



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator

CC: Tom Crawford, CFO
Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Nick Hutchinson, City Engineer
Brett Lenart, Planning Manager
Remy Long, Greenbelt Program Manager
Tom Shewchuk, IT Director

SUBJECT: Council Agenda Responses

DATE: January 7, 2019

AC – 6 - Communications from the City Administrator – Changing Driver Behavior Report 2018

Question: The report is dated August 31, 2018. Why the delay in receiving the report? (Councilmember Griswold)

Response: While the report is dated August 31, 2018, minor corrections were made to the report by the authors up until November. The report was presented to the Transportation Commission on November 14, 2018. At the December 17, 2018 City Council meeting, the City Administrator mentioned that the Study was complete.

Question: The enforcement efforts were limited to daytime hours, non-winter months and "suitable" roadways. This does not reflect all of the conditions our pedestrians face when crossing the roadway. What are the next steps for a comprehensive measure of pedestrian safety in Ann Arbor? (Councilmember Griswold)

Response: Staff recognizes there are improvements to be made to enhance pedestrian safety in Ann Arbor and this work is ongoing. Per Council's direction, staff will report on significant pedestrian safety improvements by January 31, 2019.

Question: Section 2.3.2 on page 7, describes what triggers a pedestrian establishing right of way in a crosswalk. This description is consistent with the Gainesville study but is not consistent with our crosswalk ordinance. The media reported that drivers were ticketed who failed to stop for the pedestrian decoy who was two or more feet away from the curb and who was not facing the crosswalk. Can you explain this discrepancy? (Councilmember Griswold)

Response: To clarify, section 2.3.2. of the study describes the methodology by which the researchers scored driver behavior. Staff was unable to find the media report 'that drivers were ticketed who failed to stop for the pedestrian decoy who was two or more feet away from the curb and who was not facing the crosswalk.'

Question: Can you provide the Ann Arbor pedestrian-vehicle crash data for 2008-2016 and give us an estimate of when the crash data will be released for 2017 and for 2018? (Councilmember Griswold)

Response: Data for crashes involving pedestrians from 2008 to 2017 is attached. State validated data for 2018 is expected to be available in the summer of 2019.

CA – 1 - Resolution to Approve an Interagency Agreement for Collaborative Technology and Services Schedule 29 with Washtenaw County and Appropriate \$248,000.00 from the Information Technology Fund Balance (\$538,633.05) (8 Votes Required)

Question: Q1. The cover memo mentions that Sch. 27 was never fully executed by Washtenaw County and that there was a settlement agreement where the County received \$567K. Can you please elaborate on what happened with schedule 27, and why – given that the city pays half of these costs - the City received only \$248K from the settlement rather than half of the \$567K? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The backup and recovery system is utilized by both the City and County, and the original purchase was split 50/50. The County purchased the original backup and recovery system from Dell, and the City executed an Interagency Agreement with the County and was invoiced by the County for our portion of the purchase. The backup and recovery system did not perform or meet our needs and as a result Dell provided a settlement agreement in the amount of \$567,000 that was split evenly by the City and the County. Some of the \$567K was credited by Dell towards our original purchase, and the remaining \$496K was evenly split by the City and County (\$248K each). Per Schedule 27, the County was supposed to take the settlement agreement funds, pay Dell directly, and invoice the City for our portion. The County instead, and contrary to Schedule 27, decided to refund the City \$248K. The County Finance department, for accounting purposes, needed to keep each lease separate and decided to refund us the money. As a result, the \$248K was placed in the IT Fund Balance until the new resolution and Schedule 29 could rectify the changes. In the end the \$567K settlement agreement was evenly split by the City and the County.

Question: Q2. What is this IT fund balance before and after this purchase and what other major IT-related purchases are on the near-term horizon? Also, what is the implicit interest rate in the 3 year lease/payment agreement? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: As of June 30, 2018, the audited IT Fund balance totaled \$4,307,537. This amount is comprised of: \$588,403 invested in capital assets, \$2,289,567 reserved for asset replacements, and \$1,429,565 in unassigned reserves (approx.. 20%). After the referenced \$248,000 is utilized the unassigned reserves would be reduced to \$1,181,565 (approx. 17% of operating expenditures).

There are no major *non-budgeted* IT purchases planned at this time.

The interest rate for the lease is 2%.

Question: Q3. The backup and recovery system being replaced is just 4-5 years old. Is it typical to replace major enterprise backup systems like this in that relatively short time frame? Also, what makes this new system the “far superior product”? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: It is typical to plan for the replacement of our backup and recovery systems every 4 to 5 years. Evolving technologies and the vendor you purchase the system from have a major impact on how long you are able to effectively utilize a system. The City constantly evaluates the health, supportability, and viability of its systems and replace them as needed. In the case of this backup and recovery system, the City may need to add some additional storage or do some minor upgrades (lower cost items) but anticipates the major components of the system will be viable for at least 5 – 8 years.

The original storage and recovery system the City purchased was a Dell brand. Since that time Dell purchase a company called EMC which was one of the premier backup and storage solutions in the industry and the one the City currently utilizes. This new system allows the City to reduce the number of applications required to manage its backup and recovery environment, is expandable to meet future needs, has a large client base, fixed some technical issues the City was having, and provides the City a much more stable environment. In addition, IT staff spend less time administering the backup and recovery environment.

B-1 - An Ordinance to Amend Sections 2:63 and 2:64 of Chapter 29 (Change Water, Sewer, and Stormwater Rates) of Title II of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor (Ordinance No. ORD-18-33)

Question: What action would it take to restore to previous water rates while the study is undertaken to minimize the impact of these needed rate increases? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: To undo the restructuring that was done with the prior amendments to Section 2:63 would require a new ordinance to be introduced to amend Section 2:63 to remove the prior amendments.

