Meeting Summary

Attendees

City Staff: Eli Cooper, Kayla Coleman, Robert Kellar
Consultant Team: Stacey Meekins, Sam Schwartz; Katherine Nickele, Sam Schwartz; Jeromie Winsor, AECOM; Sarah Lagpacan, AECOM

Meeting Agenda

Purpose:
Present an overview of the draft final plan and collect feedback; discuss plan performance metrics

Agenda:

1. Introduction
   a. Plan process review
   b. Draft plan document overview
2. Strategy overview & metrics
3. Q&A

This meeting was the final public meeting for the development of the Ann Arbor Transportation Plan Update. Due to public health considerations, this meeting was held virtually via the Zoom platform, using the Zoom Webinar feature. The format of the meeting followed a pattern of a series of slides, followed by a poll, followed by an open question and answer period. The following outlines the presentation and question and answer portions of the meeting. Results from the polling sessions are attached.

Introduction

The consultant team provided an overview of the planning process, including the public engagement process and highlights from the phases along the way, including the plan goals,
and the plan values of Safety, Mobility, Accessibility for All, Healthy People/Sustainable Places, and Regional Connectivity.

The consultant team also provided an overview of the plan document. Based on input from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the Transportation Commission, and the Community Advisory Committee (CAC), a list of strategies that had been compiled from best practice research and stakeholder input was refined. The resulting full list of strategies was organized by timeline and priority based on what would be needed to help the City of Ann Arbor reach its two main goals of achieving zero deaths and zero emissions. In the plan document, each strategy is associated with the value or values it represents, which 'E's it represents (Engineering, Education, Encouragement, Enforcement, Equity, and Evaluation), and the timeline in which the strategy should be initiated.

The consultant team provided an overview of how the metrics for the plan were derived:

1. Validity – does the metric accurately measure the result?
2. Reliability – does the metric remain consistent over time?
3. Simplicity – is the data easily available and we have the resources to measure it?
4. Meaningful – if the measure improves, have we improved mobility and people's lives in Ann Arbor?

Strategy Overview & Metrics
The consultant team provided an overview of some of the key strategies that address each value, followed by a polling session and a question and answer session. Below are notes from the question and answer session that followed each value discussion, including both questions and comments. Comments and questions submitted in writing through the Zoom Q&A feature are provided as submitted, but modified slightly where necessary for clarity.

Speed Control
Compilation of related questions

- Q: "Increased emphasis on speed limit reduction" will this be guided by corresponding reductions in the measured 85th percentile speeds or is the plan to simply lower already underposted speed limits? Note, underposted speed limits are illegal under State Law. What will be the impact of lower speed limits on Rush Hour Gridlock?
- Q: We need to focus on enforcing the existing speed limits, which are under our control, before spending time on lowering speed limits, which are not under our control per State Law.
- Q: I wholeheartedly support lowered posted speed limits as well as automated photo enforcement. I have seen this work very effectively in changing behavior in France.
- Q: Is the goal to slow cars down or improve safety. The 85th percentile limit rule is designed to improve traffic flow. Poor traffic flow (slow cars clogging traffic) can lead to more accidents.
- Q: Are motor vehicle related deaths the majority of deaths/injuries? Can underposted speed limits lead to more crashes?
Q: Do you recommend Ann Arbor advocate for permission to pilot automated enforcement?

Q: There are parts of automated enforcement we could do, but don't, though others in Washtenaw use them. A speed camera can still be used without issuing tickets - they're a great way to detect the worst speeders and then have police in place at the times/places the speeders are common. That's legal in Michigan, though we don't use them in AA.

Q: What is the impact of automated enforcement on actual safety?

Compilation of answers

- A: There are some limitations given state laws. We are working with MDOT. They are part of the TAC as well. We are working on how we structure our strategies to address that and work within it and how Ann Arbor can take some steps to change state laws and enact the strategies they want to see on their streets. For instance, there are some limitations on what the city can do on MDOT roads given their jurisdiction. That said, this plan, as a long range plan, is an important venue for putting forth the community's values and vision and making a statement that they hope to see certain things and being able to work with the state where they can't enact certain strategies yet but work towards that in the long term (Answered live)

- A: We do have automated enforcement as one of the tools in the toolbox for addressing dangerous behaviors. That is currently limited by state law. But, part of the strategy is to advocate for changes in that law to allow for use of automated enforcement (Answered Live)

- A: Speed limit reduction has been shown in several studies to reduce speeds in urban areas and to reduce fatal and serious injury crashes overall, which includes drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists. (Post-meeting response)

- A: Speed limit reduction is not proposed as a stand-alone strategy; it is just one of many strategies, including engineering solutions, to lower speeds and improve safety in Ann Arbor. (Post-meeting response)

Q: Speed limits are not an issue right now, as traffic is so badly backed up.....

