City of East Grand Rapids
Regular City Commission Meeting
Agenda

May 4, 2020 – 6:00 p.m.
(EGR Community Center – 750 Lakeside Drive)

1. Call to Order.
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Public Comment.
4. Report of Mayor and City Commissioners.

Regular Agenda Items
5. Discussion of neighborhood mini-traffic circle for the intersection of Elmwood/Woodlawn (courtesy hearing; action requested)
6. Discussion of neighborhood mini-traffic circles for the intersections of Argentina/San Lucia and Argentina/Pinecrest (courtesy hearing; action requested)

Consent Agenda – No Hearing Required; Approval Requested Unless Noted
7. Receipt of communications.
8. Minutes of the regular meeting held April 20, 2020.
9. Report of Finance Committee on disbursement of funds: payroll disbursements of $192,701.88; county and school disbursements of $0, and total remaining disbursements of $430,781.71.
11. Purchase of a thermal imaging camera for the Public Safety Department.
13. Amendment to Street & Sidewalk Millage Funding Policy.

Work Session
15. Capital Improvement Plan Requests.

Livestream can be viewed at: https://www.youtube.com
Search: City of East Grand Rapids

Citizens may attend the meeting in person or virtually.

Public hearings will be held if noted in each agenda item. If no hearing is noted, comments should be made during “Public Comment” in Item 3.
The City will provide reasonable auxiliary aids for individuals requiring them for effective communication in programs and services of the City.
Notice must be made to the City five (5) days prior to the program or service requesting the specific auxiliary aid.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Commissioners
FROM: Doug LaFave, Interim City Manager
DATE: April 27, 2020

RE: Neighborhood Mini-Traffic Circle-Elmwood Drive and Woodlawn Avenue

Action Requested: That the City Commission consider a neighborhood mini-traffic circle for the intersection of Elmwood Drive and Woodlawn Avenue.

Background: The City of East Grand Rapids evaluates the pavement condition rating (Paser) of all City streets to prioritize street project funding based on asset management principles in alignment with capital improvement planning. Elmwood Drive between Lake Drive and Breton Road is currently rated between a Paser 2 and 3 (poor condition) which prioritizes this street segment as a candidate for grind and resurfacing project funding for this spring. As part of the project planning process, the City completes or reviews utility assessments (like the completed water main and sanitary sewer replacement and rehabilitation that has been completed) as well as other variables including, but not limited to, traffic engineering studies, accident history and reported resident concerns. The ideal time to address any potential changes to a street segment is during a planned street project.

When a design feature change is initiated by the City based off of response to complaints, traffic engineering studies, etc. the City sends notices to residents for an open house. Notices are sent within 500 feet of an intersection or if the change is impacting and entire street segment to the entire street segment. At an open house City staff and consultants share background information, dialogue with attendees and answer questions. Comment cards/ballots are received at the open house or can be returned to the City by a set deadline. Project background, open house feedback and comment cards/ballots are then provided to the City Commission for a courtesy public hearing and consideration at a City Commission Meeting. Due to COVID-19 and associated restrictions on meetings/gatherings the City, like many other organizations, has had to adapt or modify operations to continue to serve the community during this time. In lieu of an open house the City provided a detailed informational document with a comment card/ballot to share the same type of information that would typically be covered at an open house and invited residents to contact staff to ask questions, provide comment, etc. to cover those components of an open house. The same comment card/ballot was provided with a deadline. This approach was intended to provide the same information and allow for questions and feedback but in a different format.

Project background and information:

In recent years the City of East Grand Rapids has conducted several traffic engineering studies with respect to reported concerns of speeding and disobeying stop signs on Elmwood Drive between Lake Drive and adjacent to Woodlawn Avenue. A summary of the studies is noted below:

- Elmwood Drive carries approximately 2,300 vehicles traveling east and west-bound on a weekday.
- The 85th percentile of vehicle speeds noted for each study for both directions of traffic on Elmwood from 2017 were, 25mph/27mph and in 2018 were 26mph/27mph.
No reported accident crashes have occurred in the past five years at this intersection.

10 citations have been issued for disobeying stop signs in the past five years at the All-Way stop signed intersection at Elmwood Drive and Woodlawn Avenue.

Speeding:

The traffic engineering industry standard utilized in setting the regulatory speed limit for a street uses the “85th percentile speed”. The 85th percentile speed is defined as, “the speed at or below which 85 percent of all vehicles are observed to travel under free-flowing conditions past a monitored point.” Another way to consider this is the speed at which only 15% of traffic violate on average. Traffic Engineers use the 85th percentile speed as a standard to set the speed limit at a safe speed, minimizing crashes and promoting uniform traffic flow along a corridor.

The speed studies conducted from 2017 and 2018 demonstrate that 85th percentile of vehicles are traveling at or within the conservative exceedance range allowance of 5mph over the set regulated speed, which is 25 mph. The exceedance range of the set regulated speed can range on the conservative end as noted at a 5 mph and upwards to 7-8 mph.

Intersection Traffic Control Devices/Signs:

The three-legged intersection of Elmwood Drive and Woodlawn Avenue is currently controlled with All-Way stop signs. This traffic control placement is not in accordance with appropriate traffic engineering standards. All-Way stop sign configurations should be placed when there are relatively equal volumes of traffic from the intersecting streets. Elmwood Drive averages 2,300 vehicles per day while Woodlawn Avenue averages 270 per day between Maplewood Drive and Elmwood Drive. Improperly placed All-Way stop configurations have a low adherence to stop signs placed on the dominant street segment, in this case east and west-bound Elmwood Drive. This follows one of the common reported complaints at this intersection that motorists often do not come to complete stops at this location. The appropriate traffic control configuration should be stop/yield signs for at north-bound Woodlawn Avenue while there should be no stop signs for east and west bound Elmwood or there can be a street configuration design alternative consideration. City staff and traffic/civil engineering consultants have looked at and provided for an alternative for the construction of a neighborhood mini traffic circle in lieu of the status quo.

A neighborhood mini traffic circle is a small circular, raised island placed in the center of a residential intersection to mitigate improper use of All-Way stops with the added benefit of lowering vehicle speeds on a street segment. Unlike large roundabouts, traffic mini-circles focus more on controlling right of way and vehicle speeds and are not designed to handle higher traffic volumes.

The City sent out 32 notice/information documents and comment cards/ballots to residents within 500 feet of the Elmwood Drive and Woodlawn Avenue intersection in reference consideration of a mini traffic circle compared to the alternative of leaving existing conditions in place for the street resurfacing project this spring. The received ballot responses are as follows:

- Yes: 19
- No: 2
- Neutral: 1
- No Response: 10

It is the established practice of the City to count “no responses” as “no” votes. Without the “neutral response” the total ballot count would be 19 yes and 12 no.

All other comments, questions or correspondence has been included with packet materials.
Dear Resident:

The City of East Grand Rapids evaluates the pavement condition rating (Paser) of all City streets to prioritize street project funding based on asset management principles in alignment with capital improvement planning. Elmwood Drive between Lake Drive and Breton Road is currently rated between a Paser 2 and 3 (poor condition) which prioritizes this street segment as a candidate for grind and resurfacing project funding for this spring. As part of the project planning process, the City completes or reviews utility assessments (like the completed water main and sanitary sewer replacement and rehabilitation that has been completed) as well as other variables including, but not limited to, traffic engineering studies, accident history and reported resident concerns. The ideal time to address any potential changes to a street segment is during a planned street project.

Normal protocol for the City is to host an open house for residents along a street to meet with staff and consultants to learn about and view plans as well as to ask questions in advance of City Commission consideration. Due to the restrictions in place with respect to the COVID-19 pandemic the City is not able to host a public open house gathering at this time. With this change, this notice sent to you has been intentionally detailed to provide all information that would normally be provide at an open house event. Also included with this notice is the plan sheet for the proposed neighborhood mini traffic circle option at the All Way Stop intersection of Elmwood Drive and Woodlawn Avenue. In lieu of a public open house, the City is still able to answer your questions and discuss the project. City staff is available to answer questions via phone or e-mail. To contact staff via phone, please call 616-940-4817 or if would like to communicate questions via e-mail, please feel free to contact the following EGR staff members:

Doug La Fave: dlfave@eastgr.org
Brian Bigorowski: bbigorowski@eastgr.org
Dave Johnson: djohnson@eastgr.org

Enclosed with this informational notice is a project ballot/comment card provided to all residents within 500 feet from either direction or the Elmwood Woodlawn intersection. Please complete the card and e-mail a photo of it back to one of the staff members noted above, drop it off in the EGR drop box (main entrance vestibule at the Community Center/City Hall) or mail it back to the City:

City of East Grand Rapids
DPW Admin/Engineering
750 Lakeside Drive
East Grand Rapids, MI 49506

Please complete and return the project ballot/comment card by 5pm on April 13, 2020. All project ballot/comment cards will be included with materials to the City Commission for their potential consideration at the April 20, 2020 meeting. Please only send one card per address/household only. Due to the evolving COVID-19 pandemic, the April 20, 2020 meeting may be cancelled or postponed. All
Project background and information:

In recent years the City of East Grand Rapids has conducted several traffic engineering studies with respect to reported concerns of speeding and disobeying stop signs on Elmwood Drive between Lake Drive and adjacent to Woodlawn Avenue. A summary of the studies is noted below:

- Elmwood Drive carries approximately 2,300 vehicles traveling east and west-bound on a weekday.
- The 85th percentile of vehicle speeds noted for each study for both directions of traffic on Elmwood from 2017 were, 25mph/27mph and in 2018 were 26mph/27mph.
- No reported accident crashes have occurred in the past five years on this street segment.
- 10 citations have been issued for disobeying stop signs in the past five years at the All-Way stop signed intersection at Elmwood Drive and Woodlawn Avenue.

**Speeding:**
The traffic engineering industry standard utilized in setting the regulatory speed limit for a street uses the “85th percentile speed”. The 85th percentile speed is defined as, “the speed at or below which 85 percent of all vehicles are observed to travel under free-flowing conditions past a monitored point.” Another way to consider this is the speed at which only 15% of traffic violate on average. Traffic Engineers use the 85th percentile speed as a standard to set the speed limit at a safe speed, minimizing crashes and promoting uniform traffic flow along a corridor.

The speeds studies conducted from 2017 and 2018 demonstrate that 85th percentile of vehicles are traveling at or within the conservative exceedance range allowance of 5mph over the set regulated speed, which is 25 mph. The exceedance range of the set regulated speed can range on the conservative end as noted at a 5 mph and upwards to 7-8 mph.

**Intersection Traffic Control Devices/Signs:**
The three-legged intersection of Elmwood Drive and Woodlawn Avenue is currently controlled with All-Way stop signs. This traffic control placement is not in accordance with appropriate traffic engineering standards. All-Way stop sign configurations should be placed when there are relatively equal volumes of traffic from the intersecting streets. Elmwood Drive averages 2,300 vehicles per day while Woodlawn Avenue averages 270 per day between Maplewood Drive and Elmwood Drive. Improperly placed All-Way stop configurations have a low adherence to stop signs placed on the dominant street segment, in this case east and west-bound Elmwood Drive. The appropriate traffic control configuration should be stop/yield signs for at north-bound Woodlawn Avenue while there should be no stop signs for east and west bound Elmwood or there can be a street configuration design alternative consideration.

City staff and traffic/civil engineering consultants have looked at and provided for an alternative for the construction of a neighborhood mini traffic circle in lieu of the status quo or consideration to change signage.

A neighborhood mini traffic circle is a small circular, raised island placed in the center of a residential intersection to mitigate improper use of All-Way stops with the added benefit of lowering vehicle speeds on a street segment. Unlike large roundabouts, traffic mini-circles focus more on controlling right of way and vehicle speeds and are not designed to handle higher traffic volumes.

**Applications:**
- Mini traffic circles are applied on local or collector streets (that experience speeding and/or a history of collisions)
- On two-lane collector streets, traffic mini-circles are typically applied when average daily traffic (ADT) is less than 5,000.
- Serve as an alternative for signalization or stop signs in a low volume, neighborhood context.
Placement and Design Guidance:
- Installed at intersections and should be no less than 600 feet apart to maintain a reasonable speed throughout the street.
- Each approach to the traffic circle should be yield controlled.
- The center islands may be landscaped. The City of East Grand Rapids has a right-of-way landscaping policy.

Benefits:
- Reduces vehicular speeds and potential for crashes.
- Eliminates possibility of vehicle head-on collisions.
- Provides opportunities for aesthetic landscaping and storm water infiltration.
- Improves the pedestrian and bicycling environment.
- Facilitates safer bicycle movements through residential intersections.

Disadvantages:
- Can be confusing for some drivers if they are unfamiliar with circular intersections.

Pictures of Neighborhood mini traffic circles below:

If there are any questions, comments or concerns, please feel free to contact the Department of Public Works at 616-940-4817.

Thank you for your patience and understanding during these unprecedented times.

Respectfully,

East Grand Rapids Department of Public Works
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES ☑

NO ☐

COMMENTS: It might stop speeding or running through the stop sign.

NAME: Kathy Barnett

ADDRESS: 2722 Elmwood Drive SE

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES ☑

NO ☐

COMMENTS:

NAME: Don't Carrie Caverly

ADDRESS: 2781 Elmwood
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES ☑
NO ☐

COMMENTS:

NAME: [Signature]
ADDRESS: 254 Elmhurst Dr. S

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES ☑
NO ☐

COMMENTS: It will be a lovely addition to the neighborhood & keep drivers from running the stop sign.

NAME: Richard Peschke & Katie Craig
ADDRESS: 2805 Elmwood
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A
MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES ☑
NO ☐

COMMENTS:

____________________________________

____________________________________

NAME:  Javett & Jessica Fitnich
ADDRESS:  2830 Elmwood Dr. SE

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A
MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES ☒
NO ☐

COMMENTS:

____________________________________

____________________________________

NAME:  Ryan & Amber Booth
ADDRESS:  2904 Elmwood Dr. SE
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?
Check Box

YES ☒
NO ☐

COMMENTS: Mini Traffic Circle should slow down Elmwood traffic yet not force it to stop.

NAME: Frederick + Kathleen Burkhardt
ADDRESS: 1435 Woodlawn Ave SE, EGR

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?
Check Box

YES ☐
NO ☒

COMMENTS: Drivers run the stop sign on Elmwood constantly, so maybe this would slow drivers down, especially when turning left onto Woodlawn. I hope there would be sidewalks.

NAME: Shelley + Jim Seals
ADDRESS: 1421 Woodlawn
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A
MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES

NO

Looking beyond space and aesthetics

COMMENTS:

Mini circle and avoidance would prevent redo of
Woodlawn and between 6th and 7th.
Read piece of Woodlawn Ave. Traffic signal intensity vital for
corridor during construction.

NAME: 

ADDRESS: 1450 Woodlawn Ave, SE, 207

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A
MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES

NO

Circle not necessary. Would be

an eyesore to a nice street.

NAME: Murphy

ADDRESS: 2741 Elmwood
ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES  

NO  

COMMENTS:

NAME:  

ADDRESS:  

---

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES

NO

Neutral

COMMENTS:  

The curve appears to be too mild straight to slow traffic down, hope it actually does help with excessive speeds on Elmwood. 🙄

NAME:  

ADDRESS:  

---
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS: Love it!

NAME: Biddle Brush Trust (Jeff and Emily Riddle)

ADDRESS: 2755 Elmwood Dr.
ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES  NO

COMMENTS: Love it!

NAME: Jeff & Emily Bible
ADDRESS: 1409 Woodlawn Dr
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A
MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS:  BUT ONLY IF ELMWOOD IS PAVED TO

WOODBRAVE ALONE WITH ENTRANCE TO WOODLAWN GOING SOUTH

NAME:  CAROL A. AMBROSE

ADDRESS:  1430 WOODLAWN AVE. SE
ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES ☒

NO ☐

COMMENTS:

______________________________

NAME: Randall Meilenberg

ADDRESS: 2825 Maplewood Dr SE 49806

---

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES ☐

NO ☐

COMMENTS:

______________________________

NAME: Pam St. Clair

ADDRESS: 2809 Elmwood Dr SE
Please return one card only per household

Elmwood Drive Mini Traffic Circle:
Do you support the alternative design change to construct a Mini Traffic Circle at Elmwood Drive and Woodlawn Avenue?

Check Box

Yes ☒

No ☐

Comments: Seems like reasonable solution to slow vehicles down proceeding east and west on Elmwood.

Name: [Signature]

Address: 2833 Elmwood Drive SE, EGR, MI.

- Please return one card only per household

Elmwood Drive Mini Traffic Circle:
Do you support the alternative design change to construct a Mini Traffic Circle at Elmwood Drive and Woodlawn Avenue?

Check Box

Yes ☒

No ☐

Comments: A little concerned this will cause more traffic on Sherwood.

Name: [Signature]

Address: 2847 Elmwood Dr. S.E.
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES
NO

COMMENTS:

________________________

NAME: Moore
ADDRESS: 2763 Elmwood Dr SE

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT A MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOODLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES
NO

COMMENTS: We will support this for the sake of our neighbors, but do not feel this adequately solves the problem.

NAME: Beth & Jeff Hugli
ADDRESS: 2840 Elmwood
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

ELMWOOD DRIVE MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CHANGE TO CONSTRUCT MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLE AT ELMWOOD DRIVE AND WOOLAWN AVENUE?

Check Box

YES [ ]

NO [ ]

COMMENTS: Amazing idea!

NAME: MARC SINGER
ADDRESS: 2855 ELMWOOD DR SE
MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Commissioners  
FROM: Doug La Fave, Interim City Manager  
DATE: April 27, 2020  
RE: Neighborhood Mini-Traffic Circles-Argentina Drive at Pinecrest Avenue and San Lucia Drive

Action Requested: That the City Commission consider neighborhood mini-traffic circles on Argentina Drive at Pinecrest Avenue and San Lucia Drive.

Background: The City of East Grand Rapids evaluates the pavement condition rating (Paser) of all City streets to prioritize street project funding based on asset management principles in alignment with capital improvement planning. Argentina Drive between Pinecrest Avenue and Plymouth Road is currently rated between a Paser 2 and 3 (poor condition) which prioritizes this street segment as a candidate for grind and resurfacing project funding for this spring. As part of the project planning process, the City completes or reviews utility assessments as well as other variables including, but not limited to, traffic engineering studies, accident history and reported resident concerns. The ideal time to address any potential changes to a street segment is during a planned street project.

When a design feature change is initiated by the City based off of response to complaints, traffic engineering studies, etc. the City sends notices to residents for an open house. Notices are sent within 500 feet of an intersection or if the change is impacting and entire street segment to the entire street segment. With respect to Argentina Drive, both mailing notifications applied. At an open house City staff and consultants share background information, dialogue with attendees and answer questions. Comment cards/ballots are received at the open house or can be returned to the City by a set deadline. Project background, open house feedback and comment cards/ballots are then provided to the City Commission for a courtesy public hearing and consideration at a City Commission Meeting. Due to COVID-19 and associated restrictions on meetings/gatherings the City, like many other organizations, has had to adapt or modify operations to continue to serve the community during this time. In lieu of an open house the City provided a detailed informational document with a comment card/ballot to share the same type of information that would typically be covered at an open house and invited residents to contact staff to ask questions, provide comment, etc. to cover those components of an open house. The same comment card/ballot was provided with a deadline. This approach was intended to provide the same information and allow for questions and feedback but in a different format.

Additionally the City mailed a follow up document that provided themes of questions, comments, etc. along with answers on April 24. On April 28 the City also held a virtual meeting to answer questions for residents.

Project background and information:

In recent years the City of East Grand Rapids has conducted several traffic engineering studies with respect to traffic safety on Argentina Drive between Breton Road and Plymouth Road based on reported resident concerns. A summary of the studies is noted below:
• Argentina Drive carries approximately 700-800 vehicles on a weekday, with approximately 133-135 of those vehicles’ trips occurring during both the morning and afternoon peak hours.
• The 85th percentile of vehicle speeds noted for each study for both directions of traffic from 2014-2019 are: 25 mph/26 mph, 25 mph/28 mph, 27 mph/27 mph, 27 mph/27 mph, 31 mph/30 mph, 30 mph/31 mph, 31 mph/28 mph.
• No reported accident crashes have occurred in the past five years on this street segment.

