

**PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AND ACCESS TASK FORCE
MEETING #5 – MEETING MINUTES**

Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2014

Time: 5:00 - 7:00 pm

Location: Basement Conference Room – Larcom City Hall

Attendees:

Task Force Members Present, 8: Vivienne Armentrout; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark; Linda Diane Feldt; Owen Jansson; Anthony Pinnell; Sarah Pressprich Grynewicz; Jim Rees;

Task Force Members Absent, 1: Neal Elyakin

Public Present: Larry Deck; refer to Attachment B for sign-in sheet

City Staff Present, 1: Connie Pulcipher

Consultant Present, 2: Norman Cox and Carolyn Prudhomme

Re: Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force Meeting

Meeting Called to Order: 5:01pm

1. Changes to agenda: none, unanimously approved
2. Notes from last meeting: unanimously approved
3. Public comment proposal:
 - a. J. Reese moved to add a new public comment period to the agenda at this and all future meetings, to follow the approval of the agenda. This period will be limited to no more than three speakers, each speaker limited to no more than three minutes. Speaking slots will be allocated on a first come, first serve basis via a signup sheet available just before the meeting starts. A speaking period will be retained at the end of the meeting. Speakers are limited to a single slot, either at the beginning or at the end of the meeting.
 - b. Proposal as an amendment to the Rules of Order effective immediately:
unanimously approved
4. The Task Force directed consultant to make amendments to the Pedestrian Safety and Access Plan Working Outline.
5. The Task Force reviewed Community Engagement Strategies and provided input on Priority Issues, Resources and Issues Documents, and the Draft Work Plan.
6. Public Commentary
 - a. Larry Deck - Increasing the number of pedestrian's trips is something we need address whether it is listed as a goal/objective or not. When looking at issues, make sure to address State laws and State policies regarding crosswalks and the

85th percentile speed limit setting; Ann Arbor can be a leader in pushing these forward. Shared use trail design could be better to provide more room for both bicycle and pedestrians. Should address local funding and how it prioritized. When funding sidewalk gaps, it is not always fair to put the financial burden on adjacent owners when the sidewalk is more of a community-wide amenity; for example on Scio church the surrounding neighborhood pitched-in so the burden wouldn't fall solely on the adjacent owners.

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm.

Minutes taken by C. Prudhomme

Attachment A: Meeting #5 Discussion Summary

PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AND ACCESS TASK FORCE MEETING #5 - DISCUSSION SUMMARY

Note: This is not a direct transcription of the meeting discussion. The following summary has been developed from notes taken during the meeting; comments are paraphrased. Where staff and consultants provided information and responses they are shown in italics.

- Approval of Agenda:
 - Unanimous approval of agenda. (Attachment C)
- Approval of Meeting # 4 discussion summary:
 - Putting both sets of notes together in one document is a good format.
 - Unanimous approval of discussion summary.
- Public Comment Proposal:
 - J. Rees proposed we add a new public comment period to the agenda, starting today, to follow the approval of the agenda, limited to no more than three speakers, with each speaker limited to no more than three minutes. Speaking slots will be allocated on a first come, first serve basis via a signup sheet available just before the meeting starts. We will retain the speaking period at the end of the meeting. Speakers are limited to a single slot, either at the beginning or at the end of the meeting.
 - It shouldn't increase the length of the meeting as we are just moving some slots to the beginning of the meeting.
 - Members of the public may be frustrated to hear that they are not allowed to speak after the meeting if they choose to speak at the beginning of the meeting. Maybe we could introduce the rule later if we feel that there is a demand?
 - The proposal was modeled after Council meetings. Are we sure that you can't comment both at the beginning and end of Council meetings? *There is a public comment period at the end of the meeting but we would have to look it up. (Staff follow-up: a speaker can comment both at the beginning and end of a Council Meeting)*
 - The difference with the Council meeting is they have an open ended time frame.
 - We should hold off for now on amending the speaking issue and if it becomes a problem we can address it.
 - The vast majority of people that come with public commentary have a point they want to get across. There are other ways in which people can provide input and response after the meeting, such as sending an email or providing comments at the next meeting; which should be encouraged.

