



# City of Ann Arbor Pedestrian Safety & Access Task Force



**Task Force Meeting**

**Wednesday, June 3, from 5 to 7 PM**

**Basement Conference Room ,  
Larcom City Hall**

[www.a2gov.org/pedsafety](http://www.a2gov.org/pedsafety)



**The Greenway  
Collaborative, Inc.**



# 1. Introductions

## Task Force Members:

- Vivienne Armentrout
- Scott Campbell
- Ken Clark (Secretary)
- Neal Elyakin
- Linda Diane Feldt (Chair)
- Owen Jansson
- Anthony Pinnell
- Sarah Pressprich  
Gryniewicz
- Jim Rees





## 2. Approval of Agenda

- Key meeting outcomes:
  - Refine and Vote on Draft Recommendations

1. Introductions	5:00 – 5:05 pm
2. Approval of Agenda	5:05 – 5:10 pm
3. Public Commentary (3 minutes/speaker, limit three speakers)	5:10 – 5:20 pm
4. Approval of Meeting #14 Minutes and Discussion Summary	5:20 – 5:25 pm
5. Update of the Proposed Sidewalk Snow & Ice Ordinance	5:25 – 5:35 pm
6. Draft Outline Agendas and Work Plan	5:35 – 5:40 pm
7. Round 3 Public Engagement	5:40 – 5:45 pm
a) A2 Open City Hall Survey	
b) Community Wide Meeting on July 8th	
8. Refine and Vote on Recommendations to Include in Final Draft	5:45 – 6:55 pm
a) Consensus issues ready for a vote	
b) Proposed amendments ready to discuss and vote	
c) Areas that need further attention	
9. Next Steps	6:55 – 7:00 pm
a) July 1st Task Force Meeting	
10. Public Commentary (3 minutes/speaker)	

*Meeting Packet Available on PSATF's Google Drive  
<http://tinyurl.com/npdjeaz>*



## 3. Public Commentary

- Limit to 3 speakers
- 3 minutes per speaker
- If you comment at the beginning of the meeting you cannot comment at the end





## 4. Approval of Meeting #14 Discussion Summary

- No proposed changes submitted prior to today's meeting

### PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AND ACCESS TASK FORCE MEETING #13 – MEETING MINUTES

**Date:** Wednesday, May 6, 2015

**Time:** 5:00 - 7:00 pm

**Location:** Basement Conference Room – Larcom City Hall

**Attendees:**

Task Force Members Present, 7; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark ; Neal Elyakin; Linda Diane Feldt; Owen Jansson; Anthony Pinnell; Jim Rees;  
Task Force Members Absent, 2: Sarah Pressprich Gryniewicz; Vivienne Armentrout;  
Public Present, 5: Kathy Griswold; Seth Peterson; Richard Hausman; Clark Chametski;  
Eric Lipson refer to Attachment B for sign-in sheet  
City Staff Present, 2: Connie Pulcifer; Chief Seto  
Consultant Present (The Greenway Collaborative), 2: Norman Cox and Carolyn Prudhomme

**Re:** Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force Meeting

Meeting Called to Order: 5:00 pm

1. Introductions.
2. Changes to agenda: None, unanimously approved
3. Public Commentary:
  1. Chuck Chametski – On the local advisory council for Ann Arbor Transportation Authority. One of the biggest complaints is getting to and from the bus stops in the winter. If we can't do something that is 100%, we shouldn't do it at all. Afraid that if the City took on the responsibility of clearing the sidewalks it would take too long to get things clear. Responsibility should be kept on the property owners.
4. Changes to notes and minutes from last meeting: None, unanimously approved
5. Enforcement discussion with AAPD Chief Seto
6. Sidewalk snow and ice ordinance  
Revised working for the recommendations was approved.
7. Discussion of draft process to formulate recommendations. Motion "The Task Force supports the draft process being used by the Greenway Collaborative to produce final Task Force recommendations." Was approved unanimously.
8. Discussion and Consideration of Draft Recommendations
  1. The Task Force provided comments on draft recommendations for planning and engineering.



## 5. Update on the Proposed Sidewalk Snow & Ice Ordinance

- First reading postponed to July 6th





## 5. Draft Letter to City Council

Dear Mayor and Council:

Writing on behalf of the Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force I want to clarify two points which were raised in the brief discussion preceding your decision to postpone until July 6<sup>th</sup> first reading of proposed revisions to the snow and ice ordinance of Chapter 49 (Sidewalks). Since Council members will be reviewing the proposed revisions over the next month your Task Force believes it important that you have accurate information with regard to the proposed revisions.

First, nothing in the proposed revisions to the ordinance call for property owners to clear snow and ice from crosswalks, as was stated last night. Property owners do have a responsibility **under the existing ordinance** to clear snow and ice from sidewalk approaches and ramps **leading** to crosswalks from the adjoining main sidewalk.

Secondly, and similarly, the responsibility of property owners to clear concrete bus stop pads that adjoin their sidewalk is an existing obligation under the current ordinance, albeit a poorly publicized and enforced one. And this is precisely why the Task Force feels it is important to improve the ordinance language so as to make this existing responsibility clear to all.

A combined lack of public knowledge and lack of rigorous City-wide enforcement of these requirements has led to significant problems of safety and access for sidewalk users during the last two winters especially, and these concerns have been an important part of our deliberations and our proposed revisions. We hope this clarification will be helpful in your further consideration of these revisions.

Sincerely,  
Linda Diane Feldt, Chair  
Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force







# 7. Public Engagement – Proposed Round 3 Approach

## Recommended Approach for Round #3 Public Engagement

- Community wide survey launched after July 1<sup>st</sup> once Task Force has developed “final draft” of recommendations
- Community wide meeting Wednesday, July 8<sup>th</sup> for the Task Force to present their “final draft” recommendations
- Input from Round #3 included in the August 5<sup>th</sup> Agenda Packet (sent out on July 29<sup>th</sup>)
- August 5<sup>th</sup> – Task Force develops final recommendations based on the input





# 8. Refine and Vote on Draft Recommendations

Results from Meeting #15 Homework Survey used to divide recommendations into:

- Strong support / Strong support with minor changes
- Insufficient Support
- Areas that need further attention

## PSATF Homework for Meeting #15

### Introduction

**\* 2. Task Force Charge from City Council (reference: page 1)**

On November 18, 2013 City Council passed Resolution R-13-367, which established a Pedestrian Safety and Access Task force of nine members to explore strategies to improve pedestrian safety and access in the City of Ann Arbor and make recommendations to be considered in the subsequent development of a Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. The resolution states:

The Task Force will explore strategies to improve pedestrian safety and access within a framework of shared responsibility through community outreach and data collection, and will recommend to Council improvements in the development and application of the Complete Streets model, using best practices, sound data and objective analysis; the task force will also address sidewalk gaps and create a tool for setting priorities for funding and filling those gaps; the task force will also recommend whether pedestrian safety and access should be the focus of ongoing community scrutiny through the establishment of a standing committee on pedestrian safety.

In the process of addressing the charge given to the Task Force by City Council, the Task Force found that issues related to other modes of transportation arose. The Task Force has focused on pedestrian issues but did consider bicycle, transit, and motor vehicle issues when a direct impact to pedestrian safety and accommodation was identified.

- This section should be included in the introduction
- This section should NOT be included in the introduction
- This section should be included in the introduction with the following changes:

**3. If you DO NOT believe this section should be included in the introduction, please describe why below:**



## 8. Proposed Voting Approach

- 73 Recommendations
- Where there is agreement, we need to address quickly
- Tonight we are approving specific recommendations to be included into the “Final Draft” document
  - Will be presented in the third round of public engagement in July
  - Will have the opportunity to revisit on August 5th
  - Will vote on the entire document in August 26th

### **Proposed Motion:**

To expedite the consideration of the items to be incorporated into the final draft recommendations to be shared with the public in July a formal motion, second and vote will not be utilized for each item.

After discussion of each item and the incorporation of proposed revisions, a show of hands will be used to approve the draft language as recorded in the presentation.



## 8. Strong Support /Strong Support with Minor Changes

- 34 Recommendations



# INTRODUCTION

## TASK FORCE CHARGE FROM CITY COUNCIL

On November 18, 2013 City Council passed Resolution R-13-367, which established a Pedestrian Safety and Access Task force of nine members to explore strategies to improve pedestrian safety and access in the City of Ann Arbor and make recommendations to be considered in the subsequent development of a Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. The resolution states:

*The Task Force will explore strategies to improve pedestrian safety and access within a framework of shared responsibility through community outreach and data collection, and will recommend to Council improvements in the development and application of the Complete Streets model, using best practices, sound data and objective analysis; the task force will also address sidewalk gaps and create a tool for setting priorities for funding and filling those gaps; the task force will also recommend whether pedestrian safety and access should be the focus of ongoing community scrutiny through the establishment of a standing committee on pedestrian safety.*

In the process of addressing the charge given to the Task Force by City Council, the Task Force found that issues related to other modes of transportation arose. The Task Force has focused on pedestrian issues but did consider bicycle, transit, and motor vehicle issues when a direct impact to pedestrian safety and accommodation was identified.

### Responses

I think that this shifts the language as in the council resolution towards a more general non-motorized, plan-based discussion. The other modes of transportation were not addressed in the resolution.

*The language in the last paragraph comes directly from approved language*

**Survey: 8 Support, 0 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support**

# INTRODUCTION

## PROCESS SUMMARY

The Task Force met monthly from April 2014 through August 2015 to identify issues, explore potential solutions and draft recommendations to improve pedestrian safety and access in the City of Ann Arbor. Four subcommittees were created to focus on specific topics and provide guidance to the Task Force.

The seventeen month process required extensive coordination and integration between the Task Force, a City Staff Resource Group, stakeholder focus groups and the general public. The Task force engaged the community through three rounds of public input. In addition to focus group and community-wide meetings the public engagement process included a web survey (939 participants) and a web-based mapping exercise to gather place specific comments (over 400 comments received). Public input was gathered at all meetings and there was extensive personal contact, including outreach to the disability community, meetings, discussions with City Council members and social media contact. Input from the public directly influenced development and prioritization of the Task Force recommendations.

**This section should be included in the introduction with the following changes:**

There was also extensive personal contact, attendance of stake holder meetings (especially of the disability community), meetings and discussions with city council members, social media contact, and more.

The Task Force also took public comment at all meetings, including both those of the Task Force itself, and all of its committees.

***Survey: 7 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support***

# INTRODUCTION

## THE REALITY

About 16% of Ann Arbor's residents walk to work, one of the higher percentages in the country. In a comparison between the number of pedestrian crashes and the percentage of residents that walk to work, Ann Arbor has one of the lowest crash rates in the state and country. Ann Arbor experiences about 50 pedestrian crashes each year which represents 16% of all crashes. Pedestrians account for over one-third (1/3) of all fatal crashes and nearly one-quarter (1/4 ) all serious injury crashes. The disproportionate fatality and injury rates, as compared to total percentage of crashes, illustrate the vulnerable nature of pedestrians.