- A: Thank you for sharing your thought on the speed issue. (Answered via Q&A)

Q: Lowering speed limits without changing the design of the road to lower the measured 85th percentile speeds is bad engineering and dishonest public policy!

- A: Recent studies in other communities (Minneapolis, Seattle, Portland) has shown that reducing speed by posting a lower speed limit without making road design changes can be effective in slowing vehicles. (Answered via Q&A)

Q: Why do we use so little traffic calming? You can't do much about speed limits, but we could stop over-engineering our roads for so much speeding. We've made the physical environment good for speeding, the traffic signals largely encourage it, so people speed.

- A: Traffic calming is subject to specific requirements including buy in from residents. https://www.a2gov.org/departments/engineering/traffic/traffic-calming/Pages/default.aspx (Answered via Q&A)

Q: Robert thank you for your kind and cordial responses! I just wanted to mention that, having been nearly doored on a bike, using on-street parking as a speed control measure may not be ideal. That said I appreciate the emphasis on speed control, as someone living
and commuting on an intracity arterial!
  • A: Appreciate you sharing your experience. It is important we have those first-hand life accounts. (Answered via Q&A)

• Comment: Speed is everything on safety. With or without traffic, speed is still the key safety issue. Congestion 2 times a day just shows how much more we need alternative modes of transit available. Cars take up so much space.. for everything.

• Comment: Just lowering speed limits without lowering 85th percentile speeds is cheaper and does not require the city to spend much. Is that the real reason the city just wants to lower speed limits?

COVID-19 and Remote Work

Compilation of related questions:

• Q: What assessment has been made of the influence of Covid-19 on use of local and regional transit?

• Q: Is this vision zero initiative taking into consideration overall Covid-19 effects? (since there will be many short-medium term changes in how we interact, plan and design)

• Q: References to transportation” now” should acknowledge the influence of remote working. Is that being assessed?

• Q: Has the City approached Ann Arbor's employers to dialogue about staggered start work/end work times to limit traffic jams?

• Q: Is this vision zero initiative taking into consideration the effects Covid-19 will have short and/or medium term in how pedestrians, cyclists, bikers and drivers change their mobility patterns?
  • A: We have talked about how COVID affects this plan. This is a long-range plan and we have rooted the plan in community goals and values that will remain the same regardless of COVID-19. COVID has highlighted the need for different options, destinations closer to your home, and being able to access resources; this is addressed in the plan strategies. We have seen the quick-build strategy is an important resource for cities to adjust how they use their streets and remain flexible, especially during COVID-19. (Answered live)

• Q: What is SEMCOG saying about remote working vs commuting that will influence regional transportation?
  • A: The data that the plan is derived from is from pre-COVID conditions. Even with a lower volume of traffic, these focus areas are likely still a priority. We will need to continue to monitor as we implement moving forward. The focus on safety, mobility, and accessibility are important and we will have to adapt. (Answered live)

• Q: How are we addressing future of remote work?
  • A: Reality is, no one can predict the future. Data showed pre-COVID conditions. Even with lower volume, still likely important. We will follow the data – as an emphasis. But mobility, accessibility, safety are important and we will adapt. Planning is a process (Answered via Q&A)

• Q: Covid has affected my use of busses big time and I currently see more busses with zero passengers than busses with one or two folks on them. I walk now and that may not
change for me in the future. Your plans should account for that possibility across the board. Not really a question, an observation.
  - Thank you for sharing that observation, it is important. (Answered via Q&A)

- Q: What is the current level of rush hour commuting, given the influence of Covid-19 and remote working?
  - A: Thank you for the question. Unfortunately there is not a simple answer other than it is generally lower. The AM and mid-day volume is down significantly. The PM peak, depending on corridor is approaching 80 to 90% of the prior volume with a concentration between 4:45 and 5:15. A shorter duration of a pm peak condition on many corridors. (Answered via Q&A)

- Comment: About 675,000 people died in the 1917 pandemic in the US, and yet cities rebounded. So please let’s not put safety measures “on hold” because of doomsayers about transit or employment.

**Pedestrian Accessibility and Crosswalks**

- Q: I lived in Los Angles where you were ticketed if you crossed the street outside a crosswalk. If a driver ignored a pedestrian in a crosswalk they were ticketed as well. Why hasn't the city enacted a program like this to keep pedestrians safe?
  - A: This is addressed in the plan via recommendations to conduct targeted education around specific behaviors, focused primarily on driver behavior. Pedestrian behavior is addressed through a recommendation to educate and encourage safe behaviors via a traffic safety ambassador program.