Question: Q1. At first reading I asked how much water, sewer, and stormwater rates had increased for Ann Arbor customers over the last five years and how much the rates increased over the same period for the townships we supply water to. The response was that ‘more time is requested to pull the appropriate records and to complete the requested calculations.’ Now that you’ve had the additional time, can you please provide the data? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response:

	FY15	FY19		
Townships			Change	% Change
Water	\$ 3.77	\$ 4.66	0.91	24%
Sewer	\$ 4.19	\$ 5.29	1.32	32%
The City does not maintain the Township distribution or infrastructure collection systems or provide Customer Service or billing functions				
City Residential - without customer charge				
Water	\$ 42.36	\$ 41.40	-0.96	-2%
Sewer	\$ 69.30	\$ 93.42	24.12	26%
City Residential - with customer charge				
Water	\$ 53.61	\$ 62.29	\$ 8.68	16%
Sewer	\$ 80.55	\$ 106.51	\$ 25.96	32%
City Residential based on 18ccf				

Question: Q2. Another question I asked at first reading December 17th that was not answered related to the average increase for a single-family residential customer for not just this proposed increase (which is covered in the memo), but also including the July 1, 2018 rate actions. Please provide a comparison of the average single-family residential customer bill (18 units per quarter, 2nd tier for stormwater, and 10% discount) for rates in effect June 2018 vs. the rates in effect assuming B-1 is passed? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The bill calculation is as follows (Residential customer, 18 units per quarter, 2nd tier for stormwater, and 10% discount)

June 2018: \$175.85

January 2019 (assuming B-1 is passed): \$205.19

From June 2018 to proposed January 2019:
Dollar change: \$29.34
Percentage change: 16.68%

Question: Q3. A third follow-up question from first reading relates to sewer revenues before and after the July 1, 2018 rate actions. The response to my question December 17th was that sewer revenue was not increased by the July 1 rate actions. That is hard to understand since the sewer commodity/volumetric charge was increased by 13.3% (from \$4.58 per 100 cubic feet of water flow to \$5.19 per 100 cubic feet of water flow) on July 1st. I do recognize that the sewer customer/fixed charge for larger meters was reduced, but for small meters the charge was increased and I would think the increased revenue from the sewer commodity increases would be a much larger revenue impact than from the fixed charge changes. Can you please provide the data on sewer revenues before and after the July 1 rate actions that demonstrates the changes were in fact revenue neutral? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Typically, bills are generated quarterly and are on a rotating district basis; therefore, we have not yet collected a sufficient data set to respond to this question in detail. Revenue assumptions were based on an annual basis and as indicated on page 29 of the Stantec Cost of Service Study, “the recommended rate structure presented in the following section of this report does not include the identified rate revenue adjustment for mid-year FY 2019. The recommended rates presented herein are “revenue neutral”, and only reflect the distribution of revenue necessary to bring revenue by rate class into alignment with the cost to serve each class.”

Question: Q4. Yesterday, I sent a follow-up email regarding the State’s “Second call for drinking water infrastructure projects”. I recognize the city typically applies for state funding on our water-related projects, but it is not often the state signals there is additional funding availability and we shouldn’t miss an opportunity like this, so I’d appreciate an answer to the specific question of whether the city will be making an application for this specific funding opportunity? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The City intends to make application for the Water Treatment Plant Interim UV Disinfection Project.

Question: Q5. CM Ramlawi/I discussed the possibility of “dividing the question” and separating the water and sewer increases into separate votes. I’m assuming that would be as simple as voting for the sections separately (2:63 for water and 2:64 for sewer), but please advise if anything else would be necessary beyond that? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Because the ordinance was approved at first reading to go forward as drafted, it can only be divided by amendment to the ordinance at the Council meeting.

A councilmember could move to amend the ordinance to split it into two ordinances—one amending just Sec. 2:63 (water rates) and one amending just 2:64 (sewer rates). Although unusual, it appears to be a valid as a matter of parliamentary procedure.

If the ordinance is split in two (one for water and one for sewer), unless both pass, the change from amending both water and sewer rates to amending just one of them would be a significant change that would take whichever ordinance passes back to first reading.

An alternative would be to move to amend to remove the amendments to one of the two sections—Sec. 2:63 (water rates) or Sec. 2:64 (sewer rates). If that procedure is followed, the Council would need to be aware that the section (water or sewer) removed by the amendment would be removed from further consideration or vote at the meeting. Staff, however, could bring the amendments in the removed section back—with or without revisions—as a new ordinance.

If the ordinance is split in two (one for water and one for sewer), unless both pass, the change from amending both water and sewer rates to amending just one of them would be a significant change that would take whichever ordinance passes back to first reading. If the ordinance is amended to remove one of the two sections proposed for amendment, the amendment would result in the same significant change that would take the amended ordinance back to first reading.

Question: Q6. The Administrator’s memo (AC-7) provided information regarding the debt coverage ratio for the water and sewer bonds and resulting impact on bond ratings. A couple of questions on that: Can you please provide data on these coverage ratios (water, sewer and stormwater) for the last ten years? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response:

Debt Coverage Ratio History	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
Water	3.1	2.6	2.1	2.5	2.7	2.6	1.6	1.4	1.4	0.8
Sewer	1.7	2.1	2.1	2.3	3.4	2.4	2.5	2.7	2.3	3.6

Question: Regarding water, the memo states that (without this 6% increase) the coverage ratio would drop to 1.27 in the later years of the financial plan”. What does “later years” mean - - when specifically? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: FY2029, assuming 6% rate increase each year (not including this proposed rate increase of 6%, Jan 2019)

Question: Regarding sewer, the memo states that (without the 7% increase) the “coverage ratio is projected to be 1:21, which is below the floor set by the bond prospectus”. Is that 1.21 ratio projection for 2019 or for a later year? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: That is the projection for FY2019

Question: The memo suggests that at the coverage ratios for both funds (without the planned increases) the bond rating would be lowered or be in jeopardy of being lowered. Have the rating agencies indicated this or is this staff's judgment? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: A specific conversation with the rating agencies has not been held on this topic, and they typically do not speculate on ratings. The rating and rating outlook can be affected by whether specific financial requirements (e.g. debt-coverage ratios, liquidity, etc.) are met along with more subjective criteria. Rating agencies look beyond the current financial results to evaluate the direction of the financial health of the utility.