*Recommendations: Add footnotes for statistics, but do not bring in bicycle statistics*

**This section should be included in the introduction with the following changes:**

Just wondering how 16% was derived. This is a case where I know we're supposed to be focusing on pedestrians, but in terms of fatalities, injuries, and simple vulnerability the situation really is about vehicles versus everyone else...which includes cyclists, a significant commuter group who is in perhaps MORE danger than pedestrians because of the former's frequent use of the roadway.

---

see note on "perception" – I don't think the perception vs. real it framing works here, and is confusing.

***Survey: 7 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support***

## INTRODUCTION

## APPROACH TO RECOMMENDATIONS

Five underlying issues have been identified as the root of pedestrian safety and accommodations concerns in the City of Ann Arbor. As an approach to modify behaviors and address conditions that negatively impact pedestrian safety and access, the Task Force has developed an associated objective to address each underlying issue and grouped recommendations around the identified objectives.

*Recommendation: The objectives are used to organize and may also be measured as a way to track progress. We recommend keeping them.*

**This section should be included in the introduction with the following changes:**

1) Understand what you're saying, but does it imply that increasing safety/access is all a matter of modifying behaviors? Not true unless "modifying behaviors" very broadly conceived to include, eg, adding an RRFB somewhere? 2) Do we need the objectives or does this an unnecessary layer between issues and the recommendations needed to address/resolve them?

**Survey: 8 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support**



# INTRODUCTION

## GOAL – VISION ZERO

The City of Ann Arbor should embrace the Vision Zero concept and the following four principles upon which it is based:

**Ethics:** Human life and health are paramount and take priority over mobility and other objectives of the road traffic system

**Responsibility:** providers and regulators of the road traffic system share responsibility with users;

**Safety:** road traffic systems should take account of human fallibility and minimize both the opportunities for errors and the harm done when they occur; and

**Mechanisms for change:** providers and regulators must do their utmost to guarantee the safety of all citizens; they must cooperate with road users; and all three must be ready to change to achieve safety.

When implementing vision zero, the solutions should be evidence based and the priorities for improvements guided by data.

### Responses

We did not have a full discussion (or any?) about "Vision Zero" unless it was at a meeting I missed. This is a big topic and a loaded brand. Have we examined the functioning of Vision Zero elsewhere or discussed what other priorities may be ignored? In particular the "ethics" statement is very broad, though it appears to be self-evident (of course human life and health are paramount). But as a guiding principle this could have many unintended consequences.

**Survey: 8 Support, 0 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support**

## **OBJECTIVE No. 1**

### **IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND ENCOURAGE USE**

***A. Sidewalk Gap Prioritization System*** – Improve pedestrian connectivity by filling the sidewalk gaps in the City. Towards this end, the City should implement the sidewalk prioritization system developed by City staff with input from the Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force (PSATF) that is included in the Recommendation Specifics section of this document.

## OBJECTIVE No. 1

### IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND ENCOURAGE USE

***B. Pedestrian Access in Construction Zones*** – The City should ensure through building codes, fees, policy and enforcement that a direct, safe and accessible pedestrian route is provided in all construction zones, including providing a protective shed where appropriate. All pedestrian construction routes should comply with the Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices and ADA standards. When construction requires the relocation of a transit stop or interferes with access to transit in any manner, the City shall coordinate with the transit provider to ensure that safe and barrier free access is maintained during the entire course of construction.

**In accordance with best practices**, When space is limited, a sidewalk diversion into the roadway on the same side of the street as the sidewalk should be provided rather than a sidewalk detour to the other side of a street . A pedestrian construction route should take precedent over on-street parking and all but one through motor vehicle lane in each direction when creating **barrier free** sidewalk diversions

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

I agree with this issue. that said, construction zones are likely not a high priority relative to other issues.

Edit the end of the last sentence "... when creating barrier free sidewalk diversions."

**Survey: 7 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support**

## OBJECTIVE No. 1

### IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND ENCOURAGE USE

***D. Crosswalk Maintenance*** – Maintain, in optimal condition, all pedestrian crosswalk signage, pavement markings, lighting and warning beacons so they remain highly visible to motorists and useable by pedestrians of all abilities.

## **OBJECTIVE No. 1**

### **IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND ENCOURAGE USE**

***F. Enhance and Maintain Pedestrian Network Connectivity*** – As part of the plan review process, The City should require that all new development and redevelopment projects address pedestrian connectivity. Existing pedestrian connections should be maintained and improved, including informal pedestrian connections. Areas with poor pedestrian connectivity should be remedied to the degree possible including exploring expanding connections through adjacent properties.

## OBJECTIVE No. 1

### IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND ENCOURAGE USE

***J. Complete Street Planning and Design*** – The City should always strive to implement best practices for pedestrians through complete street planning in all new construction, reconstruction, resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation and preventive maintenance projects to the highest degree possible given the project scope. In addition to referencing the American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHTO) and Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) guidelines, The City should utilize the National Association of City Transportation Official's (NACTO) *Urban Street Design Guide* and *Urban Bikeway Design Guide* when planning and designing roadways as well reference the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) design interpretations and recommended guidelines.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

In general I support this, but the pedestrian connection isn't obvious enough.

***Survey: 8 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support***

## OBJECTIVE No. 1

### IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND ENCOURAGE USE

***K. Placemaking Street Design Guidelines*** – The City should develop design guidelines and strategies that build upon local characteristics and provide visual cues to roadway users beyond typical signage and pavement markings. These guidelines should include: (1) techniques to highlight pedestrian crossing locations through landscaping, lighting and other means; (2) establishing appropriate scaled roadside environments that support pedestrian ~~activates~~ activities; (3) providing amenities that enhance the pedestrian experience; (4) providing buffering between motorized travel lanes and pedestrian spaces to improve pedestrian comfort; (5) utilizing various road and roadside design treatments that slow motorized travel to the desired speed.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

I support this recommendation completely, but I think the word "activates" at the end of Item (2) needs to be corrected to read "activities" (is that the term that is intended here)?

***Survey: 8 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support***

## OBJECTIVE No. 2

### IMPROVE UNDERSTANDING OF TRAFFIC LAWS AND LOCAL EXPECTATIONS

**A. Pedestrian Crosswalk Law** – The City should preserve the language in its current crosswalk ordinance that requires motorists to stop for and yield to pedestrians at or within a marked mid-block crosswalk or an unmarked crosswalk at an intersection. The City should also ~~work with~~ **advocate to** State officials to **promote pedestrian safety and access statewide and** ensure that local control over this issue is not overruled by a new state law.

*The current law no longer has “approaching” in the language*

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

Do we need to mention "approaching" not just "at"? Strike sentence two or reword to " advocate for pedestrians to state "

Actually I agree with this, but if the legislature passed a state mid-block crosswalk law it would be a good thing, as long as they added a provision to 257.606, allowing local jurisdictions to have different laws as long as there is appropriate signage. I don't know that that particular mechanism should be mentioned in this wording, however. Also, the current wording includes a pedestrian waiting at the curb, and this language should include that. I'm not sure "at" is adequate.

**Survey: 7 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support**



## OBJECTIVE No. 2

### IMPROVE UNDERSTANDING OF TRAFFIC LAWS AND LOCAL EXPECTATIONS

***B. Sustained Public Outreach Campaign*** – The City **and the recommended pedestrian champion (see implementaion \_\_\_)** should initiate and support a multifaceted, on-going outreach effort targeting residents, students, out of town commuters and visitors. The campaign should focus on increasing the percentage of motorists who stop for and yield to pedestrians at **all** ~~unsignalized marked mid-block crosswalks~~ and other pedestrian safety and awareness issues as deemed appropriate. This outreach effort would engage public, private and institutional entities to integrate simple positive and memorable messages into their existing correspondence and interactions with their clientele. See the recommendation Specifics section of this document for a preliminary list of ideas.

## OBJECTIVE No. 2

### IMPROVE UNDERSTANDING OF TRAFFIC LAWS AND LOCAL EXPECTATIONS

***E. Targeted Enforcement*** – In conjunction with a public outreach campaign, the City should utilize targeted enforcement aimed at improving the percentage of motorists stopping for and yielding to pedestrians at or within ~~an unsignalized marked mid-block~~ crosswalks. Locations would be determined based on reported and observed safety concerns. Targeted locations should employ current best practices for crosswalk marking and signage.

## OBJECTIVE No. 2

### IMPROVE UNDERSTANDING OF TRAFFIC LAWS AND LOCAL EXPECTATIONS

***F. Zone Treatments*** – In areas that have been identified as having a disproportionately high number of pedestrian safety concerns, the City should initiate and support temporary signage and outreach materials ~~that address the specific issue at hand~~ to address identified problems or barriers to safety. Treatments could include mobile message boards and/or temporary banners.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

eliminate "that address teh specific issue at hand" and replace with "to address identified problems or barriers to safety"

***Survey: 7 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support***

## OBJECTIVE No. 2

### IMPROVE UNDERSTANDING OF TRAFFIC LAWS AND LOCAL EXPECTATIONS

**G. *New Driver Education*** – The City should provide education materials to local driver’s education companies to communicate the importance of motorists stopping for and yielding to pedestrians at or within **a crosswalk** ~~a marked mid-block crosswalk or an unmarked crosswalk at an intersection~~. Education materials should highlight the responsibilities of motorists at Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (HAWKs), Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons (RRFBs) and roundabouts. The City should advocate through its lobbyist and State Representatives that this information be included in the State’s driver education materials.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

add -This should also be addressed at the state level by Ann Arbor State representatives.

**Survey: 7 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support**

## OBJECTIVE No. 3

### ALIGN EXPECTATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REALITIES

**A. *Sight Lines*** – Provide sight lines that permit motorists to see pedestrians at or within crosswalks from a safe stopping distance at all ~~unsignalized marked mid-block crosswalks and~~ in particular roundabout crosswalks. Towards this end, a citywide evaluation of existing conditions should be conducted and monitored on a regular basis initiated. The evaluation should address vegetation, utility poles, controller boxes, topography, road geometry, etc.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

Include a list of hazards? Vegetation, signal band utility polls and boxes, clusters of polls, etc.

**Survey: 7 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support**

## OBJECTIVE No. 3

### ALIGN EXPECTATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REALITIES

**B. *Lighting*** – Using best practices\*, provide lighting levels that permit motorists to see pedestrians at or within crosswalks from a safe stopping distance at all ~~unsignalized marked mid-block~~ crosswalks and roundabout crosswalks under ~~typical~~ nighttime and low light conditions. Towards this end, a citywide evaluation of existing conditions should be **conducted and monitored on a regular basis** initiated.