- Q: It would help to not put pedestrian crosswalks at bus stops. Everyone is standing around looking at their phones and it's impossible to tell if someone is going to cross or not......
  - A: We appreciate the observation. (Answered via Q&A)
  - A: Every bus stop is a destination and creates a demand for crossing the street at that location. Properly designing those crossings is important to encourage pedestrians to cross at the most appropriate location and to alert drivers to the potential presence of a pedestrian crossing.

- Q: Does the term "enhance visibility" include positive contrast illumination at crosswalks?
  - A: Yes, contemporary practices in lighting for crosswalks is included in the plan and includes positive contrast lighting. (Answered via Q&A)

- Q: Given the large goal of equity and accessibility, does this plan prioritize having the city clear sidewalks in the winter and to finish redoing all the curb cuts that need replacing?
  - A: The City currently relies upon private property owners to address snow removal on sidewalks. There is a citizen report system that allows all citizens to report sidewalks that are not cleared as required. The city has a mechanism to respond to those situations starting with contacting the homeowner and up to including city forces removing the snow, if the property owner fails to, at the owners' cost. Curb cuts and ADA requirements are included in the plan. (Answered via Q&A)
  - A: The plan does include a recommendation to complete all curb ramps and to update the ADA Transition Plan. (Post-meeting response)

- Q: I understand the city currently relies on residents to clear the walks, but it is still very difficult for anyone in a wheelchair or even just old. Snow Buddy has shown how effective
a supported system can be.
  o A: This is something the city has investigated but the funding for it will have to be decided on by council. (Answered via Q&A)

Bicycling:

  • Q (Phone): I work in town, I’m a builder and I travel and my guys back and forth, we are having trouble getting across downtown because of all the lanes blocked off especially on Division. I’m wondering if the city has considered making the bike highway go down Fourth Ave instead and get it out of main arteries that drivers use and allow the bikes to be further away from drivers and still get across town and get to the Williams bike lanes that were put in as well. And that is closer to the new viaduct that comes from Argo.
  
  • Q: Has the city considered using Fourth Ave as the two way bike lane highway? It would require losing parking but it allows main arteries like Division and Fifth to flow better for drivers and keeps bikes safer on a less heavily trafficked road. It also allows the new tunnel from Argo dam to connect. (Q&A)
   
  o A: The current People Friendly Streets initiative was guided by the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) and the mobility/accessibility was necessary in/around the downtown area. City staff coordinated with the DDA for the Division Street pilot project. In regard to 4th, we will continue to work collaboratively with the DDA and we appreciate your suggestion. As you’ve noted there are tradeoffs in all modal changes within the downtown district and given the proximity/familiarity the DDA has with the individual merchant associations and constituencies within the downtown, we would be coordinating closely with them as we take your input under advisement. (Answered live)

  • Comment: hear hear - I use fourth avenue already - it is the best route and connects packard to fuller

  • Q (Phone): There appears to be very little attention paid to biker negligence and bad behavior. As a pedestrian and a motorist I have seen bicyclist do very inappropriate things. When I raised this issue to a police officer, the problem is how you report this. Not just that but it is very unclear what biker responsibilities currently are. It seems to me that part of this session to improve safety has to involve bicyclists.

  o A: Education of people using all modes will be an important component to increasing safety. The plan includes strategies for public education via marketing and education campaigns as well as direct education and encouragement through an ambassador program. (Post-meeting response)

  • Q: Are all these stats (e.g. 80% in the biking slide) from Ann Arbor?
   
  o A: Yes (Answered live)

  • Q: It’s really hard to get around on bikes in AA - still, even with improvements downtown. In my neighborhood, bike lanes appear and disappear, leaving bicyclists on quite dangerous roads without a bike lane. What was the plan when a bike lane just disappears? I don’t mind going a bit out of my way to find a safe route, but a lot of times that is just not possible. Geddes Ave is a particularly egregious example.

  o A: What we have built out is a proposed network for all ages and abilities. In terms of bike routes that don’t connect currently, the focus is on establishing a full
network that provides connectivity throughout the city, that just takes time to build out. (Answered live)

- A: The city of Ann Arbor is a mature urban framework with existing land use, existing rights-of-way, and we have limits. So unfortunately, although our existing transportation plan seeks to having a connected bike lane system, the resources necessary are beyond our capacity. However, our recommendation in the plan is to continue to put priority on connecting the system. (Answered live)

- A: The bicycle and pedestrian design and planning fields have rapidly innovated over the last 5-10 years so communities have more tools to create bike routes than we used to. The plan includes a toolbox to identify where to us the appropriate tools and how to apply them. (Answered live)