Attachment A: Meeting #5 Discussion Summary

- So far everything that the public has said has been very useful and concise and it may not be a big deal if they speak at the beginning and end of the meeting.
 - If we leave the proposal as it is worded now, we can always change it later if we want to.
 - It was pointed out that we adopted rules of procedure, although not Roberts Rules, they still indicate there would be motions.
 - O. Jansson formally moved for adoption of J. Reese proposal as stated.
 - Unanimous approval to keep proposal as written, as there is the ability to change it in the future if need be. Effective today. (See Attachment D for approved proposal)
- Meeting Materials Feedback:
 - *We will not always be able to deliver materials two weeks prior to a meeting; typically it will be a week before, and will depend on how much material is provided. Is everyone okay with the amount of time that was given for the review of meeting materials prior to this meeting and is it okay for us to use our judgment on when to send out meeting materials in the future?* Unanimous consent by Task Force.
- Approval of amendments to the Pedestrian Safety and Access Plan Working Outline:
 - Should an increase in the number of pedestrian trips be a goal? Shouldn't we be facilitating pedestrian activity rather than forcing it?
 - A more strategic way to put it is to go back to accessibility and allow for the potential for people to walk if they choose. If increasing the number of pedestrian trips is not our goal, then it is an indicator of whether the City is doing well. There may be a difference between goals we promote versus benchmarks that measure our progress.
 - A lot of bicycle studies clearly indicate that the more bicyclists you have the safer it is for bicyclists, and there are probably the same studies for pedestrians. If increasing pedestrians does increase safety and access, then it should be a goal.
 - *Do you think we should amend the text to reference the safety in numbers principal?* If that would be easier for others to understand, then yes that would be good.
 - Although these may not sound like words for official city documents, terms like “enthusiastic”, “enjoyment”, “driven” and “inspired” should be included. *It is not our charge to word smith these into finely crafted goals and objectives, all we are saying is that the next time the city updates the goals and objectives the recommendations should be considered. While the words may not be our focus, the intent is key. We can include that safety in numbers changes the dynamics of the transportation system.*

Attachment A: Meeting #5 Discussion Summary

- An increase in the number of pedestrian trips should be an outcome of our efforts rather than a goal. If we increase the opportunities for pedestrians then we will increase the number of pedestrians.
- Wording is important in how it affects policy, and can lead to policy implications down the road.
- The increase in the number of pedestrians and decrease in crash rates seem more like metrics/outcomes than goals. They are worthy goals, but we shouldn't measure everything we do against those two items.
- *We will amend the working outline to address the increase in pedestrian numbers for the purpose of safety in numbers as well as stating that this should not be the only metric.*
- When we talk about safety, danger to pedestrians includes cars, ice/maintenance and other humans.
- Pedestrian crash data:
 - Why is the reduction of pedestrian crashes mentioned in the first paragraph of the working outline? *That came directly from the Federal Highway Pedestrian Safety and Access Plan Guide (PSAP Guide). We were defining what the Task Force role was as described by the PSAP Guide. We will modify the working outline to reference the PSAP Guide.*
 - There seemed to be a miss-match in the pedestrian crash data that was provided by the city. *We can come that to that at a later time, as it is off topic. That may be addressed at the next meeting with City Staff.*
- Mobility vs. accessibility is important, but the distinction may get lost among the larger audience. Accessibility is bringing destinations closer to the people, and mobility is increasing the speed. *We tried to incorporate those concepts into the wording of the outline.*
- Explicitly, this Task Force is about pedestrians, but there is a lot of talk about bicycles.
 - Maybe it is okay to include bicycles as an implicit guest.
 - Sometimes there is assumption that if you make things more pedestrian friendly then they are bicycle friendly, but that is not always the case.
 - Are bicycle included in the PSAP Working Outline? *No. Bicycles are mentioned in the City's Non-motorized Plan, but not specifically in the amendments that we proposed.*
 - It seems out of scope here. They are related but not our main focus. It is not our goal to improve bicycle access.
 - At some point we need to discuss how bicyclists use pedestrian crosswalks. It can be confusing for motorists and there is potential for conflict with pedestrians. *We will bring that discussion back at a different time.*
 - We need to think holistically about the transportation system. The focus should be on pedestrians, but we need to consider buses, cars, bicycles, etc. *There is a reference in the Task Force Resolution to the Complete Streets Model, which includes everything.*

