

## Cespedes, Christopher

---

**From:** City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 9, 2025 11:14 AM  
**To:** Cespedes, Christopher  
**Subject:** FW: problematic lane reconfiguration RFP

---

**From:** Kirk Westphal <xxxxxxx@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 18, 2024 5:43 PM  
**To:** City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission <xxxxxxx@a2gov.org>  
**Cc:** Peter Houk <xxxxxxx@gmail.com>; Erich Zechar xxxxxxxx [@gmail.com](mailto:xxxxxxx@gmail.com); Erica Briggs Whitacre xxxxxxxx [@gmail.com](mailto:xxxxxxx@gmail.com); Dharma Akmon xxxxxxxx [@gmail.com](mailto:xxxxxxx@gmail.com); Trevor Brydon xxxxxxxx [@gmail.com](mailto:xxxxxxx@gmail.com); Jennifer Queen j xxxxxxxx [@jenncornell.com](mailto:xxxxxxx@jenncornell.com); Jonathan Levine xxxxxxxx [@gmail.com](mailto:xxxxxxx@gmail.com); Adam Goodman xxxxxxxx [@gmail.com](mailto:xxxxxxx@gmail.com); Abdulrahman Ateya xxxxxxxx [@umich.edu](mailto:xxxxxxx@umich.edu); xxxxxxxx [@umich.edu](mailto:xxxxxxx@umich.edu); Hutchinson, Nicholas xxxxxxxx [@a2gov.org](mailto:xxxxxxx@a2gov.org); Dohoney Jr., Milton xxxxxxxx [@a2gov.org](mailto:xxxxxxx@a2gov.org)  
**Subject:** problematic lane reconfiguration RFP

Dear All,

I was recently made aware of city RFP # 25-03 ("Multi-lane Road Reconfiguration Evaluation").

[https://www.a2gov.org/departments/finance-admin-services/purchasing/Documents/RFP\\_25-03\\_Document.pdf](https://www.a2gov.org/departments/finance-admin-services/purchasing/Documents/RFP_25-03_Document.pdf)

It was published to satisfy council resolution R-23-415 ("Resolution to Accelerate Safety Improvements on Multilane Roads").

<https://a2gov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6403222&GUID=9DFF681B-9CAC-4E09-88DC-20B4EA882C42&FullText=1>

Below please find the discrepancies between what City Council asked for and the deliverables of this RFP. To deliver what Council requires, the RFP language should be amended because it neglects or contradicts three key parts of City Council's resolution, in addition to the requirements of Vision Zero. These corrections need not extend the timeline of the RFP.

--==

### What Council said:

"Eliminate all deaths and serious injuries by 2025... Lower car speed is a critical component of Vision Zero, as there's a 95% survival rate if a pedestrian is involved in a crash with a vehicle traveling 20 mph but only a 10% survival rate when the vehicle is travelling 40 mph"

### What the RFP says:

Mentions "safety" and "lowering speeds" in the objective statement, but contains no requirements to achieve nonlethal target speeds, which is the determinant zero deaths and serious injuries.

### Recommendation:

This is a critical failure of the RFP; target speeds must be added to the RFP.

--==

**What Council said:**

"Develop a plan for evaluation of reconfiguring **all** existing multilane roads under the City's jurisdiction"

**What the RFP says:**

"Develop a methodology and use it to evaluate city-owned multi-lane roads for **potential** roadway reconfigurations. The purpose of these evaluations is to analyze and identify **opportunities** to reprioritize roadway space... Evaluate and identify road segments that demonstrate **opportunity** for reconfiguration and develop sketches of alternative concepts for typical segments and critical locations along a segment, **should road reconfiguration become feasible**."

**Recommendation:**

The Council directive asked to evaluate reconfiguration of all multilane roads because of their inherent danger and speed. This is the default directive; the language in the RFP is weak. Inclusion of target speeds in the RFP would help mitigate this.

--==--

**What Council said:**

"Promote a 50% reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) by 2030" and explicitly repealed the requirement in an older resolution to provide "current traffic volume data including peak hour volumes... and traffic delays," as Vision Zero does not contemplate motorist convenience over safety.

**What the RFP says:**

"Identify road segments that **demonstrate challenging operational performance under existing travel demand**. **Estimate the peak hour volume reduction needed to reduce a [sic] repurpose a through vehicle travel lane**."

**Recommendation:**

This language is unacceptable and should be removed, as it

- contradicts Vision Zero's core principal (motorist convenience at peak hours does not outweigh safe operations)
- exhibits an incomplete understanding of trip reduction and puts the onus on the consultant to justify lane removals when City Council has already justified them on safety grounds. (Traffic engineers consistently overestimate the "negative" impacts of lane removals, which in turn has caused their communities to experience more roadway deaths and injuries. Removals cause peak and/or overall volume reductions; they do not need to be justified by volume reductions or capacity replacement.)
- further strengthens the inference that reconfigurations may not apply to all segments

--==--

It's also problematic that the RFP directs the consultant to the city's "speed management" website, which is inadequate and may limit the consultant's ambition. For example, the only speed management countermeasure indicated for Stadium Boulevard near Pioneer is "curb extensions." The reference to the city's speed management program should be removed.

These are just the inconsistencies that jumped out at me at first glance. I don't know if any of you had a chance to look at it before it was issued; the RFP asks the consultant to heed the direction of the Transportation Commission but I'm unaware of the TC were advised of the RFP's scope to begin with.

Because of the city's inability to achieve "quick build" improvements, this effort appears fundamental to achieving Vision Zero. Unlike previous efforts like the Lowertown Mobility Study, it must center Vision Zero, achieve specific target speeds everywhere vehicles and vulnerable road users interact, and not fall into the typical American traffic engineering trap of maintaining peak throughput.

Sincerely,  
Kirk Westphal