- Q: Any plans to put main bike routes away from main commuter routes?
  - A: Yes, a number of streets are called out in the plan as part of the low stress network. (Answered via Q&A)
  - A: We do have a number of routes that follow more local streets. We tried to focus on those low-stress routes and a lot of times those major commuter streets are hard to get to that comfort level. We tried to incorporate additional routes through neighborhoods. (Answered live)

- Q: Are bicycle advisory lanes part of this Transportation report? I don't see this in the plan.
  - A: The draft plan speaks to applying new techniques including pavement markings and the like that are included in design guides including AASHTO [American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials] MUTCD [Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices] and NACTO [National Association of City Transportation Officials] design guide.. Advisory lanes are referenced and recommended in select applications. (Please let me know if you are not familiar with the acronyms.) (Answered via Q&A)

- Q: I find the two-way bike lanes to be overwhelming in terms of cognitive load. It seems confusing and difficult to make left turns, for example. I also dislike the sensation of riding in a contra-flow bike lane. Has the team considered these issues? I am an experienced cyclist and comfortable in traffic. These new modes unnerve me.
  - A: We appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this traffic configuration. This is a level of detail we aren't getting into in this meeting but we will keep this in mind as we move forward. (Answered via Q&A)

- Q: I would support the 2:15 suggestion that bike lanes be designated on the lessor travelled streets. My travels take me east on Miller to Main and the loss of the center left turn lane to make room for a bike lane seems to be reducing safety, not increasing it. Cars blocking the west bound lane (apparently thinking it is still for left turns) and forcing cars down the bike lane for example. Moving the bike lane to a street to the north or south might be an improvement. I have seen cars in the bike lane near farmers market too, more than one.
  - A: Thank you for sharing that observation. (Answered via Q&A)

- Q: What is the thinking around the 2-way bike lanes on one-way streets? Can't the bike lanes follow the flow of traffic, like they "did" on Division and Fifth? What am I missing in the thinking on this?
  - A: Tom, please send this question to ecooper@a2gov.org so we can give it the complete answer it deserves. Thank you. (Answered via Q&A)
  - A: Two-way bike lanes are sometimes a good option to make the bicycle network
complete. They are appropriate where the physical space and infrastructure can support them and are always implemented based on sound engineering practices and industry best practices. (Post-meeting response)

- Q: Not sure “all ages” is a good label. No way I let my 7 year old granddaughter ride in a bike lane shared with a street. She just learned how to work a two wheel bike. I think I know what you intend but not sure your label quite covers it accurately.
  
  o A: Your concern is valid as experience is an important measure of comfort. (Answered via Q&A)
  
  o A: The “all ages and abilities” term is consistent with national guidance from the National Association of City Transportation Officials. The goal of those routes would be to create an environment where people do feel comfortable taking families and children of all ages on a bike; however, personal comfort levels will vary.

- Q: Plans to put bike routes away from commuter routes.
  
  o A: Yes. A number of routes that follow more local streets in the plan. We tried to focus on those low stress routes and a lot of times those major commuter streets are harder to get to the lower comfort level (Answered via Q&A)

- Q: Are the advisory bike considered to be a trial or a permanent change. If trial, how long do you expect the trial to last? Who ultimately decides which advisory bike lines will remain.
  
  o A: Advisory bike lanes are used throughout North America and are a new addition to Ann Arbor. The city made the decision to put these in place on a low speed, low traffic volume residential street. There are plans for additional advisory bike lanes this spring. (Answered via Q&A)

- Q: I am concerned that there appears to be little attention to biker behavior and negligence. As we support more access to bicycle lanes, we need to be clear about the current laws in regards to bicycling and how the laws need to be tightened to hold bikers accountable for negligence.
  
  o A: We appreciate the comment. It is always a balance to make sure everyone is abiding by their rules and responsibilities. (Answered via Q&A)

- Comment: And it would help if cyclists realized they were not visible to many vehicles with blind spots. They buzz by without checking for turn signals etc...

- Comment: I would support the 2:15 suggestion that bike lanes be designated on the lessor travelled streets. My travels take me east on Miller to Main and the loss of the center left turn lane to make room for a bike lane seems to be reducing safety, not increasing it. Cars blocking the west bound lane (apparently thinking it is still for left turns) and forcing cars down the bike lane for example. Moving the bike lane to a street to the north or south might be be an improvement. I have seen cars in the bike lane near farmers market too, more than one.