Speeding:

The traffic engineering industry standard utilized in setting the regulatory speed limit for a street uses the “85th percentile speed”. The 85th percentile speed is defined as, “the speed at or below which 85 percent of all vehicles are observed to travel under free-flowing conditions past a monitored point.” Another way to consider this is the speed at which only 15% of traffic violate on average. Traffic Engineers use the 85th percentile speed as a standard to set the speed limit at a safe speed, minimizing crashes and promoting uniform traffic flow along a corridor.

The speeds studies conducted from 2014-2019 at various locations along Argentina Drive indicate that the 85th percentile of vehicles are traveling within the conservative exceedance range allowance of 5 mph over the set regulated speed, which is 25 mph. The exceedance range of the set regulated speed can range on the conservative end as noted at a 5 mph and upwards to 7-8 mph.

Intersection Traffic Control Devices/Signs:

The four-legged intersection of Argentina Drive/San Lucia Drive is currently controlled with All-Way stop signs. This traffic control placement is not in accordance with appropriate traffic engineering standards. All-Way stop sign configurations should be placed when there are relatively equal volumes of traffic from the intersecting streets. Argentina averages 700-800 vehicles per day while San Lucia averages 400 vehicles per day north of Argentina and only 55 vehicles per day south of Argentina. Improperly placed All-Way stop configurations have a low adherence to stop signs placed on the dominant street segment, in this case east and west bound Argentina. This notes that the appropriate traffic control configuration should be stop/yield signs for north and south bound San Lucia while there should be no stop signs for east and west bound Argentina or a street configuration design alternative.

In planning for the Argentina Drive street construction project City staff recognized that 85th percentile of traffic has trended up to the conservative exceedance range allowance of 5 mph at 30 mph and above at 31 mph as well as the traffic control All Way signage noted above at San Lucia. In looking at a combined approach for traffic calming and intersection issue, City staff and traffic/civil engineering consultants propose that consideration be given regarding construction of two neighborhood mini traffic circles as an alternate option to the status quo on Argentina Avenue.

The City sent out 140 notice/information documents and comment cards/ballots to residents on Argentina Avenue between Breton Road and Plymouth Road and within 500 feet of the Pinecrest Avenue and San Lucia Drive intersection in reference consideration of mini traffic circles for traffic calming and to address the intersection All-Way location compared to the alternative of leaving existing conditions in place for the street resurfacing project this spring. The received ballot responses are as follows:

• Yes: 33
• No: 51 (3 also came from outside the notice area)
• Neutral: 2
• No Response: 54

It is the established practice of the City to count “no responses” as “no” votes. Without the “neutral response” the total ballot count would be 33 yes and 105 no.

Several residents inquired about recent Department of Public Safety activities on Argentina. A five-year activity report history has been provided. All other comments, questions or correspondence has been included with packet materials.
April 10, 2020

Doug La Fave  
City of East Grand Rapids  
750 Lakeside Drive, SE  
East Grand Rapids, MI 49506

Re: Argentina Drive Traffic Circle Review

Dear Doug,

The City of East Grand Rapids is in the process of resurfacing Argentina Drive between Pinecrest Avenue and Plymouth Road. As part of the project planning process the city collected speed data, crash history, and reported resident concerns. Residents have expressed concerns regarding vehicle speeds and safety. As a result, the city has elected to consider the installation of traffic calming measures as part of the project.

Two traffic circles have been proposed along Argentina Drive for inclusion with the project as traffic calming measures—one at Pinecrest Avenue and one at San Lucia Drive. An informational letter, dated March 18, 2020, detailing prior data collection, analysis, public feedback, industry standard practices, and treatment suggestions was mailed out to residents. Progressive AE has been asked to further review the appropriateness of installing traffic circles at the proposed locations. Additionally, Halverson Engineering, LLC, has been asked to provide insight on the design considerations for the proposed traffic circles. This letter incorporates both reviews with a summary of findings.

**DESIGN AND ENGINEERING:**

Construction plans designed for the traffic circles located at Argentina Drive/San Lucia Drive and Argentina Drive/Pinecrest Avenue were a result of an iterative process that analyzed and considered a number of factors: the existing intersection alignments in the corridor, the right-of-way widths, proposed geometry, existing utility locations and possible conflicts, and overall construction costs.

Early during the preliminary project development, possible locations for incorporating traffic circles along the corridor were identified that had streets that intersected each other perpendicularly and generally had a straight horizontal alignment projecting through the intersection. Along this corridor, there are multiple offset intersections with jogs that are not candidates for this type of treatment. The intersections of Argentina Drive/San Lucia Drive and Argentina Drive/Pinecrest Avenue meet these criteria.

Consideration in the design process was given to incorporating traffic calming concepts that could be utilized and implemented within the existing right-of-way width (66 feet). This is a standard right-of-way width for many local streets in an urban area, but it is does not allow for significant modifications to existing intersections without the acquisition of additional right-of-way from adjacent property owners. The use of traffic circles could be accomplished within the current right-of-way constraints.

Collaboratively, Progressive AE developed conceptual overlays for the proposed traffic circles at the intersection of Argentina Drive/San Lucia Drive and Argentina Drive/Pinecrest Avenue that would accommodate the movements of emergency response vehicles and refuse services (design vehicles). Generally, this would result in leaving an approximately 20-foot width for the circulating roadway which can include the gutter pan.
The traffic circles were also evaluated in these locations for suitability regarding storm water runoff/drainage and conflicts with existing utilities such as sanitary sewer, storm sewer, and watermain. A detailed topographic survey of each of the intersections was conducted to identify all existing conditions. Proposed designs do not create any conflict with existing utilities: storm manholes, sanitary sewer manholes, and water valves. Final designed grades in the traffic circles allow for positive drainage from the center of the island to the existing curb and gutter and for stormwater collection into the existing storm sewer network. Careful consideration was given during the design process to developing a reasonable, cost effective treatment that had the ability to better operate the Argentina Drive and San Lucía Drive intersection and provide traffic calming within the corridor.

**TRAFFIC CIRCLE EFFECTIVENESS:**
According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), traffic circles impact traffic speeds between 5 mph and 13 mph within 200 feet of the intersection, and between 1 mph and 6 mph upstream and downstream of the intersection. Furthermore, traffic circles have the most impact when used in a series. It should be noted that traffic circles are not typically appropriate for offset intersections.

**TRAFFIC CIRCLE SPACING:**
As mentioned above, traffic circles are most effective when used in a series. This encourages vehicles to travel at more uniform speeds of a level (closer to 25 mph) that can comfortably navigate an intersection with a traffic circle. For this project, the area of interest for traffic calming along Argentina Drive stretches from Plymouth Avenue on the west and Breton Road on the east. This segment is approximately ¾ of a mile long.

Generally, traffic circles are to be spaced a minimum of 600 feet apart—about two city blocks. Too many and/or too closely spaced traffic circles could have a negative effect on quality of life for residents. The proposed traffic circles at San Lucia Drive and Pinecrest Avenue are approximately 1400 feet apart.

The proposed spacing is compliant with industry standard practices and is appropriately located within the corridor to encourage positive driver behavior over the entire stretch of road between the major intersections of Plymouth Avenue and Breton Road. Additionally, San Lucia Drive and Pinecrest Avenue traffic will benefit from the calming effects of the traffic circles, especially Pinecrest Avenue as it serves as a connection between Lake Drive and Hall Street.

**FUTURE STEPS:**
The city will have a public meeting with a public hearing on April 20, 2020. East Grand Rapids typically hosts an open house for residents with staff and consultants to learn about and view project plans. Given the COVID-19 pandemic, additional and alternative engagement strategies are being explored. More information will be provided when it is available.

Additionally, given the limited resources and scope for this pavement surface restoration project, additional traffic calming treatments can be considered in the future. Data collection after installation of the traffic circles will be needed to inform need, treatments, and location.

**SUMMARY:**
In closing, the design process, treatment selection, and proposed locations are appropriate measures given the constraints and objectives of the project. This project will restore a good surface to Argentina Drive, improve operations at two intersections, and calm traffic. Additional communication and public feedback are expected as part of the process. Future consideration of additional traffic calming measures can be considered as necessary.

Sincerely,

Christopher E. Zull, PE
Transportation Practice Leader

Jarid Halverson, PE
Halverson Engineering, LLC
NOTICE

March 18, 2020

Dear Resident:

The City of East Grand Rapids evaluates the pavement condition rating (Paser) of all City streets to prioritize street project funding based on asset management principles in alignment with capital improvement planning. Argentina Drive between Pinecrest Avenue and Plymouth Road is currently rated between a Paser 2 and 3 (poor condition) which prioritizes this street segment as a candidate for grind and resurfacing project funding for this spring. As part of the project planning process, the City completes or reviews utility assessments as well as other variables including, but not limited to, traffic engineering studies, accident history and reported resident concerns. The ideal time to address any potential changes to a street segment is during a planned street project.

Normal protocol for the City is to host an open house for residents along a street to meet with staff and consultants to learn about and view plans as well as to ask questions in advance of City Commission consideration. Due to the restrictions in place with respect to the COVID-19 pandemic the City is not able to host a large public open house gathering at this time. With this change, this notice sent to you has been intentionally detailed to provide all information that would normally be provide at an open house event. Also included with this notice is the plan sheet for the proposed neighborhood mini traffic circle options. In lieu of a public open house, the City is still able to answer your questions and discuss the project. The City is open to in-person visits by appointment. Please call 616-940-4817 to meet with staff. If you would like to communicate questions via e-mail, please feel free to contact the following EGR staff members:

Doug La Fave: dlafave@eastgr.org
Brian Bigorowski: bbigorowski@eastgr.org
Dave Johnson: djohnson@eastgr.org

Enclosed with this informational notice is a project ballot/comment card provided to all residents within the impacted stretch of Argentina Drive. Please complete the card and e-mail a photo of it back to one of the staff members noted above, drop it off in the EGR drop box (main entrance vestibule at the Community Center/City Hall) or mail it back to the City:

City of East Grand Rapids
DPW Admin/Engineering
750 Lakeside Drive
East Grand Rapids, MI 49506

Please complete and return the project ballot/comment card by April 10, 2020. All project ballot/comment cards will be included with materials to the City Commission for their consideration at the April 20, 2020 meeting. Please only send one card per address/household only. Due to the evolving COVID-19 pandemic, the April 20, 2020 meeting may be cancelled or postponed. All public meeting agendas and materials are available via the City website at: https://www.eastgr.org/111/Agendas-Minutes
Project background and information:

In recent years the City of East Grand Rapids has conducted several traffic engineering studies with respect to traffic safety on Argentina Drive between Breton Road and Plymouth Road based on reported resident concerns. A summary of the studies is noted below:

- Argentina Drive carries approximately 700-800 vehicles on a weekday, with approximately 133-135 of those vehicles’ trips occurring during both the morning and afternoon peak hours.
- The 85th percentile of vehicle speeds noted for each study for both directions of traffic from 2014-2019 are: 25 mph/26 mph, 25 mph/28 mph, 27 mph/27 mph, 27 mph/27 mph, 31 mph/30 mph, 30 mph/31 mph, 31 mph/28 mph.
- No reported accident crashes have occurred in the past five years on this street segment.

The traffic engineering industry standard utilized in setting the regulatory speed limit for a street uses the “85th percentile speed”. The 85th percentile speed is defined as, “the speed at or below which 85 percent of all vehicles are observed to travel under free-flowing conditions past a monitored point.” Another way to consider this is the speed at which only 15% of traffic violate on average. Traffic Engineers use the 85th percentile speed as a standard to set the speed limit at a safe speed, minimizing crashes and promoting uniform traffic flow along a corridor.

The speeds studies conducted from 2014-2019 at various locations along Argentina Drive indicate that the 85th percentile of vehicles are traveling within the conservative exceedance range allowance of 5mph over the set regulated speed, which is 25 mph. The exceedance range of the set regulated speed can range on the conservative end as noted at a 5mph and upwards to 7-8mph.

The four-legged intersection of Argentina Drive/San Lucia Drive is currently controlled with All-Way stop signs. This traffic control placement is not in accordance with appropriate traffic engineering standards. All-Way stop sign configurations should be placed when there are relatively equal volumes of traffic from the intersecting streets. Argentina averages 700-800 vehicles per day while San Lucia averages 400 vehicles per day north of Argentina and only 55 vehicles per day south of Argentina. This notes that the appropriate traffic control configuration should be stop/yield signs for north and south bound San Lucia while there should be no stop signs for east and west bound Argentina or a street configuration design alternative.

In planning for the Argentina Drive street construction project City staff recognized that 85th percentile of traffic has trended up to the conservative exceedance range allowance of 5mph at 30 and above at 31 mph as well as the traffic control All Way signage noted above. In looking at a combined approach for traffic calming and intersection issue, City staff and traffic/civil engineering consultants propose the construction of two neighborhood mini traffic circles as an alternate option to the status quo on Argentina Avenue.

A neighborhood mini traffic circle is a small circular, raised island placed in the center of a residential intersection to mitigate vehicle speeds. Unlike large roundabouts, traffic mini-circles focus more on controlling vehicle speeds and are not designed to handle higher traffic volumes.

Applications:
- Mini traffic circles are applied on local or collector streets (that experience speeding and/or a history of collisions)
- On two-lane collector streets, traffic mini-circles are typically applied when average daily traffic (ADT) is less than 5,000.
- Serve as an alternative for signalization or stop signs in a low volume, neighborhood context.
- At All-Way stops that are incorrectly placed to slow traffic.

Placement and Design Guidance:
- Installed at intersections and should be no less than 600 feet apart to maintain a reasonable speed throughout the street.
- Each approach to the traffic circle should be yield controlled.
The center islands may be landscaped. The City of East Grand Rapids has a right-of-way landscaping policy.

Benefits:
- Reduces vehicular speeds and potential for crashes.
- Eliminates possibility of vehicle head-on collisions.
- Provides opportunities for aesthetic landscaping and storm water infiltration.
- Improves the pedestrian and bicycling environment.
- Facilitates safer bicycle movements through residential intersections.

Disadvantages:
- Can be confusing for some drivers if they are unfamiliar with circular intersections.

Pictures of Neighborhood mini traffic circles below:

If there are any questions, comments or concerns, please feel free to contact the Department of Public Works at 616-940-4817.

Thank you for your patience and understanding during these unprecedented times.

Respectfully,

East Grand Rapids Department of Public Works
April 23, 2020

Dear East Grand Rapids Resident(s):

The City sent a notice/informational document dated March 18, 2020 to residents on Argentina between Breton and Plymouth and direct cross-street sections of San Lucia and Pinecrest regarding a potential design feature optional change for two neighborhood mini traffic circles. Notifications for this type of project are sent to residents that reside on the street directly impacted or if an intersection is involved within 500 feet of all directions. In this instance because both applied, the mailer went to all residents who reside on Argentina and within 500 feet of the intersections in question, San Lucia and Pinecrest. The purpose of the notice/informational document was to provide information that would have otherwise been discussed or shared at an informational open house. Due to the COVID-19 situation the City was and currently is not able to have traditional meetings and public engagement/interaction per Executive Orders 2020-21 (former) and 2020-42 (current) from the State of Michigan. The notice/informational document afforded a similar path forward but in a modified way as essential operations adapt. Information was provided as noted above via mail service as well as opportunities to engage City staff to ask questions and provide feedback. All questions from residents have been answered or information has been provided to date. Further, it was noted that as part of the process (normal procedure), consideration by the City Commission would take place at a public meeting with public comment. This matter is scheduled for consideration by the City Commission at the May 4, 2020 City Commission meeting. Submitted correspondence and all materials are always made available via the City website the week before a City Commission meeting. The target date for materials to be available would be April 29, 2020. The link to public meeting information is: https://www.eastgr.org/111/Agendas-Minutes

In advance of the May 4 City Commission meeting the City will be hosting a virtual Zoom meeting to further provide opportunity for any additional questions etc. with City staff as well as traffic and civil engineering consultants. The virtual Zoom meeting is scheduled for April 28 at 10:00am. The meeting invitation will be posted to story content on the City homepage. The link will be posted at approximately 9:45am but the meeting will not commence until 10:00am. The City recommends logging in 10-15 minutes prior to the meeting to allow time to install applications (if necessary), join the meeting, adjust volume settings, etc. You may need to update your computer browser or your app to make everything work correctly. Please allow enough time. Please make sure you are in a quiet area with minimal background noise (children, dogs, TV). A set of headphones with microphone may help but are not necessary.

Street construction is essential critical infrastructure per Executive Order 2020-42 and the City of East Grand Rapids is abiding by the Executive Order and following with construction as the State of Michigan and others municipalities are. Most street construction projects did not warrant additional review and concept consideration. Argentina and a stretch of Elmwood did warrant providing an alternative design concept due to a history of complaints. It is not the intent of the City to proceed with an alternative design if it is not desired by residents who reside on or adjacent to the streets
impacted. It is important to note that reaching out to residents for feedback does not mean that the alternative design changes will be approved, but that feedback from residents is desired. Generally feedback from residents is key in determining whether any alternative design change consideration may approved by the City Commission or not.

Street maintenance and construction activities have been deemed critical infrastructure essential activities by the State and therefore these planned activities will continue as the City complies with relevant Executive Orders.

After receipt of questions, comments and concerns by the deadline, City staff has categorized what has been submitted and this follow up communication is being provided to residents so questions, comments and concerns along with answers and additional information is made available to residents. Most of the questions and comments received were from “no” responses. Most of the “yes” responses did not have questions, but did have a few comments which are listed at the at the end of this communication. Included with this follow up communication is the original notice so that background can be referenced.

Argentina-neighborhood mini-traffic circles

Resident Feedback-Theme 1: Children and Pedestrians

- Unsafe for all pedestrians.
- Difficult for children navigate because they don't know when drivers will stop.
- Children will get hurt.
- Will cause risks for those on bikes, scooters and for school children and dogs.
- Unsafe for blind pedestrians.
- Difficult and dangerous for bike riders.
- More people will drive their children to school because traffic circles are unsafe.
- Who has the right-of-way – bikers or cars?

Response-Information:

According to professional traffic safety organizations and traffic engineering studies/literature traffic circles/roundabouts improve vehicular and pedestrian/bicycle safety. The excerpt from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) with respect to safety for vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists is pasted in text below. The direct link to this information and more is also available at: https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/intersection/innovative/roundabouts/

Roundabouts can provide lasting benefits and value in many ways. They are often safer, more efficient, less costly and more aesthetically appealing than conventional intersection designs. Furthermore, roundabouts are an excellent choice to complement other transportation objectives – including Complete Streets, multimodal networks, and corridor access management – without compromising the ability to keep people and freight moving through our towns, cities and regions, and across the Nation. The FHWA Office of Safety identified roundabouts as a Proven Safety Countermeasure because of their ability to substantially reduce the types of crashes that result in injury or loss of life. Roundabouts are designed to improve safety for all users, including pedestrians and bicyclists.

Most significantly, roundabouts REDUCE the types of crashes where people are seriously hurt or killed by 78-82% when compared to conventional stop-controlled and signalized intersections, per the AASHTO Highway Safety Manual.
By reducing the number and severity of conflict points, and because of the lower speeds of vehicles moving through the intersection, roundabouts are a significantly safer type of intersection. The diagram below excerpted from *Roundabouts: An Informational Guide, Second Edition* (published as NCHRP Report 672) illustrates the difference in conflict points between a conventional, four-legged intersection and an equivalent single lane roundabout. There are 32 conflict points associated with a conventional intersection – 8 merging (or joining), 8 diverging (or separating) and 16 crossing. In contrast, there are only 8 total conflict points at an equivalent roundabout – 4 merging and 4 diverging. Not only are conflict points halved with the roundabout, the type of conflicts that remain are the same-direction variety, which result in substantially less severity, and as a result, less likelihood of injury. The reduction of both the total number of conflict points and their severity is also true for pedestrians, also shown in diagrams excerpted from the Guide.

Bicycle interaction with mini-traffic circles as provided for by FHWA, excerpt pasted below. The direct link to this information and more is also available at: [https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/intersection/innovative/roundabouts/fhwasa10007/fhwasa10007.pdf](https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/intersection/innovative/roundabouts/fhwasa10007/fhwasa10007.pdf)

Since typical on-road bicycle travel speeds are approximately 12 to 20 mph (20 to 30 km/h), the speeds of vehicles approaching and traveling through mini-roundabouts are similar to those of bicyclists. Bicyclists are encouraged to navigate through a mini-roundabout as if they were a vehicle. Where bicycle lanes are provided on the approaches to a mini-roundabout, they should be terminated to alert drivers and bicyclists of the need for bicyclists to merge into traffic.