Attachment A: Meeting #5 Discussion Summary

- *To summarize: whether it is bicycles, buses, or cars, it is a Complete Streets Model and everything affects everything else. While we are not going to solve every bicycle issue we will consider these other modes as they have an effect on pedestrians.*
 - “Enforcement of pedestrian laws” should be changed to “enforcement of laws that affect pedestrians”.
- Community Engagement Strategy:
 - Have you used this process before for community engagement? *Yes, more times that we can count.*
 - Have crowdsourcing maps been used in Ann Arbor and is the staff comfortable with using this tool? *The Downtown Development Authority is currently using a crowdsourcing map and applications have been used by other agencies and nearby communities including TheRide, WATS, and Scio Township. This was vetted by the staff team prior to this meeting and they are comfortable with using these tools.*
 - The following Stakeholder’s should be added to the list:
 - WISD
 - Center for Independent Living
 - Crossing Guards & Bus Drivers
 - Safe Routes to School
 - Was this taken from a larger list and paired down for this issue? *Yes.*
 - *Should the Community-Wide Meetings be held at the Library or Cobblestone?*
 - *Is the library big enough? Yes, it has been adequate in the past.*
 - *Preference is for Library as it is a central location.*
 - Why are the public engagement schedule headers on the PowerPoint different from what was sent to the group? *There have been some modification after we sent out meeting materials two weeks ago, the Resource Group did some simplification of the titles.*
 - What are the headers based on? *They are from the scope of the project.*
 - We need to make sure we include recommendations to ordinances in the process. *That will be covered; we will make sure that element is listed on the draft outline agendas.*
 - What is the “PSAP Elements” heading for - we are not actually doing a PSAP? *The last months of the project are focused on the working outline that addresses what elements go into a PSAP. We will be informing what could go into a PSAP not writing one.*
 - Will ordinance recommendation be included in the PSAP element recommendations? *Yes.*
 - This is a nice, clearly laid out schedule and appreciate that holidays and school calendars were considered.
- Initial List of Priority Issues

Attachment A: Meeting #5 Discussion Summary

- *Does this capture the Task Force list of priority issues discussed to-date? Based on the original document this seems to capture everything. This process will help make sure the Task Force issues are captured and addressed.*
- *This is not a definitive list but will be used and reference as we develop materials.*
- *Lighting, signage and cul-de-sac connections should be included.*
- *“Moving along the Roadway” does not cover areas such as major pedestrian corridors through parks and non-motorized paths. There may be another heading dealing with “Network Connections” that includes park pathways and neighborhood connections.*
- *Who is responsible for pathways between two private owners? Deb Gosselin will be at next meeting and can help clarify some of these issues.*
- *Would like to see enforcement broken out, but in general the list is pretty faithful to what was put together earlier.*
- *The term “bicyclists” should be used instead of “bicycles”.*
- *Bus stop design and location can be lumped together, but maintenance should be a separate bullet point.*
- *We have been collecting a lot of question from this group, meeting summaries and from emails we have received from the public and have included them all in this document.*

- **Sample Resources and Issues Documents:**
 - *Does the Task Force like the format of the Issues and Resource Documents? Does it make sense as a way to communicate and start addressing issues identified by the Task Force? Yes.*
 - *We will make this information more publically available as we go along. These documents it will be invaluable to staff as we launch into the development of a PSAP.*
 - *If we make this public, it will be a resource for everyone and sends a signal to public that all these different departments are coming together to work on pedestrian safety.*

- **A2 Fix It:**
 - *Is this running or is it in beta phase? This is running.*
 - *How do you know about it? The City launched a new website a few weeks ago and this application was part of the release. There was a huge media blitz (MLive, Facebook, Twitter).*
 - *It might be good to have a flier sent out with the water bill to notify people who are not as active in social media. The Resource Group thinks the Task Force might be a good venue to help spread the word on this new tool.*
 - *Preference can be set up to receive information on similar topic in the City.*
 - *Based on past experience in reporting sidewalk snow and ice issues, the system is so bad that you can report someone every week and still nothing happens. This system is not going to solve that problem. This tool is not necessarily going*

Attachment A: Meeting #5 Discussion Summary

to solve the problem, the Resource Group is saying that this is a new tool that we did not have last year. One advantage to the SeeClickFix application is it lets you know when staff acknowledges your comment and there is a line of responsibility.