\* Reference document on google drive

## OBJECTIVE No. 3

### ALIGN EXPECTATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REALITIES

**C. Crosswalk Visibility** – Provide active warning beacons (Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons, Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons or similar) at **all unsignalized crosswalks on any road with three or more lanes or two or more lanes in the same direction or at roundabout crosswalks** ~~at all unsignalized marked mid-block crosswalks and roundabout crosswalks~~ or in **other** locations where motorists may have difficulty detecting pedestrians at or within crosswalks. Where the safe stopping distance exceeds the night vision limit (typically on roads 35 mph or above), employ a combination of the following as necessary to remedy the issue: (1) reduce the speed of the roadway; (2) provide active warning beacons; and/or (3) add full crosswalk signalization. Towards this end, a citywide evaluation of existing conditions should be initiated and the City should institute a process to re-evaluate mid-block crosswalks as conditions change. **These recommendations should not be used as a reason to remove or not install a crosswalk.**

## **OBJECTIVE No. 3**

### **ALIGN EXPECTATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REALITIES**

***D. Crosswalk Design Consistency*** – The City should develop and adopt context sensitive design guidelines that provide consistent regulatory and warning messages for motorists and pedestrians. These guidelines should be based on applicable research and reflect current best practices. The City should set up a process to evaluate the understanding and effectiveness of various crosswalk treatments and adjust practices accordingly.



## OBJECTIVE No. 3

### ALIGN EXPECTATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REALITIES

***E. Restrict Turning Movements*** – Restrict right-on-red and left-on-red turning movements in cases where motorists do not have sufficient sight lines to safely make the turning movement without blocking crosswalks and/or in cases where there is a documented history of conflicts between turning vehicles and pedestrians. ~~Evaluate~~ **Enact a** district wide elimination of right-on-red and left-on-red turning movements in the downtown.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

I don't see this as a huge problem, but appreciate how first sentence qualifies it

***Survey: 7 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support***

## OBJECTIVE No. 3

### ALIGN EXPECTATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REALITIES

***F. Eliminate Potential Conflicts*** – In areas where there are significant conflicts between right-on-green motor vehicles and pedestrians in the crosswalk, implement and evaluate alternative signalization approaches for the intersection that eliminate this conflict. These may include pedestrian scramble signals and permissive only right turn movements.

*Recommendation: include glossary in the appendix*

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

I'm not sure what a permissive only right turn movement is - so a glossary at teh end or explanation here? Scramble may also be a new term for people. I suggest a glossary, which means we have to go back and highlight all the terms to include. More work, but needed.

***Survey: 7 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support***

## **OBJECTIVE No. 3**

### **ALIGN EXPECTATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REALITIES**

***G. Coordination of Transit Stops and Crosswalks*** – The City and transit providers should continue to coordinate the placement of crosswalks and transit stops. The City and transit providers should jointly assess the safety and accessibility of transit stops and concur on the solution when changes are needed due to new development, construction, changes in transit service or user complaints.

## OBJECTIVE No. 3

### ALIGN EXPECTATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REALITIES

**H. Sidewalk Bicycling** – The City should continue planning and engineering efforts to improve roadway bicycling infrastructure to encourage bicyclists to bike in the roadway and minimize conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians on the sidewalk especially in the downtown area. Where a dedicated bicycle lane or generally high quality/level of service for bicycles is provided in the roadway and the sidewalk is typically congested with pedestrians, adult bicycling on the sidewalk should be prohibited **with the exception of adults accompanying young children on bicycles.**

*Recommendation: given that bicycle issues are on the periphery of the Task Force's charge, keep this as is. Defining which level of service methods and standards for segments and intersections would be too cumbersome at this point.*

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

That's not good enough. We need to specify the level of service, otherwise the businesses will exert enormous pressure to call it "good enough" and force bans in place. I do support the recommendation, but we need to be more specific about the level of service, or require bike lanes. We absolutely don't want to have the city stencil more sharrows in door zones and call it a day.

**Survey: 7 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support**

## **OBJECTIVE No. 3**

### **ALIGN EXPECTATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REALITIES**

***I. Shared Use Pathways*** – Existing 8' wide or narrower pathways that are designated to be shared by pedestrians, bicyclists and other non-motorized users should be widened to meet current American Association of State highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guidelines (10' to 14' wide). For pathways with heavy use by both pedestrians and bicyclists, the City should consider pavement markings or dual path configurations together with accompanying signage to delineate separate spaces for bicyclists and pedestrians.

## **OBJECTIVE No. 3**

### **ALIGN EXPECTATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REALITIES**

***J. Ramp Drainage*** – Ramps should be designed, constructed and maintained in such a manner as to avoid the accumulation of water and formation of ice at the base of the ramp.

## OBJECTIVE No. 4

### ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF ALL USERS

**A. Access for All** – The City should embrace the challenge of making its transportation system fully accessible to persons of all abilities. The City should continue to engage the Commission on Disability Issues on the design of specific pedestrian improvements, ordinances and expand the use of best practices that promote safe, comfortable and convenient travel for individuals who rely on pedestrian networks for their daily transportation needs.

#### Responses

This duplicates the guiding principles already discussed. A specific commission should not be directed to take responsibility for this principle, any more than the Planning Commission was (not) directed to address land use and design issues.

**Survey: 7 Support, 0 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support**

## OBJECTIVE No. 4

### ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF ALL USERS

***B. Sidewalk Snow Removal Ordinance*** – The City should amend the existing sidewalk ordinance (Chapter 49) to address winter maintenance requirements to: (1) eliminate the enforcement “loophole” that occurs when new snow occurs within the clearance window of a previous snow fall; (2) provide a single warning to violators each winter season rather than one per snowfall; (3) clarify responsibility for clearing bus stops and bus shelters; (4) define the property owner as the ultimate responsible party; (5) require that all accumulation be cleared; (6) stipulate that all properties be cleared as soon as practicable but no later than 12 hours after the end of each accumulation.

#### Responses

City Council is reviewing this issue. Part of these recommendations have already specifically been eliminated by Council. It would be unduly argumentative to attempt to insist on these specifics; rather, the general principle of maintaining access should be affirmed.

***Survey: 7 Support, 0 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***



## OBJECTIVE No. 4

### ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF ALL USERS

***E. Sidewalk Snow Removal Enforcement Appeal Process*** – To improve enforcement consistency, the City should use an administrative referee or hearing board (as is utilized by Ypsilanti and Madison, WI) to consider appeals to violations of the Sidewalk Snow Removal Ordinance. ~~If an administrative referee or hearing boards is not feasible, the City should coordinate with the judicial branch to define “hardship.”~~ A description of what consists of “hardship” that would allow individuals to escape sanctions in the ordiannce needs to be developed.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

The City should consider establishment of an administrative referee or hearing board to consider appeals to violations of the Sidewalk Snow Removal Ordinance. A description of what consists of "hardship" that would allow individuals to escape sanctions in the ordinance needs to be developed.

***Survey: 7 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support***

## OBJECTIVE No. 4

### ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF ALL USERS

***H. Sidewalk Snow Removal Practices*** – The City should ~~undertake a comprehensive study to~~ assess the financial, operational feasibility **and level of community support** of the City undertaking snow and ice removal on the City's public sidewalk system.

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

The City should assess the financial and operational feasibility.... (The "comprehensive study" is too directive.)

#### **Responses**

Ultimately, I do not see this as being feasible on a city-wide basis. Snow/ice clearance is a labor-intensive activity within a short timeframe, and the volume of manpower needed to clear all ice/snow within 12 hours of a accumulation is too high. Also, there are many homeowners and neighborhoods that do not want the City to do this work, because they fear damage e.g. to young trees, picket fences, etc., which may be covered/invisible in deep snow and are known only to the owner and immediate neighbors. The potential for conflict and legal claims for damage is high.

***Survey: 6 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support***

## OBJECTIVE No. 4

### ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF ALL USERS

~~J. ***Bicycle Lane Snow Removal***—The City should revisit its current snow clearance policy and practices to give a higher priority to clearing bike lanes.~~

K. It is in the best interest of pedestrians to encourage bicyclists to use the roadway rather than the sidewalk. Therefore the City should develop ordinances, Ken fix

#### Responses

I think this is a good recommendation, but I think it's out-of-scope for this task force. There are all sorts of recommendations we could have made for cyclists, but they're out-of-scope. For example, making our driving-in-bike-lanes ordinance closer to MUTC, with enforcement, would be terrific, but too far afield.

***Survey: 6 Support, 0 Support with Changes, 2 Do Not Support***

# IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

## 2. PLANNING

***A. Prepare a Pedestrian Safety Action Plan*** – The City should prepare a comprehensive Pedestrian Safety Action Plan based on the FHWA model that incorporates the recommendations included in this document.

### Responses

We have not reviewed the FHWA model and there is no basis from my experience with this process to support additional investment in such a Plan.

***Survey: 7 Support, 0 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***

# IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

## 2. PLANNING

**C. *Develop Implementation Scenarios*** – Based on the facility recommendations included in this document, the City should ~~prepare an accounting of the location and related costs of the desired physical improvements. The City should then prepare various funding and implementation scenarios that may be used to inform budgetary recommendations.~~ develop an estimate of the costs and locations for improvements. These may be used to consider funding and implementation scenarios.

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

Eliminate "prepare an accounting". That is likely a very labor-intensive task. Rather, "The City should work to develop an estimate of the costs and locations for improved pedestrian facilities as recommended here. These may be used to consider funding and implementation scenarios."

***Survey: 7 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support***

# IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

## 3. FUNDING

***B. Pedestrian Construction Route Fees*** – The City and DDA should **structure fees such that it is always less expensive to provide** revise the fee structure that currently makes it less expensive for a business to close a pedestrian route than to eliminate on-street parking.



## 8. Insufficient Support

- 2 Recommendations
- Areas with less than 50% support



## OBJECTIVE No. 2

### IMPROVE UNDERSTANDING OF TRAFFIC LAWS AND LOCAL EXPECTATIONS

~~**D. Targeted Education**~~— The City should utilize automated cameras to document instances where motor vehicles fail to stop for and yield to pedestrians at or within ~~unsignalized marked mid-block~~ crosswalks and/or fail to stop when another vehicle is stopped for a pedestrian at a marked crosswalk.

~~Using the vehicle's license plate, the vehicle's owner should be contacted noting the time and location of the incident, a description of the behavior observed, and explanation of the potential danger to pedestrians due to the observed behavior and a summary of safe driving responsibilities and expectations. Locations for automated cameras would be temporary and determined based on safety concerns. Automated camera systems should be coordinated with other outreach and education efforts. Targeted locations should employ current best practices for crosswalk marking and signage. Statistics gathered from the camera should be used to evaluate the effectiveness of various outreach,~~

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

Provisions for privacy and use exclusive use of the cameras has to be included to be supported.

There are two different uses of automated cameras here, and they probably should be separated, because the first one may not be legal, whereas the second is definitely legal. These were separate when we discussed them in the committee, and I'd hate to see the second one thrown out with the first if the first is deemed unacceptable.

#### Responses

Guess I would rather just see our police officers handling this personally. It smacks of drones and financially and logistically would be challenging to maintain.

Would prefer to call for targeted education but leave the specific method to police discretion and have them select the tools.

Too Orwellian for my taste.

There are many operational problems, beginning with the cost of implementation of a camera system. Also, the City Council has expressed concern over privacy implications of public cameras.

