



City of Ann Arbor
Transportation Commission
2019 Annual Report

Contents

Foreword p. 1
Motions & Actions p. 2
Featured Agenda Items & Presentations p. 5
Reports & Recommendations p. 7
Attachments p. 16



Foreword

From the Chair

Over the last year the Transportation Commission has continued to work diligently to increase transportation awareness of our safety, access, and Vision Zero goals for Ann Arbor with mixed success.

The Commission plays an important role in promoting greater awareness and focus on the many facets of transportation issues and how they affect health, lifestyle, the environment, city planning, and the continuing growth of Ann Arbor. The commission utilizes the exceptional skills and experience of Commissioners to continue to help move forward and co-create a city where transportation challenges are considered front and center in decision making and planning. Further details of our work are contained in this report.

With transportation issues gaining more prominence and visibility, both locally and nationally, the Commission has also experienced some controversy and new challenges. One example is Ann Arbor's crosswalk ordinance enacted in 2011; the ordinance requires drivers to stop for pedestrians waiting to cross and for pedestrians to yield to cars who are unable to stop in time. The law has been challenged on many fronts on the state and local levels. The Transportation Commission has remained strongly in support of Ann Arbor's crosswalk ordinance, and has opposed actions to weaken it or revert to what pedestrian safety advocates and city police alike assert is a far more dangerous and unenforceable statute.

The commission's strong support of traffic safety measures, such as lane reductions and increased bicycle visibility via expanded bike lanes, has also been questioned, and in some cases denied. However, reducing vehicle speeds remains one of the primary pathways to Vision Zero (the goal of achieving zero traffic fatalities and serious injuries), and the commission has strongly supported engineering and other remedies to achieve safety for everyone using Ann Arbor's transportation network.

We began the year with controversy over reappointments of commissioners, and will begin 2020 with further questions about our role as an advisory body and ability to make effective recommendations to City Council. We aim to involve more of the general public through education and achieve better use the evaluation tools and data available for decision making, and employ open, honest, and transparent discussion on subjects of disagreement. The commission hopes that City Council will better utilize the work and recommendations of all city boards and commissions and work to navigate disagreements and conflicts in the coming year, helping to achieve our shared desire for Ann Arbor to be a truly inspiring and safe place to live and work.

It has been an honor and a pleasure to be part of the Transportation Commission since its recent creation. I look forward to passing on that leadership role and continuing to help as needed for the rest of my term as commissioner and past chair.

- Linda Diane Feldt
Chair, The City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission

COMMISSION ROSTER

VOTING MEMBERS

PRESENT

Linda Diane Feldt (Chair)
Molly Kleinman (Vice Chair)
Bradley Parsons
Julie Boland
Tim Hull (Commission on Disability Issues)
Deanna Lernihan
Tim Sanderson (AAATA Designee)
James Summers (Transportation Business Rep)
Wendy Woods (Planning Commission)
Kathy Griswold (Councilmember)

FORMER

Kyra Sims (AAATA)
Scott Trudeau (Planning Commission)
Michael Firn
Roobert Gordon (Vice Chair)
Cyrus Naheedy

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Steve Dolen (U of M)
Liz Margolis (AAPS)
Matt Webb (RTA)
Sergeant Bill Clock (Police Chief Designee)
Raymond Hess (Transportation Manager)
Howard Lazarus (City Administrator)

Please visit a2gov.org/TransportationCommission for more information.

Commission Group Photo

Motions & Actions

January 16, 2019

Micro-Mobility Statement of Values

A motion was made by Boland, seconded by Gordon, that the Micro-Mobility Statement of Values be Approved as presented. On an unanimous voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Chair and Vice-Chair Re-elections

A motion was made by Gordon, seconded by Councilmember Griswold, that Linda Diane Feldt be re-elected as Chair and Robert Gordon be re-elected as Vice Chair. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

2017-2018 Annual Report

A motion was made by Trudeau, seconded by Gordon, that the Annual Report be Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council and should be returned by 2/19/2019. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried, with a no vote by Griswold.