- *You can post comments anonymously.*
- *The list of winter citations have gone up tremendously over the last few years and if a sidewalk is not cleared the City sends contractors out.*
- *What are “unfounded complaints” listed on the Winter Maintenance Resource and Issues Brief? Those are instances where the snow or ice may have melted from the time the report was submitted to the time staff goes out to inspect it. It also includes a new snowfall which provides another 24 hours for clearance.*
- **Traffic Complaints:**
 - *The system works, however based on past experience some problems seem to be ignored, such as enforcement at crosswalks; however, they have come out for speed enforcement. We should find out how that is tracked and complied.*
 - *Is it set up to let you know if and when they have dealt with your complaint? No, not as robust as A2 Fix It. Finding out how they use this information is the next step.*
 - *In other states cameras are used to monitor and enforce traffic violations. It would be nice if someone could come in and talk to the group about the history, why it is not used in Michigan, and if it is viable in Ann Arbor. We plan on bringing in the Chief of Police and that would be a good time to have that discussion.*
- **Winter Maintenance:**
 - *What is needed or missing in the resource and issues document?*
 - *Examples of other ordinances.*
 - *Information from the non-motorized plan on snow removal at bus stops needs to be included. The non-motorized plan implies that bus stops are part of sidewalk.*
 - *The www.snowbuddy.com website is a good resource. Paul Tinkerhess would be enthusiastic to come and talk with us. Snow buddy is a private program that Paul Tinkerhess developed; he has had initial discussions with member(s) of City Council. Is there a pattern to unshoveled places - such as elderly, vacant properties, people out of town, etc.? For next meeting we can look at if we have data on where the problems are coming from.*
 - *Identification of the problem is way ahead of fixing the problem. Information itself will not get the sidewalks cleared. What would it cost for the City to just clear sidewalks?*
 - *Curb ramps and plowing techniques are an issue. What options are there that the City has?*
 - *What happens at bus stops where there is not a concrete pad from the sidewalk to the roadway? Who is responsible for clearing?*

Attachment A: Meeting #5 Discussion Summary

- People may lobby not to have bus stops by their house if they are responsible for shoveling.
 - Would like to see time from report to time of inspection.
 - This is a very budget driven activity, especially if you have one person following these complaints. It is the type of thing City Council will have to prioritize.
 - How do we currently educate people who are responsible for winter maintenance on sidewalks? It is not always clear who is responsible. It would be nice to have a GIS map where you can click on a sidewalk and see who is responsible for it. *Deb Gosselin can fill you in on that; some of that information may already exist.*
 - What is the timeline for the Issues and Resources Documents? *This is a trial; we will share with the Resource Group, and bring back for a more robust discussion in the future. A lot of this discussion will help inform the data discussion at our next meeting as well.*
 - Ultimately, our group should provide policy recommendations. *We will discuss at future meetings.*
 - It would be helpful to know the number of crashes of people falling on sidewalk as result of snow/ice/maintenance. Maybe the hospitals would have this information?
 - If this is the definition of sidewalk, then we need a definition of “walkway”.
- Sidewalk Gaps:
 - What is the name of the type of connection that goes from the end of a cul-de-sac to a nearby road and who is responsible for maintenance?
 - At some point someone needs to categorize the sidewalk map and determine which gaps are really gaps. *You are not starting from scratch; the City staff has already done a lot of research and has looked at model programs.*
 - When will we address sidewalk gaps that no one has complained about yet? *This interim policy was set up to handle requests while this study is underway. The point of this process is to look at holistically.*
 - “City can order the filling of a sidewalk gap. This process has not, however, been heavily invoked” – Why?
 - During the public engagement process we should ask if people notice any cowpaths or places where people are creating their own pathways.
 - Are there existing easements/rights-of-way in areas where there are sidewalk gaps?
 - Have any pilot areas been considered or talked about regarding sidewalk gaps? *That is a good question for Deb Gosselin.*
 - City of Austin Sidewalk Master Plan
 - Is the City using this model? *We are looking at using parts of their prioritization too.*
 - If we are to make recommendation on sidewalk prioritization we need to know how it’s done now and what’s currently is being discussed.