- Comment: Also, why did they do EVERYTHING to mess up First Street.....and Main...but why didn't they just put one bike lane going the way of traffic on First and one on Ashley going the other way......First street...I just feel sorry for the people who live there

Traffic Signals
• Q (Phone): I have a concern that I didn’t see addressed in the plan and that’s that our current traffic signal system currently discriminates against bicyclists because the signal progression is set too fast, and cyclists can’t match that. The signals that are supposed to have cyclist detection don’t have any indication on the pavement where the cyclist needs to be to trigger that detection, and it’s not clear that it would actually detect you if you were in the correct location. Is there any plan that Ann Arbor will move to a system that bicyclists can trigger and actually get green lights as often as motorists do?
  
  o A: We have a specific strategy focused on intersections and we can review that strategy and see how your suggestions would fit in there. With regard to bicycle detection, as technology advances, for in road monitors and alternative ways of measuring the presence of pedestrians/bicyclists/vehicles, the city is investing resources in making our system responsive to all users. (Answered live)
  
  o A: A strategy was added to address signal timing and how it accounts for walking and bicycling speeds, particularly in areas or along corridors with significant walk and/or bike traffic. (Post-meeting response)

• Q: I’ll note that the intersection of Pontiac and Barton is one of the new detection systems, and it reliably gives approaching cyclists a red light. Even if there’s no cross-traffic to change the signal from green to red, an approaching cyclist will get a red light. This has been reported on A2 Fixit, is a known problem with the systems (and is fixable), but nothing has been done. Could we also require that new detection systems actually work?
  
  o A: We are actively working to ensure detection systems work for cyclists as they are replaced. If you want to share the specific A2 Fix it ticket number with me, I can look into it. My email is rkellar@a2gov.org. (Answered via Q&A)

• Q: RE: signal timing: will the detection triggering assessment account for/be responsive to volumes/types of users in a corridor/at an intersection. E.g., for Washtenaw Ave. (w/40K+ ADT and unknown # of bicyclists, how would signalization be prioritized)?
  
  o A: Many of the key corridor traffic signal systems are state of the art demand responsive systems. With detection for all users the system can appropriately allocate green time to all users. (Answered via Q&A)

Next Steps and Implementation
• Q (Phone) What’s the procedure for translating the philosophies in the plan to built projects?
  
  o A: To start, we have identified focus corridors and intersections, and we have developed concept designs for these that provides a fair amount of action for physical improvements. We also have identified needs for uncontrolled crosswalks and the bike network. The plan will also include a consolidation of capital improvement projects as a visual/graphic in the plan. (Answered live)
  
  o A: The city’s capital improvement programming process includes a prioritization process that enables us to assign priority through various parameters as we value our investments. A lot of the philosophies described in this plan with regard to safety, mobility, and equity are parameters that are used in our CIP process as well. The philosophies that are in the plan will also affect the prioritization of a variety of projects that might be even outside the transportation realm. (Answered live)

• Q: What is the expected timeline to submit this plan to Council? We had very little to read and comprehend this plan. Once this plan gets out, I am hoping that there will a follow up citizen engagement session.
  
  o A: Discussed in final slide of the presentation. This transportation plan is part of the
city’s master plan. We will follow the master plan adoption process. Next steps will include: Transportation Commission and Planning Commission review, City Council, Washtenaw County, back to Planning Commission for final adoption and then the City Council for acceptance of the language of the plan. (Answered live)

- The plan will also go back to the Transportation Commission after jurisdictional review (Washtenaw County and other adjacent stakeholders). Community members are encouraged to submit additional comments on the plan to Project Manager, Eli Cooper: ecooper@a2gov.org, 734.794.6430 x43710 (Post-meeting response)

**School Collaboration**

- Q (Q&A) What collaborations have been done with the Ann Arbor Public Schools (AAPS) and the University of Michigan (U-M) for the plan?
  - A: We had representation from both AAPS and U-M on the committees. We had specific surveys targeting students at the University and a separate project that we were about to launch with the AAPS but that was right before COVID-19 lockdowns happened so we could not move forward. But we did have representation from those groups throughout the process via the committees. (Answered live)
  - We have also coordinated directly with U-M on any recommendations on their property. (Post-meeting response)

**Transit**

- Q (Phone): Around page 100, there is mention of Amtrak service. There is need for other inter-city services to be considered, such as Greyhound, Miller Transportation, and Barons Bus. Perhaps there should be a section about intercity transportation (AirRide, Amtrak, Intercity buses, UM Connector, D2A2 buses, etc.)
  - A: Intercity buses are referenced within that strategy. (Post-meeting response)

- Q: I believe that Packard buses already run every 15 minutes during peak times (pre-COVID).
  - A: Thank you for sharing this information. (Answered via Q&A)

**Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)**

- Q: Is VMT related to GHG [greenhouse gas] or reducing volume of traffic? What if all travel was by solar powered electric vehicles?
  - VMT is related to both GHG and reduction of traffic volume. Increased VMT leads to congestion and delay and can degrade safety. (Post-meeting response)