***Survey: 2 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 4 Do Not Support***



# IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

## 3. FUNDING

***D. Designated Annual Rental Fee*** – *The City should investigate the feasibility and legality of imposing a modest annual fee on all rental properties based on the number of registered tenants. This fee would be designated towards non-motorized access and safety improvements.*

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

I don't think this will fly, but we should investigate it. For that matter, we didn't propose a millage for pedestrian infrastructure improvements, but maybe we should have. I think we all figured it just wouldn't fly, but given the problems, including fatalities, with drivers around our crosswalks, people might actually consider it.

### Responses

Probably not legally doable, and why are rental properties singled out?

Because I own rental properties I'm going to abstain from either supporting or opposing this recommendation.

As a broad concept I support this, but it seems very impractical and would be difficult to get much support. I think we need to look at this sort of fee in a larger context of responsibility for funding.

it singles out a specific class of land use for added fees.

Not a legal possibility! How did this get into a draft without researching its legality under Michigan law?

***Survey: 1 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 6 Do Not Support***



# 8. Areas that need more attention

37 Recommendations



# INTRODUCTION

## THE PERCEPTION

There is a perception that Ann Arbor needs to improve pedestrian safety and access. There is also an **alternative** perception that Ann Arbor extends too many rights and/or spends too much money on pedestrian issues. This dichotomy is not unique to Ann Arbor; rather this is typical of the discussion of pedestrian issues nation-wide. It is the result of an evolving view of the role of our streets and changing priorities in transportation funding.

*Recommendations: see next page*

**This section should be included in the introduction with the following changes:**

Last sentence needs expansion, especially re nationwide trends: more people wanting to live in cities and less wanting to migrate to country/"burbs; more younger people deciding not to get driver's licenses; push for walking as matter of personal/environmental health; more older people = more potential for pedestrian crashes as older drivers/pedestrians deal w/ age-related infirmities, etc.

I'd drop the word "alternative".

### Responses

This section tripped me up. The use of the term "perception" is ambiguous: are these perceptions real, or are you wanting to contrast "perception" vs. "Reality"? And whose perception? The content itself is important, but no need for the "perception" framing.

I don't think that highlighting the disagreement on pedestrian priorities serves any purpose. Also, the last two sentences are overly wordy and discursive.

***Survey: 5 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 2 Do Not Support***

## INTRODUCTION

### THE QUESTION

The Task Force was formed on the premise that Ann Arbor needs to improve pedestrian safety and access. But is this need real? Should Ann Arbor spend additional resources towards improving conditions for people who walk? Ann Arbor has an unusually high number of pedestrian trips. This is illustrated by the 16% of Ann Arbor's residents walk to work, Ann Arbor experiences about 50 pedestrian crashes each year which represents 16% of all crashes. Pedestrians account for over one-third (1/3) of all fatal crashes and nearly one-quarter (1/4) all serious injury crashes. The disproportionate fatality and injury rates, as compared to total percentage of crashes, illustrate the vulnerable nature of pedestrians and the need to improve pedestrian safety and access in the City.

*Recommendations: Eliminate "The Perception" and add the proposed three sentences to "The Reality" and rename it "The Question"*

# INTRODUCTION

## THE COMMON GROUND

The Task force believes that people that choose to walk, or have no other choice but to walk, should not be exposed disproportionately to serious injury and/or death based solely on their means of travel. ~~It also acknowledges that people driving do not want to injure or kill pedestrians. People walking do not want to be struck by a vehicle.~~ The Task Forces' recommendations are directed towards establishing a physical and cultural environment where all modes of transportation may safely and comfortably share the right-of-way.

This section should be included in the introduction with the following changes:

I like this, generally, but it is a juggernaut statement. Perhaps it would be helpful to use words like "the taskforce believes/finds/acknowledges..As common ground.."

The following text could be added: The safety and mobility of people driving and people walking depend directly on all drivers and pedestrians behaving in accordance with the law.

include something about "people should be inspired to walk because it is safe, fun, and healthy" or similar

not sure. the first sentence contains an important message about equity for those without cars. The second statement ("People driving do not want to injure or kill pedestrians. People walking do not want to be struck by a vehicle.") can be left out. Is it self-evident?

Begin with "it is a belief that... "

### Responses

Not sure what "disproportionally" means here - is it ever quantifiable? As matter of physics and human fallibility pedestrians operating in the same space as vehicles will always be exposed to serious injury/death. Last sentence is a given.

**Survey: 4 Support, 5 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support**

# INTRODUCTION

## THE FIVE UNDERLYING ISSUES TO ADDRESS

To improve pedestrian safety in Ann Arbor the following five root issues must be addressed:

### ***Unexpected Pedestrians Crossing the Road***

Many of the pedestrian fatalities and severe injuries in the City of Ann Arbor occur where pedestrian activity is less common or unexpected. Motorists typically adjust their behavior by slowing down and becoming more alert for potential conflicts when the presence of pedestrians is obvious. In general, the more pedestrians present, the safer those pedestrians will be. This concept applies across the City and in specific areas.

### ***Misunderstanding of traffic laws and local expectations***

Much discussion has been focused on the discrepancies between the local crosswalk ordinance and the State of Michigan model. But the issue is more complex; pedestrians and motorists alike do not understand nor follow even the state or national models. This issue is compounded by the large influx of daily commuters, visitors and the City's transient student population.

### ***A disconnect between expectations and environmental realities***

Even an alert driver who understands traffic laws and values pedestrian safety may be challenged by the conditions of our current roadway environment. In some situations a "good" driver simply may not see the person waiting to cross the road or even the person within the crosswalk.

### ***Failure to consider the perspective of all transportation system users***

Some negative behaviors may be attributed more to a lack of awareness than an adversarial position. Education and enforcement should go hand in hand to help raise people's understanding of the issues and establish an environment of mutual respect.

### ***Distracted roadway users***

A study completed in a comparable university town found that distracted motorists are 15 times less likely to yield to a pedestrian in a crosswalk and about four times more likely to be involved in a conflict with a pedestrian. Distracted roadway users put themselves and other roadway users in danger. Pedestrians are the most vulnerable roadway users.

Brumfield, Ryan, and Srinivas Pulugurtha. "When Distracted Road Users Cross Paths." *Public Roads*. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Nov.-Dec. 2011. Web. 21 Apr. 2015.

**SEE COMMENTS ON NEXT SLIDE**

**Survey: 4 Support, 5 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support**

# INTRODUCTION

## THE FIVE UNDERLYING ISSUES TO ADDRESS

This section should be included in the introduction with the following changes:

1) Again, this seems to say increased pedestrian safety is all a matter of behavior modification. But what about speed limits set too high; multi-lane, one way streets downtown; no crosswalks where they're needed; no signals where signals needed? In these cases the regulations are wrong not the driver. 2) I think it would be clearer/of more impact to identify EDUCATION and ENFORCEMENT as an "Underlying Issue" and fold the content of #'s 2 and 4 under this heading. 3) In #3, what does "conditions of current roadway environment " mean as a potential problem for pedestrians - unclear to the average reader. 4) In #5 - since pedestrians are roadway users this section should also note distracted walking as a serious problem, eg ear buds and face buried in smart phone screen.

The heading of Item 2 should read "Ignorance and misunderstanding of traffic laws and local expectations". The second sentence should read: " But the issue is more complex; pedestrians and motorists alike often do not know, understand or follow even the state or national models.

Having looked at the fatality crashes on Michigan Traffic Crash Facts, I think the first statement is blatantly untrue. In the majority of pedestrian fatalities I saw, the crash occurred in places where there are many pedestrians. Also, from my own experience, there is a percentage of motorists who become more belligerent. I don't disagree with the last point of #1. For #3, I don't really agree that there are situations where a "good" driver won't see the pedestrian. We can certainly improve things, but mostly we're attempting to compensate for dangerous, illegal, and incompetent driving. If you can't see things in enough time, you're driving too fast for conditions. I think the lack of following that basic rule is what's being discussed here, and that's not being a "good" driver.

I like the general idea of highlighting several themes/issues. but not sure if these are the right top five. 1, 2 are good. #3 is unclear. #4 is a roundabout way to push complete streets. And I would add design as a central theme.

#3 delete "good" #3 add to the end "for a variety of reasons (lighting, existing foliage, the presence of bus stops, etc)."

**Survey: 4 Support, 5 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support**

*We looked at crashes with a focus on fatality and serious injury crashes but the point is well taken in that this would be hard to prove without a full blown crash analysis.*

*According to the study referenced, distracted pedestrians did not endanger themselves*

# INTRODUCTION

## THE FIVE UNDERLYING ISSUES TO ADDRESS

*There is a one-to-one relationship between the underlying issues and the objectives.*

To improve pedestrian safety in Ann Arbor the following five root issues identified through public input must be addressed:

### **1. *Unexpected Pedestrians Crossing the Road* Too often, walking is not a safe, comfortable or convenient choice.**

~~Many of the pedestrian fatalities and severe injuries in the City of Ann Arbor occur where pedestrian activity is less common or unexpected. Motorists typically adjust their behavior by slowing down and becoming more alert for potential conflicts when the presence of pedestrians is obvious. In general, the more pedestrians present, the safer those pedestrians will be. This concept applies across the City and in specific areas.~~ Our current transportation network places an emphasis on the mobility of motorized vehicles at the expense of pedestrian mobility and safety.

### **2. *Unfamiliarity and misunderstanding of traffic laws and local expectations***

Much discussion has been focused on the discrepancies between the local crosswalk ordinance and the State of Michigan model. But the issue is more complex; pedestrians and motorists alike do not know, understand nor follow even the state or national models. This issue is compounded by the large influx of daily commuters, visitors and the City's transient student population.

### **3. *A disconnect between expectations and environmental realities***

Even an alert driver who understands traffic laws and values pedestrian safety may be challenged by the conditions of our current roadway environment. In some situations, a "good" driver simply may not see the person waiting to cross the road or even the person within the crosswalk due to visibility issues.

### **4. *Failure to consider the perspective of all transportation system users***

Some negative behaviors may be attributed more to a lack of awareness than an adversarial position. Education and enforcement should go hand in hand to help raise people's understanding of the issues and establish an environment of mutual respect.

### **5. *Distracted roadway users***

A study completed in a comparable university town found that distracted motorists are 15 times less likely to yield to a pedestrian in a crosswalk and about four times more likely to be involved in a conflict with a pedestrian. Distracted roadway users put themselves and other roadway users in danger. Pedestrians are the most vulnerable roadway users.

---

Brumfield, Ryan, and Srinivas Pulugurtha. "When Distracted Road Users Cross Paths." *Public Roads*. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Nov.-Dec. 2011. Web. 21 Apr. 2015.

