

Cespedes, Christopher

From: City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission
Sent: Thursday, November 9, 2023 2:24 PM
To: Cespedes, Christopher
Subject: FW: Please stop requiring explicit City Council approval for street parking removal

From: Adam Goodman <xxxxxxx@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 2:20 PM
To: City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission <xxxxxxx@a2gov.org>; City Council xxxxxxxx@a2gov.org
Subject: Please stop requiring explicit City Council approval for street parking removal

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Hi all,

I was pleased to see DC-4, the "Resolution to Accelerate Safety Improvements on Multilane Roads", passed unanimously at City Council last night. However, I found it interesting to note that the resolution introduced and passed at Council was noticeably different from the recommendations passed on by the Transportation Commission. One of the changes was clearly positive - setting a timeline in which proposed reconfigurations should occur. However, another change removed what seemed to me to be a key provision - that Council would have to specifically approve any and all projects which *retained* multi-lane configurations.

This approach - setting a clear policy stance and requiring Council to approve all exceptions - is one that has been used for decades in our city to construct and maintain the disastrously unsafe, car-dominated transportation system we have today. As recently as 2019, Council passed [R-19-139](#), which had the [clearly intended] effect of halting almost all lane-reduction projects in the city. It seemed appropriate to me that Council should use this same tactic in last night's DC-4, but this time in pursuit of policies that are actually consistent with our Vision Zero and A2Zero goals.

It seems that Council felt otherwise. Fair enough. I can understand a stance that says, Council should simply remove costly micromanaging procedural hurdles from staff, and allow them the freedom to work toward our city's policy goals by whichever means are most expedient.

The problem is, then, that we still have a number of these micromanaging procedural hurdles on the books that work to *maintain* our deadly, car-dependent status quo. While R-19-139 was rescinded (via [R-21-022](#)), explicit Council approval is still required for a number of other types of street changes - most notably, street parking removal. As far as I can tell, this outmoded and counterproductive clause in city code [dates back to 1961](#), a time when our city clearly did not share the same transportation goals we have in 2023. Please amend this ordinance to give our city's transportation staff access to *all* the tools they need to achieve our transportation safety & sustainability goals.

Thank you for your attention to this issue.

- Adam