniors may not live to be 80 to qualify as Lockwood residents because of the dioxin and drinking water poisoning the development will accelerate. No statues will be built or municipal building dedicated to those people who get this deadly trade-off wrong.

I offer all of this from the Ghost of Ray Dolph. Ray was an interesting guy who cared deeply about our city. He came to Ann Arbor at the age of 23 in 1908 and twenty years later had become one of Ann Arbor's leading citizens. Ray founded the Chamber of Commerce and the Rotary Club of Ann Arbor in 1915. As a young man, I would encounter people with tales of how Ray Dolph saved their life, for example a woman at the University who as a child was kidnapped while playing in her front yard in the 1920s to be held for ransom. Ray Dolph ran down the kidnappers and brought the girl home to her family. During the Great Depression, Ray organized those with tractors to plow the many empty lots Ann Arbor had in those days, so that the afflicted could plant and harvest vegetables at no cost to themselves. When actual currency disappeared in Ann Arbor, as it also did in other cities during the Depression, Ray organized the merchants to charge even numbered prices and organized the area banks to permit multiple endorsement checks so that commerce, including doctors visits and food and clothing purchases, could continue. Appropriately, he forwarded the idea to President Franklin Roosevelt. Should we not, each in our own way, care as deeply about Ann Arbor as Ray Dolph and be as equally thoughtful?

I ask the Planning Commission to honor Ray Dolph's ecological investments and enterprise and substantial gift in creating Dolph Park as a nature area. And also to honor Guy C. Larcom for whom their meeting building is named. There are traditions to be maintained in Ann Arbor that are not inconsistent with its humane and thoughtful policies.

The Lockwood development is not critical to Ann Arbor. It can be argued as a takeout-or-leave it proposition. But Dolph Park nature area is critical to the City and the people, rich and poor, who live in it.

To act fully on behalf of Lockwood and not on behalf of Dolph Park and the people of Ann Arbor is to risk not only the haunting by the Ghost of Ray Dolph but by the Ghost of his friend, Guy C. Larcom, as well. And believe me, since I knew them both, you do not want that.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Lawrence Dolph

---

Lawrence R. Dolph  
3110 Lakewood Drive  
Ann Arbor, Michigan  
Cell: (734) 516-5841  
Ldolph@RFDInsight.com  
www.RFDInsight.com  
LinkedIn: Lawrence Dolph

## Lenart, Brett

---

**From:** Jody Tull <jody@beinawe.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 07, 2018 4:24 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** 1140 Broadway

Dear Planning Commission,

I strongly object to the multiple relaxations of Ann Arbor's planning regulations, awarded to the developers of 1140 Broadway. We have useful practical and well thought out planning regulations, which other residents have to obey. This has resulted in the preservation and development of an attractive, peaceful and eminently livable city, which regularly wins plaudits as a "best place to live" or "best place to retire". Other generations of planners and council members have stood firm and maintained the character of the city, but this present generation is giving away the farm for the sake of extra tax revenue. This is a short term, lazy solution to a set of perfectly normal, business-as-usual financial problems. Once this begins, it will only get worse, as future developers gain the grounds to sue - why can't we have these advantages, they will claim, that were given to others? Our city is a goose that lays golden eggs, but we are setting about the goose in a way that will quickly kill it. Show some respect for the wise and long headed Ann Arbor residents who have willingly supported our planning regulations for years past and do not support this rolling over under pressure from developers to whom we owe nothing.

Regards,  
Jody Tull  
1632 Broadway

## Lenart, Brett

---

**From:** kengarber@prodigy.net  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 10, 2018 10:51 AM  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Kate Pepin  
**Subject:** master plan review

Dear Commissioners:

Thank you for reviewing the city master plan annually, and for considering public comment.

I have one suggestion for page 100 of the Land Use element (2009) of the master plan. This includes the site-specific land use recommendations for Northeast Area site 1, the 63-acre parcel on the west side of Pontiac Trail, east of M-14 and north of the Huron Highlands subdivision. Because the northern half of this site is currently being developed as the North Sky subdivision, this section needs updating. I agree with all the 2009 recommendations regarding density, housing type, community design techniques, natural features and parkland, and preservation of the historic house on the southeast part of the site. But I think that these recommendations should apply to the currently vacant 32-acre vacant southern parcel specifically. That's a one-word fix.

In addition, I would like to see the following sentence slightly modified: "A vehicular and pedestrian connection should be provided to the existing stub on Skydale Drive to provide access to off-site parks and to allow residents to the south access to any parkland on the site." Change "vehicular and pedestrian connection" to "pedestrian connection." (Delete vehicular.) A vehicular connection may be appropriate, but it would depend on how this parcel is ultimately developed. If the vehicular connection is used mainly to allow access to parkland, as described in the master plan, that's desirable. But if there's a chance that the connection will be used as a primary vehicular access by residents of the development to their dwellings, that should be subject to discussions with the Huron Highlands neighborhood to the south, not codified in the master plan, since it will affect traffic on Skydale Drive and possibly other streets.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Best regards,  
Ken Garber  
2387 Hilldale  
(734) 741-0134 phone

## Lenart, Brett

---

**From:** Lenart, Brett  
**Sent:** Friday, May 11, 2018 12:07 PM  
**To:** 'beth collins'  
**Cc:** Kowalski, Matthew  
**Subject:** RE: Postponed Lockwood

Hello-

These comments will be shared with the Planning Commission. We are working to provide follow up information to the questions raised by the Commission at the last meeting. Any responses will be provided in writing in advance of the next time the item appears on the agenda.