March 20, 2019

Electric Vehicle (EV) Readiness Subcommittee

A motion was made by Boland, seconded by Kleinman, that Commissioner Gordon represent the Transportation Commission on the Energy Commission's EV Readiness Subcommittee. On a unanimous voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

April 17, 2019

FY 2019-20 Major Street Projects Requested for Review

A motion was made by Boland, seconded by Councilmember Griswold, that the FY19-20 Major Street Projects Requested for Review be Approved. On a unanimous voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Crosswalk Ordinance

A motion was made by Gordon, seconded by Kleinman, that City Council maintain the Crosswalk Ordinance in its current iteration based on the review and discussion of the ordinance that the Commission has had. The Commission action will be forwarded to the City Council and should be returned by 5/6/2019. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried. Nay vote by Councilmember Griswold.

A motion was made by Kleinman, seconded by Councilmember Griswold, to discuss and take action on the State of Michigan Crosswalk law at the May 15, 2019 Transportation Commission meeting. On a unanimous voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Transportation Commission Resolution - FY 2020 Proposed Budget

A motion was made by Councilmember Griswold, seconded by Trudeau, that the Resolution be Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council and should be returned by 5/6/2019. On a unanimous voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

May 15, 2019

City Council Resolution Regarding Community Engagement and Approval Processes for City Related Improvement Projects

A motion was made by Parsons, seconded by Kleinman, that the Transportation Commission Response to the City Council Resolution Regarding Community Engagement and Approval Processes for City Related Improvement Projects be Accepted as amended by the Commission. The Commission action will be forwarded to the City Council and should be returned by 6/17/2019. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried, with a no vote by Sanderson and Councilmember Griswold.

Scio Church Service Drive Traffic Calming

A motion was made by Kleinman, seconded by Gordon, that the Transportation Commission recommends that City Council approve the Resolution to Approve the Installation of Traffic Calming Devices on Scio Church Service Drive. The Commission action will be forwarded to the City Council and should be returned by 6/3/2019. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried, with a no vote by Councilmember Griswold.



Scio Church
Service Drive
Raised Crosswalk

Lane Evaluation Projects (Earhart, Traverwood, and Green)

A motion was made by Kleinman, seconded by Parsons, that the Transportation Commission recommends that City Council approve the Resolutions to Proceed with Road Reconfigurations for Green Road, from Burbank Drive to Plymouth Road, for Traverwood Drive, from Huron Parkway to Plymouth Road, and for Earhart Road, including a Safety Enhancement Project, from US-23 to South Waldenwood Drive, and to allocate \$34,500 from the General Fund for improvements associated with the Earhart roundabout (\$100,000). The Commission action will be forwarded to the City Council and should be returned by 6/17/2019. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried. Nay vote by Councilmember Griswold.

July 17, 2019

Lane Evaluation Projects (Earhart, Traverwood, and Green)

A motion was made by Kleinman, seconded by Gordon, that the Transportation Commission recommends that City Council approve the Resolutions to Proceed with Road Reconfigurations for Green Road, from Burbank Drive to Plymouth Road, for Traverwood Drive, from Huron Parkway to Plymouth Road, and for Earhart Road, including a Safety Enhancement Project, from US-23 to South Waldenwood Drive, and appropriate \$34,500.00 and \$40,500.00 respectively from the General Fund and Alternative Transportation Fund Balances; and, that an additional statement from the Transportation Commission be provided to City Council with this action. The Commission action will be forwarded to the City Council and should be returned by 8/5/2019. On a unanimous voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

State of Michigan Crosswalk Law



A motion was made by Gordon, seconded by Kleinman, that the Transportation Commission forward their recommendation concerning HB 4738 to City Council for consideration and should be returned by 8/5/2019. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried with a no vote by Bill DeGroot.