***Survey: 4 Support, 5 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support***



# INTRODUCTION

*From public input*

## THE SEVEN SYMPTOMS

The following seven behaviors have been identified as symptoms of the failure to address the five underlying issues:

### ***Motorists passing other vehicles that are stopped for pedestrians in a crosswalk***

*This behavior is most frequently seen on multi-lane roadways but also observed on two lane roads where cars enter the on-coming travel lane to pass. This behavior is both dangerous and illegal throughout Michigan and the US.*

### ***Motorists failing to stop for pedestrians at midblock crosswalks***

*This behavior is observed for pedestrians waiting at the edge of the roadway as well as for pedestrians fully within the crosswalk or standing on a crossing island.*

### ***Motorists failing to stop for pedestrians at school crosswalks***

*Marked school crosswalks are not immune to symptoms 1 and 2. Parents driving their children to school often violate crosswalk laws.*

### ***Motorists failing to yield to pedestrians when turning at intersections***

*This happens at traffic signals where the pedestrian has the "Walk" light and at stop signs when the pedestrian is in the crosswalk and clearly has the right-of-way.*

### ***Inconsistent signing, marking and signaling of crosswalks***

*Participants in the stakeholder and public meetings have expressed confusion over what rules apply to the various crosswalk configurations and questioned why some crosswalks with seemingly similar characteristics are treated very differently.*

### ***Snow and ice accumulation on sidewalks and crosswalks inhibiting pedestrian travel***

*A single un-cleared property, ramp, crosswalk or crossing island can make an entire route impassable, place pedestrians in danger or inhibit pedestrian travel altogether.*

### ***Motorists speeding in residential neighborhoods***

*Residential streets are experiencing motor vehicle speeds that are inappropriate for a space shared by bicyclists and pedestrians. This situation has a negative impact on the quality of life and safety of residents.*

**SEE COMMENTS ON NEXT SLIDE**

**Survey: 4 Support, 5 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support**

# INTRODUCTION

## THE SEVEN SYMPTOMS

**This section should be included in the introduction with the following changes:**

Ok as written, but confirms my comments in "Underlying Issues", specifically the need to list Enforcement and Education as Underlying Issues since many of these symptoms reflect a failure of enforcement and education (and here I mean the encouragement of mutual respect, not lack of knowledge of the law).

Would like #3 combined with #2. Comment about parents is unnecessary, especially as we never(?) specifically address school crosswalks, safe routes to school, or parental behavior. Would like #5 to be higher on the list.

If #2 of the previous page acknowledged that pedestrians also don't always obey the laws, there probably should be something about that here. That problem seems to almost exclusively be on campus. Also, our signal system discourages pedestrians from both walking and obeying the signals.

I think these seven need some more justification, e.g., evidence. Are these the top seven risks?

#3 delete the last sentence - not needed to make the point - unfairly targets parents over others. #5 add "lighting" in the first sentence.

***Survey: 4 Support, 5 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support***

# INTRODUCTION

## THE SEVEN SYMPTOMS

The following seven behaviors have been identified through public engagement as some of the most important issues. These may be viewed as symptoms of the failure to address the five underlying issues:

### **1. Motorists passing other vehicles that are stopped for pedestrians in a crosswalk**

*This behavior is most frequently seen on multi-lane roadways but also observed on two lane roads where cars enter the on-coming travel lane to pass. This behavior is both dangerous and illegal throughout Michigan and the US.*

### **2. Motorists failing to stop for pedestrians at midblock crosswalks**

*This behavior is observed for pedestrians waiting at the edge of the roadway as well as for pedestrians fully within the crosswalk or standing on a crossing island.*

### **3. Motorists failing to stop for pedestrians at school crosswalks**

*Marked school crosswalks are not immune to symptoms 1 and 2. ~~Parents driving their children to school often violate crosswalk laws.~~*

### **4. Motorists failing to yield to pedestrians when turning at intersections**

*This happens at traffic signals where the pedestrian has the "Walk" light and at stop signs when the pedestrian is in the crosswalk and clearly has the right-of-way.*

### **5. Inconsistent signing, marking and signaling of crosswalks**

*Participants in the stakeholder and public meetings have expressed confusion over what rules apply to the various crosswalk configurations and questioned why some crosswalks with seemingly similar characteristics are treated very differently.*

### **6. Snow and ice accumulation on sidewalks and crosswalks inhibiting pedestrian travel**

*A single un-cleared property, ramp, crosswalk or crossing island can make an entire route impassable, place pedestrians in danger or inhibit pedestrian travel altogether.*

### **7. Motorists speeding in residential neighborhoods**

*Residential streets are experiencing motor vehicle speeds that are inappropriate for a space shared by bicyclists and pedestrians. This situation has a negative impact on the quality of life and safety of residents.*

**Survey: 4 Support, 5 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support**

# INTRODUCTION

## THE WAY FORWARD

Throughout the process of developing these recommendations Ann Arbor has been compared to other communities where motorists stop for pedestrians at or within crosswalks and pedestrians are generally treated with much higher regard. Most of the communities that have been cited as examples do not have a different set of laws or a radically different infrastructure than Ann Arbor. The culture of each community determines the level of respect for pedestrians.

The recommendations within this report are geared towards promoting a positive pedestrian safety culture in Ann Arbor through a wide spectrum of activities. Evidence of the potential for successful culture change is demonstrated by the great strides Ann Arbor has made in becoming a more bike friendly community over recent years. Success of efforts to create a bike friendly culture in Ann Arbor is evidenced by the significant increase in the number of bicyclists throughout the year.

The Pedestrians Safety and Access Task Force views the recommendations included in this document as a means to improve the walking environment and respond to the demand for a more pedestrian friendly culture in Ann Arbor.

**SEE COMMENTS ON NEXT SLIDE**

***Survey: 5 Support, 3 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***

# INTRODUCTION

## THE WAY FORWARD

**This section should be included in the introduction with the following changes:**

Well said! I think cultural change is a strong theme for our document and perhaps could be tied in throughout the document? It might mesh well with the vision zero elements. "number of bicyclists throughout the year." Should be "over the years"?

I think this underplays safety a bit too much. Harassment, bullying, and ignoring are somewhere between safety and access, since they only fail to be a safety issue because pedestrians give up their rights to avoid a crash.

is the first sentence true? It may be true, but is unsubstantiated. We don't really know about "regard". I guess it is a question of culture vs. regulations vs. enforcement vs. design. I would not elevate culture above all the other elements. The second paragraph is better is stressing the multi-dimensional approach needed.

### Responses

I question the accuracy and usefulness of all this. It is not particularly useful to bring in bikes and I don't see any actual data to support this claim. Also, the statement about comparison to other communities is vague and not supported by examples.

***Survey: 5 Support, 3 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***

# INTRODUCTION

## THE WAY FORWARD

Throughout the public engagement process of developing that informed these recommendations, Ann Arbor has been compared to other communities where motorists stop for pedestrians at or within crosswalks and pedestrians are generally treated with much higher regard. Most of the communities that have been cited as examples do not have a different set of laws or a radically different infrastructure than Ann Arbor. The culture of each community determines the level of respect for pedestrians.

The recommendations within this report are geared towards promoting a positive pedestrian safety culture in Ann Arbor through a wide spectrum of activities. Evidence of the potential for successful culture change is demonstrated by the great strides Ann Arbor has made in becoming a more bike friendly community over recent years. Success of efforts to create a bike friendly culture in Ann Arbor is evidenced by the significant increase in the number of bicyclists throughout the year.

The Pedestrians Safety and Access Task Force views the recommendations included in this document as a means to improve the walking environment and respond to the demand for a more pedestrian friendly culture in Ann Arbor.

***Survey: 5 Support, 3 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***

# INTRODUCTION

## THE OBJECTIVES

The following objectives directly respond to the five underlying issues:

- 1. Improve Pedestrian Access and Encourage Use***
- 2. Improve Understanding of Traffic Laws and Local Expectations***
- 3. Align Expectations and Environmental Realities***
- 4. Address the Needs of All Users***
- 5. Reduce Distractions and Minimize Consequences***

A general guiding principal is identified for each objective, followed by the priority recommendations.

***SEE COMMENTS ON NEXT SLIDE***

***Survey: 6 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***

# INTRODUCTION

## THE OBJECTIVES

### I would support these objectives only if the following changes were made

I dislike the wording of #3, just as I had problems with it when listed before. I'd prefer something like compensate for misperceptions and poor judgement.

There are two issues here: (a) are these the top objectives? (b) do these objectives "directly respond to the five underlying issues"? I know why you want to link objectives to issues, if we change one we may need to change the other... Again, #3 is problematic -- the use of the language about expectations vs. "realities" And I will stress the importance of design. (I see four elements of a comprehensive approach to better pedestrian safety and access: good design, regulation, enforcement, education/culture.

### Responses

I've gotten a little lost in the nomenclature. We have issues, symptoms, objectives, and recommendations. Are these objectives needed or self-evident to the point of not really adding anything? Can't we go from issues to how the problems are manifested (the symptoms) to recommendations?

***Survey: 6 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***



# INTRODUCTION

## THE OBJECTIVES

*There is a one-to-one relationship between the underlying issues and the objectives.*

The following objectives directly respond to the five underlying issues:

- 1. Improve Pedestrian Access and Encourage Use***
- 2. Improve Understanding of Traffic Laws and Local Expectations***
- ~~3. Align Expectations and Environmental Realities~~ Implement Best Practices for Pedestrian Safety***
- 4. Address the Needs of All Users***
- 5. Reduce Distractions and Minimize Consequences***

A general guiding principal is identified for each objective, followed by the priority recommendations.

***Survey: 6 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***

# ISSUES RELATIONSHIP TO OBJECTIVES

*There is a one-to-one relationship between the underlying issues and the objectives.*

1. *Too often, walking is not a safe, comfortable or convenient choice.*

***Improve Pedestrian Access and Encourage Use***

2. *Unfamiliarity and misunderstanding of traffic laws and local expectations*

***Improve Understanding of Traffic Laws and Local Expectations***

3. *A disconnect between expectations and environmental realities*

***Implement Best Practices for Pedestrian Safety***

4. *Failure to consider the perspective of all transportation system users*

***Address the Needs of All Users***

5. *Distracted roadway users*

***Reduce Distractions and Minimize Consequences***

# OBJECTIVE No.1

## IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND ENCOURAGE USE

### *Guiding Principle*

The most effective means to increase pedestrian safety is to increase the number of pedestrians. The most effective means of increasing the number of pedestrians is to make walking an attractive choice.

I would support this guiding principle only if the following change was made:

Uncomfortable with first statement as a blanket statement. Clearly increasing number of pedestrians is a positive factor, but "the most effective"??? Seems to me it's one of many factors. In second sentence presume you are using "attractive" to mean safe? If it means more, which it should, maybe you should use "safe and attractive."

I don't think this is empirically always the case. It depends also on how you define safety. Is it an absolute or relative measure? If the latter, then it is the standard ratio: incidents/exposure (i.e., injuries&deaths/pedestrian miles walked). Yes, there is sometimes "safety in numbers" (especially for dangers in assaults on streets at night, etc.). But in other cases, incidents rise with pedestrian numbers.

Add to the beginning of the sentence "One of ..."

### Responses

(I support) But would prefer if "culture" was incorporated too, e.g."The most effective means to promote pedestrian-friendly culture and increase pedestrian safety is to increase the number of pedestrians by making walking an attractive and accessible choice. "

The most effective means to increase pedestrian safety is to improve driver education and increase enforcement. I don't personally agree that butts on bikes is the most effective way to improve safety for cyclists, either. However, I do agree that encouraging more pedestrian trips will help.