- Q: Is the VMT measurement including the outside-the-boundary portion of trips that ICLEI [International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives] says we’re supposed to count? (Q&A)
  - A: Discussed during the live presentation.
  - A: The intent for the city’s plan is to address the city’s VMT within the city and our jurisdiction. (Answered Live)

**Parking**
• Q: Higher parking pricing shifts the cost onto low wage workers who have to commute to work here. That shifts the cost on to people who can afford it the least or requires them to spend hours on the bus to get to work. How does your plan address this inequity?
  o A: Discussed during the live presentation.
  o A: In the pricing strategy, we do have a qualifier about limiting the effect of any pricing strategy for low-income residents (e.g. tiered income pricing strategy).
• Comment: Might not be a resident. Could be an hourly wage worker outside of Ann Arbor. People who earn little money can't afford to be residents.....
• Q: Why is the DDA proposing expanding the downtown parking supply (at an extraordinarily high price per space) without implementing transportation demand management techniques like pricing first? This seems counter to our transportation and A2Zero plans.
  o Discussed in live presentation, however we can't speak for the DDA. (Answered via Q&A)
  o The DDA is a major contributor to transportation demand management (TDM) as a partner and financial supporter; the DDA is adding incremental amounts of parking as needed to address demand and also works to evaluate and refine parking pricing to address demand. (Post-meeting response)
• Q: A reasonable question was dismissed, so let me rephrase it · if you're planning to try congestion pricing in parking, you will need to take into account that a tremendous amount of the parking in Ann Arbor is University of Michigan parking. Are there plans to try to coordinate that with the University?
  o A: Discussed in live presentation.
  o A: There is a longstanding relationship with the University and the city to the extent that we can such as the Connector with intercept parking at the city’s edge. The university has multi-headed organization with medical demand growing. But, we recognize that University travel affects our roadways and our transportation system and we continue to work with them to achieve our mutual best interest. (Answered live)
• Comment: Geez, any chance we could get the University to go along with demand-based parking costs? They're half the problem there.

Healthy Streets

• Q: I am currently amazed that what has happened so far is to decrease accident potential. So far I have had several near bad accidents with the Healthy Streets on Main.
  o A: Thank you for the input, we appreciate your perspective on how things are working out, or not. (Answered via Q&A)
• Q: The bottom line for me right now, is that this Healthy Streets program has been such a complete mess, I have little faith in what the city planners have in store going forward.
  o A: Thank you for sharing your thoughts. (Answered via Q&A)
• Q: Was the City able to gain enough data from the Healthy Streets initiative prior to their early closure?
The City and the DDA were able to collect scheduled data prior to the facilities reverting to general traffic patterns. (Answered via Q&A)

Q: Question related to Healthy Streets pilot and future plans -- Going forward, will the DDA also be the lead city agency (Eli did note that the DDA was the lead on the current pilot) for non-DDA district streets?

A: Healthy Streets was a city plan, passed by city council. The DDA had its own plan for the downtown area including expanded outside areas for businesses. (Answered via Q&A)

Crashes and Safety

Q: How many of the injuries in a year are from biking and how many are from walking?

A: This report will help: Crash statistics, including those involving bicyclists and pedestrians, can be found in the City's annual crash report: [link](http://a2gov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4586728&GUID=BF04C9E6-E6B3-4F82-9AE5-F72889111B7F&Options=&Search=) (Answered via Q&A)

Q: How many people are killed by bicyclists vs. automobile drivers? I suggest we prioritize accordingly.

A: Here are some crash statistics that may be helpful. Crash statistics, including those involving bicyclists and pedestrians, can be found in the City's annual crash report: [link](http://a2gov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4586728&GUID=BF04C9E6-E6B3-4F82-9AE5-F72889111B7F&Options=&Search=) (Answered via Q&A)

Q: I've looked at the sustainability framework in the past, and was shocked that it didn't have criteria to support transportation safety projects. Has this changed?

A: A2Zero focuses on transportation recommendations that impact emissions and were not directly focused on safety.

Q: What are the most impactful engineering changes that the plan is considering and how does that compare to the expected impact on safety that police enforcement measures will have?

A: The most impactful changes will be those that address the focus intersections and corridors. The specific measures to be taken at those locations, and others, will depend on the unique conditions and needs and may include only engineering measures, only enforcement measures, or some combination of those as well as the addition of education measures. There is no one strategy that will make a big enough impact to achieve all of the city's goals.