Some additional resources for information pertaining to mini-traffic circles and pedestrian/bicycle safety include but are not limited to:

- FHWA/Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS): This program and guide is a collaboration that includes the Federal Highway Administration, Institute of Transportation Engineers and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center amongst others: [http://guide.saferoutesinfo.org/engineering/neighborhood_traffic_circles.cfm](http://guide.saferoutesinfo.org/engineering/neighborhood_traffic_circles.cfm)

**Resident Feedback-Theme 2: Drivers-Motorists**

- Drivers don't know how to drive in traffic circles.
- Drivers will speed through a traffic circle.
- Teens will not adjust speed.
- Drivers will be confused.
- Concern that drivers will go thru & over the circle at night.
- Concerned about teens doing night lap races.

**Response-Information:**

Traffic circle locations must have signs placed in accordance with the Michigan Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD). Signs are placed to notify motorists that they are approaching/entering a mini-traffic circle and how to navigate it with R1-2 (Yield), with an R6-5P (Traffic Circle Circulation). R4-7 (Keep Right) signs are located in the mini traffic circle for entering traffic to shift right. If/when a change occurs W23-2 (New Traffic Pattern Ahead) signs with flags are typically placed to provide a warning and/or reminder to motorists. See signs note below:
Resident Feedback-Theme 3: All-Way Stop

- Safer.
- Would slow traffic.
- More effective for traffic calming.
- Less expensive.

Response-Information:

As was noted in the initial notice/information piece, stop signs are not to be used to slow traffic. All-way stop configurations require that traffic volumes are generally equal from both east-west and north-south approaches. The most common complaint received for incorrectly placed stop sign locations is that motorists don’t come to a complete stop and disregard it. That typically follows with requests to law enforcement for directed patrols. Traffic engineering experts, literature and studies advise/show that motorists behave this way primarily on the dominant volume direction because they are conditioned and know that there is not likely to be traffic from the intersecting direction. The disregard for stop signs is not in defiance of the stop signs themselves, it’s because they are being improperly utilized.

Signs are significantly less expensive than street alteration changes or modifications. The City does not place new signs at locations unless they are warranted in accordance with traffic engineering standards.

Please reference feedback theme 1 above regarding safety above regarding study data and conflict points.

Additional resources related to the use of stop signs and appropriate placements are available at by visiting the following links:


Regarding the optional consideration, it was noted that there is no accident history in the past five years, so though neighborhood mini-traffic circles are safe and not dangerous, it is certainly also true that the existing configuration on Argentina from a report/data perspective is not noted as unsafe either.
Resident Feedback-Theme 4: Expense

- What are the anticipated costs?
- Waste of resources.
- Spend money on road resurfacing.
- Misuse of road funds.
- Fix potholes instead.

Response-Information:

The total approved allocation for mill and overlay street construction projects is $1,505,100. The low qualified bids were favorable from February totaling $1,233,979. Each mini traffic circle costs approximately $30,000 or 2% of the total.

The City does routinely fill/repair potholes and this operation is has not been adjusted to in regards to capital projects.

Other items noted are important/welcomed comments that are received and are provided to elected officials.

Resident Feedback-Theme 5: Winter

- Where will snow be put by snowplows?
- It will create slippery curves in the winter.

Response-Information:

Snowplows plow snow towards the outer direction of roadways or edge of the road, the same as a straight segment of roadway.

Existing storm sewer catch basins remain in place for drainage and operational maintenance policies and treatment would remain in place.

Resident Feedback-Theme 6: Parking

- Do not want to lose parking on north side of Argentina.
- To slow traffic, restore parking on south side of Argentina.

Response-Information:

No parking changes are included with the design change consideration. Neighborhood mini traffic circles are placed into the existing intersection so there no changes other than signage and the mini traffic circle in the center.

Parking change/alterations can be requested through the parking petition request policy. Please contact DPW Administration/Engineering at 616-940-4817.

Resident Feedback: Lighting

- Does not want additional streetlight to illuminate circle.
- Concern about headlight beams coming through windows.
Response-Information:

No street lighting changes were or are proposed.

No elevation changes are proposed at the intersections noted. Only the center of the intersection would potentially change with the mini traffic circle placed in the existing intersection. Currently headlight impact can be from all directions from turning movements.

Resident Feedback: Other (with response-information provide if possible-bold)

- Not a good location. Locations were selected based on multiple variables to address the conservative exceedance range allowance of 5mph over the regulated speed as well as to attempt to address the all-way stop that is not in accordance with traffic engineering standards.
- No reported accidents.
- Not necessary
- Location is too narrow
- Will large vehicles (school buses, lawn service trucks with trailers, construction vehicles) be able to navigate? The traffic circles were designed with fire trucks, box trucks, etc. in mind. The rolled curb allows for additional spacing for larger vehicles to maneuver.
- Will be an eyesore in the neighborhood.
- Signage is distracting.
- Important thru street for emergency vehicles.
- Increase police enforcement instead. There is documented Public Safety activity on Argentina and enforcement is a component of traffic safety. Enforcement has temporary impacts with respect to motorist behaviors while design changes alter the physical environment for 24/7 impact.
- Ridiculous to decide during COVID 19, Can't discuss with neighbors, Not a high priority and should be deferred. This is understood and respected. Street construction was planned for spring and is noted as essential infrastructure per Executive Order from the State of Michigan. Construction progress will continue to proceed, the difference being whether existing conditions stay the same with a new road surface or whether the alternative design options are approved in conjunction with the new road surface. Timing for any change has to be coordinated with construction. Certainly during planning for street projects the City did not know that the COVID-19 situation would occur. If City staff ignored the reported complaint history, studies and traffic control devises and did not provide an alternative option for consideration from the planning process some residents might also find that unacceptable. City staff that are required to report to serve the community are trying to do their best to serve the community. Making sure that all information is provided and resident feedback is solicited is important.
- Who will maintain the circle space? The City Parks and Recreation-grounds Maintenance Division per the City ROW landscaping/maintenance policy.
- Traffic calming welcome and needed.
- Will slow traffic.
- Supportive but landscaping is desired. The City Parks and Recreation-grounds Maintenance Division would plant and maintain per the City ROW landscaping/maintenance policy.
- Great idea.
- Traffic needs to be slowed down.
• Intersection would be safer.

If there are any questions, comments or concerns, please feel free to contact the Department of Public Works at 616-940-4817.

Thank you for your patience and understanding during these unprecedented times.

Respectfully,

East Grand Rapids Department of Public Works
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES  ☑

NO  ☐

COMMENTS:

Traffic calming measures are welcome & needed.

NAME:  Payton Stevens/Brittany Carpenter

ADDRESS:  965 Lakeside Dr. SE
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES     ☐
NO

COMMENTS:
A very strong no. We have lived here for 20
years and it is not a problem. Please do not waste
the city's money on this.

NAME:  Paul and Rosanna Maier
ADDRESS:  2035 Argentina
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES ☒

NO ☐

COMMENTS:

Traffic calming measures are welcome and needed.

NAME: Payton Stevens/Brittany Carpenter

ADDRESS: 965 Lakeside Dr. SE
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Laurel Stanley <lmstanley76@gmail.com>
Date: March 30, 2020 at 5:10:09 PM EDT
To: Doug LaFave <dlafave@eastgr.org>
Cc: David Johnson <djohnson@eastgr.org>, Brian Bigorowski <bbigorowski@eastgr.org>
Subject: Argentina Drive Traffic Circle

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

☐ YES
☐ NO

COMMENTS:

______________________________
I think it will slow traffic through this intersection.

NAME: Laurel Stanley

ADDRESS: 2612 Raintree Ave SE
Lynda Taylor

From: Brian Bigorowski
Sent: Monday, March 30, 2020 5:31 PM
To: Lynda Taylor
Subject: Fwd: Argentina Drive Traffic Circle

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Laurel Stanley <lmstanley76@gmail.com>
Date: March 30, 2020 at 5:10:09 PM EDT
To: Doug LaFave <dlafave@eastgr.org>
Cc: David Johnson <djjohnson@eastgr.org>, Brian Bigorowski <bbigorowski@eastgr.org>
Subject: Argentina Drive Traffic Circle

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

---

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES ☒
NO ☐

COMMENTS:

I think it will slow traffic through that intersection.

NAME: Laurel Stanley

ADDRESS: 1050 Pinecrest Ave SE
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS: It would be nice to have a tree planted in the traffic circle!

NAME: John & Charlotte Hilber

ADDRESS: 21164 Argentina Dr SE 58714

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS: Yes @ San Lucia. No @ Pinecrest unless I have more information.

NAME: Anna Nowak

ADDRESS: 1033 San Lucia Dr SE
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES ☑

NO ☐

COMMENTS:

______________________________

NAME:  Ted Barba

ADDRESS: 1955 Argentina Dr. S.E.

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES ☑

NO ☐

COMMENTS:

______________________________

NAME:  Mark & Sarah McKenna

ADDRESS: 2046 Argentina Dr. SE
NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES  ☐

NO  ☒

COMMENTS:

NAME:  J. Isherwood

ADDRESS:  2608 Argentina Dr. SE - GR 49506

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES  ☐

NO  ☒

COMMENTS:
Traffic circles are difficult for children walking to
and from school to navigate. They do not know when
drivers will stop. I have heard from parents near the
NAME:  Nancy Buth (George too)

ADDRESS:  942 San Lucia SE

Alexander and Cambridge/Alexander and
Page Alexander & Ciddings traffic circles that this is a problem. More parents are now driving their
children to school.
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES □
NO □

COMMENTS: I don't think people know how to drive in traffic circles - kids will get hurt.

NAME: R. D. Eeader
ADDRESS: 1026 San Lucas Dr SE

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES □
NO □

COMMENTS: Yes, if middle is nicely landscaped and the curvature is not too sharp.

NAME: RICK O' STRANDER
ADDRESS: 2224 Argentina Dr. SE
NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES ☐

NO ☐

COMMENTS: Great Idea ☑

NAME: Julie Riemenschneider

ADDRESS: 2256 Argentina Dr. SE

NAME: Margaret Bumshead

ADDRESS: 2310 Argentina Dr. SE
NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES [X]

NO [ ]

COMMENTS: The traffic that turns onto Argentina from Britton really needs to be slowed down.

NAME: Marvi Hazard

ADDRESS: 2334 Argentina Dr SE

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES [ ]

NO [ ]

COMMENTS: I had almost been "picked off" more than once while backing out of the Dr. Man

NAME: Janice Broder

ADDRESS: 1636 Plymouth Dr SE 1970S
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES □

NO □

COMMENTS:
All it will do is put an eyesore in the neighborhood. Traffic isn't that heavy.

NAME: Charles Kathleen Brown

ADDRESS: 925 Santa Barbara St.

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES □

NO □

COMMENTS: STRONGLY OPPOSE. WE HAVE 3 YOUNG KIDS AND CARS ALREADY SPEED.

NAME: Daniel Mercier

ADDRESS: 936 San Lucia Dr

MUCH SAFER.
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS: The signage is very
discriminating; traffic is not dense

NAME: Kim Smith

ADDRESS: 980 Plymouth

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS: No reported accident crashes

NAME: Mooney

ADDRESS: 919 San Lucia
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES [X]

NO [ ]

COMMENTS: That intersection would be much safer with a traffic circle. People speed down Argentina endangering children.

NAME: Shannon Armstrong

ADDRESS: 826 Pinecrest Ave SE

-----

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES [X]

NO [ ]

COMMENTS: 

NAME: Rogers

ADDRESS: 830 Pinecrest Ave SE
NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES ☐
NO ☐

COMMENTS:

SOUNDS GOOD BUT WOULD PREFER PEAVING PROCEED BETWEEN SUNLIFE & ARGENTINA

NAME: Peter Shiffer

ADDRESS: 925 Pine Crest SE

---

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES ☐
NO ☐

COMMENTS:

NAME: Rick Hershberger

ADDRESS: 926 Pine Crest SE
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES ☑

NO □

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________

______________________________
NAME: Kelly & Jeff Cross

______________________________
ADDRESS: 1015 Pinecrest Ave

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES ☑

NO □

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________

______________________________
NAME: Steven Martindale

______________________________
ADDRESS: 1028 Pinecrest Ave, SE
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES □

NO ✗

COMMENTS:

RIDICULOUS WASTE OF MONEY

UNSAFE FOR BLIND PEDESTRIANS

NAME: CARES

ADDRESS: 945 SAN LUCIA SE

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES □

NO ✗

COMMENTS:

WASTE OF MONEY, CONFUSING, IMPORTANT THRU STREET FOR EMERGENCY VEHICLES, SPEND MONEY ON ROAD REPAIRING

NAME: ROBERT ROASEGER

ADDRESS: 1027 SAN LUCIA DR SS 49506
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES □

NO X

COMMENTS: Please do not spend money this way. Out of all the
Financial needs people will have,
NAME: Sara Ackerman
ADDRESS: 9604 Maxwell Ave SE

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES X

NO □

COMMENTS: I hope it also slows traffic on Pinecrest as well!
NAME: Warren Olsen
ADDRESS: 1033 Pinecrest SE
PLACE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES ☑

NO ☐

COMMENTS:
Would also support 4-way stop as alternative, but defer to traffic engineer recommendation.

NAME: Bryan & Angie Walters
ADDRESS: 1039 Beechmont SE

PLACE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES ☑

NO ☐

COMMENTS: Eastbound Argentina traffic often fails to see obstructed view of stop sign at Argentina/San Lucia intersection. I have seen many vehicles blow thru the intersection.

NAME: Daniel Kubick
ADDRESS: 1016 San Lucia SE
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES  □
NO   □

COMMENTS: I like the idea, Please consider less signage, more foliage, and no sidewalk around center.

NAME: Robert and Megan Coleman
ADDRESS: 1619 San Carlos Drive SE

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES  □
NO   □

COMMENTS: Living here for over 25 years, we have never experienced any traffic or walking issues. We do not agree that this is a needed project.

NAME: Brian & Sharon Barkwell
ADDRESS: 1051 Pinecrest SE, BGR
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS:

NAME: Phil & Deb Rewerts
ADDRESS: 816 Pinecrest SE

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS: Not necessary. Waste of resources. Consider increased police enforcement. Traffic calming @ St. Luke Rae & Lake Dr.

NAME: David & Jennifer Kirchgesner
ADDRESS: 855 Pinecrest
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES [ ]

NO [ ]

COMMENTS: It would be helpful to know the costs anticipated w/ leaving Argentina as is vs. adding the two traffic circles (and associated labor and insurance costs).

NAME: Brown, Susan Lennon

ADDRESS: 804 Pinecrest Ave. SE

Thank you.

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES [ ]

NO [ ]

COMMENTS: Great Idea!

NAME: Paul, Elizabeth Luce

ADDRESS: 1022 San Lucia
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES  ☑
NO   ☐

COMMENTS:

________________________________________________________

NAME:  Foley & Van der Elst
ADDRESS:  1030 San Lucia Dr SE

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES  ☒
NO   ☐

COMMENTS:

Expect signage requiring cars to yield to pedestrians

NAME:  Joel and Liz Stouten
ADDRESS:  1041 San Lucia Dr  616-915-0913
NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES ☑

NO ☐

COMMENTS:

NAME: Scott & Elizabeth Loos

ADDRESS: 1044 San Lucia

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES ☑

NO ☐

COMMENTS: They don't need to be large, the one on Argentina/Cambridge is too large.

NAME: Bill & Jan Lewis

ADDRESS: 1063 San Lucia
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES  ☑

NO  ☒

COMMENTS:

No. Stop signs are FAR more effective for traffic calming and safety of walkers and bikers. This is a mis-use of the road funds! Resurface roads and replace stop signs for better traffic flow for the town.

NAME: Daniel T. McLaren

ADDRESS: 1058 San Lucia SE

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES  ☐

NO  ☑

COMMENTS: Absolutely NOT

Not necessary - not needed

NAME: John & Joanna Fizz

ADDRESS: 1047 San Lucia AC SE
NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS:

1) There is no real "intersection issue"—there are never cars backed up at Argentina and San Lucas.
2) There are intersections/roads that are much more congested & dangerous—like Lake Dr. & San Lucas Rd.

NAME: Thomas Cook & Hanne Smith

ADDRESS: 900 Pinecrest Ave.

---

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS: Expensive & disruptive

unnecessary

NAME: David Ziegler

ADDRESS: 944 San Lucia Dr. SE EGR 99506
NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:

DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES ☐

NO ☒

COMMENTS: THEY LOOK GREAT BUT WE COULD JUST ADD A STOP SIGN INSTEAD

NAME: Vito Spano

ADDRESS: 937 San Lucia Drive SE

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:

DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES ☒

NO ☐

COMMENTS: This great since so many people speed by 20 mph + over.

NAME: Joseph Zemanic

ADDRESS: 1000 San Jose Dr SE
NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

**Pinecrest is not**

**YES**

**NO**

where the speed is **✓** at the

highest. Headling west past Floral
down the hill at San Jose and
San Juan, that is the PROBLEM.

Doug LaFave and I have gone back and forth
on this. Speed study last October
showed the speeds were too

**NAME:**

San Jose & San Juan.

**ADDRESS:**

Patrick R. Lincolnhol 961 San Jose 847 877 0468.

PINECREST IS A WASTE OF TIME.

Please return one card only per household

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

**YES**

**NO**

**NAME:**

**ADDRESS:**

1940 Argentina Dr. SE Tina is almost 70 mph

for 2-way traffic at speed.
NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES □

NO ☒

COMMENTS: (e.g., paragraph)
(1) Money better spent on street repair, (2) 4-way stops would be
less expensive and would slow traffic.
(3) Put up speed signs along Argentina.
(4) Traffic circles may have risks to pedestrians,
especially children and school children.

NAME: Charles E. McCullum and Lois Temple-McCallum

ADDRESS: 2220 Argentina Drive SE, EGR MI 48826

PLEAS Return one card only per household

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES □

NO ☒

COMMENTS: Totally unnecessary. Living just down the street
for 17 years I see no problem with that intersection. We feel it would
cause more problems with people/kids crossing, not a good use
of money.

NAME: Tippett

ADDRESS: 2225 Argentina Dr. 4954
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES  

NO  

COMMENTS: This is an inappropriate use of taxpayers’ dollars and is unnecessary when compared to the actual traffic count.

NAME: Jonathan Andreas

ADDRESS: 2214 Argentina Dr SE, East Grand Rapids, MI 49506

2 more stop signs would make more sense.

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES  

NO  

COMMENTS: It makes it more difficult for bike riders, dangerous; and there are a lot of people on bikes.

NAME: Patricia Thornquist

ADDRESS: 2252 Argentina Dr SE, GR, MI 49506
NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE
PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS: Thank you for asking

Not needed - low traffic - # needed elsewhere especially now

NAME: Rosemary Stevenson

ADDRESS: 2344 Argentina Dr. SE

NAME: Ted Azkoul

ADDRESS: 965 Breton SE
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES ☐
NO ☑

COMMENTS:

NAME: Brian Rieth
ADDRESS: 1007 Broken Rock SE

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES ☑
NO ☐

COMMENTS: Argentina Dr & San Lucia Dr: Stop Signs seem appropriate. Recommend removing Traffic Circl from plot.

NAME: Cody Coppi
ADDRESS: 1013 Floral Ave SE
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS: Put a stop sign on Pinecrest.

Mini Traffic Circles are dangerous & if we need to please postpone

NAME: "Rupprecht"

ADDRESS: 929 San Lucia

Pediculas to decide during COVID-19

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS: In the absence of accidents this does not seem necessary

NAME: "Jeff and Shannon MacKeigan"

ADDRESS: 917 Pinecrest Ave
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES □
NO □

COMMENTS:

__________________________________________

NAME:  RHEET & ANNE WILLIAMSON
ADDRESS:  959 PINECREST AVE SE

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?
Check Box

YES □
NO X

COMMENTS:

I would like to see something done at the intersection of Kingsley Lake Drive and Sun Shiny Rise.