C – 1 - An Ordinance to Amend Sections 7:605 and 7:607 of Chapter 96 (Medical Marijuana Facilities) of Title VII of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor

Question: Regarding C-1, one of the changes to the ordinance proposed here is to eliminate the requirement to show proof of insurance. While I understand that applicants still need to demonstrate that security measures are in place, it's not clear to me why we'd eliminate the proof of insurance requirements. Can you please elaborate on the rationale for the change as well as what we were trying to accomplish with the proof of insurance requirement in the first place and why that's no longer necessary or appropriate? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Proof of insurance is generally required for vendors or applicants who are doing business with the City, not typically for private businesses applying for permits that the City is not otherwise a party to the private business activity. For example, proof of insurance is required for a banner permit due to the applicant's use of the City's right-of-way. Proof of insurance is not required for permits that the City is not involved in the business otherwise, such as liquor licenses. This amendment will simplify that process for medical marijuana permitted businesses. To obtain a City permit requires proof that a state license has been issued to the permit applicant. Under state law, the applicant must meet the requirements for insurance under state law. Thus, the City's requirements are redundant.

Question: Also on C-1, how many of the applicants receiving temporary permits have returned with the state documentation to this point and what is the deadline before the temporary permit expires? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Five applicants have returned with their proof of State license and are ready for a final City permit. The temporary City permits are good for one year and the final permit will expire concurrent with the State license.

DB-1 – Resolution to Approve the 715 Heather Way Annexation, 0.52 Acres, (CPC Recommendation: Approval - 8 Yeas and 0 Nays)

Question: Were there any concerns or issues raised by residents about this annexation? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: No.

DB – 2 - Resolution to Approve Revised Bylaws of the Environmental Commission

Question: This is described as being consistent with Council Resolution R-08-496. That resolution is from 2008-- what other Commission Bylaws have been revised in the last ten years, specifically in accordance with that resolution? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: An initial review finds the following bylaws were either created or revised:

Independent Community Police Oversight Commission
Transportation Commission
Housing Board of Appeals
Human Rights Commission
Design Review Board
Commission on Disability Issues
Planning Commission
Elizabeth Dean Fund Committee
Historic District Commission
Public Art Commission
Park Advisory Commission
Housing and Human Services Advisory Board
Cable Communications Commission
Public Market Advisory Commission
Zoning Board of Appeals

Question: 4.1 (Membership)

Are there plans for other commissions to limit their public appointments to those “nominated by the City Council members currently serving on the Commission”? How is this an improvement on the phrase “nominated and approved by City Council”? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: This language reflects requirements of the enabling ordinance: City Code section1:237(2)(a).

Question: Same section: Why aren't the appointments from Planning, PAC, and Energy subject to approval from city council? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: This language reflects requirements of the enabling ordinance: City Code section 1:237(2)(a).

Question: 4.4 (Membership)

Are there plans for other commissions to remove a requirement that each member of the Commission "shall have been a registered elector in the City of Ann Arbor for at least one year immediately preceding the time of appointment"? Do commissions generally find one-year-residency to be a burdensome requirement for membership? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: This language reflects the revised language in the 2014 amendment to Charter section 12.2(a).

Question: 7.2 (Meetings)

Are there plans for other commissions to allow special meetings by the written concurrence of only three voting members? Do commissions generally find the standard of "majority of voting members" to be a burdensome requirement for calling special meetings? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Three is the standard number to avoid potential issues of deliberation by a quorum.

Question: Same section: in a special meeting called by only three voting members, business can be conducted beyond the purpose stated in the public notice "by unanimous consent of the voting members present." If a special meeting called by only three members was attended by only three members, could those three people effectively vote to expand the purpose of a meeting and conduct business beyond the public notice? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: No. A quorum would still be required to conduct any business at a special meeting.

Question: 7.8 (Meetings)

Would the quorum requirement prevent three commission members from calling a special meeting (7.2) and then conducting commission business such as collaborating with other city commissions or committees, holding public hearings, or meeting with City personnel? If not, are there plans for other commissions to meet and function with only three members? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: A quorum would still be required to conduct any business at a special meeting. Three members would not constitute a quorum and therefore could not conduct business.

Question: Has the Environmental Commission ever call a special meeting?
(Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Yes, in the past the Environmental Commission has held special meetings on topics such as Phosphorus, the Huron River Watershed Plan and the other topics of special interest to the Commission. Special joint meetings between the Energy and Environmental Commissions, including the one held on September 5th of 2018, are also technically special meetings.

Question: What circumstances led to the proposal to change the number of commission members needed to call a special meeting? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Three is the standard number to avoid potential issues of deliberation by a quorum.

Question: Regarding DB-2, in reading through the track changes it does not seem there are substantive changes to the Commission's purpose, scope, membership etc, but I may have missed it. If there are substantive changes, can you please summarize them? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: These changes are primarily to comport with the current standard bylaws provisions. The Commission's purpose, scope, and membership are governed by the enabling ordinance. Some changes in the bylaws reflect substantive changes in the ordinance made on July 21, 2014 (including nomination of members by City Council members serving on the Commission and appointment of designates from other City boards without Council approval-see bylaws section 4.1) and the 2014 Charter amendment requiring that members must be registered electors in the City at the time of appointment – see bylaws section 4.2.

Question: Also on DB-2, a new section (9.5) is added related to consulting city staff on creating subcommittees. That practice makes a lot of sense and I'm wondering if that language is in other Board & Commission bylaws? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: This provision is part of the current standard bylaws provisions and will be incorporated into existing bylaws as they come through the bylaws amendment process.

DB – 3 - Resolution to Approve the Purchase of a Conservation Easement on the Lepkowski Property in Northfield Township and to Appropriate \$478,867 (8 Votes Required)

Question: Q1. Does Northfield Township have any type of farmland or open space protection program and if so, why is that program not contributing any funding to this purchase? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The Northfield Township Board of Trustees established a Land Preservation Committee to address land use concerns and promote land preservation in the township, however there are no township funds for PDR at this time. The only townships within the Greenbelt District that have dedicated land preservation funds are Webster, Scio, Ann Arbor and Augusta Townships. The Greenbelt consistently partners with those townships on projects to maximize our leverage.

Question: Q2. Was the County asked to participate in the funding for this PDR? If not, why not, and if so, why did they decline? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation Commission was asked to participate in this project. The County has established its own project ranking criteria, and commits its available funding for PDRs to the few top ranking candidates based on its own criteria. Since the County has limited funding to apply to projects across the entire county, the County's funding was committed to higher-scoring projects and there was not available funding to contribute to this PDR. Each land preservation organization/program has established its own criteria, and what is a priority for one partner is not always reflected in the priorities developed by another partner.

