Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions & Project Updates 5 minutes
2. CAC #2 Feedback Summary 5 minutes
3. Greenway Design Assumptions 10 minutes
4. Route Evaluation Approach & Synopsis 30 minutes
5. Feedback Activity & Report Out 60 minutes
6. Next Steps 5 minutes
7. Public Commentary 3 min / person
PROJECT UPDATES & SCHEDULE
Task 1: PROJECT INITIATION

Step 1. Project Kick-off & Consultant Selection
- Intro Meeting (11/19)
Step 2. Existing Conditions Analysis
- CAC#1 (5/4)
Step 3. Issues & Opportunities Analysis
- CM#1 (6/16)

Task 2: PLANNING OBJECTIVES & OPTIONS, IMPACT ANALYSIS & COST SCENARIOS

Step 1. Planning Objectives & Option Scenarios
- CAC#2 (9/14)
Step 2. Impact Analysis and Cost Scenarios
- CAC#3 (1/11)
- SH#1 (2/1)

Task 3: MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS & STRATEGIES

Step 1. Prioritize Conceptual Level Planning Options
- CAC#1 (5/4)
Step 2. Develop Draft Recommendations & Strategies
- CAC#2 (9/14)
- CAC#3 (1/11)

Task 4: MASTER PLAN DOCUMENTATION & ACTIONS

Step 1. Develop Draft Plan Documents
- CAC#1 (5/4)
Step 2. Develop Draft Implementation & Management Plan
- CAC#2 (9/14)
Step 3. Prepare Final Draft Documentation
- CAC#3 (1/11)
Step 4. Master Plan Review & Adoption
- SH#1 (2/1)
Project Updates since CAC#2 (9/14/2016)

• Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
  – Stormwater and water quality focus meetings
  – Washtenaw County Parks Border-to-Border (B2B) Trail and railroad coordination

• Stakeholder Meetings
  - Allen Creek Greenway Conservancy.
  - Potawatomi Mountain Biking Association
  - Developer discussions for proposed projects. Two easements discussed related to upcoming development projects
    - 615 S. Main
    - Jefferson Project (corner of Ashley and W. Jefferson)

• Route Options & Technical Evaluation
  – Project Management Team and Technical Advisory Committee effort
Citizens Advisory Committee – Members & Affiliation

• Peter Allen  Peter Allen & Associates
• Maria Arquero De Alarcon  UM, Assistant Professor of Architecture and Urban and Regional Planning at Taubman College
• Eric Boyd  Board Member: Old West Side Association & Friends of the Border to Border Trail. Old West Side resident
• Terry Bravender  Water Hill Resident
• Robin Burke  Land Protection Manager, Legacy Land Conservancy
• Vince Caruso  Allen's Creek Watershed Group (ACWG)
• Bob Galardi  Parks Advisory Commission
• Nancy Goldstein  Old West Side Resident
• Sue Gott  University Planner
• Chris Graham  Environmental Commission
• Robin Grosshuesch  Water Hill Resident
• Jim Kosteva  UM Director of Government Relations
• Darren McKinnon  Allen Creek Greenway Conservancy
• Sarah Mills  City Planning Commission
• Rita Mitchell  Sierra Club Huron Valley Group
• Melinda Morris  Allen Creek Greenway Conservancy
• Seth Peterson  Old West Side resident, bike rider
• Alice Ralph  Burns Park (South) Neighborhood Resident
• Ellen Ramsburgh  Historic District Commission
• Sonia Schmerl  Board Member: Old West Side Association, Old West Side Resident
• Sandi Smith  Downtown Development Authority

Note: Views of CAC members do not necessarily reflect view of groups and organizations from which they are affiliated.
CAC #2 FEEDBACK SUMMARY
CAC members reviewed proposed cross-sections and maps of conceptual routes in CAC Meeting #2.