NAME:  TERRY & MELINDA O'ROURKE
ADDRESS:  1064 PINECREST AVE
NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES □

NO ☑

COMMENTS:
While I agree the traffic situation needs to be addressed on Argentina, I do not think this is the appropriate solution.

NAME: Emily Patricia Roy

ADDRESS: 1012 Pinterest Ave SE, EGR 49506

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES □

NO ☑

COMMENTS: Do we need the additional expense when there have been no accidents there in recent memory.

NAME: Sullivan

ADDRESS: 839 Pinterest
NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS: We don't think the traffic at Argentia and Finecrest would warrant traffic circles.

NAME: David & Ethel Sawyer

ADDRESS: 881 Finecrest

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS: The proposed location is very narrow. I feel the extra 3 ft. between 3rd & 4th would be able to accommodate something like this.

NAME: Jack Smith

ADDRESS: 964 Floral
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES √

NO □

COMMENTS:

__________________________________________

NAME: Jon Meyer

ADDRESS: 1010 San Juan Dr. SE

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES □

NO □

COMMENTS:

__________________________________________

NAME: Lisa Somra

ADDRESS: 1011 Santa Cruz
NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES, but only at Pinecrest. ☑
Unnecessary at St. Lucia. ☐
NO - Need a light at Lake Dr & San Lu Rea!

COMMENTS:
Definitely should be simplified on St. Lucia & no stop on Argentina. Where the big traffic problem is by the high school at San Lu Rea & Lake Dr. That is an accident waiting to happen. Also - Lake Dr. at Lovett is awful - very difficult to see cars coming and dangerous to turn left on to Lake Dr.

NAME: David & woman Peterson (w & v)

ADDRESS: 850 Pinecrest Ave.

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES ☐
NO ☑

COMMENTS: I've seen too many drivers speed thru other traffic circles & turn not adjusting speeds.

NAME: J. de Keir

ADDRESS: 2930 Argentina pr sd
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE? Check Box

YES [ ]

NO [x]

COMMENTS:  

[handwritten text]

NAME: Leistra

ADDRESS: [redacted]

---

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE? Check Box

YES [ ]

NO [x]

COMMENTS:  

Would rather see stop signs, even if not in accordance with traffic standards.

NAME: Eric + Rita Graham

ADDRESS: 2204 Argentina Dr SE
NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS: Hell NO!! Use the money to fix our pot holes.

NAME: Jim Mantakounis

ADDRESS: 1901 Argentina Dr.

[Repeat form with different responses and comments]
NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES  □

NO  □

COMMENTS:

I've seen these put in when I lived in Chicago. They always caused confusion with drivers and did not end up being safe for pedestrians.

NAME: ALEX GUTRANNO

ADDRESS: 1915 ARGENTINA

NAME: MARY ANN SHELINE

ADDRESS: 1908 ARGENTINA DV
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES ☑

NO ☐

COMMENTS:

______________________________

NAME: Michael J. Amanda Vizcachiro

ADDRESS: 1818 Argentina Dr. SE

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES ☑

NO ☐

COMMENTS: Slowing traffic is a good idea

______________________________

NAME: Andrew Schmidt

ADDRESS: 1850 Argentina Dr. SE
George and Sherry Lessens
836 Pinecrest Ave SE
East Grand Rapids, MI 49506

RE: Argentina Traffic Calming Proposal

Although we approve of traffic calming measures on Argentina Ave SE we withhold (NO) our support for mini traffic circles unless several concerns are addressed:

1. On-street, no-parking zones are established and enforced according to established traffic guidelines on the leading and departing approaches to the traffic circles, including Pinecrest Ave and San Lucla. Presently, the clear-vision area on WB Argentina approaching Pinecrest is impaired due to parked vehicles and an offset (less than 90° intersection).

2. Commercial and municipal utilities be upgraded along with (before) any road improvements.
   a. DTE is replacing gas lines on several EGR streets which are being followed by road improvements.
   b. Are all municipal and private water lines in this area lead-free? Argentina between Pinecrest Ave and Breton Ave SE had extensive utility upgrades when it was done a few years ago.
   c. How are the utilities west of Pinecrest Ave on Argentina not in need of the same replacement? We would like our road improvement tax dollars spent in conjunction with upgrades.

3. Determine whether 'large vehicles' will be able to safely navigate the traffic circles. Despite the official master plan Pinecrest Ave is an alternate north-south feeder route for Breton SE and Plymouth SE, extending nearly the entire length of EGR. This makes it popular for EGRHS students.
   a. EGR school bus(es) travel Pinecrest daily. We would like to be shown how it will be able to navigate the 270° turn.
   b. Commercial and construction vehicles with trailers (especially lawn-care companies) may have the same issue.
   c. If allowed by traffic guidelines, signage – Traffic Circle Ahead, or No Trucks - be prominently placed at major entrances to streets that contain the traffic circles – San Lu Rae and Pinecrest, Breton and Argentina, Plymouth and Argentina, etc. Proper decisions can be made by vehicle operators whether they can safely navigate them before entering those streets.

Sincerely,
George and Sherry Lessens
Parents of
Eric Lessens, EGR Class of 2006
Ariel Lessens, EGR Class of 2010
I spoke with you yesterday about the proposed rondos on Argentina. I forgot to ask why the City feels the need for rondos. Why has this even come up?

There is just not enough traffic. The rondos would actually slow things down.

The current big rondo on Argentina that is east of Plymouth is actually an eyesore.

I understand that the rondos would meet MDOT specifications. But, seriously, where is the snow going to go during the winter?

I strongly discourage the City from going through with this project. I think that many of us could suggest some other streets that need basic attention. Why start a new project?
Doug,

Given the current Covid 19 challenges I am responding to your feedback survey via email.

A lot has transpired in the past month and perhaps the traffic circle proposal is dated given the current health care, economic, and fiscal challenges likely to manifest itself in the coming months.

Mark us down at 2150 Argentina as a NO VOTE for the proposed traffic circle. I appreciate the staff and City Commission willing to investigate new solutions but our intersection and street layout was never really designed with a traffic circle as its original design intent.

Attached are our list of concerns.

Regards
Mike & Carole McDonald
616-243-2048
Comments on Proposed Traffic Circle at Pinecrest/Argentina Intersection

1. Prior to the mid-90's Argentina had parking on both the north and south side of Argentina from Pinecrest to Breton. We do not want to lose any parking on the north side of Argentina. If there is a desire to slow traffic on Argentina, restore parking on the south side of Argentina between Pinecrest and Breton.

2. Given the current economic challenges from the Coronavirus it would seem a new traffic circle doesn’t seem to be a high priority and should be deferred.

3. From the drawings it appears no curb cut modifications are required....but we do not want to lose any parking privileges on Argentina or Pinecrest which has parking only on one side of the street.

4. The information packet shows a traffic circle example with a tree planted in the traffic circle. The construction drawings enclosed with the survey depict only turf treatment. Who will maintain this space?

5. We do not want to have additional street lighting to illuminate the traffic circle.

6. There is a concern related to cars at night driving thru and over the traffic circle causing significant noise in the middle of the night.

7. As a homeowner on the corner of the proposed traffic circle, we have a concern of headlight beams now coming thru the windows of our home. The homes were sited in the 1920's based on a perpendicular grid orientation for the streets.

8. Given the proximity to the high school, the traffic circle could become an attractive nuisance to speed thru the circle and attract late night lap races around the circle.

9. If speeding has been a concern over the years, how many tickets for speeding on Argentina have been written in the last 5 years? This could be a revenue enhancing opportunity instead of an expense of $35,000 to install a traffic circle.

10. Will this traffic circle impede vehicles with trailers, such as lawn service trucks who trailer their equipment? Will they run over the curb and create jarring noises because equipment is shifting?
Good Afternoon, Mr. Laave:

I am re-sending an edited version of an email I sent last week to supplement the post card for residents, which provides insufficient space for cogent discussion of the above-referenced matter, particularly as there will be no publicly attended hearing. I have owned the home on the southeast corner of Argentina at San Lucia since 1992. During that time, there has been at least one motor vehicle accident at this intersection, although it likely was 20 or more years ago. I also personally have observed numerous vehicles ignoring the stop signs, either by running straight through, without slowing or stopping, or by slowing only enough to roll through and turn, even when another car is already waiting at the adjacent stop sign.

I regularly drive and walk along Argentina east to Breton or west to Plymouth. My personal observation is consistent with your letter: many vehicles exceed the 25 mph speed limit and are, in fact, are quite impatient when following a behind a compliant vehicle. Moreover, because on-street parking is allowed on both sides of Argentina Dr, 25 mph is too fast for safe travel on the narrower roadway along the blocks immediately west of Breton. Generally, in that area, one vehicle must pull to the side in order to allow an approaching vehicle to safely pass in the opposite direction. There is a high level of pedestrian and bicycle traffic along the entire length of Argentina Drive, both on the sidewalks and in the roadway. This traffic, involving people of all ages, begins at 5:30-6:00 a.m. and continues until well after dark on most days, in all but the most inclement weather, throughout most of the year. During almost any day, this non-vehicular traffic exceeds vehicular traffic, except during traditional "rush hours." This has been particularly true during this current period of state-imposed self-quarantine. There is very little traffic enforcement or patrol along Argentina, SE.

Consequently, I support the proposed installation of at least a second traffic control device at the intersection of Argentina Drive and Pinecrest. However, in my opinion, while installation of "mini-traffic circles" at two relevant intersections may be a good solution for vehicular traffic along Argentina, it is not a good solution for either the pedestrian/bicycle traffic or for the residents adjacent to and near these intersections.

Vehicle traffic speeding along Argentina is the problem. Even though there is more vehicular traffic along Argentina than the perpendicular side-streets, the volume is not so high as to cause long lines of vehicles waiting at any "arm" of the San Lucia all-way stop at any time of the day. Removing the stop signs on Argentina will only allow vehicles to continue speeding in either direction and, in fact, may even increase speeding violations. Furthermore, allowing vehicles to travel straight through or turn at the subject intersections without stopping will increase the danger to the significant numbers of pedestrians and, particularly, bicyclists also passing by.

Furthermore, based upon my nearly 30-years' experience with this intersection, I do not believe that installation of mini-traffic-circles will solve the problem. My observation is that bicyclists, regardless of age, rarely observe traffic-control devices. The majority of bicyclists in this area are school-age children who mostly do not stop at the intersection. Drivers will be concentrating on negotiating through the circle and will not be looking or
stopping for pedestrians and bicycles. Will there be "Stop/Yield for Pedestrians and Bicycles" signs installed in or near the traffic circles? Will there be a lower speed limit posted at the circle?

This past weekend, motor vehicles stopping at Argentina and San Lucia were forced to delay resuming travel much longer than normal, due to the numbers of people walking or bicycling in the Argentina roadway in order to maintain "safe social distance" from sidewalk traffic and adjacent residents out working in their yards. Had there been an existing traffic circle at this intersection, vehicles would not have been required to stop at all before travelling through the intersection and there might have been a visual obstruction impeding motorists from seeing the pedestrians in the roadway until it was too late.

I also am concerned as to how traffic circles will affect the parking situation along both Argentina and the adjacent side-streets. Many, if not most, of the homes in this area have very short driveways and residents commonly own multiple vehicles. Street parking is at a premium. Will the existence of traffic circles at these intersections result in placement of "No Parking" signs at each corner? How far from the intersection will parking be prohibited?

I have some knowledge and experience with traffic engineering due to 25 years serving as an attorney for another municipality. My understanding is that recent trends in traffic-control practices favor and encourage pedestrian and bicycle traffic over the convenience of motorists. In short, I support leaving the San Lucia intersection unchanged and adding an additional "All-Way Stop" at Pinecrest. I also favor one or more additional all-way stops at reasonable intervals along Argentina. This would slow vehicular traffic for non-vehicular traffic, and also is much more economical than constructing more high-maintenance installations.

Furthermore, after drafting my original email, I walked eastbound along Argentina, SE, and decided to propose the following alternative configuration:

1) Install an appropriately-sized mini-traffic circle at the intersection with San Jose, SE. This location is approximately half-way between Plymouth and Breton and is the only north/south roadway that runs straight through from Hall Street to Wealthy Street. Furthermore, the current configuration of this intersection has the portions north and south portions of San Jose off-set from each other and, consequently, requires vehicles travelling through to make a slight diagonal right- or left-hand turn, depending upon direction travelled. This is a configuration commonly seen with other existing traffic-circles throughout the metropolitan area.

2) Leave the existing all-way stop at the San Lucia intersection intact and install additional all-way stops at the Lakeside and Pinecrest intersections. Additionally, post signs indicating that vehicle must stop for bicycles and pedestrians.

This alternative configuration would result in traffic-control devices every 2-3 blocks along Argentina, SE. It would slow traffic and make Argentina much less attractive or convenient for drivers who use it as a "speedy" short-cut in order to avoid the Breton/Lake Drive traffic. Mandating drivers to stop or signally slow travel speed at roughly equal intervals will make it much more difficult to greatly exceed 25 m.p.h and also provide multiple points where it would be safer for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or to discuss this matter further.

Very Truly Yours,

Margaret P. Bloemers
1940 Argentina Dr, SE
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES - SUPPORT ADDITIONAL DEVICE □

NO - NOT TRAFFIC CIRCLES □

However, many requests have no need for "driving thru roundabouts,
COMMENTS: I think it would help to have two islands,
I have lived at Sonnycalia Argentina intersection for since 1972,
been observed numerous vehicles either turning off 
driving thru the turn,
NAME: YVONNE S. BEHRMANN (WINDSHIELD WASHE)
ADDRESS: 1940 ARGENTINA DR. SE TINA IS MOST CONVINCED 
FOR 2-LANE TRAFFIC IN 1989.
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO ☒

COMMENTS: a letter is attached

NAME: Jean Hopkins

ADDRESS: 959 San Lucia Dr W, corner of San Lucia & Argentina
my driveway.
As my property is on 1/4 of the round-a-bout project I should have a lot of "say" about this.
Please do not construct a round-a-bout at the intersection of San Lucia Dr and Argentina Dr.
I am sure you have more important construction jobs to attend to.
It is not important for this particular intersection.

No - No - No
A taxpayer of the City of East Grand Rapids.
Jean Hopkins

Dear East Grand Rapids Dept. of Public Works,
I do not see any reason what so ever to construct a round-a-bout at the intersection of San Lucia Dr and Argentina.
The information in the letter you sent to me mentioned no accidents in the last five years. Our intersection is a cul de sac - less traffic.
It will be difficult for pedestrians with their baby carriages and children and animals on a leash to cross. Drivers in a round-a-bout never seem to stop circularly. There will be no stop signs which makes it worse for pedestrians and children on bikes.
It is ridiculous and a waste of taxpayers' money to construct an extra materials.
I am sure the curbs will be torn up (therefore sprinklers on my waterway).
It will probably be difficult backing out or entering...
Case Details

Case Number: 26258
Tags:
Customer: Hopkins, Jean
959 San Lucia Drive Southeast
Grand Rapids MI 49506
616 243 4064
Jeanhopkins37@lcloud.com

Preferred Contact Method: Phone
Submitted By: Hopkins, Jean
Submission Channel: Citizen portal
Topic: Streets>Construction Projects (City Services)

Status: New
Request Type: Question
Location of Request: San Lucia Dr. Argentina Dr.
East Grand Rapids MI 49506
Facility: N/A
Primary Owner: Bigorowski, Brian
Secondary Owner: Johnson, Dave
Date/Time Created: 04/10/2020 10:46
Date/Time Closed:

Original Request
Do not replace the San Lucia Dr./Argentina Dr. four way stop sign with a round a bout. A waste of money It Interferes with driveways and is a terrible hazard to pedestrians trying to cross the street. It will cause “jaywalking” where some one is going to get injured.

Customer Communications
No records of communication activities found
* Customer Communications are visible on the customer's case status page.

Internal Activity
Internal Notes
No records for internal activities found

Tasks

Case Contacts
Role | Name | Email | Phone
--- | --- | --- | ---
Primary Owner | Bigorowski, Brian | bbigorowski@eastgr.org |
Secondary Owner | Johnson, Dave | djohnson@eastgr.org |
Collaborator | LaFave, Doug | dlafave@eastgr.org |

Attachments
No attachments found
April 9, 2020

Dear Katie Favale, East Grand Rapids City Commissioner, and Neighbors:

We (Dave and Carol Distel) have been residents in East Grand Rapids for over 15 years and have lived on San Lucia Drive for most of that time. Actually, we are living in our second house now on the street on the exact same block. So, we are intimately familiar with the vehicular traffic congestion, traffic patterns, vehicle traffic speeds, pedestrian traffic (i.e., children — so many young kids walking to school including our own, bikes, dogs, adults, etc.). We love this street and our community for its safety, friendliness, charm and neighborhood feel. We all watch out for one another...we love that also!

The reason we are writing to you is that we learned (through the mail) of a very dangerous road project proposed by the City of East Grand Rapids that compromises the well-being of our neighborhood. We are particularly concerned that it could harm the children, bikers, dogs, and walkers in the area. Many of these children are very young, learning to ride bikes, often getting ahead of their parents. What a great neighborhood to grow up in!!! The City’s project compromises our safety, puts unnecessary costs on the taxpayers, and threatens our property values. In addition, the project is proceeding with a ‘vote’ by mail using an index card with 2 lines for comments. We are disappointed and disturbed with the City’s process in these unprecedented times where we, as a neighborhood, are unable to discuss our concerns together, and with our Mayor and Commissioners because of the Coronavirus and orders from the State of Michigan preventing us from doing so. The City’s notice was dated March 18, 2020 and the vote is due on April 10, 2020, (only a couple of weeks) right in the height of social distancing, quarantine, economic crisis, loss of jobs, etc. Is this really an fair and organized approach from our trusted City leaders?

We are e-mailing this letter to Katie Favale, Mayor of East Grand Rapids, and we request that she forward this email and letter to the East Grand Rapids Board of Commissioners. At the same time, we will be placing these letters into as many of the neighborhood mailboxes as we can (up to 25 near my corner of San Lucia and Argentina) in hopes that they will email their own concerns to kfavale@easter.org because the index card was insufficient to express our concerns.

The project we are referring to is putting ‘mini traffic circles’ on the corners of (1) San Lucia Drive and Argentina (we live at 660 San Lucia Dr. on one of the corner homes) and (2) Pinecrest and Argentina. We fully support keeping the 4 way stop in place on Argentina and San Lucia and adding one at Pinecrest and Argentina. Why? Because it will slow traffic in these neighborhoods keeping our children, dogs, bikers, walkers, and everyone safe. We have lived on this street a long time and cars often rush down the street to deliver pizzas, Jimmy Johns, and teenagers and adults not understanding whom they are placing at risk. It bothers us that the area is not policed properly to deter vehicles from speeding. Removing traffic stop signs on our corner only increases the speed of vehicles leading up to these busy intersections shared by vehicles, pedestrians, and bikes.

We called Dave Johnson from the City today to learn there was a ‘vote’ ending tomorrow (April 10th?). What? Where is the due process in this? “Railroading a Vote” now through mail is ineffective and we are not even sure who is voting. We suppose there is a good way to stack a vote for people getting a voting card, insufficiently informed, potentially misinformed by the City of East Grand Rapids. We live on the intersection and understand the problem better than most. Our neighborhood deserves to be heard in person, which I understand is the normal process in East Grand Rapids. We don’t think our ‘NO’ vote will upend the proposal. This is frustrating because we can’t even go knock on our neighbors’ doors to discuss it with them like we would in normal times.

We demand a full discussion and understanding of the project. We would like to hear out the people that are proposing it as well as those in favor of it. Here is what we understand are the benefits provided by the City (in bold) and our response follows:

1). Reduces vehicular speeds and potential for crashes – We know this is false if 4 ways stop are used. The City’s project may have the effect of slowing traffic on the corner of Pinecrest and Argentina, but the project actually will increase speed on Argentina and San Lucia leading up to the intersection. The proposal removes the 4 way stop on our corner. Today, vehicles approaching our corner need to stop, not slow down. Leading up to the intersection, speeds will be faster in the future if the proposal wins. There also may be blind spots for pedestrians and vehicles not seeing children on the other side of the turnout due to landscaping that may be present, and multiple other distractions all happening simultaneously and faster than now. We ask the Mayor and Commissioners, which of you will stand up and be responsible for the first seriously injured child if the City’s proposal goes through?
you will stand up and be responsible for the first seriously injured child if the City’s proposal goes through? Whose hands are soaked with the blood of the first fatality? Keep our children and dogs safe! Four way stops on both proposed corners is abundantly safer!