Question: The cover memo indicates the federal grant was submitted under the Huron River Initiative Regional Conservation Partnership Project (Huron River RCPP) and that the City joined the partnership in 2016. Who are the other members of the partnership and why isn't the partnership itself (or any of the other members) contributing to the funding of this PDR? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The other members of the Huron River RCPP include Legacy Land Conservancy, Six Rivers Land Conservancy, Huron River Watershed Council, Ducks Unlimited and the Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation Commission, along with NRCS. NRCS is a contributing partner to this project, funding 50% of the value of the PDR and matching the Greenbelt funds 1:1. Within the Huron River RCPP (and all RCPPs), each organization brings its priority projects into the partnership, and NRCS provides match funding. Four partners have brought Agricultural Land Easement projects into the Huron River RCPP: Legacy Land Conservancy, Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation Commission, Six Rivers Land Conservancy and the City of Ann Arbor Greenbelt. Six Rivers Land Conservancy's service area does not include Washtenaw County, and therefore they are not able to be a contributing partner to any Greenbelt PDRs. Both Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation Commission and Legacy Land Conservancy have committed their available funding under the Huron River RCPP to other projects within the RCPP area.

The Greenbelt has a strong record of leveraging partnerships. Recently, the City of Ann Arbor led and completed a project in Ann Arbor Township where Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation Commission provided 50% the PDR funding. Additionally, Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation Commission has committed funds to two City-led projects targeted for closing by March 31, 2019 – one of which the County is committing 20% of the PDR funds and NRCS is providing 49%, and another where the County is contributing 15.5% of the funds and NRCS is providing 49%. In those cases,

the properties scored as high priorities under both the Greenbelt and the County's ranking criteria.

Northside STEAM SRTS Sidewalk Gap Project

Question: While the SRTS resolution is not officially on tonight's agenda, it could be if an 8 vote requirement is needed to vacate the road for the sidewalk, as the current plan entails. Could this question of whether 8 votes are required be added to the Agenda Questions? While the final vote to apply the assessments is when the 8 vote majority applies for special assessments, an 8 vote supermajority may apply with these early votes since the City Council is essentially voting to vacate street parking. Is a second vote necessary because Council likely was not aware that they were vacating street parking (they likely were just voting to approve sidewalks) and vacating street parking is a much more significant vote which requires a supermajority? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: This project does not involve vacation a City right of way, or any other feature that would trigger an 8-vote supermajority requirement.

Name	State Jurisdiction	Fatal Crashes	Incapacitating Injury Crashes	Non- incapacitating Injury Crashes	No Injury Crashes	Total Pedestrian Crashes
S Ashley St & N Ashley St & W Huron St	Y	0	2	15	3	20
E Huron St & S Main St & N Main St & W Huron St	Y	0	4	13	2	19
S 1st St & W Huron St & N 1st St	Y	0	1	11	2	14
S University Ave & Church St		0	4	9	1	14
E Madison St & S State St		0	0	12	1	13
N University Ave & S State St		0	1	11	1	13
N 4th Ave & S 4th Ave & E Huron St	Y	0	1	11	1	13
W Liberty St & S Main St & E Liberty St		0	2	9	0	11
E Liberty St & S 5th Ave		0	2	7	2	11
E Liberty St & S 4th Ave		0	2	8	1	11
S University Ave & S State St		0	0	11	0	11
Packard St & S State St & Arbor St		0	1	10	0	11
S State St & Hill St		0	3	7	0	10
Packard St & Hill St		0	2	8	0	10
E Liberty St & S Division St		0	0	9	1	10
S 5th Ave & E Huron St & N 5th Ave	Y	0	1	8	1	10
E Ann St & Glen Ave		0	0	10	0	10
Glen Ave & E Huron St	Y	0	0	8	1	9
S Ashley St & W Liberty St		0	2	7	0	9
S 4th Ave & E Washington St		0	1	8	0	9
S University Ave & Washtenaw Ave	Y	0	1	7	1	9
S Forest Ave & S University Ave		0	1	6	2	9
W William St & E William St & S Main St		0	1	8	0	9
S Division St & E William St		0	0	8	0	8
Maynard St & E William St		0	0	8	0	8
S University Ave & E University Ave		0	1	7	0	8
W Washington St & S Ashley St		0	1	6	1	8
W Washington St & S Main St & E Washington St		0	2	5	1	8
S Division St & E Washington St		0	0	7	1	8
S State St & E Liberty St		0	3	4	1	8
E Huron St & N State St & S State St	Y	0	1	5	2	8
Glen Ave & Catherine St		0	0	8	0	8

Beakes St & N Main St & W Kingsley St & E Kingsley St		0	0	7	0	7
Thompson St & E Liberty St		0	1	6	0	7
E Washington St & S State St		0	2	3	2	7
S 5th Ave & E Washington St		0	2	5	0	7
S State St & E William St		0	0	7	0	7
Braun Ct & N Main St		0	0	7	0	7
Geddes Ave & Washtenaw Ave	Y	0	0	5	1	6
N University Ave & S Thayer St		0	0	5	1	6
Washtenaw Ave & Washtenaw Ct	Y	0	1	5	0	6
S 5th Ave & Packard St		0	1	4	1	6
Hill St & Church St		0	0	5	1	6
Packard St & Mary St		0	0	6	0	6
Maynard St & E Liberty St		0	1	5	0	6
E Huron St & N Ingalls St	Y	0	0	4	2	6
E Huron St & N Thayer St	Y	0	0	5	1	6
E Huron St & S Division St & N Division St	Y	0	0	6	0	6
W Ann St & E Ann St & N Main St		0	2	3	1	6
Miller Rd & N Main St & Catherine St		0	0	6	0	6
Catherine St & Detroit St		0	0	4	1	5
N Division St & E Ann St		0	0	5	0	5
S Observatory St & E Medical Center Dr		0	1	3	1	5
Fletcher St & E Huron St	Y	0	0	3	2	5
N 4th Ave & Depot St		0	0	5	0	5
Murfin Ave & N Campus Blvd & Bonisteel Blvd		0	0	5	0	5
Murfin Ave & Bonisteel Blvd & N Campus Blvd		0	0	5	0	5
Depot St & N Main St		0	0	5	0	5
E Hoover Ave & S State St		0	1	4	0	5
Sybil St & Hill St		0	2	3	0	5
Church St & Willard St		0	2	3	0	5
E William St & Thompson St		0	0	5	0	5
S Observatory St & S Forest Ave & Washtenaw Ave	Y	0	0	5	0	5
Woodmere Ct & S University Ave		0	1	3	1	5
Woodmere Ct & S University Ave		0	1	3	1	5
S State St & Whaley Ct		0	1	3	1	5
Glenwood Rd & Washtenaw Ave & Platt Rd	Y	0	0	5	0	5