Vice-Chair Elections

A motion was made by Parsons, seconded by Gordon, that Kleinman be elected as Vice Chair. On a unanimous voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Energy Commission Electric Vehicle (EV) Readiness Subcommittee - Transportation Commission Representative

A motion was made by Kleinman, seconded by Parsons, that Robert Gordon continue serving on the Energy Commission's EV Readiness Subcommittee and act as an informal liaison to the Transportation Commission. On a unanimous voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

August 21, 2019

Micro-mobility Committee Appointment

A motion was made by Kleinman, seconded by Griswold, that Scott Trudeau be appointed to the Micro-Mobility Committee. On a unanimous voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.



September 18, 2019

CIP Committee Recommendations

A motion was made by Parsons, seconded by Councilmember Griswold, that the CIP Committee Recommendations be Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Planning Commission and should be returned by 10/15/2019. On a unanimous voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

October 16, 2019

Barton Drive Resurfacing and Water Main Replacement Project

A motion was made by Kleinman, seconded by Parsons, that the Barton Drive Parking Removal Resolution be Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council and should be returned by 11/18/2019. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried with a No vote by Councilmember Griswold.

November 20, 2019

FY21 Policy Agenda Input

A motion was made by Kleinman, seconded by Woods, that the Transportation Commission FY21 Policy Agenda Input be Approved as amended by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council Policy Agenda Committee and should be returned by 12/16/2019. On a unanimous voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Featured Agenda Items & Presentations

January 16, 2019

2019 Street Resurfacing and Related Projects Presentation and Q & A (DAVE DYKMAN)
Transportation Plan Update Presentation and Q & A (ELI COOPER AND STACEY MEEKINS)

February 20, 2019

Quiet Zone Assessment - Ann Arbor Railroad Presentation and Q&A (ELI COOPER)
Road Diet Evaluations Presentation and Q&A (CYNTHIA REDINGER)

March 20, 2019

Six Es: Education, Enforcement, Engineering, Encouragement, Evaluation, and Equity Presentation (RAYMOND HESS)

April 17, 2019



Ann Arbor Area Transportation Authority (AAATA) Updates (getDowntown Program, Commuter Challenge, ArborBike Relaunch) + Q&A (CHRIS SIMMONS)

May 15, 2019

Regional Transit Authority (RTA) Update - Presentation and Q&A (MATT WEBB)

June 19, 2019

Commissioner Communication Guidelines Presentation (NANI WOLF)
Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) Update (DEBORAH GOSSELIN)
Lane Reconfiguration Projects Update (RAYMOND HESS)
Streetlight/Illumination Presentation (RAYMOND HESS) (20 MINUTES)

July 17, 2019

Downtown Development Authority (DDA) Updates (AMBER MILLER)
SnowBuddy Presentation (LISA BRUSH)
Community Engagement Presentation (KAYLA COLEMAN)

August 21, 2019

Relmagine Washtenaw (NATHAN VOGHT)
Crash Data Reporting and Trends (CYNTHIA REDINGER)
Construction Impacts to Active Transportation (RAYMOND HESS)
Ann Arbor Area Transportation Authority (AAATA) Construction Impacts (TIM SANDERSON)



DDA's William St. Bikeway Project

September 18, 2019

Downtown Development Authority (DDA) Parking Presentation (JADA HAHLBROCK & SUSAN POLLAY)
Comprehensive Transportation Plan Presentation (ELI COOPER & STACEY MEEKINS)
Pedestrian Safety & Access Task Force (PSATF) Recommendations on Construction Impacts to Active Transportation (LINDA DIANE FELDT)
CIP Committee Recommendations (LINDA DIANE FELDT & BRADLEY PARSONS)

October 16, 2019

Transit Zoning District Update Presentation (BRETT LENART)
Barton Drive Resurfacing and Water Main Replacement Project Presentation (JANE ALLEN)
FY 20 Policy Agenda Input (LINDA DIANE FELDT)
Sidewalk Gap Criteria and Weighting Presentation (NICK HUTCHINSON)

November 20, 2019

University of Michigan Parking Update (STEVE DOLEN)
Ann Arbor Public Schools (AAPS) Project Overview and School-City Coordination (LIZ MARGOLIS)
Comprehensive Transportation Plan Update (ELI COOPER & STACEY MEEKINS)
Crosswalk Prioritization Discussion (RAYMOND HESS)

