

Cespedes, Christopher

From: City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2023 1:23 PM
To: Cespedes, Christopher
Subject: FW: Another transportation study not grounded in Vision Zero?

From: City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission <xxxxxxxxx@a2gov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 5, 2023 8:35 AM
To: Westphal, Kirk (DGT) <xxxxxxxxx@gmail.com>
Cc: City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission <xxxxxxxxx@a2gov.org>
Subject: RE: Another transportation study not grounded in Vision Zero?

Good morning Kirk,

Thank you for contacting the City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission. Your concerns will be provided as a communication item on the July 19th Commission Agenda.

Your message has also been forwarded too transportation staff, so that they are also aware of your comments and may respond separately.

From: Kirk Westphal <xxxxxxxxx@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 3, 2023 5:56 PM
To: City Council <xxxxxxxxx@a2gov.org>
Cc: Steglitz, Brian <xxxxxxxxx@a2gov.org>; Hess, Raymond <xxxxxxxxx@a2gov.org>; Dohoney Jr., Milton <xxxxxxxxx@a2gov.org>; Miller, Amber <xxxxxxxxx@a2dda.org>; City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission <xxxxxxxxx@a2gov.org>
Subject: Another transportation study not grounded in Vision Zero?

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.

Dear Council,

I am excited that you are taking steps to study downtown usability in a more holistic manner, however I am disappointed in several aspects of the proposal from Smith Group for the Downtown Circulation study, dated January 17.

<https://a2gov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12109948&GUID=1A930525-5716-4AA4-B640-DED547C27156>

While I appreciate that Vision Zero and our transportation plan are mentioned a couple of times—and most of the proposed areas of study are extremely important—this is different from grounding the proposal in the primary goal that the city has agreed on: zero deaths and serious injuries on our roads. I am very concerned about the budget for modeling car "traffic operations" and the language highlighting "tradeoffs," "network impacts," "future conditions," and accommodating the regrettable outcomes of the Lowertown Mobility Study (such as the fact that it left the dangerous Broadway & Division intersection as-is).

You have explicitly agreed that there are no "tradeoffs" when it comes to the safety of our road users. Allowing consultants to use language like this and consider the potential inconveniences to single-occupant car drivers in their

analysis should be a non-starter. Likewise, acknowledging the "future conditions" of increased car volumes (if that is the intent) is also perplexing when we have committed to eliminating 50% of in-town car trips.

It's unfortunate that in the 7 months between the final version of this proposal being delivered to staff and reaching your inboxes, it doesn't appear that input was sought from the Transportation Commission, the Vision Zero Implementation Committee, or advocacy groups such as Walk Bike Washtenaw. My guess is that they would have recognized the proposal's 1) incomplete compliance with goals in the transportation and carbon neutrality plans, 2) failure to recognize our goal to significantly reduce VMT, and 3) lack of direct recognition of City Council's commitment to eliminate road deaths and serious injuries in the next 2 years.

Please consider sending this proposal and all future ones to the Transportation Commission for review before considering funding. And as I have asked before, I also hope you will take this opportunity to prohibit staff and consultants from using scientifically unsound and dangerous car traffic modeling tools and "level of service" metrics that only serve to ingrain road trauma into our transportation systems.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kirk Westphal
734-xxx-xxxx