Sheridan Dr & Washtenaw Ave & Manchester Rd	Y	0	2	1	1	4
Washtenaw Ave	Y	0	0	4	0	4
Geddes Ave & Washtenaw Ave	Y	0	0	4	0	4
Washtenaw Ct & Washtenaw Ave	Y	0	0	4	0	4
Herbert Dr & Murfin Ave		0	0	4	0	4
E Madison St & Packard St		0	0	3	1	4
Elm St & Washtenaw Ave	Y	0	1	3	0	4
Geddes Ave		0	0	4	0	4
Washtenaw Ave & Wilmot St	Y	0	0	3	1	4
Geddes Ave & Washtenaw Ct		0	0	4	0	4
S Ashley St & W William St		0	0	3	1	4
S 4th Ave & E William St		0	1	3	0	4
Forest Ct & Washtenaw Ave	Y	0	1	3	0	4
Thompson St & Packard St		0	0	3	1	4
Packard St & S Division St		0	0	3	1	4
S 4th Ave & Packard St		0	1	2	1	4
S University Ave & Walnut St		0	0	4	0	4
Hill St & E University Ave		0	0	4	0	4
S Main St & W Davis Ave & E Davis Ave		0	0	3	1	4
Packard St & Arch St		0	0	4	0	4
S Observatory St & Washington Hts		0	0	3	1	4
S 1st St & W Liberty St		0	1	3	0	4
Ann Arbor Railroad & W Liberty St		0	1	3	0	4
N Ashley St & W Ann St		0	0	3	1	4
Miller Rd & N Ashley St		0	0	4	0	4
Catherine St & N 4th Ave		0	0	4	0	4
N Division St & E Ann St		0	0	3	0	3
E Ann St & N State St		0	0	2	1	3
Lake Lila Dr & Plymouth Rd		0	1	2	0	3
S Huron Pkwy & Plymouth Rd		0	0	3	0	3
Nixon Rd & Plymouth Rd		0	0	3	0	3
Bishop Ave & Plymouth Rd		0	1	2	0	3
Zina Pitcher Pl & Catherine St & Catherine Rd		1	0	2	0	3
S Main St & W Hoover Ave		0	0	2	1	3
Greenwood Ave & Packard St		0	0	3	0	3

Packard St & Vaughn St		0	0	3	0	3
E Hoover Ave & Mary St		0	1	2	0	3
S Main St & Pauline Blvd		0	0	2	1	3
S State St & Granger Ave		0	1	2	0	3
Packard St & Cross St		0	0	3	0	3
Hill St & Washtenaw Ave	Y	0	1	2	0	3
Oakland Ave & Hill St		0	0	3	0	3
Hill St & Tappan Ave		0	0	3	0	3
Tappan Ave & Hill St		0	0	3	0	3
S State St & Monroe St		0	0	2	1	3
S University Ave & Elm St		0	0	3	0	3
E William St & S 5th Ave		0	0	2	1	3
Geddes Ave & Church St		0	0	3	0	3
S Observatory St & Geddes Ave		0	0	3	0	3
N University Ave & Fletcher St		0	0	2	1	3
Geddes Ave & S Observatory St		0	0	3	0	3
S Main St & Packard St		0	0	3	0	3
N State St & E Ann St		0	0	2	1	3
S Main St & E Hoover Ave		0	0	2	1	3
Broadway St & Plymouth Rd		0	0	2	1	3
Packard St & Hikone Dr		0	0	2	1	3
Hikone Dr & Packard St		0	0	2	1	3
Platt Rd & Packard St		0	1	2	0	3
Stone School Rd & E Eisenhower Pkwy		0	0	2	1	3
Maplewood Ave & Packard St		0	1	1	0	2
Woodmanor Ct & Packard St		0	0	2	0	2
E Huron St & Washtenaw Ave & Zina Pitcher Pl	Y	1	0	1	0	2
Packard St & Burton Rd		0	0	2	0	2
S Service Dr & E Eisenhower Pkwy		0	0	1	1	2
E Eisenhower Pkwy & N Service Dr		0	0	1	1	2
Packard St		0	0	2	0	2
Birch Hollow Dr & Stone School Rd		0	1	1	0	2
W I 94/State RAMP & S State St & S State/W I 94 RAMP	Y	0	0	1	1	2
Iroquois Pl & Packard St		0	0	2	0	2
Bedford Rd & Washtenaw Ave & E Stadium Blvd	Y	0	1	0	1	2