2). Eliminates the possibility of vehicle head-on collisions – This is a very low risk in a residential neighborhood with 4-way stops at each proposed corner. We ask you, how many head on collisions have taken place at these intersections over the last 10 years? We suspect none. As noted above coming to a complete stop and following the traffic safety rules (i.e., stop, look, and proceed) is much improved from a safety standpoint vs rolling through the roundabout from 4 directions. Because, the City’s proposal doesn’t require a stop, visibility could be impaired from a combination of higher speeds through the intersection, landscaping distractions and blind spots, traffic moving in 4 directions without stopping, pedestrian traffic from 4 directions, and nighttime and weather related low visibility and slippery impacts. If we are honest with one another, there is little risk to a head on collision on a 4-way stop. We ask the Mayor and Commissioners, which of you will stand up and be responsible for the first seriously injured child if the City’s proposal goes through? Whose hands are soaked with the blood of the first fatality? Keep our children and dogs safe! Four way stops on both proposed corners is abundantly safer!

3). Provides Opportunities for Aesthetic Landscaping and Storm Water Infiltration – There are storm drains already on each corner of the intersections of (1) San Lucia and Argentina and (2) Pinecrest and Argentina (i.e., actually there are 2 per corner). Aesthetics creates blind spots and dangerous situations that can happen much faster than with 4-way stops. With the loss of jobs in our community, we certainly don’t need to spend money in East Grand Rapids to create more aesthetics. Why is aesthetics in the middle of an intersection a goal anyway? Are we just putting lipstick on the pig? Again, we ask the Mayor and Commissioners, which of you will stand up and be responsible for the first seriously injured child if the City’s proposal goes through? Whose hands are soaked with the blood of the first fatality? Keep our children and dogs safe! Four way stops on both proposed corners is abundantly safer!

4). Improved the Pedestrian and Bicycling Environment – As outlined in #1 above, we could not disagree more. We live on the corner and the pedestrian and bicycling traffic is high. How can this be a rational explanation when cars do not come to a complete stop, then look, and proceed. We ask the Mayor and Commissioners, which of you will stand up and be responsible for the first seriously injured child if the City’s proposal goes through? Whose hands are soaked with the blood of the first fatality? Keep our children and dogs safe! Four way stops on both proposed corners is abundantly safer!

5). Facilitates safer bicycle movements through residential intersections – So if this is true, the bikes add another layer of traffic not required to stop. This poses a threat to those bikers to the faster moving vehicles and the bikers pose a threat to the safety of our children, dogs, and pedestrians sharing the intersection. This all is exponentially worse at night and with poor weather conditions. We ask the Mayor and Commissioners, which of you will stand up and be responsible for the first seriously injured child if the City’s proposal goes through? Whose hands are soaked with the blood of the first fatality? Keep our children and dogs safe! Four way stops on both proposed corners is abundantly safer!

The sole disadvantage outlined in the City’s proposal (in bold below) is understated. Our response to the City’s sole disadvantage follows:

1). Can be confusing for some drivers if they are unfamiliar with circular intersections – We agree with this for sure, but I would not limit the point to ‘some’ and those ‘unfamiliar’. Depending on the number of vehicles, bikes, pedestrians, dogs, etc. In the intersection at or near the same time, their speeds, distractions if listening to music, texting, on the phone, relative direction each competing person is moving, weather, night-time, etc. no matter how the City tries to spin it, It is a serious hazard that will cause accidents. We ask the Mayor and Commissioners, which of you will stand up and be responsible for the first seriously injured child if the City’s proposal goes through? Whose hands are soaked with the blood of the first fatality? Keep our children and dogs safe! Four way stops on both proposed corners is abundantly safer!

At least some of the other disadvantage left out are:

2). Driveways are in close proximity to the Intersection - With no stop required, it poses an additional risk to accidents leading up to the intersections from residents pulling out of their driveways and cars not preparing for a full stop.
3). Parking along the road near the intersection will add another layer of complexity to the intersections – Is the City taking away our road parking near the intersection as we enjoy today?

4). Night lights from vehicles will shine on and into the corner houses – This compromises the corner houses’ privacy and sense of safety well-being with these distractions constantly coming through our living spaces.

5). Property Devaluation – Is the City going to pay the residents for the depreciation this causes in our property values? Or will the residents affected, need to form a coalition to sue the City to reduce our taxes and pay us for our home devaluations?

6). Justification of the Money being Spent and Fiduciary Responsibility – How do you justify spending money on this in the middle of what could be a recession, potentially a depression from many expert views. If the City of East Grand Rapids has unlimited funds to throw at these ill-conceived projects, why not put the funds earmarked in our schools (e.g., many programs have been cut in recent years), or lower taxes, or give refunds to the taxpayers, or help people without jobs. Moreover, the Pinocrest and Argentina Intersection was recently repaved. So, do we rip it up and start over again? Ask yourselves if you are being good fiduciaries with taxpayers’ money in our time of need?

7). The Process is Unfair – As noted above, the ‘vote’ is taking place without public hearings including from those most impacted. Rather than defer decisions, the ‘vote’ is taking place in the height of the Coronavirus pandemic, social distancing, quarantines, economic crisis, job loss, etc. The citizens are at a disadvantage while the Mayor and Commissions work to railroad this through.

In summary, we would welcome a discussion to understand if the City has really have thought this through and given this time for input of those impacted in our neighborhoods. The concept and timing are terrible, and this is one stress our residents don’t need right now! If we need to fight this, we will build a coalition among the neighborhood and investigate taking legal action that will shine light on all the poor judgement the City seems to be exercising as fiduciaries of our community.

We placed a call to the mayor, Katie Favale, today, and left Dave’s phone number (616) 648-5393. We have not heard back. Again, we welcome a discussion from her or any the Commissioners to talk while we most of us suffer through Coronavirus and potentially a recession/depression.

Sincerely,

David and Carol Distel

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS: I live on the corner and traffic is minimal. I am more concerned about safety for the many children and adults who pass through each day.

NAME: David and Carol Distel

ADDRESS: 960 San Lucia Drive
To go with the others

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lisa Nargi <l_nargi@yahoo.com>
Date: April 10, 2020 at 3:45:38 PM EDT
To: "kfavale@eastgr.org" <kfavale@eastgr.org>
Cc: "dlafave@eastgr.org" <dlafave@eastgr.org>, "bbigorowski@eastgr.org"<bbigorowski@eastgr.org>, "djohnson@eastgr.org"<djohnson@eastgr.org>
Subject: Traffic Circle-Argentina

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Katie,

I hope you and your family are doing well and staying healthy during this time.

We (Dean and Lisa Nargi) are writing to let you know we are opposed to the traffic circle project at Pinecrest/Argentina/San Lucia. We live at 963 Pinecrest (corner house on Argentina). We have lived at the address for the past 14 years. Having raised three children on this street (current ages 16, 14 and 11), we are very well versed on the traffic situation along the street of Argentina. As we have watched our kids grow up and being keenly aware of the dangers they faced, we have not been aware of any major accidents or other problems for that matter. We feel that putting in a traffic circle would create a more dangerous situation especially with all the teenagers that drive up and down our street everyday. Everyone is familiar with the flow of traffic on Argentina--putting in traffic circle would only cause confusion and reduce visibility for drivers. In addition, living on the corner comes with less privacy and increased traffic chaos and noise. The traffic circle would increase vehicle lights shining into our home which would impact privacy and cause sleep disturbances. After doing some research we understand traffic circles in front of home decreases their property value, lastly why during this time of financial uncertainty are we using tax payer dollars for this project? As Pinecrest Ave is the main thoroughfare to the high school, residents have been requesting to have our street paved, which we see as a far greater issue. Our street is covered with pot-holes--which is dangerous and causes unneeded wear and tear on our vehicles. Every year we call the City of EGR and are told "not this year, but it's on the list". It is very frustrating that this traffic circle project is even being considered and then without a proper town hall meeting and vote, where our voices can be heard. I am reaching out to you because as our mayor I would hope that you would listen to and take into consideration the opinions of the people in your community.

I look forward to hearing from you. Due to the social distancing in place it is challenging to discuss this with my neighbors and residents of Pinecrest. Below my signature I am including neighbors who are also opposed to the traffic circle. They gave me permission via text message to add their name to this email.

Sincerely,

Dean and Lisa Nargi 963 Pinecrest Ave (email written by)

Sarah and Scott Hedeman 954 Pinecrest Ave (email written by)
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

- No accidents to dat [X]
- Seem unnecessary [ ]
- Seem like traffic could back up more.

Check Box

COMMENTS: It is right in front of our house. It will cause more noise.

NAME: Nargi
ADDRESS: 963 Pinecrest Ave SE

[Handwritten note: high school will help traffic]
PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS: Would love to see one at Lakeside and Argentina in the future.

NAME: Allison Huh

ADDRESS: 2330 Argentina Dr SE

---

PLEASE RETURN ONE CARD ONLY PER HOUSEHOLD

NEIGHBORHOOD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES:
DO YOU SUPPORT THE CHANGE TO ADD MINI TRAFFIC CIRCLES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAFFIC CALMING ON ARGENTINA DRIVE?

Check Box

YES

NO

COMMENTS: Not needed. Why spend any $ on this when we need either a 4-way stop or light @ Lake Drive + San LuRoe.

NAME: John Canny Baxter

ADDRESS: 934 Donevert St, 362
I wanted to add a point to my comments. I was told to check out the traffic circles on Giddings and Alexander and another one further south on Giddings (can’t think of the cross street). I was walking last evening in this area. I noticed 3 cars go through the circles and all three did the exact same thing. They went around the circle, and as soon as they exited the circle, they “floored” it. All three of them did the exact same thing. So I really do not think putting traffic circles on Argentina is going to solve the problem. The car may have to slow down as they approach the circle, but then they are just going to speed up once they are out of the circle.

I have heard some people suggest speed bumps. That is NOT a good idea. Speed bumps do not work for people who have sedan vehicles. SUV types which are higher up may tolerate them better, but regular vehicles (and I have two of those in my household) are much too low to the ground to tolerate a speed bump. They wreak havoc on the vehicles, so please do not consider that idea.

Is there a reason that we can’t have a stop sign on Argentina at Pinecrest? Would that help the issue?

Also, another idea I had is the solar-powered speed registration device like on Lake Drive, after you enter into East Grand Rapids after crossing the East Beltline. I think that could be a very effective tool to slow people down.

As I said on my comment card, I have lived here for 20 years and do not see this as such an issue as some others. But I really do not want my street to be a street with traffic circles or speed bumps.

Thank you.
Rosanne Mack
Here is an email in opposition to the Argentina traffic circles. 
Note the letter at the bottom. He is passing it to all the neighbors. 
This is probably why we’re getting such negative feedback.

Begin forwarded message:

From: David Distel <davidjdistel@gmail.com> 
Subject: Response to City Proposal for Roundabouts 
Date: April 9, 2020 at 7:15:28 PM EDT 
To: Katie Favale <kfavale@eastg.org> 
Cc: Carol Distel <caroldistel@gmail.com> 

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Katie-

I know you are new on the job and we, unfortunately, have not met. So congratulations and condolences on this controversial project lined up in our neighborhood. I am a small business owner in Grand Rapids and I can’t tell you how busy I am. This is a terrible time to be responding to something like this and it was a poor decision to circumvent your normal process under the COVID-19 crisis and the fall-out.

We dropped the attached letter to 25 of our neighbors’ mailboxes. We received 6 calls so far and a lot of people wondering (1) why the town would propose such a crazy idea at this time, (2) spend the money on better projects to benefit the needy (including schools), and (3) who’s idea was it to circumvent an open house and do this by mail. It looks really bad.

What became very clear to me in the few discussions I have had is that nobody really understands the project. Dave Johnson who were told to call doesn’t understand it. Pete Rueppert said his wife Jessica thought the stop signs were staying in place when she voted. (I think turnabouts work on a yield system, not stopping). Anyway, there is a lot of confusion by not having people affected to be able to learn more about it and then respond. I saw the Mooney’s out walking tonight and they are very opposed and would like to see money be put to better use in our schools.

Katie, now is the time to show some leadership. The last thing I want to do is to bring in attorney’s, but we have do have a relatively wealthy group of neighbors and I am pretty sure I can get it funded to protect our rights, that is if we have to. I am hoping you will do the right thing here.
Another Argentina letter...

Begin forwarded message:

From: Alex Gutfraynd <agutfraynd@gmail.com>
Subject: Argentina Dr Proposed Construction
Date: April 9, 2020 at 9:58:34 PM EDT
To: kfavale@eastgr.org

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Mayor,

I was writing as a concerned resident of 1915 Argentina Drive. I have read the proposed traffic changes with small roundabouts at San Lucia and Pinecrest. I really do not feel that they would provide any benefit to residents and am hoping that this project does not move forward. The four-way stops are efficient and straightforward for pedestrians and drivers. Roundabouts would cause significant confusion amongst everyone. I fear that there would be more car accidents, car vs pedestrian accidents, and higher rates of speed on Argentina.

In addition to the significant safety risk, the project would not provide any real benefit. Busier intersections function well with a four-way stop. Money spent on this would be put to better use elsewhere with community improvement projects.

Please reconsider the proposed project.

Thank you,
Alex Gutfraynd
Karen Brower

From: John Arendhorst
Sent: Sunday, April 12, 2020 2:59 PM
To: Karen Brower
Subject: FW: Ward 3

Karen – I received the email below from Barb Levandoski. Please include it in the commission materials for our upcoming meeting. Thanks!

John Arendhorst
East Grand Rapids
City Commissioner, Ward 3
Phone: 312.919.0773

From: Barbara Levandoski [mailto:levandoski@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, April 11, 2020 2:10 PM
To: John Arendhorst
Subject: Ward 3

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

First, we have become aware of a proposed 2 rondos on Argentina. We feel that there is not enough traffic. Also, we don’t think rondos are a safe option for kids walking to and/or from school or sports or library or whatever.

Second, why don’t you just list your e-mail addresses on the City website so that we don’t have to go through hoopla to get to you.

Stay safe.

Barb Levandoski
900 Santa Barbara
4/13/2020

To: Doug LaFave, Brian Bigorowski, Dave Johnson

From: Thomas C. Fuller

RE: Objection to the Argentina Dr. traffic circles, and the City process on this matter.

I am a lifelong resident of the Argentina corridor neighborhood, having been raised on Santa Cruz and raising my own family on Floral Ave. for the past 27 years. I recently learned from a stranger in a spontaneous conversation that the City of EGR is planning on redesigning two intersections on Argentina (Pinecrest, and San Lucia), and building traffic circles at these locations. I believe that these circles will make pedestrian life more dangerous and are unnecessary. I am also alarmed that this plan has occurred without notifying all of the residents on all of the streets that intersect Argentina Dr. and allowing their input.

As a resident on Floral Ave., I drive on Argentina Dr. in both directions several times per day. So do all of my neighbors. We drive down Argentina to get to Breton Rd.. We drive down Argentina to get to Plymouth Ave. We also walk and bicycle up and down Argentina Dr. for recreation and visiting friends and family. The people impacted by this proposed project go far beyond just the people living near those intersections. Every household for at least a block north and south of Argentina Dr., on all twelve streets that intersect Argentina should have been notified and included in this process. I believe not doing this will result in considerable public backlash and outcry when this project gets underway. It isn’t too late to slow down this process and include the citizens in decisions about their community.

There have been no auto accidents on this stretch of road in over five years. The tendency of some drivers to not fully stop at these intersections can be addressed in other less expensive and less intrusive ways. How about more regular police presence and enforcement? Or a four way stop at Pinecrest?

Traffic circles are dangerous for pedestrians, not safer as the City website states. Try walking through one when a car is moving through. Most drivers do not know how to navigate traffic circles well. I fear that children especially are in more danger crossing the street with these proposed “traffic calming” measures. These intersections are rather small. With a cement circle in their centers, and piles of new snowfall, these will be very tight and slippery curves for cars.

Please stop moving ahead on this project and make more of an effort to include all of the people who really will be impacted by this project. This is especially important during the Covid19
stay-at-home order when citizens can't attend public meetings, and likely do not know about this plan.

Sincerely,

Thomas C. Fuller  
924 Floral Ave. SE  
East Grand Rapids, MI 49506  
drtomfuller@gmail.com
This was caught in quarantine in error.

Gary Veldhof  
East Grand Rapids

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello, Bryan and John

Regarding Tom Fuller’s below email and attached document (in reference to the notice in the below link about the proposed Argentina mini traffic circles), I have some questions:  
https://www.eastgr.org/DocumentCenter/View/2323/Notice-Argentina-traffic-circle

-Can you clarify where the proposed mini traffic circles would be installed along Argentina?

-Do you have drawings showing the layout of these traffic circles, including how pedestrians crossing the streets will be handled?

-Are you looking at various designs of mini traffic circles? I’m not impressed with the design of the traffic circle (mini traffic circle?) at Alexander and Cambridge due to the high curb that is easy to miss/not see (especially in the snow/night/rain). The potential for accidents and vehicle damage seems high with that design. I prefer a more tapered design to a high curb. I’m also not impressed with how pedestrians are handled at that traffic circle.

-Are there other changes to the existing curbs, etc. to make room for these proposed mini traffic circles?
Overall, I am a fan of traffic circles (roundabouts, as I call them). I used to live in England and I believe they work great at controlling speed, keeping traffic flowing, and avoiding the all too common problems with 4-way stops. That said, I’ve never seen a roundabout in England with a curb at the edge and I feel there are some improvements that can be made when looking at the traffic circle at Alexander and Cambridge.

Thank you for your time and I look forward to your reply.

-Marc

Marc Noordeloos
903 Floral Ave SE
East Grand Rapids, Michigan 49546

From: "Thomas Fuller (via Google Docs)" <drtomfuller@gmail.com>
Reply-To: Thomas Fuller <drtomfuller@gmail.com>
Date: Monday, April 13, 2020 at 3:30 PM
To: Marc Noordeloos <marc.noordeloos@gmail.com>
Subject: Neighborhood FYI

drtomfuller@gmail.com has attached the following document:

If you agree, please write your commissioners Bryan Walters (hwalters@eastgr.org) and John Arendshorst (jarendshorst@eastgr.org), and Mayor Katie Favale (kfavale@eastgr.org).
Doug LaFave

From: Mary Fuller <medfuller@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2020 3:35 PM
To: Katie Favale; Bryan Walters; jarendshorst@easrgr.org; Doug LaFave; Brian Bigorowski; David Johnson
Subject: Proposed traffic circles on Argentina

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

It has just come to my attention (through a conversation with a neighbor) that the city is proposing to place 2 traffic circles on Argentina.

I am strongly opposed to this. I have lived in this neighborhood for 27 years and frequent these intersections on a daily basis (on foot, on a bicycle and in a car)....easily more than 2-3x/day. I have never noticed any problem at either one of them, aside from the typical slow and fast rolling stops. (Which I feel could be lessened if stop sign violations were enforced......just give out a few tickets and see if word gets around)! I feel as if we would be creating a potential problem where none currently exists. I do not perceive ANY benefit from the traffic circles, in fact, I feel they will be more dangerous both for pedestrians and bikers.

My questions with regard to safety are this:

1. How are pedestrians (including many children) supposed to navigate these intersections if cars do not stop?

2. Who has the right of way when a biker and a car come to the circle at the same time....because there is definitely not space for both of them time (as there is now with the stop signs).

I wish I had been more vocal when all the "bump outs" were put in because as a biker, these are a nightmare. I hope you will extend public comment related to these traffic circles and notify all residents living 1-2 blocks off Argentina between Breton and Plymouth. I will certainly abide by the "will of the people" as long as all the "people" have a chance to have their say.

Sincerely,

Mary D. Fuller
924 Floral SE

PS: I would also appreciate it if someone could get back to me with data regarding number of tickets issued/month for stop sign violations. I have tried to contact the department of public safety but have not been able to get a hold on anyone secondary to the Covid pandemic. Thanks so much!
Dear Katie,

I hope you and your family are doing well and staying healthy during this time.