The idea here seems to be to direct policy to encourage pedestrian travel over all other forms. Yes, we should make pedestrian travel attractive, safe, and accessible. But as a policy directive, would it be used, for example, to eliminate parking for vehicles in many locations?

***Survey: 4 Support, 3 Support with Changes, 2 Do Not Support***

## OBJECTIVE No.2

### IMPROVE UNDERSTANDING OF TRAFFIC LAWS AND LOCAL EXPECTATIONS

#### *Guiding Principle*

People should have a reasonable understanding of the laws for which they are held accountable.

I would support this guiding principle only if the following change was made:

Would "must" be more appropriate than "should" here? Isn't this understanding a requirement for getting a driver's license? Pedestrians don't need a license to walk, of course, though they too have an obligation to know the law and their obligations under it while walking.

In general I support this guiding principle, but find the wording too weak. In e.g. line with drivers' education and people's personal safety, can we change it to read: "People must have good knowledge and a reasonable understanding of the laws for which they are Held accountable." If we want "complete" streets, then all users of every type MUST have good knowledge of the rules that govern all forms of traffic that use those streets.

Needs clarification or explanation.

Edit - "People should have access to and be accountable for understanding the laws ..."

#### Responses

I might support the concept behind this, but one reasonable interpretation of this would be that we shouldn't have laws that hold people to account if people don't understand them. I think that's ludicrous. I think this should say instead, "There is no excuse for not knowing and understanding the traffic laws." - which is the basic rule anyway.

***Survey: 4 Support, 4 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***

## **OBJECTIVE No. 3**

### **ALIGN EXPECTATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REALITIES**

#### ***Guiding Principle***

The physical environment should facilitate safe, comfortable and convenient pedestrian travel and the desired interaction between roadway users.

## **OBJECTIVE No. 4**

### **ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF ALL USERS**

#### ***Guiding Principle***

City infrastructure, laws and enforcement should address the needs of all users of the transportation system with special consideration for the most vulnerable individuals.

## OBJECTIVE No. 5

### REDUCE DISTRACTIONS AND MINIMIZE CONSEQUENCES

#### *Guiding Principle*

Visual, manual and cognitive behaviors that distract from the safe use of the roadway should be discouraged and potential consequences of crashes should be minimized.

#### Responses

Too general. Is this about applying eye makeup while driving or...?

*Survey: 7 Support, 0 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support*

## OBJECTIVE No. 1

### IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND ENCOURAGE USE

**C. Sidewalk and Ramp Connectivity** – Where two streets that both have sidewalks intersect, the sidewalks should be extended and ramps provided to connect the sidewalks across the intersecting street even if the crosswalk is not marked. If there is a compelling safety and/or accessibility reason to not to provide a crosswalk at that location and that issue cannot be resolved, pedestrian crossing should be prohibited through signage and an appropriate crosswalk should be provided as close to the intersection of the streets as possible.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

Generally OK, but still confusing. And how many of these are there? perhaps this would be better as part of the sidewalk gaps program?

This makes it far too easy for staff to eliminate crosswalks that should exist. I would support this with a maximum distance between crosswalks in the 300-500' range.

Not clear. "Two streets that both have sidewalks intersect..." Is not clear and is less clear through the paragraph.

#### Responses

I agree with the spirit of this statement, but I fear that the issue is more complex than this simple statement. So I am hesitant.

**Survey: 5 Support, 3 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support**



# OBJECTIVE No. 1

## IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND ENCOURAGE USE

***E. Crosswalk Spacing*** – The City should adopt guidelines that define a maximum distance between marked crosswalks based on the road’s context and pedestrian travel demand. Travel demand should not only consider current use but also latent demand. Guidelines should be based on providing the most direct cross corridor route possible between typical pedestrian trip origins and destinations with the goal of adding no more than 10 % to the total trip distance. Guidelines should be mandatory for new and reconstructed roads and retrofitted to existing streets as resources permit.

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

Generally OK. I like not mandating a specific distance. 10% of total travel time seems very tricky to measure for peds. I'd like to add something like "marked crosswalks are key to facilitating access and increasing safety for people who walk crossing the roadway"

We should recommend a maximum distance. I suggest 500 feet. Several TF members have reservations about recommending a hard limit. I suggest we allow Traffic Engineering to exceed the limit only upon the approval of the Planning Commission. Leaving crosswalk spacing solely up to the discretion of Traffic Engineering has not worked in the past and will not work in the future.

This needs more of a number than simply adding 10% to trip distances. The MUTCD points out a minimum 300' between crosswalks, and a member of our Task Force has recommended no more than 500'. I think that is reasonable. We need to make it hard for staff to reject frequent crosswalks. Perhaps, "Plan for crosswalks at distances of not more than 500' between crossings, and implement that minimum distance as resources permit." The death on Geddes in the past year may have been a dart-out, but the parent is right that there should have been a crosswalk there.

I support the general sentiment, but the specifics should be worked out better, e.g., the 10%. I am not sure how one could implement this.

***Survey: 5 Support, 4 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support***

# OBJECTIVE No. 1

## IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND ENCOURAGE USE

**G. Pedestrian Signals**– The pedestrian “Walk” phase should be integrated into traffic signal phasing whenever feasible and extended to the maximum possible time. In areas where more than one pedestrian frequently cross during the same signal phase, the “Walk” phase should last a minimum of 15 seconds. The City should work towards having countdown pedestrian signals at all locations. Push button activation of pedestrian signals should be avoided in all instances in the downtown business districts and other areas with high pedestrian volumes.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

Strike 2nd sentence (well covered in sentence 1)

Remove the recommendation for countdown signals. They provide no benefit for pedestrians and are harmful to motorists.

I don't think this makes the problem clear enough. How about, "at all signals, unless an engineering study has been done based on pedestrian crash history, pedestrians should get a walk signal at the same time (or a bit sooner) as adjacent motorists get a green signal, and that pedestrian walk signal should be as long as the green signal minus the pedestrian crossing interval (when the signal changes to flashing don't walk.) Push button activation should only be used to extend the pedestrian walk signal phase (and presumably the roadway green signal), or to shorten the cross-traffic green phase to provide a pedestrian walk signal sooner. Push buttons should only be used to provide exceptional pedestrian crossing opportunities - the signal system should automatically and by default provide walk signals in every phase cycle.

does this match state requirements? And why the problem with push buttons?

**Survey: 5 Support, 4 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support**

## OBJECTIVE No. 1

### IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND ENCOURAGE USE

**H. Push Button Activation** – When a pedestrian is required to push a button to activate a crossing signal, the following three conditions should be mandatory: (1) provide audio, visual and tactile feedback when the button is pushed; (2) the “Walk” phase is called as soon as possible and given the same consideration in timing as vehicular actuation; and (3) the “Walk” signal should last a minimum of 15 seconds where multiple pedestrians frequently cross during the same signal phase.

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

Meh on 3rd sentence, it seems like the time to cross would change with context. To start, I'd really like the city to ensure that it's installed sound feedback is working properly. Timing of signals is not a huge deal for me, personally.

As noted in the previous recommendation, (3) still sounds far too weak to me. Let me go back to Pontiac / Barton as an example. Before the recent change, pedestrians got the walk at the same time as the adjacent green, and had a walk signal the full length of the green minus the final pedestrian crossing time. Now, pedestrians never get a walk signal unless they push the crossing button. Then they get about 15 seconds to cross, and the signal goes back to flashing and then solid don't walk, even if the adjacent roadway signal is green for several more minutes. The previous walk signal was appropriate. The current one is blatant discrimination against pedestrians, for no particular reason.

again, be aligned with state guidelines.

**Survey: 6 Support, 3 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support**

# OBJECTIVE No.1

## IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND ENCOURAGE USE

***I. Land Use Planning the Promotes Pedestrian Travel*** – As part of the master plan revision process, the City should incorporate the following strategies to promote an increase in pedestrian travel: (1) a fine-grained mix of land uses that place common trip origins and destinations within easy walking distance; (2) enhanced pedestrian connectivity throughout the City via the establishment of a dense pedestrian network ; (3) building and site design guidelines that encourages retail use and architectural details that provide an engaging environment to pedestrians at the street level; (4) strategically placed parking structures that facilitate walking to multiple destinations; (5) park and walk lots on the edge of downtown; and (6) utilizing existing parking lots in City parks as part of a park and walk program.

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

Would like to add "compact-land use" #3, can we also mention setbacks and minimizing parking lots adjacent to the streets and sidewalks? Not sure about park and walk lots...

I support this recommendation completely, but please correct the typing error in the heading. It should read "Land Use Planning THAT Promotes Pedestrian Travel.

I don't support the concept of the "park and walk" lots and certainly not using parking lots in City parks. This would open up the use of spaces intended for park users by commuters. There are enforcement issues here. New parking lots directed at walkers in the periphery would mean construction of new walkways as well, competing with resources for in-town sidewalks and shared use paths.

***Survey: 6 Support, 3 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support***

## OBJECTIVE No.2

### IMPROVE UNDERSTANDING OF TRAFFIC LAWS AND LOCAL EXPECTATIONS

**C. Gateway Treatments** – At the non-freeway roadway entrances to Ann Arbor, the City should post regulatory signage that concisely summarizes the City’s crosswalk ordinance requirements and related penalties. In conjunction with the regulatory signs, other outreach measures, such as temporary banners and mobile message boards should be utilized to support the messages of the public outreach campaign in a positive manner.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

is this feasible? how much text would fit on the sign? etc.

#### Responses

I don't believe such signage will be effective. It will cause visual clutter and consume resources that could better be used for regulatory signage at crosswalks and elsewhere.

**Survey: 6 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support**

## OBJECTIVE No. 4

### ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF ALL USERS

**C. Sidewalk Snow Removal Ordinance Enforcement** – The City should proactively enforce sidewalk clearance ~~focusing on~~ using the following priority areas: (1) within a ¼ mile of schools; (2) high volume bus stops; (3) safe-routes to schools; (4) shopping districts; (5) near health care facilities; and (6) areas with known people with disabilities.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

Could we use the same guidelines as the sidewalk prioritization? For transit, it could be greater than X (10, or 3, or?) Riders per weekday

#### Responses

If there are limited resources for enforcement, these priorities could remove enforcement elsewhere. Perhaps the language could be changed to indicate that these are high priority without actually making them a ruling priority.

**Survey: 6 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support**

## OBJECTIVE No. 4

### ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF ALL USERS

***D. Ice Mitigation Resources*** – The City should dramatically increase the availability and distribution points of the free sand and salt mix.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

?? No idea if these are insufficient

"dramatically" is a little um, dramatic. We can be less dramatic and more specific. Such as distribution points in each ward at a minimum and where there are convenient places or where businesses volunteer to host distribution so that most residents are within 1-2 miles of a distribution point.