Q (Phone): I am excited about this plan and I've been talking about Vision Zero for a decade now. There are a couple of areas I am impressed with such as crosswalk lighting and the use of metrics throughout the plan. Given that Vision Zero focuses on reducing deaths/serious injuries of all roadway users, does the plan mention people who are riding in vehicles? They are not the more vulnerable of users, but a death is a death regardless of who the person is and we want to have buy-in from the total community.

A: This plan was framed for the entire community. While there is focus on the vulnerable users, the tier 1 and tier 2 focus corridors for safety are based on vehicle-to-vehicle crashes. The priority recommendations are framed around the vehicle system. We have included the vehicle realm as a priority. The recommendations in the plan result in safer conditions for all. Road geometric changes address vehicle safety, slower speeds enable drivers to pay better attention, and human factors such
as distracted driving. This is relevant for all users, all citizens within our community.
(Answered live)

General

• Q: What about allowing commercial/shopping/services in neighborhood areas?
  o A: Discussed during the live presentation.
  o A: There is a recommendation in the plan for 20-minute neighborhoods. Multi-use
    neighborhoods, including commercial businesses is important.
  o The 20-minute neighborhood is defined as having land uses classified as a school,
    park, grocery, and retail within a 20-minute walk. However, the parcels classified as
    “grocery” may include stores such as mini-marts that don't serve fresh food. (Post-
    meeting response)

• Q: The 20 minute neighborhood said nothing about commercial. It was Play, Work, School.
  (Q&A)
  o A: Please refer to (UPDATED: page 112) in the draft. This language is found there
    "A 20-minute neighborhood is a place where residents can meet most of their daily,
    non-work needs (like shopping, groceries, parks, and schools) within a safe,
    convenient 20-minute walk." (Answered via Q&A)

• Q: Does the city only plan to blame bad drivers and exclude poor traffic engineering
  decisions on catastrophic outcomes?
  o A: If you have specific concerns as far as engineering issues we would appreciate
    those details. (Answered via Q&A)

• Q: There are several 4-5-lane roads in the city, both MDOT and non-MDOT, where people
  have been injured or killed. Some run next to schools and have had children killed and
  seriously injured in them. The data-driven answer to decrease pedestrian (and driver)
  injuries would be to reconfigure the roads to 2-3 lanes, particularly if the traffic volumes are
  under 20k. So why has the lane configuration strategy been relegated only to roads that
  have “previously been identified”? This seems like this should be an immediate-term effort.
  o A: We appreciate your comment. Please bear in mind this is a long-term plan.
    (Answered via Q&A)

• Q: Is there some way to suggest other metrics? For example for the first round, a really
  good metric would be an annual, properly-done survey of residents as to whether they
  think our transportation system is safe for all. Easy to measure, and highly relevant. It
  could be tacked onto a bigger survey of resident satisfaction. “Share of injuries and
  fatalities” doesn't really get at how safe things are, since you might get lucky with a year
  without a problem, even the system isn't really any safer than the year before. You'd get a
  much more stable and interesting result with a survey in that case.
  o A: If you have additional metrics in mind, please share them with the project leader,
    Eli Cooper, at ecooper@a2gov.org (Answered via Q&A)
  o A: An annual survey is included in the plan and several of the metrics are tied to that
    survey.

• Q: Is the city exploring ways of taking control of MDOT trunklines if they refuse to address
  dangerous speeds or lane configurations (eg Washtenaw, Huron, and Main)?
  o A: Taking over MDOT trunklines is not currently an option. (Answered via Q&A)
A: More specifically, taking over jurisdiction of MDOT streets is complicated by several factors, including MDOT’s willingness and the city’s ability to operate and maintain the facilities. (Post-meeting response)

Q: Improving problematic intersections is good, however if the roads leading to the intersection have an unnecessary number of lanes, improving the intersection without reconfiguring the roads leading to them is missing the point. Please employ “systems thinking” as you propose.

  o A: Appreciate the observation. (Answered via Q&A)
  o A: This plan outlines a safe-systems approach to planning for and designing streets that are safe for all users. (Post-meeting response)

Q: On p. 33 of the draft plan, Washtenaw, Packard, and S State are labeled as “Tier 1” corridors on the map but are not listed on p. 32.

  o A: Thank you for pointing that out, we will address it. (Answered via Q&A)

Q (Phone): I would like to thank Eli and the group who were responsible for putting this public engagement session together. It has been exceptionally well run. I would like a follow up to this engagement session later on. A few concerns: E. Summit and also concerns at the intersection of Division and High Street. Where people have concerns about specific locations, to whom should these concerns be sent?

  o Please submit all feedback to Project Manager Eli Cooper: ecooper@a2gov.org 734.794.6430 x43710. (Answered live)

Q: This is a great presentation, and the work that went in is very appreciated, and I think it could be made even better if it were presented with a bit more enthusiasm that better represents the excitement that I (and others might) feel about it!

  o A: Thank you for sharing your thoughts. (Answered via Q&A)

Q: How will responses to [the in-meeting Mentimeter] survey [about metric] be translated? For example, would prioritization rating for “share of commute trips by walking, biking, transit” equate to a recommendation to update zoning, adopt transit-oriented development, and other land use recommendations?

  o A: Discussed in the live presentation.
  o A: We have some recommendations in the plan regarding land use zoning and transit supported land uses. The ranking question is to give the city an idea what is the most important metric to be considering according to the public. But everything proposed as a metric has recommendations supporting that metric already included in the document.