We (Dean and Lisa Nargi) are writing to let you know we are opposed to the traffic circle project at Pinecrest/Argentina/San Lucia. We live at 963 Pinecrest (corner house on Argentina). We have lived at the address for the past 14 years. Having raised three children on this street (current ages 16, 14 and 11), we are very well versed on the traffic situation along the street of Argentina. As we have watched our kids grow up and being keenly aware of the dangers they faced, we have not been aware of any major accidents or other problems for that matter. We feel that putting in a traffic circle would create a more dangerous situation especially with all the teenagers that drive up and down our street everyday. Everyone is familiar with the flow of traffic on Argentina—putting in traffic circle would only cause confusion and reduce visibility for drivers. In addition, living on the corner comes with less privacy and increased traffic chaos and noise. The traffic circle would increase vehicle lights shining into our home which would impact privacy and cause sleep disturbances. After doing some research we understand traffic circles in front of home decreases their property value, lastly why during this time of financial uncertainty are we using tax payer dollars for this project? As Pinecrest Ave is the main thoroughfare to the high school, residents have been requesting to have our street paved, which we see as a far greater issue. Our street is covered with pot-holes—which is dangerous and causes unneeded wear and tear on our vehicles. Every year we call the City of EGR and are told "not this year, but it's on the list". It is very frustrating that this traffic circle project is even being considered and then without a proper town hall meeting and vote, where our voices can be heard. I am reaching out to you because as our mayor I would hope that you would listen to and take into consideration the opinions of the people in your community.

I look forward to hearing from you. Due to the social distancing in place it is challenging to discuss this with my neighbors and residents of Pinecrest. Below my signature I am including neighbors who are also opposed to the traffic circle. They gave me permission via test message to add their name to this email.

Sincerely,

Dean and Lisa Nargi  963 Pinecrest Ave (email written by)

Sarah and Scott Hedeman 954 Pinecrest Ave
Shannon and Jeff MacKeigan  917 Pinecrest Ave
Amy and Steve Rockwell  840 Pinecrest Ave
Julie DeKoker 2130 Argentina
Doug,  

My husband, Paul Kratochwill and I have received your communication regarding traffic issues and proposed solutions. It is unfortunate that we are unable to hold a regular meeting; this is far too important to decide via a post card without hearing what neighbors think too. Why can't you hold a Zoom / YouTube live event? With this kind of technology available, there are options available.

We would like to know a couple of things.

- on what information do you base the locations of these traffic circles? I can't see how putting a circle at Pinecrest and a circle at San Lucia is going to make a hill-of-beans worth of difference where I am located. (2011 Argentina)
- where did you measure speed on Argentina? Where we are located, cars coming from San Lucia or anywhere from the east easily hit 35+ MPH in front of our home.
- how will this stop the "cut through traffic" from Hall to San Lu Rae on San Jose? I have almost been hit more times than I can count trying to cross the street with my dog. I wear a neon green jacket, my husband wears a neon orange jacket; drivers don't pay attention and take the corner turning right onto San Jose at alarming speeds. I have been flipped off and honked at, more than once, for CROSSING THE STREET. What will traffic circles do for this?
- where is our public safety in these discussions? I never see patrol cars on Argentina and with 700-800 cars a day, you would think that would be a pretty easy money maker, just behind those traveling much faster on San Lu Rae.

I realize these are unusual times. I would hate to think you are trying to slam through traffic changes without the opportunity for us to ask questions with the benefit of hearing how this impacts us all.

Right now, I am underwhelmed with both the city's response and these proposals. I look forward to your response.

Deirdre Honner  
616.648.3199
Doug LaFave

From: Karen Brower
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2020 7:55 AM
To: Doug LaFave
Subject: FW: Roads

Received this morning.

-----Original Message-----
From: Beth Woudstra <bethwoudstra@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2020 6:45 AM
To: Karen Brower <KBROWSER@eastgr.org>
Subject: Roads

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Morning Karen,

I just heard from a friend that you have plans to put a round about over on Orchard and Argentina? I am shocked that the city would think that is necessary! The first priority should be to fixing our roads. I feel they are the worst in Michigan. Have you driven down any of the Wood streets? It’s embarrassing! We live on Beechwood and our road is the best of all the wood streets. The way that the dirt road is maintained has gone way down hill. You spent all that money on putting in the signs for water levels. We have lived in our house for 6 years. We have never have seen that dirt road flooded! We pay $20,000 in taxes and with that Mileage it increased by $1,000. Fix our roads! We do not need a round about at Orchard and Argentina.

Thank you,
Beth Woudstra

Sent from my iPhone
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/22/2019</td>
<td>TRAFFIC POLICING</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JOSE DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/12/2019</td>
<td>TRAFFIC POLICING</td>
<td>LAKESIDE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/2015</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>LAKESIDE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/18/2015</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>LAKESIDE/ARGENTINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/18/2015</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>LAKESIDE DRIVE SE AND ARGENTINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/22/2015</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>LAKESIDE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/20/2016</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>OGDEN/ARGENTINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/24/2016</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>2200 ARGENTINA DR SE/900 ORCHARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/25/2016</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>ARGENTINA / LAKESIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/27/2016</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>LAKESIDE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/27/2016</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>ARGENTINA / PLYMOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/28/2016</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / PLYMOUTH RD SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/2016</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>ARGENTINA / PLYMOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/15/2019</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>2130 ARGENTINA SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/16/2019</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>ARGENTINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/17/2019</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>2200 ARGENTINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/18/2019</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JOSE DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/19/2019</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / FLORAL AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/20/2019</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / MAXWELL AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/21/2019</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / MONTEREY DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/23/2019</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>2300 ARGENTINA DR SE/900 OGDEN AVE SE / MAXWELL AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/24/2019</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>ARGENTINA/SAN JOSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/25/2019</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>2080 ARGENTINA DR SE/1000 FLORAL AVE SE / MONTEREY DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/26/2019</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>2227 ARGENTINA/900 LAKESIDE DR SE / OGDEN AVE SE / MAXWELL AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/28/2019</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>1846 ARGENTINA/1000 MONTEREY DR SE / 1000 SANTA CRUZ DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/30/2019</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>2147 ARGENTINA/900 ORCHARD AVE SE / SAN JOSE DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/30/2019</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATROL</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / FLORAL AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/27/2016</td>
<td>SPEED TRAILER</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE/ORCHARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/2016</td>
<td>SPEED TRAILER</td>
<td>2129 ARGENTINA DR SE/900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/2016</td>
<td>SPEED TRAILER</td>
<td>2100 BLOCK ARGENTINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/04/2017</td>
<td>SPEED TRAILER</td>
<td>2123 ARGENTINA DR SE/900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/22/2018</td>
<td>SPEED TRAILER</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JOSE DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/14/2019</td>
<td>SPEED TRAILER</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JUAN DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/24/2019</td>
<td>SPEED TRAILER</td>
<td>2100 ARGENTINA DR SE/1000 FLORAL AVE SE / SAN ANTONIO DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/24/2019</td>
<td>SPEED TRAILER</td>
<td>2040 ARGENTINA DR SE/1000 SAN ANTONIO DR SE / 1000 SANTA CRUZ DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/30/2019</td>
<td>SPEED TRAILER</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JOSE DR SE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Argentina Citations Issued
From 4/15/2015 to 4/15/2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ticket Date</th>
<th>Upon Street</th>
<th>At / Near Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/24/2015 11:33:00 PM</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH AVE</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/4/2015 5:18:00 AM</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH AVE</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2015 3:17:00 PM</td>
<td>LAKESIDE DR</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25/2016 11:09:00 PM</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR</td>
<td>SAN LUCIA DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/29/2016 1:29:00 AM</td>
<td>BRETON RD</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2017 1:03:00 AM</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH AVE</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/2017 11:53:00 AM</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR</td>
<td>SAN LUCIA DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/16/2019 12:56:00 PM</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR</td>
<td>OGDEN AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISOBEY STOP SIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEEDING, 1-10 OVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEEDING, 1-10 OVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEEDING, 11-15 OVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEEDING, 1-10 OVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEEDING, 1-10 OVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISOBEY STOP SIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEEDING, 1-10 OVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4/15/2020 1:32:35 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/16/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA/GLADSTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/29/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/18/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / PLYMOUTH RD SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / ORCHARD AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/19/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JOSE DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JOSE DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/17/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>SAN LUCIA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JOSE DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>SAN JOSE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/20/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / PINECREST AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/11/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / BRETON RD SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/26/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JOSE DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/24/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / BRETON RD SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/14/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / LAKESIDE DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/18/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH AND ARGENTINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>SANTA BARBARA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/25/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SANTA CRUZ DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SANTA CRUZ DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>SAN JOSE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/21/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>SANTA BARBARA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JUAN DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/08/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JUAN DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/14/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>MAXWELL AVE SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/20/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / ORCHARD AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/07/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>SAN LUCIA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/04/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / BRETON RD SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN LUCIA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>SAN JOSE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / BRETON RD SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>SANTA CRUZ DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/2016</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/03/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SANTA BARBARA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/15/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/23/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SANTA CRUZ DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/05/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / ORCHARD AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/24/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>SAN LUCIA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>LAKESIDE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>SAN JOSE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/17/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PINECREST/ARGENTINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/26/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/11/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN LUCIA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/23/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / LAKESIDE DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/21/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA/SANTA BARBARA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / PINECREST AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / OGDEN AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/28/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / PINECREST AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / ORCHARD AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / ORCHARD AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/28/2017</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/20/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / FLORAL AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JOSE DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/22/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>SAN LUCIA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>SAN LUCIA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SANTA BARBARA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/16/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/02/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/24/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN LUCIA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/02/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SANTA CRUZ DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN LUCIA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/11/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / PINECREST AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>SAN JOSE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/20/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN LUCIA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/14/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>SAN LUCIA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/28/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>2309 ARGENTINA SE/900 OGDEN AVE SE / 800 MAXWELL AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/21/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/24/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JOSE DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/20/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>2266 ARGENTINA/900 OGDEN AVE SE / 800 MAXWELL AVE SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/04/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>SAN JOSE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>FLORAL AVE SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/25/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / MONTEREY DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/26/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/18/2019</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/23/2019</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location Details</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/03/2019</td>
<td>LAKESIDE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/2019</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/15/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / PLYMOUTH RD SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/2019</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/17/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / OGDEN AVE SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/19/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / MAXWELL AVE SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/20/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JOSE DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/25/2019</td>
<td>PINECREST AVE SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/30/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / PINECREST AVE SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/12/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JUAN DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/15/2019</td>
<td>2130 ARGENTINA SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN LUCIA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/05/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SANTA CRUZ DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SANTA BARBARA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/17/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / FLORAL AVE SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/03/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN LUCIA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/04/2019</td>
<td>SAN JOSE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/07/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SANTA CRUZ DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / MONTEREY DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/15/2019</td>
<td>SAN JUAN DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/19/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SANTA BARBARA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/2019</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SANTA CRUZ DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / MONTEREY DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / PLYMOUTH RD SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/2019</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/31/2019</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/2019</td>
<td>LAKESIDE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/15/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / PLYMOUTH RD SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/2019</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/09/2019</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2019</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2019</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2019</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2019</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/25/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / BRETON RD SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/2019</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/23/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JOSE DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/23/2019</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / BRETON RD SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/27/2019</td>
<td>2344 ARGENTINA DR SE/900 BRETON RD SE / 900 OGDEN AVE SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/14/2020</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / OGDEN AVE SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/2020</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / PLYMOUTH RD SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/26/2020</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/2020</td>
<td>ARGENTINA / OGDEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2020</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / BRETON RD SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/24/2020</td>
<td>FLORAL AVE SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/27/2020</td>
<td>SAN JOSE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/06/2020</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/24/2016</td>
<td>OUIL OR OUID</td>
<td>SAN JOSE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/2017</td>
<td>OUIL OR OUID</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/14/2019</td>
<td>OUIL OR OUID</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/12/2015</td>
<td>OBLITERATING JUST</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/21/2019</td>
<td>OBLITERATING JUST</td>
<td>SANTA BARBARA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/17/2016</td>
<td>OBLITERATING JUST</td>
<td>SANTA BARBARA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/2017</td>
<td>OBLITERATING JUST</td>
<td>SANTA BARBARA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/21/2018</td>
<td>OBLITERATING JUST</td>
<td>SANTA BARBARA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2020</td>
<td>OBLITERATING JUST</td>
<td>SANTA BARBARA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/09/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/12/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/24/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/03/2019</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS</td>
<td>SANTA BARBARA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/19/2019</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS</td>
<td>SANTA BARBARA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/2019</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS</td>
<td>SANTA BARBARA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/2019</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS</td>
<td>SANTA BARBARA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2019</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS</td>
<td>SANTA BARBARA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/09/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATION</td>
<td>OGDEN AVE SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/12/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATION</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/24/2015</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATION</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/22/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATION</td>
<td>FLORAL AVE SE / ARGENTINA DR SE(NO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATION</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/03/2019</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATION</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN LUCIA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/19/2019</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATION</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN LUCIA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/2019</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATION</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / PLYMOUTH RD SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/2019</td>
<td>TRAFFIC VIOLATION</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / PLYMOUTH RD SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/15/2015</td>
<td>DRIVING LAW VIOLA</td>
<td>SANTA BARBARA DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/24/2015</td>
<td>DRIVING LAW VIOLA</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/27/2015</td>
<td>DRIVING LAW VIOLA</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/2016</td>
<td>DRIVING LAW VIOLA</td>
<td>BRETON RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/20/2016</td>
<td>DRIVING LAW VIOLA</td>
<td>LAKESIDE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/2017</td>
<td>DRIVING LAW VIOLA</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/2017</td>
<td>DRIVING LAW VIOLA</td>
<td>LAKESIDE DR SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2018</td>
<td>DRIVING LAW VIOLA</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JOSE DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/21/2018</td>
<td>DRIVING LAW VIOLA</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/2019</td>
<td>DRIVING LAW VIOLA</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/15/2019</td>
<td>DRIVING LAW VIOLA</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / PLYMOUTH RD SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/12/2019</td>
<td>DRIVING LAW VIOLA</td>
<td>ARGENTINA DR SE / SAN JUAN DR SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/2019</td>
<td>DRIVING LAW VIOLA</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH RD SE / ARGENTINA DR SE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mayor Favale called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. in the City Commission Chambers at the East Grand Rapids Community Center and led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance. She announced the meeting was being held mostly electronically as allowed by Executive Order 2020-48 in response to the COVID-19 crisis. She invited any citizen attending by computer or phone to ask questions or offer comments during the public comment times.

Present in Person: Mayor Favale

Present Virtually: Commissioners Arendshorst, Duncan, Hamrick, Hecksel, Pachla and Walters

Absent: None

Also Present: City Attorney Huff; Interim City Manager LaFave; City Clerk Brower; Public Safety Director Herald; Parks & Recreation Director Bunn; Finance Director Mushong; Communications Specialist Licari (phone); Janyce Huff

2020-51. The agenda was approved as published.

2020-52. No public comment was received.

2020-53. Commissioner Walters acknowledged the emails received from residents regarding a proposed traffic circle on Argentina and noted the emails would be part of the discussion at the next meeting.

Commissioner Hecksel reminded everyone to practice recommended social distancing and handwashing procedures during the COVID-19 outbreak.

Commissioner Duncan thanked all of the city staff members who are working to maintain city operations and infrastructure during the stay at home order.

Interim City Manager LaFave thanked the commissioners and community members for supporting the city staff who are working to continue daily duties either onsite, in the field or from home.

Mayor Favale also thanked the city employees who are maintaining streets, answering phones, processing requests, patrolling streets and answering medical calls.

2020-54. Final Reading of an ordinance to amend Chapter 79C of Title VII of the City Code pertaining to recreational marijuana facilities and establishments.

Interim City Manager LaFave explained this ordinance amendment has been discussed in prior meetings because of the expiration date contained in the original ordinance. The proposed amendment contains the same language but removes the expiration date.

Mayor Favale opened this issue for public comment. No other public comment was received. Mayor Favale closed the public comment.

2020-54-A. Pachla-Hamrick. That an ordinance to amend Chapter 79C of Title VII of the City Code pertaining to recreational marijuana facilities and establishments be adopted as attached in Exhibit “A” and that staff be directed to place this issue on a work session agenda in June or July of 2021.

Commissioner Arendshorst noted that while he wanted to revisit this issue in the future, he felt that much of the data that would be needed to make any changes to the ordinance may not be available for some time. He felt it was best to hold a work session next year and then decide if any changes were needed.
Commissioner Pachla agreed that a work session would allow the public to give input and allow additional time for more information from the state.

Commissioner Hecksel stated he had originally favored a formal expiration date to make sure the issue was discussed; however he was comfortable with specifying that the issue be discussed at a work session next summer.

Commissioner Hamrick thought it was important to set a date to review new information and public input. She also wanted to hear from the school board and others in the community.

Commissioner Walters stated he would be voting against the motion because he did not feel that the federally mandated 1,000’ buffer from school property or and the layout of Gaslight Village would change in the future that would warrant any changes. He noted that very little public input has been received, most likely because people are comfortable with the proposed ordinance that prohibits marijuana establishments in East Grand Rapids. He did not feel it was necessary to revisit this issue at a specific date in the future since any commissioner could ask for a review at any time if needed. He supported the ordinance amendment as written and did not feel a work session date was necessary.

Mayor Favale spoke in favor of adopting the ordinance amendment that removes the expiration date.

Yeas: Arendshorst, Duncan, Hamrick, Hecksel, Pachla, Walters and Favale – 7
Nays: -0-

Commissioner Walters clarified that he decided to vote yes to support fellow commissioners who want to discuss this issue again in the future and to avoid the misconception that he did not support the provisions of the ordinance prohibiting marijuana facilities in East Grand Rapids.

2020-55. Introduction of an ordinance to amend Section 1.4 of Chapter 1 of Title I of the City Code adopting the recodified city code publication.

City Attorney Huff explained the city code book has been completely updated and is ready for formal adoption by the city commission. He recommended adopting this ordinance as an emergency in one reading to avoid any gaps in coverage or effective dates.

2020-55-A. Walters-Arendshorst. That an ordinance to amend Section 1.4 of Chapter 1 of Title I of the City Code adopting the recodified city code publication be adopted as attached in Exhibit “B.”

Yeas: Arendshorst, Duncan, Hamrick, Hecksel, Pachla, Walters and Favale – 7
Nays: -0-

2020-56. Hamrick-Pachla. To approve the consent agenda as follows:

2020-56-B. Payroll disbursements of $214,182.17; county and school disbursements of $125.34, and total remaining disbursements of $694,229.50.
2020-56-C. The Public Safety Department’s 2019 Annual Report.
2020-56-D. A four-year contract through 2024 with Cannonsburg Wood Products of Rockford, MI at a rate of $10 per cubic yard for two 40-yard containers and $5.00 per cubic yard for a 120-cubic yard trailer.
2020-56-E. The purchase of computer networking equipment from Eastern Data at a cost of $14,930.00.
2020-56-F. The purchase of apparel and t-shirts for Parks & Recreation programs from Hillhouse of Grand Rapids in the amount of $51,747.00.

Yeas: Arendshorst, Duncan, Hamrick, Hecksel, Pachla, Walters and Favale – 7
Nays: -0-
2020-57. Mayor Favale reopened the meeting for public comment. No public comment was received.

2020-58. Finance Director Mushong explained the overall city budget is $24.7 million in several different funds. She noted the city was transitioning to a new budget software that would be easier for everyone to understand and would be mobile friendly for residents to use.

Ms. Mushong announced the city staff is anticipating a significant reduction in state-shared revenues due to the drop in sales-tax revenue resulting from the COVID-19 closure of businesses. City departments will be deferring capital purchases until at least October 1 and will then determine whether the situation warrants further action or delays. Interim City Manager LaFave stated this “wait and see” approach allows the city to avoid reworking the budget until the impacts are fully known. Mr. LaFave noted the city policy of maintaining a 20% fund balance is to allow operations to continue in case of natural disasters or financial emergencies, so the COVID-19 pandemic would certainly be a case where utilizing the saved fund balance would be appropriate, if that becomes necessary. Commissioner Walters questioned whether the city would need to reduce staff due to the lower revenues associated with the COVID-19 situation. Mr. LaFave stated these decisions would be made later once the full extent of the financial impact is known.