Reports & Recommendations

Recommendation to City Council - State of Michigan Crosswalk Law

Transportation Commission Recommendation to City Council Concerning House Bill No. 4738

July 17, 2019

In response to House Bill No. 4738, which proposes statewide crosswalk law as an amendment to the Michigan Vehicle Code, the Transportation Commission recommends the following:

- Ann Arbor City Council and Mayor Taylor speak out against HB 4738 as proposed; this is vital to preserve Ann Arbor's high standard of safety and to offer greater protection and encouragement to pedestrians and drivers throughout the state.
- Ann Arbor City Council direct their Policy Agenda Committee to engage the State of Michigan in updating the draft bill to reflect best practices as represented by the Ann Arbor and Kalamazoo crosswalk ordinances.

Additional considerations:

- A number of City Councilmembers have promoted HB 4738, despite it being in direct conflict with the will of the Ann Arbor public and previous City Council decisions.
- It is unknown the effect HB 4738 may have on Ann Arbor's crosswalk ordinance, and it may make the local ordinance easier to invalidate. There is an active and persistent group that has tried to render the local ordinance ineffective.
- The proposed state law endangers everyone using the right of way, both motorists and pedestrians. HB 4738 is particularly problematic for the most vulnerable members of our community: children, the disabled, and the elderly.
- Ann Arbor Public Schools (AAPS) has denounced the bill, stating "If House Bill No. 4738 passes it will create unsafe conditions and confusion for student walkers and bikers. This district will not, in good conscience, educate students to step off the curb into the street as vehicles approach. This bill will essentially negate the work that has been done to increase student walkers and bikers by creating an unsafe and confusing crossing law for our community."
- If HB 4738 overrides Ann Arbor's local ordinance, then Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) will be rendered ineffective as a pedestrian safety tool. At present, RRFBs alert motorists to the presence of a pedestrian at the curb, thereby notifying drivers via the flashing lights that they are required by local ordinance to stop and providing a safe point of entry for the pedestrian. Under the proposed state law, the lights would flash but motorists would not be required to stop until the pedestrian enters the right of way and endangers their own life, thereby rendering the device ineffective if not outright deceptive. Because of RRFBs' strategic location throughout the city, they overwhelmingly protect schoolchildren and the disabled on high-traffic right of ways with few pedestrian crossing points, such as Stadium Blvd. adjacent to Pioneer High School and numerous locations on Plymouth Rd.

Acknowledgments:

Prepared with consideration to independent statements from Transportation Commission members Julie Boland, Linda Diane Feldt, Tim Hull and Liz Margolis (AAPS), and input from Anthony Pinnell, Resident, Member of the former Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force and Scott Trudeau, former Transportation Commission member.

Recommendation to Transportation Commission - Capital Improvements Plan (CIP)

Recommendations from the CIP Committee for Transportation Commission Approval
August 8, 2019

The Transportation Commission Requests that staff incorporate, and Planning Commission approve, the following project for the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP):

Elmwood Drive Bike Boulevard

- Including active transportation treatment at the Platt and Huron Parkway T-intersection providing shared-use path connection to Canterbury (westbound) as well as guiding cyclists across Platt to Scheffler Park (eastbound).
- Including a low-stress bicycle connection from the Platt and Packard intersection to the Elmwood bike boulevard to provide safe bicycle and pedestrian routes through this high-volume area.
- Including pavement marking and signage along Elmwood to support a low-stress bicycle boulevard.

Acknowledgments:

Prepared by CIP Committee Members – Linda Diane Feldt and Bradley Parsons.

6 E's Report - Education, Encouragement, Engineering, Enforcement, Evaluation, and Equity

Education

Linda Diane Feldt

This is a first pass at listing the who what and when of an educational focus. The next step is likely to select the top priorities and flesh out a possible plan or recommendation to whoever would be responsible for carrying it out. Components can also be included with the other E recommendations, and future agenda items.

Targets – pedestrians, cyclists, car drivers, elementary kids, middle school kids, high schoolers, college students, elderly, disabled, commuters (non resident visitors and workers, patients and business people).