Ann Arbor Saline Rd & S Main St		0	1	1	0	2
Packard St & Shadford Rd		0	0	2	0	2
Henry St & E Park Pl & E Stadium Blvd & S Industrial Hwy		0	0	2	0	2
E Stadium Blvd & Packard St		0	0	2	0	2
Golf View Ln & S Main St		0	0	2	0	2
S Main St & Fieldcrest St		0	0	2	0	2
Packard St & Burton Ave		0	0	2	0	2
Cherry Tree Ln & Packard St		0	0	2	0	2
Thompson St & Richard L Kennedy Dr		0	1	1	0	2
Packard St & E Eisenhower Pkwy		0	0	1	1	2
Elmwood St & Packard St		0	1	1	0	2
E Hoover Ave & Ann Arbor Railroad		0	0	2	0	2
Woodlawn Ave & Packard St		0	0	2	0	2
E Hoover Ave & Buffalo St		0	0	2	0	2
University Ter & E Medical Center Dr		0	0	2	0	2
Maiden Ln & Freesia Ct		0	1	1	0	2
Keppler Ct & S 7th St		0	0	2	0	2
E Jefferson St & Thompson St		0	1	1	0	2
E Jefferson St & S 5th Ave		0	0	2	0	2
S 7th St & W Liberty St		0	0	2	0	2
Geddes Ave & N University Ave		0	0	2	0	2
N University Ave & S Observatory St		0	0	2	0	2
S University Ave & Tappan Ave		0	0	2	0	2
W Liberty St & W Stadium Blvd		0	1	1	0	2
S Main St & Hill St		0	1	1	0	2
S Division St & Hill St		0	0	2	0	2
Hill St & S Forest Ave		0	0	2	0	2
Hill St & S Forest Ave		0	0	2	0	2
S Main St & Adams Ave		0	2	0	0	2
W Mosley St & S Main St & E Mosley St		0	2	0	0	2
Koch Ave & S Main St		0	2	0	0	2
Brooklyn Ave & Packard St		0	0	2	0	2
Brooklyn Ave & Packard St		0	0	2	0	2
Packard St & Woodlawn Ave		0	0	2	0	2
Granger Ave & Packard St		0	0	2	0	2

Packard St & McKinley Ave		0	1	1	0	2
E University Ave & Packard St		0	1	1	0	2
Federal Blvd & Commerce Blvd		0	0	1	1	2
S State St & Arch St		0	0	2	0	2
Greene St & E Hoover Ave		0	0	2	0	2
Brown St & E Hoover Ave		0	0	2	0	2
Detroit St & E Kingsley St		0	0	1	1	2
E Kingsley St & N 4th Ave		0	0	2	0	2
Cedar Bend St & Fuller Rd		0	0	1	1	2
Fuller Rd		0	0	1	1	2
N Medical Center Dr & Fuller Rd & Maiden Ln & Fuller St		0	1	0	1	2
Plymouth Rd & Green Rd		0	0	2	0	2
Murfin Ave & Hubbard St		0	0	2	0	2
Miner St & W Summit St		0	0	1	1	2
Broadview Ln & Broadway St		0	0	2	0	2
N 4th Ave & E Ann St		0	0	2	0	2
N 1st St & W Ann St		0	0	2	0	2
Washington Hts & E Medical Center Dr		0	0	2	0	2
N Main St & E Summit St & W Summit St		0	0	2	0	2
E Medical Center Dr & Simpson Dr		0	1	1	0	2
E Ann St & Zina Pitcher Pl		1	0	1	0	2
S Maple Rd & N Maple Rd & Jackson Ave	Y	0	0	2	0	2
Fletcher St & E Washington St		0	1	0	1	2
S 1st St & W Washington St		0	0	2	0	2
S Thayer St & E Washington St		0	1	1	0	2
E Medical Center Dr & E Hospital Dr		0	1	1	0	2
Washtenaw Ave & Zina Pitcher Pl & E Huron St	Y	1	0	1	0	2
S 7th St & W Huron St	Y	0	0	1	0	1
W Washington St & S 7th St		0	0	1	0	1
W I 94 BL/W I 94 RAMP & Jackson Ave	Y	0	0	1	0	1
Jackson Ave & W I 94/I 94 BL RAMP	Y	0	0	1	0	1
2nd St & W Liberty St		0	0	1	0	1
Dexter Ave & Westwood Ave		0	1	0	0	1
N Ingalls St & Catherine St		0	0	1	0	1
N 5th Ave & Catherine St		0	0	1	0	1

N Thayer St & Catherine St		0	0	1	0	1
Catherine St & N Division St		0	0	1	0	1
E Medical Center Dr		0	0	1	0	1
Dexter Ave & Worden Ave		0	1	0	0	1
Allen Dr & Dexter Ave		0	1	0	0	1
Doty Ave & Dexter Ave		0	1	0	0	1
E Ann St & S Observatory St		0	0	1	0	1
Glendale Dr & Dexter Ave		0	1	0	0	1
Highlake Ave & Lakeview Dr & Hilltop Dr		0	0	1	0	1
W Huron St & Edmund Pl	Y	0	1	0	0	1
W Huron St & Crest St	Y	0	1	0	0	1
W Huron St & Arbana Dr	Y	0	1	0	0	1
N Ingalls St & E Ann St		0	0	1	0	1
N Thayer St & E Ann St		0	0	1	0	1
Jackson Ave		0	0	1	0	1
Jackson Ave & I 94 BL/E I 94 RAMP & Highlake Ave	Y	0	0	1	0	1
Pontiac St & John A Woods Dr		0	1	0	0	1
Indianola Ave & Pontiac St		0	1	0	0	1
Moore St & Plymouth Rd & Broadway St & Maiden Ln		0	0	1	0	1
Newport Pl & Newport Rd & Miller Rd		0	0	0	1	1
Maiden Ln & Nielsen Ct		0	0	1	0	1
W Summit St & Wildt St & Hiscock St		0	0	1	0	1
Lake Shore Dr & N Main St		0	0	1	0	1
Hayward St & Murfin Ave		0	0	1	0	1
N Maple Rd & Miller Rd		0	0	0	1	1
Franklin St & Miller Rd		0	1	0	0	1
Westport Rd & Newport Rd		0	0	1	0	1
N Maple Rd & SB N Maple/NB N Maple TURN & Maple/E M 14 RAMP		0	1	0	0	1
Green Rd & Baxter Rd		0	0	1	0	1
N Maple Rd & Foss St		0	1	0	0	1
Plymouth Rd & Murfin Ave & Upland Dr		0	0	0	1	1
Taylor St & Pontiac St		0	1	0	0	1
Pontiac St & Amherst Ave		0	1	0	0	1
Nixon Rd & S Huron Pkwy		0	0	1	0	1
Plymouth Rd & Prairie St		0	0	1	0	1