QUESTIONS ASKED IN TAKE-HOME FEEDBACK ASSIGNMENT:

- Overall comments on the proposed routes?
- Are there other route options that should be considered?
- Are there other options to connect into neighborhoods to explore?
- What locations might support entry plazas, trailheads, green spaces, etc?
Use Border-to-Border (B2B) trail (if connected to B2B further to the south or accessing at Lake Shore Drive).

Use *eastside* of N. Main St. (narrow ROW area).

Use *westside* of N. Main St. (adjacent to public & private property).

Enhance Lake Shore Drive as access to B2B.

Enhance trail in Bluffs Nature Area. Add N. Main St. mid-block crossing and/or continue on westside of N. Main St.

Bridge over N. Main St. and railroad to connect to B2B trail. *CAC members like the Bluffs connection regardless of overall route alignment. Provides a link into Bandemer Park from Bluffs Nature Area.*

OFF-STREET ROUTES preferred, almost unanimously, over on-street routes. User experience, character, continuity, safety all seen as major benefits.
1. Use B2B Trail if able to connect at or near Argo Dam.
2. Continue along eastside of N. Main St. Constrained ROW along this section. Potential to connect to overpass bridges near existing rail bridge.
3. Continue through Bluffs Nature Area to Wildt St / Railroad Corridor, using existing trail alignment.
4. Use railroad corridor to connect to Summit, with bridges over N. Main St. and the MDOT rail corridor (north or south side of the existing rail bridge)
5. Connect to the potential pedestrian tunnel under the MDOT railroad. Access needed through private property. Attractiveness of tunnel was questioned – not along a “desire line”
6. Connect along Summit Street, through Wheeler Park, and via on-grade to pedestrian tunnel or with new bridge through the MDOT railroad.
7. Utilize railroad corridor and/or portions of Hiscock St.
8. Use 721 N. Main and connection on Felch back to railroad corridor on to on-street greenway along Ashley St. Preference for taking advantage of 721 N. Main.

Note: These routes are conceptual in nature in order to convey general / potential ideas.

Yellow highlighted routes were preferred by CAC members based on feedback.

RED TEXT = Overarching CAC comments/feedback
1. Utilize railroad corridor and/or adjacent properties. Trail elevated along embankment or on-grade at the base of embankment. Rail on-grade at Liberty St.

2. Use railroad on-grade. Need to address street crossings via mid-block crossings or intersection improvements.

3. On-road connection along Ashley, to Kingsley, to First St.

4. Potential private property connections.

5. Miller Ave and Summit St. connections/feeders to a trail in railroad corridor.

6. Explore connection opportunities into West Park trails and across Chapin Street.

7. Bypass and/or feeder trail utilizing Hawk signal at Huron St.

Felch street – Explore 1-one way conversation from N. Main St. to Ashley.

Note: These routes are conceptual in nature in order to convey general/potential ideas.
1. Utilize existing railroad corridor. **Consider elevated crossings** near S. Main St. & Madison St. intersections.

2. First St / Jefferson St. / Ashely St. connection to railroad corridor. – **Jefferson is narrow, consider alternative?**

3. Continue down Ashley St. to Mosley, with mid-block crossing improvement.

4. On-road option along Madison St. to Fifth Ave to Hill St., to Division Ave to Hoover St.

5. Route option parallel to railroad corridor following UM service drive.

**Limiting motor-vehicles at William/First and Jefferson/Ashley.**

1. Utilize existing, wide, rail corridor on the west side of the tracks. Enhance existing railroad crossing at Stimson St.

2. Route option parallel to railroad corridor following UM service drive.

3. On-road connection along Hoover St. to S. State St. to endpoint at Stimson St.

4. Potential bypass / connecter from South Campus to Rose Athletic Campus.

5. Access through parking lot to Stadium Blvd. Connect down to S. State Street via stairs/ramps. **Undesirable**

6. Connection from Stadium Blvd. to White St. and Stimson to access endpoint.

**OTHER:** Explore tunnel connection under Stadium Blvd.

---

Note: These routes are conceptual in nature in order to convey general / potential ideas.