What to teach – vision zero, traffic calming benefits, value/danger of every point of driver/bicyclist/pedestrian and other intersection, crosswalk law, personal responsibility and awareness, value of reflective clothing and using lights for visibility, what the research suggests, reasons evidence for staff and council decisions.

When to teach – emphasis on prevention, education with enforcement, safety curriculum in schools, drivers ed, when bikes are purchased, defensive driving and walking/biking, large events pre-info go over safety concerns, city entrance corridors, on buses for passengers, on buses externally, other transportation hubs, UM orientation for new students, social media.

Special challenges –

- 80,000 out of town visitors/workers per day
- prevailing car culture
- lack of money local, state and federal
- unclear/mixed messages - everyone thinks they are an expert already – dissemination of studies, evidence, reports, evaluations urgently needed
- population is somewhat transitory
- perception that Ann Arbor laws are different from other cities or countries

- distracted driving growing national emergency
- driving/biking/walking while impaired
- aging population can mean greater disability population

Evaluation

Kathy Griswold

Methodology

1. When the population size is small, such as pedestrian crashes in the City of Ann Arbor, then the most effective action is to evaluate each crash site against best-practice standards and make improvements. For example: Crosswalk illumination – positive-contrast lighting is more effective, per 2008 FHWA report.
2. Next evaluate crash data. What data are needed? (Crashes, as well as close calls)
3. Other ideas?

What to consider in making data-driven decisions in evaluation process:

- Timing of evaluation
- Benchmarking
- Experts and scientific reports
- Federal Highway Administration & Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices
- National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO)
- Engineering standards and best-practices (various governmental and advocacy groups such as Michigan, SEMCOG, WATS and the League of American Bicyclists)
- Vision Zero principles
- Best practices worldwide, especially Europe

Examples:

Immediate and mid-term evaluation (feedback)

- Consider electronic radar speed signs and speed limit signs– displays the driver’s speed and captures speeds for later analysis. Drivers are reported to slow down up to 80% of the time. Further evaluation needed. (We must design the roadway for the desired speed and behavior, but electronic radar signs may be a low-cost, interim solution.)
- Study communities that defy trends, such as NYC and Grand Rapids.
- Continuously evaluate monthly crash data for Ann Arbor

Long-term evaluation

- Compare Ann Arbor 10-year crash data with peer-city, state and federal crash data

Relevant Comments:

- Cost Benefit Analysis – not always relevant with Vision Zero
- Uniform signage, markings and roadway design
- Refuge islands
- 3-D crosswalks

Equity

Bradley Parsons

This is largely a summary of “Pursuing Equity in Pedestrian and Bicycle Planning,” from the Federal Highway Administration with some local examples to illustrate barriers that inhibit equitable access to transportation networks and data-points that can augment the tools currently utilized in transportation planning. Equity concerns in transportation focus on under-served communities and seek affordable and reliable transportation options for entire communities and all types of individuals.

Traditionally Under-served Populations:

- Low Income
- Minority
- Older Adults
- Limited English Proficiency
- Persons with Disabilities

Equity concerns to keep in mind:

- 24% of Americans living in poverty do not own a car.
- Low-income, minority, or immigrant individuals are more likely to have jobs that require transportation at night or early morning.
- Language barriers inhibit education on best and safest practices.
- Individuals with language barriers, constraints due to age, constraints due to ability, and constraints due to income are most likely to be forced to travel by foot or wheel on roads lacking safe facilities.
- Limited mobility options equates to limited economic opportunities.
- Disparity in pedestrian fatality rates based on race and social class.

Strategies to Address Inequities:

- Hiring, Training, and Communication with Equity in mind.
- Expand beyond Complaint-Based or Community Request initiated projects.
- Consider the impact on under-served communities in every project.
- Foster Inclusive Public Involvement, including: informal meetings, non- traditional times, providing childcare, partnering with community groups.
- Evaluate land-use policies for better mobility and occupational opportunities in under-served areas.
- Measuring connectivity in networks of various modes.