Sincerely,

**Brett Lenart, AICP - Planning Manager**  
City of Ann Arbor Planning & Development Services

Direct (734) 794-6000 #42606 | General (734) 794-6265

**From:** beth collins <rdhbeth@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 10, 2018 8:03 AM  
**To:** Kowalski, Matthew <MKowalski@a2gov.org>; Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>  
**Cc:** Ackerman, Zach <ZAckerman@a2gov.org>; Warpehoski, Chuck <CWarpehoski@a2gov.org>; Smith, Chip <ChSmith@a2gov.org>; Taylor, Christopher (Mayor) <CTaylor@a2gov.org>; PAC\_Distribution <PAC@a2gov.org>; NAP <NAP@a2gov.org>  
**Subject:** Postponed Lockwood

Hello everyone,

I wanted to wait a week after the Planning Commission Meeting to see what the status is to date, and request to be "in the loop" about the 3365 Jackson property.

All of the issues which were brought up at the May 1st meeting, I have brought to staff attention numerous times.

FINALLY, the Planning Commission listened, heard, and raised many of the same concerns.

The residents of the Sister Lakes want to sincerely thank the Commission for listening and going into the morning hours.

We are still concerned that there is just a postponement.

What is being done now?

What is the status of the "research" that city will be doing on all of these issues?

Has Lockwood responded to the request to move the loading zone and dumpster closer to Jackson Rd. and moving the tot-lot further from Jackson Rd? And possible moving the whole structure back to the reverse E shape? Even with doing all of these things, it doesn't address the too large building on too small lot, on a bluff over a protected lake. If it isn't protected now, it sure should be. Just as the Huron River is protected. These are the only lakes made from the glaciers over 10,000 years ago in all of southern Michigan. They should have the same protection as the precious Huron River from overdevelopment. I ask you all to look at this rain garden going in on the other side of the lake, from normal home and street run off. Weber's at one point was polluting

the lake, unknowingly. It has shrunk in size, and when you read Mr Dolph's letter (he sent you last week) about how Ray Dolph protected it with windmill aeration, it really is touching. What great citizenry.

I believe another traffic study should be done, with adding the approximately 14 semi trucks (commercial food, linen, produce, beverage deliveries and waste management) entering and doing Michigan turns. Then there is the ambulance and fire trucks (Commissioner Mills brought up) for emergency response to NON assisted living, with limited medical staff on site. With 140 residents and online shopping, did Ms Redinger look into all the UPS and Fed Ex trucks entering and exiting on these D,E, and F rated roads.

I am sure you have reached out to Dan Hamel at MDEQ, who told me he would have a contact at Gelman for me to correspond, and then told me Gelman would not talk to me. I think an independent water engineer should be consulted on the bioswale infiltration beds and how much it will affect the plume. Of course Roger Rayle has all the numbers about HOW drastically high the 1,4-dioxane is under me and this property. What does the EPA say? I am certain you will get answers, where I did not.

I hope a NAP and PAC will study what should be done on the Kirkland Warbler migration, which just flooded the park last week and weekend with bird watchers from all over the state and country. There were so many birds, in my backyard and the property, flitting around the brush. Audubon stated that Dolph Nature Area has replaced the Arb as the hotspot for them. I also heard there were over 20 species of warblers, many on the protected list.

There also have been many articles written about the precious First Sister Lake and how we need to protect it from development. I have seen written words of being able to extend the park and purchase land to the north of the park (this is that land maybe). I have brought this up and the need for a shady dog park on the west side, and more Dolph parking off Jackson Rd. We could keep this area protected, leave the dioxane undisturbed and monitored properly (on the site where the plume is the worst), and add keep this green canopy area inside the city. Maybe picnic areas and benches for people who work on Jackson Rd to eat lunch and add to their quality of life during the week, and for birthday parties and residents during the weekend.

When I was told there are no precious trees, like the burr oaks, on the site, it made me sick to my stomach. I love these large silver maple trees and think they are beautiful. I love to go walk at Gallup Park, where the "scrubby brush" is the same along the river as Dolph Park is and this property. The perfect habitat for many wildlife species and birds.

I will volunteer to be the park steward of this property (if acquired ) and volunteer 10 hours a week maintaining the "park" if it is made so.

Thank you for your time reading this and any response would be appreciated, as well as updates,

Sincerely,  
Elizabeth Collins  
Sister Lakes neighborhood representative