- **Yellow** highlighted routes were preferred by CAC members based on feedback.
- **RED TEXT** = Overarching CAC comments/feedback.

1/11/2017
• For raised railroad facilities, ramps/access to the trail will be critical.
  – No one will use it if they have to go out of their way to access it.

• Explore design opportunities for bike boulevards / road closures / road reductions for on-street options.

• Think more creatively and bigger picture about possible flood control opportunities and co-projects.

• Connecting to and expanding green space is critical and is a real driver and motivator for public support for the project.

• Consider other alignments for on-street connections if using the rail corridor is not a viable option.
CAC Meeting #2 - Additional Key Points from CAC

• Think about WALLY potential (and also Connector).
  – What if bridges need to be rebuilt?
  – Opportunity to then explore pedestrian facilities?

• Think about financing strategies – maybe a Business Improvement District (BID) for the Allen Creek area?

• Where alignments along the rail corridor are limited (e.g. due to easement access), consider adjacent private properties for access (e.g. Fingerle)

• Consider phasing strategy
  – Do we go for low fruit or put out a bold vision for a more robust option?
GREENWAY DESIGN ASSUMPTIONS
Defining the Greenway

• **Think of the Allen Creek Greenway as an Urban Trail**
  – The greenway must respond to and respect the urban context: private properties, street grid, access, buildings, and infrastructure.
  – Opportunities for large, connected, and contiguous open spaces are consequently limited.

• **The Urban Trail will likely be a hybrid of on-street and off-street sections.**
  – At a minimum, on-grade street crossings will be needed in many locations.

• **Connections will be identified along the Urban Trail alignment:**
  – Secondary connectors can provide feeders into adjacent neighborhoods and connect to other assets (parks, community assets, etc.)
  – Opportunities for connecting to or establishing larger open spaces for habitat, recreation, or other public uses will still be a part of the overall plan.
Greenway Design Assumptions - **Amenities**

- Trail will be well lit with **pedestrian scale lighting**
- **Landscaping** and greening will be incorporated, including trees
  - Native plantings emphasized
  - Larger landscaped / restoration areas incorporated where opportunities exist.
- **Stormwater treatment opportunities** will be incorporated and integral to the design.
  - "Visible" techniques preferred over invisible approaches
  - Will meet requirements for Green Streets policy and applicable stormwater regulations
  - Not a “floodplain management or control” project
- **Art and interpretative elements** are anticipated.
  - Can be incorporated as linear expressions along the trail.
  - Incorporated into nodes / entries / plazas
  - Incorporated into trail structures (e.g. bridges)
- **Wayfinding** will be incorporated
Greenway Design Assumptions – **Trail Design**

- **Trail paving materials** will be a suitable surface for all users (e.g. no aggregate, no difficult biking surfaces).

- Typical **trail corridor** dimensions:
  - 30'+ preferred for trail “corridor”
  - Paved trail width will vary – 20’ preferred, 10’ min.
  - Rail road "envelope" is 9' from center of tracks

- Preference for **bike traffic to be separated** from pedestrian traffic by lane markings and/or physical features (i.e. possible only on wide trail cross-section areas).

- **Bridges** will be considered to clear difficult crossings.

- **Ramps** to elevated sections at 7% grade on average (compliant with ADA requirements)
  - 15' minimum clearance for bridging over roads
  - 22' minimum clearance for bridging over railroads

- **Signage** for pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists will be used to help regulate traffic flows where conflicts exist.
Greenway Design Assumptions – *Street Considerations*

- **Removal of parking** on at least one side of the street is assumed.
- Desire to **preserve existing curb edge** on non-trail side of the street (minimizes utility impacts).
- Lane removals are not anticipated. Removal of turn lanes may be needed in some locations.
- **Travel lanes may be reduced in width.** 11.5' minimum when adjacent to curb face (e.g. outside lanes), otherwise 10' minimum.
- **Protected bike facilities preferred** and elevated to curb height to provide physical separation.
- **Street crossings will be enhanced.** Stop signs or other signal controls may be warranted.