Green Rd & Greenbrier Dr		0	0	1	0	1
Traverwood Dr & Plymouth Rd		0	0	1	0	1
S Huron Pkwy		0	0	1	0	1
Gettysburg Rd & Green Rd & Burbank Dr		0	0	1	0	1
S Huron Pkwy & Leslie Cir		0	0	0	1	1
Nixon Rd & Sandalwood Cir		0	0	1	0	1
Skydale Dr & Pontiac Trl		0	0	1	0	1
Traverwood Dr & S Huron Pkwy		0	0	0	1	1
Arrowwood Trl & Pontiac Trl		0	0	1	0	1
S US 23/Plymouth RAMP & Plymouth Rd	Y	0	1	0	0	1
Plymouth Rd & Plymouth/S US 23 RAMP	Y	0	1	0	0	1
E Summit St & Detroit St & Beakes St & N Division St		0	0	0	1	1
Hiscock St & Miner St		0	0	1	0	1
Dexter Rd & Evergreen Dr		0	0	1	0	1
Miller Rd & Red Oak Rd		0	0	1	0	1
Elizabeth St & High St		0	0	1	0	1
Miller Rd & Mapleridge St		0	0	1	0	1
Miller Rd & N 7th St		0	0	1	0	1
N 5th Ave & Beakes St		0	0	1	0	1
Fuller Rd & Fuller Ct		0	1	0	0	1
Beakes St & N 4th Ave		0	0	1	0	1
N Ashley St & W Kingsley St		0	0	1	0	1
Beal Ave & Fuller Rd		0	0	1	0	1
Maiden Lane Ct & Maiden Ln		0	1	0	0	1
N 5th Ave & Depot St		0	0	1	0	1
N 4th Ave & E Summit St		0	0	1	0	1
Maiden Ln & Island Dr		0	1	0	0	1
N Campus Blvd & Fuller Rd & Fuller Ct		0	1	0	0	1
Pinewood St & Dexter Rd & Kuehnle St		0	0	1	0	1
Wall St & Island Dr		0	1	0	0	1
Dexter Rd & Glenwood St		0	0	1	0	1
Dellwood Dr & Dexter Rd		0	0	1	0	1
Dexter Rd & Dexter Ave & N Maple Rd		0	0	1	0	1
E Kingsley St & N 5th Ave		0	0	1	0	1
Detroit St & N 5th Ave		0	0	0	1	1

N Ingalls St & Lawrence St		0	0	1	0	1
Lawrence St & N Thayer St		0	0	1	0	1
Jackson Rd & Wagner Rd & Jackson Ave		0	1	0	0	1
Jackson Rd & Jackson Ave & Wagner Rd		0	1	0	0	1
Catherine St & W Medical Center Dr		0	0	1	0	1
Wagner Rd & Ferry St		0	1	0	0	1
Arch St & White St		0	0	1	0	1
S Forest Ave & Roosevelt Ct		0	1	0	0	1
E University Ave & Michigan Ave		0	0	1	0	1
E Hoover Ave & Sybil St		0	0	1	0	1
S 1st St & W Davis Ave		0	0	1	0	1
W Stadium Blvd & Federal Blvd		0	0	1	0	1
S Forest Ave & Cambridge Rd		0	1	0	0	1
E Keech Ave & Buffalo St		0	1	0	0	1
E Keech Ave & S Main St		0	1	0	0	1
W Stadium Blvd & Pauline Blvd		0	0	1	0	1
Packard St & Brookwood Pl		0	1	0	0	1
Packard St & Sylvan Ave		0	1	0	0	1
Washtenaw Ave & Brockman Blvd	Y	0	0	1	0	1
Dewey Ave & S State St		0	0	1	0	1
Washtenaw Ave & Tuomy Rd	Y	0	0	1	0	1
Sheehan Ave & Granger Ave		0	0	1	0	1
White St & Granger Ave		0	0	1	0	1
Snyder Ave & Hutchins Ave		0	0	1	0	1
W Stadium Blvd & Hutchins Ave		0	0	1	0	1
Gardner Ave & Packard St		0	0	1	0	1
Rose Ave & S State St		0	1	0	0	1
Shadford Rd & Ferdon Rd		0	0	0	1	1
S Maple Rd & Bens Dr		0	0	1	0	1
Washtenaw Ave & Oxford Rd	Y	0	0	1	0	1
Blakely Ct & S Division St		0	0	1	0	1
Washtenaw Ave & Baldwin Ave	Y	0	0	1	0	1
Hill St & Lincoln Ave		0	0	1	0	1
Washtenaw Ave & Hill St	Y	0	0	1	0	1
S Maple Rd & W Liberty St		0	0	1	0	1

5th St & Princeton St		0	0	1	0	1
Cross St & S Division St		0	0	1	0	1
Greene St & Hill St		0	0	1	0	1
Brown St & Hill St		0	0	1	0	1
Cambridge Rd & Washtenaw Ave	Y	0	0	1	0	1
S Division St & Benjamin St		0	0	1	0	1
Oakland Ave & S Forest Ave		0	1	0	0	1
Arch St & Oakland Ave		0	0	1	0	1
Arbordale Dr & Raymond St		0	0	1	0	1
Arbordale Dr & Lennox St		0	0	1	0	1
Greene St & E Davis Ave		0	0	1	0	1
Arbordale Dr & Ivydale St		0	0	1	0	1
E Davis Ave & Brown St		0	0	1	0	1
Washtenaw Ave	Y	0	1	0	0	1
Willard St & E University Ave		0	0	1	0	1
W Madison St & E Madison St & S Main St		0	1	0	0	1
5th St & W Madison St		0	0	1	0	1
W Liberty St & Burwood Ave		0	0	1	0	1
Thompson St & E Madison St		0	0	1	0	1
Willard St & S Forest Ave		0	0	0	1	1
Dartmoor Rd & W Liberty St		0	0	1	0	1
Thaler Ave & Burwood Ave		0	0	1	0	1
Westwood Apartment Dr & W Liberty St		0	0	1	0	1
Geddes Ave & Orchard Hills Dr & Vinewood Blvd		0	0	1	0	1
Thaler Ave & W Stadium Blvd		0	0	1	0	1
Concord Rd & Geddes Ave		1	0	0	0	1
W Stadium Blvd & Winewood Ave		0	0	1	0	1
Ridgeway St & Geddes Ave		1	0	0	0	1
Geddes Ave & Harvard Pl		1	0	0	0	1
Geddes Ave & Onondaga St		1	0	0	0	1
Geddes Ave & Highland Ln		1	0	0	0	1
S 1st St & W Jefferson St		0	0	0	1	1
W Stadium Blvd & S Maple Rd		0	0	1	0	1
Abbott Ave & S Maple Rd & W Stadium Blvd		0	0	1	0	1
Gallup Park & Fuller Rd		1	0	0	0	1