Finance Director Mushong explained a new line item showing a 2% contingency for funds that will be used to maintain the recommended fund balance while allowing for fluctuations in various line items throughout the year. She also reviewed the trends in taxable values vs. assessed values, millage rates, and the impacts of Proposal A and Headlee amendments on local revenues. She noted that staff is still working on long-term solutions to the pension funding situation. She did not feel that any water/sewer rate adjustments were necessary at this time and highlighted the increase in street condition ratings following the first few years of the Street & Sidewalk Millage.

Budget work sessions will take place following the May 4 and May 18 City Commission meetings to review capital requests and departmental budgets before adopting a final budget in early June.

The meeting adjourned at 7:28 p.m., subject to the call of the Mayor until May 4, 2020.

Karen K. Brower, City Clerk

Attachments:  
A – Ordinance amendment to Chapter 79C pertaining to recreational marijuana.
B – Ordinance amendment to Section 1.4 of Chapter 1 adopting the new city code.

Attachments listed above are available for inspection at the office of the City Clerk.
AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF THE CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS BY RESTATING CHAPTER 79C OF TITLE VII OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS WHICH PROHIBITS MARIHUANA ESTABLISHMENTS AND FACILITIES IN THE CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS

THE CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS ORDAINS:

Section 1. Chapter 79C was added to Title VII of the Code of the City of East Grand Rapids on a temporary basis on December 3, 2018. The City is restating Chapter 79C to eliminate the expiration date contained in the initial ordinance. Chapter 79C of Title VII of the Code of the City of East Grand Rapids is hereby amended in its entirety to read as follows:

CHAPTER 79C. MARIHUANA ESTABLISHMENTS AND FACILITIES

Sec. 7.150 DEFINITIONS.
The following words, terms and phrases, when used in this article, shall have the meanings ascribed to them in this section, except where the context clearly indicates a different meaning:

(a) IHRA means the Industrial Hemp Research Act, 2014 PA 547, MCL 286.841 et seq.
(b) Marihuana establishment means that term as defined in the MRTMA.
(c) Marihuana facility means that term as defined in the MMFLA.
(d) MMFLA means the Medical Marihuana Facilities Licensing Act, 2016 PA 281, as amended.
(e) MMMA means the Michigan Medical Marihuana Act, 2008 IL 1, as amended.
(f) MRTMA means the Michigan Regulation and Taxation of Marihuana Act, 2018 IL 1, as amended.

Sec. 7.151. Marihuana Establishments and Facilities Prohibited.
(a) Pursuant to Section 6 of the MRTMA, marihuana establishments are prohibited within the boundaries of the City of East Grand Rapids.
(b) Marihuana facilities are prohibited within the boundaries of the City of East Grand Rapids.

Sec. 7.152. Rights Unaffected by Article.
(a) Except as specifically provided in Section 7.151, this article shall not affect the rights or privileges of any individual or other person preserved under the MRTMA.
(b) This article does not affect the rights or privileges of a marihuana facility outside of the City of East Grand Rapids to engage in activities within the City of East Grand Rapids that it is permitted to engage in under the MMFLA within a municipality that has not authorized marihuana facilities to operate within its boundaries.
(c) This article does not affect the rights or privileges of registered qualifying patients or registered primary caregivers under the MMMA or the MMFLA.
(d) This article does not affect the rights or privileges of any individual or other person under the IHRA.
(e) This article does not affect the rights or privileges of any individual or other person under any other federal or state law, rule or regulation related to the medical use of marihuana.

Section 2. This Ordinance shall be effective on May 1, 2020.

Section 3. Notice of adoption of this Ordinance shall be published within ten (10) days after enactment by publication of a digest, summary, or statement of purpose of the ordinance as provided in Chapter VII, Section 7.5 of the Charter of the City of East Grand Rapids.

NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF ORDINANCE BY THE CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS

Notice is hereby given that on April 20, 2020, the City Commission of the City of East Grand Rapids adopted an ordinance restating Chapter 79C of Title VII of the City Code. This Chapter prohibits marihuana establishments and marihuana facilities within the City of East Grand Rapids. The full text of the Ordinance is available for inspection by and distribution to the public at the office of the City Clerk. No further publication of this ordinance is required or contemplated.

City of East Grand Rapids

By ____________________________
Karen K. Brower
City Clerk.
AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 1.4 OF CHAPTER 1 OF TITLE I OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS TO ENACT A CODE OF ORDINANCES FOR THE CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN, REVISING, AMENDING, RESTATING, CODIFYING AND COMPILING CERTAIN EXISTING GENERAL ORDINANCES OF THE CITY DEALING WITH SUBJECTS EMBRACED IN SUCH CODE OF ORDINANCES, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

WHEREAS, the present general and permanent ordinances of the City of East Grand Rapids are inadequately arranged and classified and are insufficient in form to assure the preservation of the public peace, life, health, safety and general welfare of the municipality and for the proper conduct of its affairs; and

WHEREAS, the Acts of the Legislature of the State of Michigan empower and authorize a political subdivision of the State to revise, amend, restate, codify and compile any existing ordinances and all new ordinances not heretofore adopted or published and to incorporate such ordinances into one ordinance in book form; and

WHEREAS, the City Commission of the City of East Grand Rapids has authorized a general compilation, revision and codification of the ordinances of the City of a general and permanent nature and publication of such ordinance in book form; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary to provide for the usual daily operation of the municipality and for the immediate preservation of the public peace, life, health, safety and general welfare of the municipality that this ordinance take effect immediately upon its adoption.

THE CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS ORDAINS:

Section 1. Section 1.4 of Chapter 1 of Title I of the Code of the City of East Grand Rapids is amended in its entirety to read as follows:

A. The general ordinances of the City of East Grand Rapids as revised, amended, restated, codified, and compiled in book form are hereby adopted as and shall constitute the "Code of Ordinances of the City of East Grand Rapids, Michigan."

B. Such Code of Ordinances as adopted in Section 1 shall consist of the following Titles:

I. Administration
II. Utilities and Services
III. Parks and Public Grounds
IV. Street and Sidewalks
V. Zoning and Planning
VI. Food and Health
VII. Businesses and Trades
VIII. Building Regulations
IX. Police Regulations
X. Traffic

C. All prior ordinances pertaining to the subjects treated in such Code of Ordinances shall be deemed repealed from and after the effective date of this ordinance except as they are included and reordained in whole or in part in such Code; provided, such repeal shall
not affect any offense committed or penalty incurred or any right established prior to the effective date of this ordinance, nor shall such repeal affect the provisions of ordinances levying taxes, appropriating money, annexing or detaching territory, establishing franchises, or granting special rights to certain persons, authorizing public improvements, authorizing the issuance of bonds or borrowing of money, authorizing the purchase or sale of real or personal property, granting or accepting easements, plat or dedication of land to public use, vacating or setting the boundaries of streets or other public places; nor shall such repeal affect any other ordinance of a temporary or special nature or pertaining to subjects not contained in or covered by the Code.

D. While the City Code book and online version of the City Code will be regularly updated to include new ordinances and revisions or repeals of existing ordinances, there will be a period of time from when an ordinance or ordinance amendment is formally adopted and becomes effective and until the ordinance or ordinance amendment appears in the City Code book and online. All ordinances and ordinance amendments become effective in accordance with the provisions of the City Charter regardless of when they appear in the City Code Book or online.

E. Such Code shall be deemed published as of the day of its adoption and approval by the City Commission and the Clerk of the City is hereby authorized and ordered to file a copy of such Code of Ordinances in the Office of the Clerk.

F. Such Code shall be in full force and effect as provided in Section 2, and such Code shall be presumptive evidence in all courts and places of the ordinance and all provisions, sections, penalties and regulations therein contained and of the date of passage, and that the same is properly signed, attested, recorded, and approved and that any public hearings and notices thereof as required by law have been given.

Section 2. This ordinance is declared to be an emergency ordinance necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, life, health, safety and general welfare of the people of this municipality, and shall take immediate effect as provided in Chapter VII, Section 7.2 of the Charter of the City of East Grand Rapids.

Section 3. Notice of adoption of this ordinance shall be published by publication of a digest, summary, or statement of purpose of the ordinance as provided in Chapter VII, Section 7.5, of the Charter of the City of East Grand Rapids.

NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF ORDINANCE BY THE CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS:

Notice is hereby given that on April 20, 2020, the City Commission of the City of East Grand Rapids adopted an ordinance restating Section 1.4 of Chapter 1 of Title I of the City Code in its entirety. This section adopts the entire new City Code and gives it immediate effect. The full text of the ordinance and the City Code is available for inspection by and distribution to the public at the office of the city clerk. No further or additional publication of this ordinance is required or contemplated.

CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS

By: __________________________
    Karen K. Brower, City Clerk
City of East Grand Rapids  
Department of Public Safety  

1st Quarter Report - 2020  
January 1 – March 31
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Department Highlights & Accomplishments:

During the 1st Quarter of 2020, the East Grand Rapids Department of Public Safety was able to:

- On Thursday, February 6, Chief Herald and Detective Sergeant Kolster appeared before the Michigan Law Enforcement Accreditation Commission to answer any questions regarding our final on-site assessment. After answering numerous questions regarding our department and the accreditation process, the MLEAC Board unanimously voted to accept the East Grand Rapids Department of Public Safety as one of only 25 law enforcement agencies to receive accreditation status in Michigan.

- Conduct training with sworn personnel on:
  - Arrests: In-custody (January)
  - Medical First Response (January, February & March)
  - MABAS (January)
  - Response to Resistance (February)
  - Sexual Harassment (March)
  - Several Manual of Policy and Procedures updates
  - Fire Assessments

- Capt. Buikema coordinated the hiring and background investigation processes to fill two PSO vacancies.

- Prepared COVID-19 action plan.
## Crime Statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part I – Violent Crime</th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>% 19-20</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>% 19-20</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>% 19-20</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>% 19-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Rape</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder &amp; Non-Neg. Mansl.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Violent Crime</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part I – Property Crime</th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>% 19-20</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>% 19-20</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>% 19-20</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>% 19-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking &amp; Entering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>400%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-300%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Property Crime</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>150%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-400%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary:

No significant trends.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part II Crime</th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>% 19-20</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>% 19-20</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>% 19-20</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>% 19-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault &amp; Battery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>600%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bomb Threats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Violations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-400%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery/Counterfeiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Fraud</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Law Violations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Account/NSF Check Viol.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Ordinance Violations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>600%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>900%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1500%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscene Phone Calls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating While Impaired</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-300%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resisting/Obstructing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenses/Ind. Exposure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation/Prostitution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking/Intimidation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>500%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism/MDOP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons Violations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Part II Crime: 9 16 78% 8 7 -13% 5 19 280% 22 42 91%

Commentary:

No significant trends.
### Part III Offenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animal Offenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal/Dog Bites</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Viol./Compl.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-400%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-300%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-800%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juvenile Offenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curfew/Loitering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juv. Runaway/Miss.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misc. Offenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Assist</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist Other LE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Viol./War.Arst</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-57%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic/Neig. Dispute</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Alarms</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-70%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Bldg/Door/etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susp. Veh/Person.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-38%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voided complaints</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Part III Offenses:</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>-21%</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>-33%</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
<td><strong>-8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>369</strong></td>
<td><strong>291</strong></td>
<td><strong>-21%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary:**

Part III Offenses include non-criminal activity, court violations, and juvenile status violations. No significant trends.
# Part I Crime - Arrests:

## Part I–Viol. Crime Arrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q</th>
<th>1st Q</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault 0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Rape 0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder &amp; Non-Neg. Mansl. 0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery 0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Violent Crime Arrests:</strong> 0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Part I–Prop. Crime Arrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q</th>
<th>1st Q</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson 0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking &amp; Entering 0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny 0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft 0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Property Crime Arrests:</strong> 0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
<td>0 0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Commentary:

The cumulative arrest totals for each year include both juvenile and adult arrests. When reviewing the figures above, please keep the following in mind: Arrests represent the actual number of individuals arrested. An individual may have been charged with multiple offenses. The reader is cautioned against comparing arrests and offenses, as many times they do not occur in the same quantities.
## Part II & Part III Crime - Arrests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part II Crime - Arrests</th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault &amp; Battery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-200%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bomb Threats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Violations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-200%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-400%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgergy/Counterfeiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Fraud</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Law Violations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Account/NSF Check Viol.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Ordinance Violation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscene Phone Calls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating While Impaired</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-300%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resisting/Obstructing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-400%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-75%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-400%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenses/Indecent Exp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation/Prostitution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking/Intimidation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening/Harassing Compl.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism/MDOP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons Violations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Part II Crime Arrests:</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-89%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-71%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-80%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part III Crime - Arrests</th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warrant Arrest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>500%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>700%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>400%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1600%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Violations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole/Probation Viol.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Offenses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-67%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curfew &amp; Juv. Runaways</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Part III Crime Arrests:</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Commentary:

No significant trends.
Traffic Crash Offenses & Enforcement Activity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Crash Offenses</th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Fatal Injury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-57%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-79%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit &amp; Run</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-83%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-300%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Property</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Traffic Crashes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-60%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>156%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-83%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Enforcement Activity</th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Law Citations</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>158%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-74%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Warnings</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-52%</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enforcement Activity</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-56%</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking Enforcement

Parking Citations Issued: 10 18 80% 63 16 -75% 37 17 -54% 110 51 -54%

Commentary:

Beginning in March, traffic related enforcement activity dropped due to Covid-19/Stay Home Stay Safe policies. In Kent County, all law enforcement agencies are working in concert with one another and have agreed to enforce serious traffic violations and make physical arrests only when necessary.
Criminal Investigations:

### Assigned Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Liaison Officers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-57%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-700%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>600%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assigned Cases</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>-39%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>-47%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>-15%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Clearance Status of Assigned Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfounded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-44%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>160%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (i.e., victim failed to)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-200%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-300%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-600%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT Other Agency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT Arrest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-190%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-600%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant Denied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>400%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleared by Citation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assigned Cases</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>-33%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>-53%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>-16%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary:**

Multiple arrests and/or clearance codes may be issued for one criminal complaint resulting in the number of clearance codes being greater than number of assigned cases.
## Support Services Division Report:

### Year End Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Activity</th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accident Report Copy Requests</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>300%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikes Registered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>500%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>400%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOIA Requests Processed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-80%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-64%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Copy Requests</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>400%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Copy Requests</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gun Related Processes

| Purchase Permits Issued | 0     | 3     | 300% | 0     | 0     | 0%   | 0     | 0     | 0%   | 0     | 3     | 300% |
| Total Guns Registered   | 14    | 18    | 29%  | 9     | 20    | 122% | 22    | 17    | -23% | 45    | 55    | 22% |

### Miscellaneous Activity

| Walk-in PBT’s | 1     | 1     | 0% | 4     | 1     | -75% | 12    | 0     | -1200% | 17    | 2     | -88% |
| Background Checks | 52    | 45    | -13% | 27    | 50    | 85% | 59    | 31    | -47% | 138   | 126   | -9% |
| Sex Offenders Registered | 2     | 1     | -50% | 0     | 0     | 0%   | 0     | 0     | 0%   | 2     | 1     | -50% |
| Vehicle Impounds Processed | 2     | 3     | 50% | 3     | 1     | -67% | 3     | 0     | -300% | 8     | 4     | -50% |
| Vehicles Auctioned | 0     | 0     | 0% | 1     | 0     | -100% | 0     | 4     | 400% | 1     | 4     | 300% |
| PPO’s Processed | 2     | 0     | -200% | 4     | 1     | -75% | 2     | 2     | 0%   | 8     | 3     | -63% |

**Total SSD Activity:** 88 87 -1% 68 88 29% 116 63 -46% 272 238 -13%

### Commentary:

Walk-in PBT’s were temporarily suspended due to Covid-19 Stay home/Stay Safe policies.
Medical & Fire Service Report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Resp./Emergency</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-48%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Death</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overdose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicides/Attempts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Medical Activity</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>-48%</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>-14%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Fire Service Activity** |        |        |     |        |        |     |        |        |     |          |          |     |
| Single Family Dwelling | 1      | 1      | 0%  | 3      | 1      | -67%| 0      | 0      | 0%  | 4        | 2        | -50%|
| Multiple Family Dwelling | 0      | 0      | 0%  | 0      | 0      | 0%  | 0      | 0      | 0%  | 0        | 0        | 0%  |
| Commercial/Other Building | 0      | 0      | 0%  | 0      | 0      | 0%  | 0      | 0      | 0%  | 0        | 0        | 0%  |
| Vehicles             | 2      | 0      | -200% | 0      | 0      | 0%  | 0      | 0      | 0%  | 2        | 0        | -200%|
| Miscellaneous Outdoor | 1      | 0      | -100% | 0      | 0      | 0%  | 0      | 0      | 0%  | 1        | 0        | -100%|
| **Fire Runs Total**: | **4** | **1** | **-75%** | **3** | **1** | **-67%** | **0** | **0** | **0%** | **7** | **2** | **-71%** |

| **Other Fire Service Runs** |        |        |     |        |        |     |        |        |     |          |          |     |
| Hazardous Conditions | 1      | 4      | 300% | 54     | 1      | -98%| 2      | 6      | 200% | 57      | 11       | -81% |
| False or Unfounded Alarms | 1      | 5      | 400% | 7      | 1      | -86%| 2      | 2      | 0%  | 10      | 8        | -20% |
| Mutual Aid Given      | 0      | 0      | 0%  | 4      | 0      | -400%| 1      | 0      | -100% | 5        | 0        | -500%|
| Mutual Aid Received   | 0      | 0      | 0%  | 0      | 0      | 0%  | 0      | 0      | 0%  | 0        | 0        | 0%  |
| Smoke/Odor Investigation | 5      | 1      | -80% | 5      | 2      | -60%| 1      | 0      | -100% | 11       | 3        | -73% |
| All Other Runs        | 12     | 2      | -83% | 0      | 1      | 100%| 2      | 2      | 0%  | 14       | 5        | -64% |
| **Other Fire Service Runs Total**: | **19** | **12** | **-37%** | **70** | **5** | **-93%** | **8** | **10** | **25%** | **97** | **27** | **-72%** |

| **Total Medical and Fire Activity**: | **34** | **27** | **-21%** | **92** | **25** | **-73%** | **29** | **21** | **-28%** | **155** | **73** | **-53%** |

**Commentary:**

Fire Service Activity includes any calls received where fire apparatus responded. No significant activity.
### Internal Affairs Report:

#### Internal Affairs Complaints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abuse of Authority</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive/Use of Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Touching/Behavior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misuse of Position/Authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Profiling/Discrim.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Intimidation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Illegal Activity

#### Improper Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mishandled Pers. Property</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Decision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsification of Documents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules &amp; Regulation Violation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Procedure Violation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate Detainment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Questioning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate Child Interview</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishandling Evidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe Vehicle Operation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viol. Of Dispatch Procedure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Unprofessional Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rudeness/Threatening</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate Statement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprofessional Conduct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Complaints:**

| 0 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0 | -100% | 1 | 0 | -100% |

#### Internal Affairs Complaint Dispositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained in Part</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sustained</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exonerated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exon. in Part/Not Sus. in Part</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfounded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unf. in Part/Sustained in Part</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Dispositions per qtr:**

| 0 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% |

**% Not sustained/Exoner./Unfounded:**

| 0 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% |

### Commentary:

No significant trends or activity.
Selected Community Service Activity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School/Community Liaison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Presentations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety Drills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Tours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Seat Installations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Community Activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>400%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Community Activity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>700%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>400%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>150%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:

No significant trends or activity.
Search & Seizure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>% 19/20</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>% 19/20</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>% 19/20</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>% 19/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search &amp; Seizure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident to Arrest</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-67%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-44%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-75%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.C. and Exigent Circumstances</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>400%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain View</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open View</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-73%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-71%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-64%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop &amp; Frisk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veh. Impound &amp; Inventory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-67%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Pursuit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-200%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-300%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searches Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-59%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-52%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-73%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:
No significant trends.
Response to Resistance (Use of Force):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1st Q 19</th>
<th>1st Q 20</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calls for Service</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>1226</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to Resistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:

Officers will generally contact at least one individual during a call for service, but have numerous contacts with citizens that are not documented throughout the course of a 24hr. shift. Calls for service include all contacts with individuals that would involve an arrest or a Response to Resistance.