- Most street ROWs (rights-of-way) are 66' wide.
  - 15' sidewalk/amenity zone in residential areas typical
  - Pavement widths typically 32 – 34 feet wide in residential areas
  - Pavement widths in downtown commercial areas typically 36-40 feet wide.
ROUTE EVALUATION & SYNOPSIS
Exploring three “what if” scenarios...

**Rail Corridor**
What might it look like if the rail corridor was used to the greatest extent possible?

**Public/Private**
What might it look like if on-street sections were minimized AND the rail corridor was NOT used at all?

**On-Street Route**
What might it look like if *only* on-street and publicly accessible connections were used?
**ROUTE Options**

- Four route options are used for *evaluation purposes*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rail Corridor</th>
<th>Public / Private Option</th>
<th>Street A (1st St.)</th>
<th>Street B (Ashley St.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14,578’ (2.76 miles)</td>
<td>16,025’ (3.04 miles)</td>
<td>17,240’ (3.27 miles)</td>
<td>17,066’ (3.23 miles)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- For consistency, all routes terminate at the Border-to-Border (B2B) trail at Lake Shore Drive.
- *Remember – the final alignment is anticipated to be a hybrid of on-street and off-street sections*
ROUTE Options: RAIL

- ~14,500’ (2.76 miles) – shortest, most direct route
- Follows *within* the rail corridor property for the majority of the route
- Elevated road crossings at the following locations:
  - South Main & Madison, Washington (by the YMCA), Huron, Miller, Felch, and North Main
ROUTE Options: PUBLIC / PRIVATE

• ~16,000’ (3.04 miles)
• This option is based on (a) No access to the rail road; (b) Minimal use of on-street segments
• Includes a mix of public AND private property – following the Allen Creek floodplain
  – Determining the viability of access to any private property has not been fully explored
• Utilizes Bluffs Nature Area to access a bridge over North Main
• Uses an elevated bridge to cross South Main
ROUTE Options: STREET A (1st St. Option)

- ~17,250’ (3.27 miles) – Longest route
- Utilizes the “tunnel” under the MDOT railroad berm into the DTE property.
- On-street option that utilizes 1st Street (west side) in the central portion of the route.
- Crosses South Main with a new signalized intersection at Mosely
• ~17,000’ (3.23 miles)
• Utilizes the tunnel under the MDOT railroad bridge and connects through Wheeler Park
• On-street option that utilizes Ashley (east side) for the central portion of the route
• Crosses South Main at Madison
Route Evaluation Criteria

Consider benefits AND impacts, relative to ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenway &amp; User Experience</th>
<th>Land Use &amp; Economics</th>
<th>Hydrology &amp; Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>Cost &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>Management &amp; Operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Some criteria will be more pertinent for the entire *route* and others for specific *segments*.
- Many of the criteria are more *subjective* in nature – others are difficult to measure.
- Faded out criteria (Cost & Implementation and Management & Operations) will be considered at a later date.
### Evaluation Criteria

#### Greenway & User Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of Use</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elevation transitions</td>
<td>Steeper grades requiring ramps and/or large elevation changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>Length of travel before interruption/ required break point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points of access (plaza / trailheads)</td>
<td>Number of access points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Environment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street crossings</td>
<td>Type of crossing (4-way stops, signals, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road crossing intensity</td>
<td>Crossing distance and/or vehicle volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road speeds</td>
<td>Speed of parallel and cross-traffic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visibility</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Eyes on the Trail”</td>
<td>Trail visibility from public space or other active areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique views from the trail</td>
<td>Locations where broader / longer / novel views are possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Connectivity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open space access / creation</td>
<td>Type of open space (existing vs. potential) and ease of connectivity or access to it (e.g. directly on the trail versus adjacent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility &amp; Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Vehicle Travel</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel / turn lane elimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking space removals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb modification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Bicycle Infrastructure</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike connectivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transit</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Stops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Railroad modifications</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railroad on-grade crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Floodplain Opportunities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain interactions</td>
<td>Area within floodplain, floodway, or other flood prone areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater treatment opportunities</td>
<td>Areas with opportunities for managing larger volumes of stormwater.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Utility impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities (Water, Sewer, Sanitary)</td>
<td>Locations where major utilities may be impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light / utility poles</td>
<td>Number of utility poles potentially impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Trees</td>
<td>Number of street trees (or other trees) impacted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation Criteria