***Survey: 6 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support***

## OBJECTIVE No. 4

### ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF ALL USERS

***F. Sidewalk Snow Removal Ordinance Education*** – The City should engage in a multifaceted, multi-media public education campaign just prior to each winter season. The education campaign should underscore the importance of clearing snow and ice from sidewalks, crosswalks and crossing islands for the mobility and safety of all pedestrians. Special attention should be focused on the needs of school children and people with disabilities that rely on those systems for their daily transportation needs. The education campaign should specifically address who has the responsibility for clearing bus stops and bus shelters. All education materials should be easy to understand and include supporting graphics where applicable.

As part of the annual winter season education campaign, the City should provide, to all residents and business owners, an easy to understand explanation with supporting graphics of their responsibilities in regards to the sidewalk snow ordinance. The information should define the penalties for non-compliance, as well as available assistance for individuals with physical and/or financial hardships. Available resources, such as free sand/salt mixes provided by the City, should be noted. The materials should clearly convey that each property owner bears the ultimate responsibility for clearing the sidewalk in cases where contracted services or volunteer parties are utilized. Education materials regarding various methods of clearing a sidewalk should be provided. The pros and cons of various ice melt and traction materials or products should be provided with cost, environmental, effective temperature and pet safety considerations addressed.

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

can we add through city publications, on line messages, water bill, waste watcher, on the web site, and provide and encourage language for council members who are communicating with their constituents.

I question the "multifaceted, multi-media" directive. The City has several well-worn means of communicating with citizens and will doubtless use them to supply this information. The communication strategy used is beyond the scope of this task force.

***Survey: 6 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support***



## OBJECTIVE No. 4

### ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF ALL USERS

**G. Road Snow Removal Practices** – The City should investigate solutions and associated costs to amend its current street snow clearance practices to eliminate impassable snow piles left in the crosswalk, sidewalk ramps, crossing islands and bus stops. City practices should be such that an accessible pedestrian route is provided in a timely manner concurrent with the clearance of the streets.

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

It does NOT make sense to link together (time-wise) the clearing of streets and the clearing of sidewalks. The subject matter of the second sentence here is covered by previous recommendations in this survey - eliminate this sentence here. ALSO, GENERALLY SPEAKING, A LOT OF DUPLICATION/OVERLAP IN ALL THESE SNOW/ICE RECOMMENDATIONS - CONSOLIDATE?

---

"investigate and implement as a high priority"

**Survey: 6 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 0 Do Not Support**

## OBJECTIVE No. 4

### ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF ALL USERS

***I. Accessible Roundabouts*** – The City should uniformly utilize rumble strips in advance of crosswalks at roundabouts as an audible warning for all pedestrians.

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

Seems to me this would be a very useful addition to mid-block crosswalks, not just roundabouts!

**Responses**

Not clear that this is the best design. Roundabout design needs to be studied more broadly.

***Survey: 6 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***

## OBJECTIVE No. 4 ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF ALL USERS

### *K. Sidewalk Snow Removal Assistance –*

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

What is meant by this assistance: financial? organization of snow-clearers for property owners? the City taking on the cost of hiring a firm? As you have noted, this needs to be fleshed out before we can approve it.

on the web site list non-profits willing to help, provide a "sign up" service for those in need that will be communicated to a non-profit willing to help, encourage coordination and information sharing for those willing to help, refer people to businesses and non profits willing to "adopt" low income and seniors who need help. The city can do most of this through the web site, without being liable for referrals.

There's no additional description. I think this is recommendation that the city do the clearing for some people, free of charge. I'm OK with that, if it's revenue neutral, and they're careful in choosing who gets the help. Fines for able people going to this would be terrific, for example.

***Survey: 4 Support, 3 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***

## OBJECTIVE No. 5

### REDUCE DISTRACTIONS AND MINIMIZE CONSEQUENCES

***A. Primary Road Traffic Calming*** – Traffic calming measures should be routinely employed on primary roads as necessary to minimize the likelihood of death or severe injury to pedestrians crossing the road. Towards that end, all primary roads with unsignalized marked mid-block crosswalks that have a posted speed limit greater than 30 mph or where the 85 percentile speed is greater than 30 mph should be evaluated for traffic calming measures. The desired state is to have the 85 percentile speeds at 30 mph or less.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

I'm concerned that mentioning the 85th percentile gives support to that process, which I believe is flawed.

The only problem with this, having thought about it some more, is that we need to be much more careful to make it clear that this is *\*not\** talking about speed bumps. It needs more wording about 'appropriate measures to the level of roadway'. This is going to blow up all over MLive. We should make sure that people (other than the trolls who will anyway) don't jump to incorrect conclusions any more than necessary.

#### Responses

Primary roads? State highways, etc.? This is too ill-defined and broad.

***Survey: 5 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***

## OBJECTIVE No. 5

### REDUCE DISTRACTIONS AND MINIMIZE CONSEQUENCES

***B. Local Road Traffic Calming*** – Traffic calming measures should be routinely employed on residential streets and school zones as necessary to minimize the likelihood of death or severe injury to pedestrians within or crossing the road. Towards that end, any residential street where the 85 percentile speed is greater than 25 mph or a school zone where the 85 percentile speed is greater than 25 mph during school hours should be evaluated for traffic calming measures. The desired state is to have the 85 percentile speeds at 25 mph or less.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

I'm concerned that mentioning the 85th percentile gives support to that process, which I believe is flawed.

#### Responses

"Traffic calming" not defined as to method. If this means neck-outs, speed bumps, etc., I'm against it. Good design, signage, enforcement, yes.

***Survey: 6 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***

## OBJECTIVE No. 5

### REDUCE DISTRACTIONS AND MINIMIZE CONSEQUENCES

***C. Lower Speed Limits Citywide*** – To minimize the likelihood of death or severe injury to all users of the roadway and to increase reaction time resulting from distracted driving, the posted speed of all non-freeway roads in the City of Ann Arbor should be 25 mph or less. Special exceptions may be posted for parkways and boulevards with minimal driver distractions, a design that safely accommodates greater travel speeds and virtually non-existent cross corridor pedestrian travel.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

add after the word roadwat first sentence: "and to increase reaction time resulting from distracted driving"

I welcome the spirit of this recommendation -- 25 mph as a default speed. but can we reword so that it more easily acknowledges those roads where higher speeds are appropriate?

#### Responses

I think this is a great idea, but I think it's pretty clearly illegal. We \*can\* put in traffic calming measures, increase enforcement, do better engineering, discourage speeding with signaling, etc., but we can't just arbitrarily set speed limits like that.

Not feasible for certain classes of roads. Not in accordance with all relevant laws.

***Survey: 3 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 3 Do Not Support***

## OBJECTIVE No. 5

### REDUCE DISTRACTIONS AND MINIMIZE CONSEQUENCES

***D. Distracted Driving and Walking Campaign*** – The City of Ann Arbor, through a multifaceted multi-media campaign, should utilize existing resources to raise awareness of the dangers of distracted driving and distracted walking.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

Call it a "Distracted Driving and Walking" Campaign

does this work? I would add "using campaigns that have been shown to be effective"

#### Responses

Again with the "multifaceted multi-media campaign". This is not likely to be listened to. We've all heard it.

***Survey: 5 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***

## OBJECTIVE No. 5

### REDUCE DISTRACTIONS AND MINIMIZE CONSEQUENCES

***E. Partner with Research Institutions*** – The City of Ann Arbor should partner with research institutions to develop and test various engineering, education, ordinance and enforcement solutions targeted towards minimizing distracted driving.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

This is the same as the previous question. (*D. Distracted Driving Campaign*)

#### Responses

Duplicate of prior item. (*D. Distracted Driving Campaign*)

***Survey: 6 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***



## OBJECTIVE No. 5

### REDUCE DISTRACTIONS AND MINIMIZE CONSEQUENCES

#### ***F. Local Ordinance on the Use of Hand-held Devices by Vehicle***

***Operators*** – The City of Ann Arbor should enact and enforce an ordinance that bans the use of hand-held and hands-free devices by all operators of motorized vehicles or bicycles (police excepted) and make the use of such a primary enforced law.

#### Responses

Need to know more

---

I don't think we have seen any evidence that this is a significant factor in pedestrian safety in the city. Or that it works. I think emphasis on the 25 mph city wide is much more real and important.

---

I don't believe that we have this legal authority.

***Survey: 5 Support, 0 Support with Changes, 3 Do Not Support***

## OBJECTIVE No. 5

### REDUCE DISTRACTIONS AND MINIMIZE CONSEQUENCES

***G. Main Street and Stadium Boulevard Intersection Improvements*** – Given the prominence of this intersection, its proximity to Pioneer High School and the amount foot traffic that moves through this intersection during football, basketball and other special events throughout the year , this area’s landscape and facilities should be designed to be welcoming, comfortable and safe for pedestrians. State-of-the-art pedestrian facilities and signals paired with traffic calming techniques should be employed to ensure safety and access for all pedestrians. Pathways should be wide enough to accommodate large crowds and separate bicycle and pedestrian pathways should be employed.

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

Actually, this should be a roundabout. Between Pioneer’s empty grassy field and the UM golf course, there’s room to build a roundabout. A two-lane 10mph roundabout would be perfect there. But otherwise, I do support this recommendation.

#### Responses

I don't think - for the purposes of our charge, our work and our final document - that we should be getting down to the level of specific locations. Once you cross this line where's the limit?

Too specific

***Survey: 5 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 2 Do Not Support***

# IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

## 1. ADVOCACY AND OVERSIGHT

***A. Identify a Pedestrian Champion*** – The City should designate an authoritative public official to champion and promote pedestrian safety and access throughout the City; and provide them with minimal funding and staff support.

I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

and provide them with minimal funding and staff support

### Responses

Not convinced this would have a major and lasting impact.

Should not be made a job position. Let the Mayor do it if it serves his purpose.

***Survey: 5 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 2 Do Not Support***

# IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

## 1. ADVOCACY AND OVERSIGHT

***B. Establish a Standing Committee on Pedestrian Safety and Access*** – The City should establish an ongoing official board or committee to address pedestrian safety and access issues and to oversee the implementation of the recommendations included in this document.

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

official ? Maybe instead say high level, reporting to the mayor and city council. We should say where they fit in and where they get their authority. Maybe Connie has suggestions?

---

As the Bicycle Coordinating Committee and the Environmental Commission recommended, there should be a transportation or non-motorized transportation committee that's constantly looking at ways to improve our transportation system for pedestrians.

### **Responses**

I don't see a functionality. Would the committee review staff work? Would it attempt to tell Council how to direct transportation funds? Based on how this task force has operated, it seems a waste of resources, staff time, and the efforts of well-meaning community members.

***Survey: 5 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***

# IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

## 2. PLANNING

***B. Update Goals and Objectives in Related City Plans*** – As part of the plan update process; the City should update the Goals and Objectives of the City’s Non-motorized Transportation Plan and Transportation Master Plan.

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

We should specify who in the city. At what level. Staff? Task Force? Council committee? This would get lost otherwise.

**Responses**

I understand that there was a recent update of that Plan.