Attachment A: Meeting #5 Discussion Summary

- The Austin model doesn't give higher prioritization for schools. *It might be helpful if the Task Force provides recommendations like this regarding the model.*
 - There are areas where whole neighborhoods are missing sidewalks. There is a concern that existing trees and landscaping would need to be removed in those locations. How do we handle those gaps versus gaps with little to no vegetation or landscaping issues? *We will work this into future discussions.*
- Work Plan and Draft Outline Agendas:
 - As noted earlier ordinance revisions should be addressed.
 - It is not clear if this is an information item, policy item, or action item. *It will probably be a combination of everything.,*
- September 3rd Meeting - Data Types:
 - Will we get a link to the actual data sets? *These documents describe the data sets and if the data is already publically available you will get the link. If not, maybe we will tell you why it is not, or that may end up being one of your recommendations.*
 - *This is not a request to have staff go out and collect the data; this is a request to learn more about specific data types.*
 - Do other cities look at demographics in regards to snow removal?
 - Have other cities developed effective ways to get pedestrian counts?
 - What are the trips that are not happening because of lack of access? For example some people deal with sidewalk gaps by walking on the street, other people take a different route, drive their car, or don't walk at all.
 - Do we have information on how pedestrian signal heads work in different areas of the City?
 - Is there more information on how snow enforcement actually works?
 - ***With your next meeting packet you will receive all the information the Resource Group put together on the different data sets and the homework for the Task Force will be (a) read it and (b) if there are some additional questions, you should sent it to us in advance to help the City staff prepare for next meeting.***
 - *City staff members who will be on next meetings panel are same staff members who are completing the data summaries.*

Attachment B: Sign-in Sheet



CITY OF ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN
Public Services Area/Systems Planning
301 E. Huron Street
P.O. Box 8647, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107

Web: www.a2.gov.org

**SIGN-IN SHEET - PEDESTRIAN SAFETY & ACCESS TASK FORCE
TASK FORCE MEETING #5**

Date: Wednesday, August 20th, 2014

Time: 5:00 - 7:00 pm

Location: Basement Conference Room - Larcom City Hall

NAME

1. Larry Deck
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____
11. _____
12. _____
13. _____
14. _____
15. _____

Attachment C: Approved Agenda



CITY OF ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN
Public Services Area/Systems Planning
301 E. Huron Street
P.O. Box 8647, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107

Web: www.a2gov.org/pedsafety

APPROVED AGENDA - PEDESTRIAN SAFETY & ACCESS TASK FORCE

TASK FORCE MEETING #5

Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2014

Time: 5:00 - 7:00 pm

Location: Basement Conference Room – Larcom City Hall (301 E Huron Street)

Chair: Linda Diane Feldt

Secretary: Ken Clark

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda | 5 – 5:05 pm |
| 2. Approval of Meeting #4 Discussion Summary | 5:05 – 5:10 pm |
| 3. Public Comment Proposal | 5:10 – 5:20 pm |
| 4. Approve amendments to Pedestrian Safety and Access Plan Annotated Outline | 5:20 – 5:30 pm |
| 5. Community Engagement Strategy | 5:30 – 5:50 pm |
| 6. Initial List of Priority Issues | 5:50 – 6:05 pm |
| 7. Sample Resources and Issues Documents | 6:05 – 6:40 pm |
| a) Winter Maintenance | |
| b) Sidewalk Gaps | |
| 8. Next Steps | 6:40 – 6:55 pm |
| a) Work Plan and Draft Outline Agendas | |
| b) Data Types | |
| c) Confirm Attendance for Next Meeting | |
| 9. Public Commentary (3 minutes/speaker) | |