### Economic impacts
- **Commercial proximity**: Concentration of commercial destinations
- **Employment proximity**: Concentration of jobs within proximity of the corridor
- **Population proximity**: Population density near the corridor

### Building Impacts
- **Single-family houses**: Count of single-family houses / residential units potentially impacted
- **Commercial buildings / structures**: Count of structures potentially impacted

### Historic preservation impacts
- **Historic District**: Length of route within historic districts
- **Historic Landmarks**: Distance and impact to historic landmarks

### Land Access
- **Parcel characteristics**: Number of parcels with access needed
- **Connectivity to development**: Count + size of adjacent / nearby properties under development
### Route Synopsis: RAIL OPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USER EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>HYDROLOGY &amp; INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elevation transitions</td>
<td>Floodplain interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>Stormwater treatment opport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points of access</td>
<td>Utilities (Water, Sewer, Sanitary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street crossings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road crossing intensity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road speeds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Eyes on the Trail”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique views from the trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space access / creation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOBILITY &amp; TRANS.</th>
<th>ECONOMIC / LAND USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel / turn lane elimination</td>
<td>Online connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking space removals</td>
<td>Commercial proximity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way adjustments</td>
<td>Employment proximity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb modification</td>
<td>Population proximity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike connectivity</td>
<td>Single-family structure impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Stops</td>
<td>low Single-family structure impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad on-grade crossings</td>
<td>low Commercial structure impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track separation</td>
<td>Historic Districts / Landmarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER COMMENTS

Moderate degree of connectivity ... BUT relies on many additional connector trails/links to access the rail property (especially for elevated sections).
### Route Synopsis: PUBLIC / PRIVATE OPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USER EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>MOBILITY &amp; TRANS.</th>
<th>HYDROLOGY &amp; INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
<th>ECONOMIC / LAND USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elevation transitions</td>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>Floodplain interactions</td>
<td>Commercial proximity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Points of access</td>
<td>Stormwater treatment opport.</td>
<td>Employment proximity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street crossings</td>
<td>Utilities (Water, Sewer, Sanitary)</td>
<td>Population proximity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road crossing intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-family structure impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road speeds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial structure impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Eyes on the Trail”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Districts / Landmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unique views from the trail</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open space access / creation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Connectivity to development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel / turn lane elimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking space removals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right-of-way adjustments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curb modification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Railroad on-grade crossings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Track separation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= POSITIVE / PRO  
= MODERATE / NEUTRAL  
= NEGATIVE / CON
### Route Synopsis: STREET A (1st Street) & STREET B (Ashley Street)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USER EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elevation transitions</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points of access</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street crossings</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road crossing intensity</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road speeds</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Eyes on the Trail”</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique views from the trail</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space access / creation</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOBILITY &amp; TRANS.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel / turn lane elimination</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking space removals</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way adjustments</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb modification</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike connectivity</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Stops</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad on-grade crossings</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track separation</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYDROLOGY &amp; INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain interactions</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater treatment opport.</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities (Water, Sewer, Sanitary)</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECONOMIC / LAND USE</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial proximity</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment proximity</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population proximity</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family structure impacts</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial structure impacts</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Districts / Landmarks</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel characteristics</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity to development</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER COMMENTS
The trail may be on either side of the street – no determination has yet been made regarding which side of the street is preferred and/or more feasible.