Q: Sorry to say that the mentimeter surveys have not been helpful at all!

  o A: Appreciate your feedback. (Answered via Q&A)

Comment: I loved walking in my neighborhood, but now there is traffic because all the usual ways are blocked...Main St, First St....Fifth St etc....Main isn't blocked, but it has become much more difficult to navigate...

Comment: The biggest problem is that the roads are already dangerously narrow. Double Tractor trailers use the streets in Ann Arbor...

Comment: That is because people LIVE there....and have cars......it's getting really bad to park in our neighborhood......
• Comment: You can’t build lots of apartment buildings and not expect increased automobile traffic...

• Comment: Members of my family work in Detroit and Livonia.....they are just glad they are working...

• Comment: What I don’t understand, is that the development downtown in the past decade has been tremendous. Two apartment buildings just on Main St at Mosley and Madison. They tore down the South main Market to do that. Now they are trying to narrow lanes right where they have increased population and decreased access to a local grocery outlet etc. There is a lot more traffic with these buildings. Turning onto Main is more dangerous with these building. There is a 7/11 there too. And then they put orange barrels everywhere to narrow lanes. The city needs to get together on whether they want to keep building apartments, or decreasing traffic. These things are not compatible, and trying to implement the Healthy Streets on South Main has been largely unused, and unsafe for motorists.

• Comment: Thanks for the opportunity to participate, and for your work on these issues, it is much appreciated! Continued movement towards less vehicle traffic and reducing carbon emissions while increasing pedestrian and bicycle safety is the way to go for Ann Arbor.

• Comment: When I hear that enforcement against residents is the chief means of improving safety, I am not optimistic about achieving the safety goals!

• Comment: I’d like to see more of this in the plan: direct action regarding motorist behavior - which is, specifically, the /only/ cause of death and emissions (in this context at least).
Mentimeter

Please enter the code

123456

Submit

The code is found on the screen in front of you

Type in the code at the top of this slide
What is your favorite way to get around?

- Walking: 8
- Biking: 10
- Taking Transit: 1
- Driving: 8
- Other: 1
I have participated in public engagement for this plan:

- Online: 15
- In-person: 7
- Neither: 7

Total: 29 participants.
SAFETY & MOBILITY
Do you support each SAFETY metric?

- Annual # of people killed or seriously injured in crashes: 4.5
- Share of serious injuries and fatalities incurred by people walking and biking: 4.6
- Share of serious crashes related to dangerous driving behaviors: 4.5
- # of safety improvements installed per year: 3.3
- % of streets (by mile) with a speed limit of 25 mph or less: 3.7
Do you support each MOBILITY metric?

- Population within 1/4-mile of the all ages and abilities bike network: 3.3
- Population within 1/4-mile of a high frequency transit route: 3.9
- Share of trips made by walking, biking, and transit: 4.2
- # of shared mobility vehicles available: 3
ACCESSIBILITY & HEALTHY PEOPLE/SUSTAINABLE PLACES
Do you support each ACCESSIBILITY metric?

- Transportation costs as a % of household income: 3.5
- Average # of jobs accessible within 20 minutes: 3.8
- Share of bus stops that are accessible, per the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA): 4
- Miles of gaps in the sidewalk network: 3.7
Do you support each HEALTHY/SUSTAINABLE metric?

- Average vehicle miles traveled per day: 3.6
- Share of population living in 20-minute neighborhood: 3.8
- Share of population meeting physical activity guidelines: 3.5
REGIONAL CONNECTIVITY
Do you support each REGIONAL CONNECTIVITY metric?

- **Share of commute trips on transit**: 3.8
- **# of go!pass (or equivalent) holders**: 3.5
Rank the following metrics by importance

1st: Share of serious injuries and fatalities incurred by people walking and biking
2nd: Share of trips made by walking, biking, and transit
3rd: Transportation costs as % of household income
4th: Miles of gaps in the sidewalk network
5th: Share of commute trips on transit
Are there other metrics we should track?
Thank You!