3rd St & W Liberty St		0	0	1	0	1
Hamilton Pl & E William St		0	0	1	0	1
Geddes Ave & Elm St		0	0	1	0	1
Mack Rd & Wilmot St & S Observatory St		0	0	1	0	1
W Jefferson St & S Ashley St		0	0	0	1	1
W Huron St & Tulip Tree Ct	Y	0	1	0	0	1
Forest Creek Ct & Stone School Rd		0	1	0	0	1
Stone School Rd & Stone School Cir		0	0	1	0	1
Stone School Rd & Cloverly Ln		0	0	0	1	1
Eisenhower Pkwy & E Eisenhower Pkwy		0	0	0	1	1
Nixon Rd		0	0	1	0	1
Nixon Rd		0	0	1	0	1
Nixon Rd & S Huron Pkwy		0	0	1	0	1
E Ann St & S Observatory St		0	0	1	0	1
S Observatory St		0	0	1	0	1
Washtenaw Ave & Service Dr	Y	0	1	0	0	1
Beakes St & Beakes Ct		0	0	1	0	1
Plymouth/S US 23 RAMP & Plymouth Rd	Y	0	1	0	0	1
Plymouth/N US 23 RAMP & N US 23	Y	1	0	0	0	1
N Division St & Catherine St		0	0	1	0	1
S Forest Ave & Forest Ct		0	0	0	1	1
S State St & Kms Pl		0	0	1	0	1
Arbordale Dr & Evelyn Ct		0	0	1	0	1
S Forest Ave & Cambridge Rd		0	1	0	0	1
Maiden Lane Ct & Wall St		0	1	0	0	1
E I 94 BL/W I 94 RAMP & Jackson Ave	Y	0	0	1	0	1
Broadway St & Beakes St & N Division St		0	0	0	1	1
Plymouth Rd & Green Rd		0	0	1	0	1
N Maple Rd		0	1	0	0	1
N Maple Rd & NB N Maple/SB N Maple TURN		0	1	0	0	1
Packard St & Whitewood St		0	0	1	0	1
Packard St & Parkwood Ave		0	0	1	0	1
La Salle St & Packard St		0	0	1	0	1
Bellwood Ave & Packard St		0	0	1	0	1
Lookout Cir & Platt Rd & Oakwood St		0	0	1	0	1

Oakbrook Dr & S State St		0	0	1	0	1
Fernwood St & Norwood St		0	0	1	0	1
Platt Rd & Cascade Dr		0	0	1	0	1
Ann Arbor Saline Rd & Fieldcrest St		0	1	0	0	1
Canterbury Rd & Platt Rd		0	0	1	0	1
S US 23 & E Washtenaw/S US 23 RAMP	Y	1	0	0	0	1
N US 23 & N US 23/E Washtenaw RAMP	Y	0	0	1	0	1
Edgewood Dr & Platt Rd		0	0	1	0	1
Platt Rd & Old Boston Ct		0	0	1	0	1
Ann Arbor Saline Rd & W Oakbrook Dr & Northbrook Dr		1	0	0	0	1
E Stadium Blvd & Woodbury Dr		0	0	1	0	1
E Stadium Blvd & Saint Francis Dr		0	0	1	0	1
Stimson St & S Industrial Hwy		0	0	1	0	1
Stimson St & White St		0	0	1	0	1
Henry St & White St		0	0	1	0	1
Ferdon Rd & E Stadium Blvd		0	0	0	1	1
E Stadium Blvd & Golden Ave		0	0	1	0	1
Page Ave & Jewett St		0	0	1	0	1
Chalmers Dr & Washtenaw Ave	Y	0	0	1	0	1
Baldwin Ave & Packard St		0	0	1	0	1
Arlington Blvd & Washtenaw Ave	Y	0	0	1	0	1
N State/W I 94 RAMP & S State St	Y	0	0	0	1	1
N State/W I 94 RAMP & W I 94	Y	1	0	0	0	1
S State St & N State/E I 94 RAMP	Y	0	0	1	0	1
S State St & E I 94/State RAMP	Y	0	0	1	0	1
S State Rd & S State St & State Cir		0	0	1	0	1
S State Rd		0	0	1	0	1
Shadowood Dr & Laurelwood Cir & Blain Ct		0	1	0	0	1
Stone School Rd & Champagne Dr & Partridge Path		0	0	1	0	1
Shadowood Dr & Hardyke Ct		0	1	0	0	1
E Ellsworth Rd & Stone School Rd		0	0	0	1	1
Ann Arbor Railroad & E Ellsworth Rd & W Ellsworth Rd		0	0	0	1	1
Research Park Dr & W Ellsworth Rd		0	0	0	1	1
W Jefferson St & Ann Arbor Railroad		0	0	0	1	1
Packard St & Colony Rd		0	0	1	0	1

Packard Rd & Packard St		0	0	0	1	1
Packard St & E Eisenhower Pkwy		0	0	0	1	1
S Industrial Hwy & Eisenhower Pl & E Eisenhower Pkwy		0	0	1	0	1
Boardwalk St & E Eisenhower Pkwy		0	0	1	0	1
Packard St & Creek Dr		0	1	0	0	1
Packard St & Rosedale St		0	0	1	0	1
Ticknor Ct & Stone School Rd		0	0	1	0	1
W Eisenhower Pkwy & E Eisenhower Pkwy & S State St & Eisenhower Pkwy		0	0	1	0	1
Boardwalk St & E Eisenhower Pkwy		0	0	1	0	1
S State St & E Eisenhower Pkwy & Eisenhower Pkwy		0	0	1	0	1
E Eisenhower Pkwy & Market Pl		0	0	0	1	1
Stone School Rd & Baylis Dr		0	0	1	0	1
W Eisenhower Pkwy & Signature Blvd		0	0	1	0	1
Mall Dr & S State St		0	0	1	0	1
S State St & Briarwood Cir		0	0	1	0	1
Hilton Blvd & Victors Way & S State St		0	0	1	0	1
La Salle St & Lorraine St		0	0	1	0	1