Local Examples:

South of Interstate 94:

A vibrant neighborhood of low- and moderate-income individuals and include a high minority population, yet has limited access to the larger active-transportation network due to Interstate 94 as well as gaps in the network once crossing the interstate.

East of Highway 23:

A significant percentage of commuters to and from Ann Arbor originate in Ypsilanti Township, Pittsfield Township, and the City of Ypsilanti. These locations also consist of low- and moderate-income individuals and include a high minority population. Highway 23 forces all users to use Washtenaw, Packard, Ellsworth, or E Huron—all high-speed, high volume corridors with limited facilities. Significant gaps in the network continue once individuals travel west of Highway 23.

<https://maps.semcog.org/CommutingPatterns/>

<https://demographics.virginia.edu/DotMap/>

<https://www.census.gov/censusexplorer/censusexplorer.html>

<https://maps.semcog.org/bicyclenetwork/>

Equity

Tim Hull

Adapted from the FHWA: Pursuing Equity in Pedestrian and Bicycle Planning - Equity in transportation seeks fairness in mobility and accessibility to meet the needs of all community members. A central goal of transportation equity is to facilitate social and economic opportunities through equitable levels of access

to affordable and reliable transportation options based on the needs of the populations being served, particularly populations that are traditionally under-served. Traditionally under-served groups include individuals in at least one of the following categories: low income, minority, elderly, limited English proficiency, or persons with disabilities. It is important to note that transportation equity does not mean allocating transportation resources in equal amounts to all people. Transportation equity relates to how transportation practitioners can provide access to affordable and reliable transportation (and specifically, pedestrian and bicycle facilities and programs) to fairly meet the needs of all community members, particularly traditionally under-served populations.

Current State

General Needs & Challenges Surrounding This “E” (for Ann Arbor)

In transportation planning, we need to consider equity both with respect to mode and ability.

One area of particular concern for equity is with the road network. Currently, road construction projects use “level of service” as a metric, which solely considers speed of automobile travel without giving any consideration to other uses. This can be cited as a reason to not add infrastructure for other uses (such as bike lanes or sidewalks) or not slow down traffic to improve pedestrian safety, without even taking those users into account. Disadvantaged socioeconomic groups as well as persons with disabilities are less likely to be able to drive or have access to a car, meaning that infrastructure that favors automobile travel disadvantages them. “Level of service” discounts human quality of life, especially for populations that rely on transit or active transportation.

At the same time, we don’t have a comparable requirement for non-motorized access – for instance, the Washtenaw/Pittsfield intersection requires pedestrians to cross 3 times to get from the bus stop on the south side of the street to the north side. This provides a disadvantage to bus riders, many of whom are low-income, elderly or disabled (cannot drive), or school-age (too young to drive), and makes commuting both more difficult and dangerous for already-vulnerable populations. Traffic signals can also have the effect of favoring vehicular travel when a button must be pressed to activate the pedestrian cycle, as frequently this requires the pedestrian to wait longer. Finally, during construction projects, pedestrian access is frequently closed in places where vehicular access is maintained.

Another area where we see uneven treatment of road users based on mode is in road vs sidewalk construction and snow removal. While road construction and snow removal is taken care of by the City, sidewalk construction and snow removal is the responsibility of property owners. This leads to uneven conditions from property to property with respect to the presence of sidewalks and snow removal, and also makes it easier for vocal property owners to block sidewalk construction due to the use of special assessments (and a requirement for property owner benefit).

Yet another area of particular concern comes with respect to land use policy. Outside of downtown, many developments are surrounded by surface parking. In most of these cases, these spots are necessary to fulfill parking minimums required by our zoning code. At the same time, we don’t require/incentivize access for other modes of transportation in the same way.

Equity can also be a concern from the standpoint of demographics. For one, if improvements are proposed to transportation infrastructure, we need to ensure that these are distributed equitably among different neighborhoods. Also, transportation needs to serve the needs of all such groups equitably. One area of concern in this respect is with respect to transit – currently, AAATA service (except for more expensive NightRide) does not serve those working late night or holiday shifts, and service is heavily oriented around downtown/UM Hospital with the hub/spoke service model. This design, limited-hours and limited-service area, excludes people of low socio-economic status that work late shifts or commute to housing that is on the outskirts of the city but between

major transit corridors (spokes). Also, traveling outside the service area can be difficult. While there are valid reasons for concentrating service on peak hours/destinations, more could be done to serve those who find themselves outside these.