***Survey: 6 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***

# IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

## 3. FUNDING

**A. Traffic Calming Funding** – The City should develop a prioritization system and yearly budget for traffic calming measures with an emphasis on proximity to schools, pedestrian crash history, professional evaluation and reported incidents.

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

Council should do this? We should specify who rather than "the city"

I think this loses the part of the recommendation that we drop the requirement for neighborhood support. Maybe that's part of another recommendation.

### Responses

I don't like traffic calming used as the phrase rather than road safety design or some other phrase.

**Survey: 5 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support**

# IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

## 3. FUNDING

**C. Proportional Funding** – *The proportion of all transportation funding (from Federal, State and local sources) allocated towards pedestrian safety and access projects (currently around 4%) should substantially increased to more closely reflect the following: (1) the number of residents who walk to work as identified by the Census’s American Community Survey, currently 16%; (2) the percent of all crashes involving a pedestrian, currently 16%; (3) the percent of all crashes resulting in an incapacitating injury to a pedestrian, currently 23%; and (4) the percent of all crashes resulting in pedestrian fatality, currently 35%.*

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

I think I support this but I need more time and maybe help understanding it - where there other alternatives?

### Responses

Way too fast. I agree we should end up there, but the funding recommendation we made got us there in a time frame that council could handle, with conditions that would protect it from budget cutting. We can't forget the lesson of 1% for art - if the funding is cautious, inevitable, but rises and falls automatically with the conditions, it will work. If it isn't context sensitive, it will eventually be rejected.

I don't believe this is even legally possible - there are restrictions on most forms of funding that direct most funds to roads. Also not politically reasonable considering the state of our roads.

**Survey: 5 Support, 1 Support with Changes, 2 Do Not Support**

# IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

## 3. FUNDING

### *E. Sidewalk Gap Funding –*

**I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:**

We need to flesh out this item first before we approve it. Funding all the projects needed to eliminate Ann Arbor's sidewalk gaps will be a complex issue.

I don't see an actual recommendation here.

Except in the case of annexed properties and all new construction, I believe the city should cover the cost for eliminating sidewalk gaps. as long as the priorities are used for where teh city fills them. But my mind could be changed for the really large gaps especially in wealthy neighborhoods where residents have planted trees and made other landscaping decisions that have made creating sidewalks more difficult and expensive.

Not sure what sidewalk funding method is being proposed here.

#### **Responses**

There are no recommendations made. This is a complex subject. Too bad we never addressed it in the course of the Task Force.

***Survey: 3 Support, 4 Support with Changes, 1 Do Not Support***



# RECOMMENDED DATA COLLECTION

Understanding that there are limited resources available, the Task Force's has identified the following data resources that would be helpful in evaluating existing conditions and determining future improvements:

1. Data inventory of pedestrian slip and fall injuries as it relates to winter sidewalk maintenance. Hospital records may be a resource in accruing this information.
2. A comparison analysis of sidewalk gap data and crash data to identify if there are any patterns associated to pedestrian crashes where sidewalks are not present.
3. An analysis of vulnerable populations in relation to pedestrian crashes, such as crashes involving children or seniors.
4. Crosswalk analysis to identify spacing between existing crosswalks, including marked and unmarked crosswalks, to determine where additional mid-block crosswalks may be needed.
5. Pedestrian counts in consistent locations over time.
6. Text based UD10 versions of all of Ann Arbor's pedestrian crashes.
7. EDITOR'S NOTE – These can be found at <http://www.michigantrafficcrashfacts.org/>
8. Provide a succinct overview (e.g. one page brief) of the American Community Survey (ACS) data showing pedestrian travel over time in Ann Arbor. U.S. Census data should be incorporated to illustrate changes in the percentage of trips over time.

Use data collected by Washtenaw Bicycling and Walking Coalition as a resource.

## I would support this recommendation only if the following change was made:

Please add: The City should conduct an online survey to vote on the establishment of a major East-West bicycle highway route extending from the University of Michigan central campus (e.g. Washtenaw and South University) westwards through downtown and the Old West Side right through to Stadium Boulevard (e.g. Washtenaw and Liberty). This would act as a magnet to draw bicyclists off of sidewalks, decrease motorized traffic congestion in the downtown area, and at the same time increase non-motorized traffic across the City. The survey should ask if people want such a major bicycle artery and offer various options for a route.

Isn't #6 available at Michigan Traffic Crash Facts? It seems as though this is what the PDF form of the crash report is.

## Responses

I'd rather see the money spent on obvious infrastructure, enforcement, and education needs.

What would the data be used for? I don't think this answers any questions that we were asked to consider.

**Survey: 4 Support, 2 Support with Changes, 2 Do Not Support**

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Now this will take some further thought! We've certainly talked about a lot of other stuff, eg, petitioning for an experimental red RRFB project; getting rid of downtown multi-lane one-way streets which encourage higher speeds, etc. Will try to give this further thought. Two items which might help to bolster our intro material: \* More than 4500 pedestrians and 700 bicyclists are killed in traffic accidents every year in the U.S. While proportionally speaking Ann Arbor may be doing much better than average, there are no guarantees that without continued vigilance and upgrading/expansion of our pedestrian safety measures our local numbers will continue to be this low. As the U.S. Secretary of Transportation Anthony Foxx has stated: "This is the safest time for transportation in history, except for pedestrians and bicyclists." The numbers of people who regularly walk, and those bicycling for recreation and commuting, have all increased significantly, as has vehicular traffic, so the potential for an increase in pedestrian/cycling accidents is real, and every community needs to be doing whatever it can to minimize this potential. \*A detailed 2013 survey of Americans attitudes about walking found that four-fifths of respondents want streets to be designed for safer walking, and three-quarters want better enforcement of speed limits, even if both strategies result in slower driving. (I highly suspect an Ann Arbor survey would mirror these numbers or better them). Other: "Research shows that lowering a speed limit without other improvements like road design changes or improved police enforcement doesn't work to slow traffic - it's the roadway design that affects the speed." (Zegeer, UNC).

*Recommendation:*

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Not sure if there's enough on consistent signage or maintenance of existing facilities in recommendations or in budget. Another thing that might be good to add to the intro section: the public benefits of having a pedestrian friendly culture/infrastructure. There seem to be an us vs them dynamic when the crosswalk or show ordinance is discussed and I'd love to give us and council a few talking points (ideally based on research) on how everyone benefits when their community is safe and accessible for walkers. I think many people take the benefits for granted, and it would be great to get them on paper. Something like... We'd like to promote safety and access for people who walk for and to encourage mobility, but the public would benefit in general if more people walk because x,y,z (e.g. less congestion, less carbon emissions, allows elderly to stay in homes longer, increases affordability index, more neighborhood cohesion, healthier kids, etc).

*Recommendation:*

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

This is an excellent summary list of ideas and suggestions we have looked at over the past year. Despite the restrictions put on the City by the State Government, I still feel we should clearly and openly state that the City needs to think very creatively about future-oriented local funding sources for financing pedestrian-related improvements that benefit people driving as well. At the very least we should recommend that the City raise the issue with Lansing as a detrimental imposition by the State of rules that unfairly tie our hands in our local affairs. Michigan's economy is tied to the World economy, not just Lansing's, and we want our freedom to raise funding locally as we see fit.

*Recommendation:*

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Street design should not be left to the discretion of Traffic Engineering. Major street construction projects should be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

*Recommendation:*

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Who are the task force members and why we have valid standing Some more mention of the health benefits of walking Some more mention of the economic studies that show walkability increases property value We should have a list of people to thank, by name, for participating We should be suggesting a request for a clear process, with ongoing communication and feedback, when a request for a sidewalk, traffic calming, or speed decrease is made. There should be clear and fair criteria for prioritization and a simple process so concerned participants if requesting these things always know what is going on and their status. I didn't see the recommendation for eliminating sidewalks that suddenly have steps. A number of sidewalks in Ann Arbor must be reconstructed to eliminate that hazard. That's all I can think of just now.

*Recommendation:*

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

As noted, the traffic calming seemed to have lost a lot of detail about changing the existing neighborhood traffic calming program. It needs to be revised to be less onerous for putting in traffic calming. The requirement that there be neighborhood support should be dropped in favor of a ranking scheme that takes neighborhood support into account, but allow it to be overridden by public need. If a neighborhood doesn't want traffic calming but there are two school-related crossings on the street with a pedestrian crash history, what the neighborhood doesn't want may need to be passed over for the public good. *\*Very\** important - that funding proposal was not what was proposed and considered. You need to go back to what we discussed, because that proposal will be stillborn. I keep pointing out that there are cheaper options for flashing warnings than RRFBs. There are MUTCD-approved illuminated pedestrian signs, and we really should put many of those in while we're waiting for funding to upgrade things to RRFBs. I saw very little about enforcement here. I expect more questions than just the automated cameras. Something like, "crosswalk enforcement operations should be carried out on an on-going basis, with at least four enforcement operations per year."

*Recommendation:*

## **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

Having looked at the results, it occurs to me that there was a fairly popular recommendation that got lost. That was to paint/mark curbs in the downtown in the places where it would be illegal for pedestrians to cross, directing them to crosswalks. That was to deal with the rare locations where it's actually a violation of MUTC for a pedestrian to cross, which has the side effect of pointing out all of the places (the vast majority) where it's actually legal.

***Recommendation:***



## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Thanks for putting together this comprehensive list! Given so many possible recommendations (and all the detail), I do think it important to set priorities (e.g., rank some of these recommendations). Also: I would again stress the importance of a multi-faceted approach: design, education, regulation, enforcement, and add to that signage/lighting. I think design is key.

*Recommendation:*

I'm speechless.

*Recommendation:*



# Potential Homework

## Introduction to document:

- No specific recommendations were submitted for this section
- An individual or subcommittee would need to draft this prior to the next meeting

## Need someone to propose recommendations for:

- Sidewalk gap funding
- Sidewalk snow removal assistance
- *Editor did not have anything to work with on these*



A subcommittee will have to be posted to the City Meeting Notices



# 9. July 1st Task Force Meeting

- Next Task Force Meeting is July 1st
  - 5pm to 7pm
  - Basement Conference Room , Larcom City Hall
- Refine and Vote on remaining Draft Recommendations



- July 1 – Refinement and Vote on Recommendations
- August 5 – Finalize Recommendations
- August 26 – Approve Recommendations
- September 14 – Present to City Council



## 10. Public Commentary

- 3 minutes per speaker
- If you commented at the beginning of the meeting you cannot comment at the end





## 11. Moratorium on Crosswalk Removal

Given the recent removal of two crosswalks on Huron Street, The Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force requests that the City impose an immediate moratorium on closing existing crosswalks (marked or unmarked) until the City adopts policies and/or procedures that take into consideration the recommendations of The Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force and other public input.



# City of Ann Arbor Pedestrian Safety & Access Task Force



## Questions?

Norman COX, PLA, ASLA and  
Carolyn Prudhomme, ASLA

**The Greenway Collaborative, Inc.**  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

[www.a2gov.org/pedsafety](http://www.a2gov.org/pedsafety)