Use of force is a rare occurrence in East Grand Rapids. No significant trends.
Date: May 4, 2020

To: Honorable Mayor and City Commissioners

From: Mark Herald, Director of Public Safety

Subject: Purchase (2) Flir K33 Thermal Imagers with truck chargers

Action Requested: That the City Commission authorize the purchase of two Flir Brand Thermal Imaging Camera’s from Phoenix Safety Outfitters located in Upper Arlington, Ohio for the amount of $6,861.72.

Background: The two thermal imaging cameras that the Department currently uses are manufactured by two different companies and operate differently. Replacement of both cameras allows for easier use by assigned officers as the operation of both cameras would then be the same. The new cameras have a much better visible display and are significantly easier to use. They also can adjust the heat detection level which will allow the user to detect hot spots or hidden fires during overhaul situations which reduces the chance of a rekindle. I recommend purchase from Phoenix Safety Outfitter as they were the low bid. Adequate funds for this purchase exist in the FY 2019/2020 Capital Budget General Fund Account 101-265-9700 (Drug Seizure).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Safety Outfitter</td>
<td>2 (Cameras)</td>
<td>$2,804.32</td>
<td>$5,606.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Truck Chargers)</td>
<td>$626.64</td>
<td>$1,253.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,861.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edarly Company</td>
<td>2 (Cameras)</td>
<td>$3,162.00</td>
<td>$6,324.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Truck Chargers)</td>
<td>$725.00</td>
<td>$1,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,774.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis Fire Equipment</td>
<td>2 (Cameras)</td>
<td>$3,165.00</td>
<td>$6,330.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Truck Chargers)</td>
<td>$709.00</td>
<td>$1,418.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,748.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Finance Committee has reviewed this report and found it in order.

Approved: ____________________________

Doug La Fave, Interim City Manager

To Protect, To Be Safe, To Be Friendly, Fair, and Ethical
Bill to:

DAN OLNEY
CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS DPS
770 LAKESIDE DR SE
GRAND RAPIDS MI 49506
UNITED STATES
Customer Phone: 616-949-7010
Customer Email: dolney@eastgr.org

Ship to:

DAN OLNEY
CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS DPS
770 LAKESIDE DR SE
GRAND RAPIDS MI 49506
UNITED STATES
Customer Phone: 616-949-7010
Customer Email: dolney@eastgr.org

Date: 20 Feb 2020

Terms: Reference Terms in Body of Quote

Acct Questions: cgrogen@phoenixoutfitters.com
Account Rep: Matt Dumond
Bin Reference #: 
Sent By: Beverly Reed
Ship Method: 
Web Addr: www.phoenixoutfitters.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Item ID</th>
<th>Item name</th>
<th>Item $</th>
<th>Extended $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>#72203-0411</td>
<td>Flir - K33 Thermal Imager Kit includes, Hard Case, Camera, (2) Batteries, Carabiner Strap, Retractable Lanyard, Tabletop Charger with Power Supply and USB Cable</td>
<td>$2804.32</td>
<td>$5608.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>#T198322ACC</td>
<td>Flir - K33 Truck Charger</td>
<td>$626.54</td>
<td>$1253.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal $6861.72

MI-ST TAX EXEMPT @ 0% $0.00

Total $6861.72

Paid to date $0.00
1. Truck Charger
   $725.00
   QTY 2
   $1,450.00

2. FLIR K33 Thermal Imaging Camera
   $3,162.00
   QTY 2
   $6,324.00

Cart Subtotal
$7,774.00
# QUOTE

## ALEXIS FIRE EQUIPMENT CO.
109 EAST BROADWAY
ALEXIS, IL 61412
(309) 482-6121

## ORDER INFORMATION
- **ORDER NUMBER:** 0046925
- **ORDER DATE:** 2/17/2020
- **SALESPERSON:** WEB
- **CUSTOMER NO:** CA102

## SOLD TO:
EAST GRAND RAPIDS PUBLIC SFTY
DAN OLNEY
770 LAKESIDE DRIVE SE
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49506
CONFIRM TO:

## SHIP TO:
EAST GRAND RAPIDS PUBLIC SFTY
DAN OLNEY
770 LAKESIDE DRIVE SE
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49506

## ORDER DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NUMBER</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>ORDERED</th>
<th>SHIPPED</th>
<th>BACK ORDER</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72203-0411</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,165</td>
<td>6,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLIR K33 240 X 180 TIC KIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[WHSE: 020]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T198322</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>709.00</td>
<td>1,418.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLIR TRUCK CHARGER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[WHSE: 020]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/EQ- SHIPPING EACH 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00
SHIPPING COSTS ARE ADDITIONAL

QUOTE EXPIRES 4/30/2020

**Net Order:** 7,748.00
**Less Discount:** 0.00
**Freight:** 0.00
**Sales Tax:** 0.00
**Order Total:** 7,748.00
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and City Commissioners
FROM: Karen Mushong, Finance Director
DATE: April 12, 2020

RE: FY 2019-20 Budget Amendments

Action Requested: That the City Commission approve the resolution amending the FY 2019-20 budget for the quarter ending March 31, 2020.

Background: The General Fund and Special Revenue Funds have been detailed by department/category on the worksheets attached to the resolution due to their budget level being approved by department subtotal.

All these changes represent the proposed budget numbers for FY 2019-20 as shown in detail in the FY 2020-21 City Manager Recommended Budget document. Some of the major amendments include the reduction of $197,600 for the City Manager vacancy in the General Fund and some changes to the transfers in the Street Funds to balance the funding sources between the funds. Other changes are not significant and represent operating adjustments.

In the General Fund, there is a net proposed amendment to bring the planned use of unrestricted fund balance to 200,000 at June 30, 2020. This will change the projected ending unrestricted fund balance to $3,222,691 or 26.21% of budgeted expenditures. The FY 2019/20 original budget was approved with a planned ending unrestricted fund balance of $3,106,641 or 24.98% of budgeted expenditures.

The amendments were reviewed by the Finance Committee and were found to be in order.

__________________________________________
Doug La Fave, Acting City Manager
WHEREAS, it is necessary to amend the appropriations of the City's budget by making the proper adjustments and transfers where necessary; and

WHEREAS, that various funds may require a change in appropriations due to a change in unanticipated costs

WHEREAS, departments have reviewed their budget and are proposing the adjustments to be made; and

WHEREAS, the City Manager has reviewed the amendments and is recommending that the adjustments be

WHEREAS, the Commission may adopt general funds* and special revenue funds* for FY 2019-2020 by departmental appropriation subtotal as presented in attached information; and

WHEREAS, the Commission may adopt the non-general funds and non-special revenue funds for FY 2019-2020 by fund total; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of East Grand Rapids that the budget be amended as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Proposed Amendments</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL FUND*</td>
<td>12,158,000</td>
<td>(80,800)</td>
<td>12,493,000</td>
<td>(195,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(335,000)</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>(220,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR STREET*</td>
<td>1,621,300</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>1,946,300</td>
<td>(15,400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(325,000)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>(265,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL STREET*</td>
<td>1,567,600</td>
<td>(162,400)</td>
<td>1,622,600</td>
<td>12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(55,000)</td>
<td>(175,000)</td>
<td>(230,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL STREET*</td>
<td>2,061,400</td>
<td>105,200</td>
<td>1,986,400</td>
<td>45,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT FUND*</td>
<td>38,700</td>
<td>(21,500)</td>
<td>65,300</td>
<td>(13,100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26,600)</td>
<td>(8,400)</td>
<td>(35,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEALTHY POOL DEBT SERVICE*</td>
<td>148,700</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>148,700</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL COMPLEX DEBT SERVICE*</td>
<td>549,300</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>549,300</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER AND SEWER*</td>
<td>4,465,200</td>
<td>(199,500)</td>
<td>5,045,200</td>
<td>(19,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>Fund Balance Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH CARE*</td>
<td>2,073,500</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>(130,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,203,500</td>
<td>324,000</td>
<td>(230,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(360,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERF*</td>
<td>824,100</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>(400,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,224,100</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>(20,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(420,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEB TRUST FUND*</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL ASSESSMENT*</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>(13,600)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13,600)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AYES:  
NAYS:  
ABSENT:

I, Karen Brower, the duly appointed Clerk of the City of East Grand Rapids, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of a Resolution adopted by the City of East Grand Rapids at a Regular Meeting held April 20, 2020, in compliance with the Open Meetings Act, Act No. 267 of the Public Acts of Michigan, 1976, as amended, the minutes of the meeting were kept and will be or have been made available as required by said Act.

CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS  
BY: __________________________

Karen K. Brower, City Clerk
### CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS
#### GENERAL FUND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amended Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Amendments</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY TAXES &amp; PENALTIES</td>
<td>$ 8,855,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 8,855,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LICENSES AND PERMITS</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERGOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMS</td>
<td>1,102,300</td>
<td>(9,100)</td>
<td>1,093,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARGES FOR CURRENT SERVICES</td>
<td>569,300</td>
<td>(16,100)</td>
<td>553,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION REVENUE</td>
<td>1,212,400</td>
<td>(37,800)</td>
<td>1,174,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINES &amp; FORFEITS</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST AND RENTS</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER REVENUES</td>
<td>159,000</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>163,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,158,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>(60,800)</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,097,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS
## GENERAL FUND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>Amended Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Amendments</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL GOVERNMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY COMMISSION</td>
<td>$30,200</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$30,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY MANAGER</td>
<td>373,400</td>
<td>(197,600)</td>
<td>175,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY ATTORNEY</td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>305,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTIONS</td>
<td>27,600</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>31,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSOR</td>
<td>126,300</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>128,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCE</td>
<td>739,000</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>744,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL ADMIN</td>
<td>244,200</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>252,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GENERAL GOVERNMENT</strong></td>
<td>1,845,700</td>
<td>(177,600)</td>
<td>1,668,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC SAFETY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY</td>
<td>$5,488,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,488,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE PROGRAMS</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PUBLIC SAFETY</strong></td>
<td>5,494,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,494,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY BUILDINGS</td>
<td>$941,400</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$946,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONING ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>140,500</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>143,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET LIGHTING</td>
<td>100,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEALTH STREETSCAPE MAINT</td>
<td>199,500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>209,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASTE COLLECTION</td>
<td>464,800</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>466,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE RESTORATION</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>145,400</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>156,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CITY SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>2,012,600</td>
<td>30,800</td>
<td>2,043,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECREATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION</td>
<td>$817,700</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$820,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOL PROGRAMS</td>
<td>224,300</td>
<td>(18,700)</td>
<td>205,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL EVENTS</td>
<td>150,600</td>
<td>(12,800)</td>
<td>137,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>108,100</td>
<td>(9,700)</td>
<td>98,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUNDS MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>474,700</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>476,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION SPORTS</td>
<td>193,700</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>199,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE SCHOOL SPORTS</td>
<td>67,700</td>
<td>(9,300)</td>
<td>58,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUATIC CLUB (WAVES)</td>
<td>103,900</td>
<td>(8,800)</td>
<td>95,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PARKS &amp; RECREATION</strong></td>
<td>2,140,700</td>
<td>(49,000)</td>
<td>2,091,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>11,493,000</td>
<td>(195,800)</td>
<td>11,297,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS
## MAJOR STREET FUND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amended Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Amendments</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERGOVERNMENT PROGRAMS</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANOUS REVENUE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST AND RENTS</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>(1,400)</td>
<td>9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFERS IN</td>
<td>760,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>806,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>$1,621,300</td>
<td>$44,600</td>
<td>$1,665,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>76,100</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>93,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>(14,000)</td>
<td>806,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUTINE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>314,300</td>
<td>(24,800)</td>
<td>289,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC SERVICES</td>
<td>104,300</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINTER MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>227,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>227,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>144,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>144,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSERS OUT/DEBT SERVICE</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$1,946,300</td>
<td>$(15,400)</td>
<td>$1,930,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET CHANGE IN FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
<td>(325,000)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>(265,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS**  
**LOCAL STREET FUND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amended Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Amendments</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY TAX REVENUE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERGOVERNMENT PROGRAMS</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANOUS REVENUE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST AND RENTS</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>(7,400)</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFERS IN</td>
<td>1,215,700</td>
<td>(155,000)</td>
<td>1,060,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,567,600</td>
<td>$(162,400)</td>
<td>$ 1,405,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                        |                |                     |                 |
| **EXPENDITURES**       |                |                     |                 |
| ENGINEERING            | 71,900         | 17,400              | 89,300          |
| STREET CONSTRUCTION    | 910,700        |                     | 910,700         |
| ROUTINE MAINTENANCE    | 255,600        | (4,800)             | 250,800         |
| TRAFFIC SERVICES       | 27,600         |                     | 27,600          |
| WINTER MAINTENANCE     | 214,700        |                     | 214,700         |
| STREET ADMINISTRATION  | 142,100        |                     | 142,100         |
| **TOTAL EXPENDITURES** | $ 1,622,600    | $ 12,600            | $ 1,635,200     |

|                        |                |                     |                 |
| **NET CHANGE IN FUND BALANCE** | (55,000)       | (175,000)           | (230,000)       |
# CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS
## MUNICIPAL STREET FUND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amended Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Amendments</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY TAX REVENUE</td>
<td>1,345,000</td>
<td>(77,500)</td>
<td>1,267,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST AND RENTS</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>15,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFERS IN</td>
<td>710,000</td>
<td>173,600</td>
<td>883,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>$2,061,400</td>
<td>$105,200</td>
<td>$2,166,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDEWALKS</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORM DRAINS</td>
<td>110,700</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>114,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFERS OUT</td>
<td>1,670,700</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>1,716,700 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$1,986,400</td>
<td>$45,200</td>
<td>$2,031,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET CHANGE IN FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Street construction activity will be recorded and paid out of this fund. However, at the end of the fiscal year, allowable expenditures will be transferred to the Major or Local Street Fund in order to be accounted for the year-end Act 51 report.
## CITY OF EAST GRAND RAPIDS
### DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT FUND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amended Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Amendments</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUG SEIZURE PROCEEDS</td>
<td>38,700</td>
<td>(21,500)</td>
<td>17,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>$ 38,700</td>
<td>$ (21,500)</td>
<td>$ 17,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES &amp; WAGES</td>
<td>24,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>40,700</td>
<td>(13,100)</td>
<td>27,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$ 65,300</td>
<td>$ (13,100)</td>
<td>$ 52,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET CHANGE IN FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
<td>(26,600)</td>
<td>(8,400)</td>
<td>(35,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Mayor and City Commissioners  
FROM: Karen Mushong  
DATE: March 26, 2020  

RE: Street and Sidewalk Funding Policy Update

Action Requested: To approve an adjustment to the existing Street and Sidewalk Funding Policy to account for the expected decrease in revenue to be received from the State of Michigan.

Background: Monies received from the Michigan Transportation Fund (“gas tax”) are a major outside source of revenue in the City’s Major and Local Street Funds. This revenue source is also unpredictable and has a history of fluctuating depending on the state economy, the amount of gasoline purchased and the politics of State budgeting.

City residents approved a 2.0 millage for improvements to the East Grand Rapids streets and sidewalks in 2015. Since the State was also discussing additional funding during the time of the millage campaign, it was stated that if additional permanent Michigan Transportation Funds were allocated by the State, the amount of millage would be evaluated based on the funding needs in the Street Funds during the budget process when the millage rates are set by the City Commission.

When we began to receive additional funding from the State, the City added the following language to the Street and Sidewalk Funding Policy: Additional Michigan Transportation funds will be allocated on January 1, 2017 (received in March). The additional amount allocated from the State on a calendar year will be adjusted for inflation based on the yearly inflation rate and for the reduction of the millage rate under Headlee. The adjusted amount of additional revenue will be reduced from the yearly projected tax revenue and the maximum millage rate will be reduced accordingly on the tax bill following the previous calendar year.

However, due to the current COVID-19 situation, we received the following message from the State of Michigan – Given the current climate amid the COVID-19 crisis we feel it would be prudent to start planning for a decline in MTF revenues. This message is a friendly courtesy to suggest that you carefully review your street/road projects and capital improvements to ensure that you are prepared for this unprecedented time.

The City would like to be able to complete all the Street projects as planned, and to ensure we can do so, would like to levy the millage rate on July 1, 2020 at the maximum allowed under Headlee which is estimated to be 1.8347 (original millage is 2.0 mills). The reduction in the millage rate for the additional State revenue (after accounting for inflation and the Headlee rollback) would have reduced tax revenue by $121,973 (or 0.1612 mills) to 1.6735 mills. Based on the average taxable value of $187,600, the difference of 0.1612 mills will cost the average household $30.24 per year. We can account for any surplus on the 2022 tax bills if need be.

This was reviewed by the Finance Committee and was found to be in order.

Doug La Fave, Interim City Manager
MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Commissioners
FROM: Doug La Fave, Acting City Manager
DATE: April 10, 2020

RE: FY 20-21 MERF Replacements and Purchases

Action Requested: That the City Commission approve MERF replacements and purchases for FY 20-21.

Background: The City purchases vehicles and equipment through State of Michigan bids through MiDeal or other collective purchasing contracts when possible. This allows the City to realize savings for purchases because of the much larger volume and economy of scale. MiDeal contracts and equipment and vehicle information is available via the State of Michigan website via the following link:

https://www.michigan.gov/dtmb/0,5552,7-358-82550_85753_96139_96141-311143--,00.html

NJPA is another government contract purchasing consortium that the City utilizes for purchasing trucks. The contract # for truck purchase through NJPA is 081716-NVS.

The attached report provides and assessment of each vehicle or piece of equipment as well as recommended replacements.

This has been reviewed by the Finance Committee and found to be in order.
MERF Replacement Purchases FY 20/21

1. **#110, 2006 Ford Econoline E-150 Van-DPW Engineering**

Vehicle Information:

- 30,660 miles/3,944 hours
- Air conditioning system needs to be replaced
- Complete underbody has rusted
- Front and rear suspension need replacement
- Heavier rated vehicle is needed for Engineering tools/equipment

Vehicle Replacement: 2020/2021 Chevy ¾ ton pickup truck

- MiDeal Contract
- Berger Chevrolet
- Not to exceed $35,000 with options
2. **#136, Bobcat Toolcat 5600T-DPW Operations**

Vehicle Information:

- 2,175 hours
- Uni-frame which is an encased frame structure that houses valves, solenoids, tubes, hoses and wiring is rusting through
- Body/frame are rusted
- Floorboard is rusted through-welded together with steel plate
- A/C condenser is rusted and corroded-does not work-will need to be replaced
- Suspension is rusted, worn and loose

Vehicle Replacement: 2020 Bobcat Toolcat

- MiDeal Contract
- Carleton Equipment
- Not to exceed $60,000 with options

Vehicle Information:

- 69,517 miles/13,088 hours (Equivalent to 288,000 miles from ready idling)
- High mileage equivalent on all mechanical system parts
- Water pump is leaking—would require dropping the motor and taking transmission out of the bottom to complete repair
- Has had exhaust/cab issues

Vehicle Replacement: 2021 Ford Explorer Police Interceptor-Public Safety

- MiDeal Contract
- Gorno Ford
- Not to exceed $36,000 for vehicle
- Additional amount in-house or through vendor for moving cage, mounts, etc.
- Total not to exceed $48,700
4. #127, 2012 International 7400-DPW Operations

Vehicle Information:

- 21,852 miles/2,529 hours
- Flywheel housing has a small crack
- The bottom of the engine above the oil pan is rusted and all aluminum and die cast housings are oxidized and deteriorating
- The frame crossmembers are showing signs of rust along with front springs, slack adjusters and brackets
- The box hoist carriage and bottom supports are extremely rusted and corroded
- All hydraulic tubes, fittings and hoses are very rusty and deteriorated

Vehicle Replacement: 2020-2021 International 7000 Series

- MiDeal Contracts and NJPA contract 081716-NVS
- West Michigan International for truck chassis
- Truck and Trailer Specialties for dump box, spreader, underbody plow, junior wing plow, controllers, hydraulics systems and lighting
- Not to exceed $200,000
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and City Commissioners
FROM: Karen Brower, City Clerk
DATE: April 28, 2020

RE: Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Worksession: May 4, 2020

There will be a worksession following the City Commission meeting on Monday, May 4th to review the Capital Improvement Plan for FY 2020-21 to FY 2025-26. Please bring your Capital Improvement Plan book with you (yellow/white cover).

Link to CIP Book: https://www.eastgr.org/Archive.aspx?ADID=981

kb/9596