- **Green** = POSITIVE / PRO
- **Yellow** = MODERATE / NEUTRAL
- **Red** = NEGATIVE / CON
Route Synopsis

• The **RAIL** option performs the best overall.
  – *Most closely aligned with the CAC’s preference for a contiguous off-street trail.*
  – However, the rail option is entirely contingent on access to the rail corridor for its best advantages to be achieved.

• The **PUBLIC/PRIVATE** option performs in between the rail and street options overall.
  – It also reflects the CAC’s preference for an off-street trail - although the experience is more fragmented and less contiguous.
  – This option is highly reliant on negotiating property access rights for the trail.
  – However, it provides some of the best opportunities for associated trail enhancements, like connections to open space and floodplain / stormwater management opportunities.

• The **STREET** options (A and B) perform similarly, but lowest overall.
  – The context for STREET A is more residential in character with less intense road crossings.
  – The context for STREET B is more commercial in character, following along more urban and trafficked roads, but provides higher levels of access to jobs and commercial areas.
  – Both street options require significant reconstruction of the street edge

• **A hybrid option is the most likely outcome in terms of feasibility and to maximize benefits**
FEEDBACK ACTIVITY
CAC Feedback Activity – Two Parts

CAC members broken into four groups. Use dot stickers, base maps, and flipcharts to provide feedback.

**ACTIVITY #1** - Discuss the importance of the criteria. (15 minutes)
– Each CAC member will put 2 dots to note criteria most important to them. Criteria can receive more than one dot.
– This will help the project team assess which considerations and factors are most important to the CAC.

**ACTIVITY #2** – Each group will be assigned one route option to consider in more detail. (25 minutes)
– Place GREEN dots in locations that your group thinks are the greatest opportunities.
– Place RED dots in areas that your group thinks are the greatest challenges to overcome.
– Add notes to provide additional information and explanation of your dot placement.
– Your group may also consider which alternative segments (jumping to other options) could be explored to avoid challenged areas.

**REPORT OUT** – One member of each group to share highlights of group discussion. (5 minutes)
NEXT STEPS
Next Steps

• **Project Team Activities:**
  – Summarize CAC #3 feedback
  – Route cost evaluation
  – Develop draft recommendations and strategies
  – Stakeholder meetings (January & February)

• **Community Wide Meeting #2 – February 16th, 6:30pm**
  – Location: Council Chambers
  – Similar content as provided in CAC #3
  – Additional feedback opportunities for public

• **CAC Meeting #4 – April 19th, 8:30am**
  – Location: Council Chambers
  – Review draft recommendations and strategies
ADDITIONAL REFERENCE SLIDES
Introductions & Project Participants

Project Management Team

City of Ann Arbor
- Craig Hupy: Public Services Area Administrator
- Connie Pulcipher: Systems Planner + Project Manager
- Brett Lenart: Planning Manager
- Cresson Slotten: Systems Planning Unit Manager
- Kayla Coleman: Systems Planning Analyst

SmithGroupJJR
- Neal Billetdeaux: Principal, Landscape Architect
- Oliver Kiley: Landscape Architect + Project Manager
- Keenan Gibbons: Landscape Architect
- SGJJR Resources: Civil Engineering Expertise
- Quandel Consultants: Rail & Transit Expertise

Technical Advisory Committee

City of Ann Arbor
- Troy Baughman: Systems Planning Engineer, Utilities
- Renee Bush: Safety Services (Police)
- Amy Brow: Safety Services (Fire)
- Chris Carson: Project Management, Construction
- Eli Cooper: Transportation Program Manager
- Tom Crawford: Finance and Administration
- Becky Gajewski: Natural Area Preservation
- Jerry Hancock: Stormwater & Floodplain Program Coordinator
- Jeffrey Kahan: Planning & Development
- Robert Kellar: Communications
- Amy Kuras: Parks & Recreation
- Jennifer Lawson: Systems Planning, Water Quality Manager
- Amber Miller: Downtown Development Authority
- Molly Maciejewski: Field Operations Services Manager
- Matt Naud: Environmental Coordinator
- Jill Thacher: City Planner, Historic Preservation

Washtenaw County & Other Non-City
- Harry Sheehan: Wash. County Water Resources Commission
- Peter Sanderson: Wash. County Parks Commission
- Nick Sapkiewicz: Wash. Area Transportation Study
**Route Synopsis: RAIL OPTION Details**

**PROs**
- Highest continuity.
- Least amount of road crossings and lower intensity.
- Many unique views and gateway points.
- Least impact to roadway operations.
- Least encumbered by floodplain restrictions.
- Relatively low utilities impact (not in road ROW).
- Very few building / structure impacts
- Close proximity to many active / future development sites.
- Little impact to on-street parking

**CONs**
- Requires access to the railroad property.
- Close proximity to rail tracks may require narrower trail design than what is preferred.
- Points of access are most restricted due to the elevated nature of many sections
- Less “eyes on the trail” than other options
- Least opportunity to manage stormwater within the primary parcels (i.e. the rail right-of-way).
- Lowest level of residential population in close proximity.

**OTHER COMMENTS**
- Moderate degree of connectivity ... BUT relies on many additional connector trails/links to access the rail property (especially for elevated sections).
Route Synopsis: PUBLIC / PRIVATE OPTION Details

**PROs**

– Highest potential for connecting trail uses directly to existing and potential open spaces.
– Many opportunities for unique views from the trail.
– Lower impacts to road operations and geometry.
– Little impact to on-street parking.
– High degree of connectivity to bicycle infrastructure and facilities.
– Potential for pursuing stormwater treatment opportunities.
– Good proximity to active/proposed development zones (possible route options).
– Many key parcels are already in public ownership. Some private parcels have easements for a potential trail facility.

**CONs**

– Greatest amount of grade change over the course of route due to combination of elevated sections and steeper terrain areas (i.e. Bluffs Nature Area)
– Requires the most new mid-block street crossings
– Crosses the railroad corridor the most at existing crossing locations (which will need enhancement)
– Highest impact to existing buildings and structures due to off-road nature of the tail.
– Greatest number of parcels and property owners impacted by the route. Success of this option depends on obtaining access to private properties.
Route Synopsis: STREET A (1st Street) Details

PROs
– High degree of accessibility due to being on-street.
– High “eyes on the street” factor.
– High opportunities for connecting to existing or potential open space.
– Good access to transit stops.
– The most residents are within close proximity.
– Minimal amount of buildings impacted.

CONs
– Lowest continuity of any route option
– Has the most road crossings with the highest average speeds for cross traffic.
– Views and user experience from the on-street section affords little unique or fresh views of the city.
– Has the greatest potential impact on travel lanes (turn lane removal)
– Impacts many metered parking spaces and many residential spaces (permit and unregulated)
– Requires the most curb modification

OTHER COMMENTS
– Analysis assumed the trail would be mostly on the **WEST side of 1st St.** Further design exploration (i.e. localized grading factors, utility location, etc) may suggest switching to the east side of the road.
– Passes through the Old West Side historic district.
**Route Synopsis: STREET B (Ashley St.) Details**

**PROs**
- High degree of accessibility due to being on-street.
- High “eyes on the street” factor.
- Best access to transit stops, closer to downtown / Blake transit center.
- Good degree of bicycle connectivity
- Highest concentration of jobs within close proximity
- Highest concentration of commercial destinations within close proximity
- No building impacts anticipated

**CONs**
- Tied for the most road crossings (with Street A)
- User experience from the on-street section affords little unique or fresh views of the city.
- Moderate impact on travel lanes
- Impacts many metered parking spaces and many residential spaces (permit and unregulated)
- Requires additional ROW space in some areas
- Requires the 2nd most curb modification (over 13,000 SF)
- Significant utility overlap with water and sanitary utilities.
- Alignments passes the most through the floodplain.

**OTHER COMMENTS**
- Analysis assumed the trail would be mostly on the **EAST side of Ashley**. Further design exploration (i.e. localized grading factors, utility location, etc) may suggest switching to the west side of the road.
- Passes through the Old West Side historic district.