Background Research

Relevant Existing City of Ann Arbor or State of Michigan Programs/Initiatives

1) Program: SnowBuddy

Strengths/benefits: Helps clear snow in participating neighborhoods.

Deficiencies/needs: Still relies on the general public for snow removal, currently only serves selected neighborhoods.

2) Program: NightRide/HolidayRide

Strengths/benefits: Provides shared-ride taxi service at a discounted rate when AAATA fixed-route services are unavailable.

Deficiencies/needs: Costs more than fixed-route service (and does not accept monthly passes), less predictable time-wise.

3) Program: Sidewalk Millage

Strengths/benefits: Covers sidewalk maintenance on a city-wide basis, without requiring special assessments.

Deficiencies/needs: Doesn't cover construction of new sidewalks or snow removal.

Programs/Initiatives in Other Cities/States (if applicable)

1) Program (Location): California SB 743 (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpa/sb743.html>)

Strengths/benefits: Replaces level of service metric with alternative metrics (vehicle miles traveled).

Possible applicability to Ann Arbor: Could serve as a model as far as alternatives to level of service.

2) Program (Location): San Diego – Ordinance 21057 (<https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/transportation/mobility/tpa>)

Strengths/benefits: Removes parking minimums for housing in Transit Priority Areas (areas in proximity to current/future frequent transit), instead requiring alternative transportation amenities to be offered.

Possible applicability to Ann Arbor: Could be a potential mode-neutral alternative to parking minimums.

Next Steps

Questions to Consider

Performance measures used in transportation planning need take equity of mode/ability into account. Also, the process needs to account for all demographics and socioeconomic groups equitably.

Ideas – How to Improve This “E” (high-level policy targets, goals, metrics, innovations)

- Move to replace or augment level of service with a metric that is more neutral with respect to mode.
- Have the City take responsibility for construction and snow removal for sidewalks
- Operate traffic signals in a way that ensures all modes are treated neutrally.
- Take steps to ensure access is maintained during construction projects on an equitable basis with respect to mode if at all possible.
- Revise zoning codes to not require parking, or to allow other transportation amenities to be substituted in place of parking.
- Implement policy to ensure transportation improvements are implemented equitably across all neighborhoods, and communicate with AAATA with respect to service improvements.

What community stakeholders should be engaged in future discussions?

AAATA (for transit-related decisions), SnowBuddy (with respect to snow removal), stakeholders involved in transportation and land use Master Plan updates, disability advocacy organizations (Ann Arbor CIL, Commission on Disability Issues).

Enforcement

Molly Kleinman

Adapted from the League of American Bicyclists:

Basic laws and regulations need to govern walking and bicycling and the rules of the road to ensure safety for all road users. With a good set of laws and regulations in place that treat all travelers equitably within the transportation system, the next key issue is enforcement. Law enforcement officers must understand these laws, know how to enforce them, and apply them equitably to ensure public safety. A good relationship between the active transportation community and law enforcement is essential; for example, a police representative can participate on a Bicycle Advisory Committee to increase awareness on both sides. Similarly, having more police officers walking and on bikes helps increase understanding of local issues. On college and university campuses, theft prevention is a huge undertaking.

Current State

Ann Arbor has a proactive active transportation set of rules and ordinances. Building off the MVC and UTC, the City's ordinance language goes one step further in extending protection to pedestrians preparing to cross the street. These regulations have been in place for over a decade and have led to an increase in stop compliance by motorists at uncontrolled mid-block crosswalks. Studies undertaken in the City evidenced a stop compliance rate of less than ten percent at such locations in the early 2000s. The recently completed Changing Driver Behavior effort is an example of active enforcement as well as showcasing the increased stop compliance experienced in Ann Arbor today. Additional enforcement options proven effective in other places include camera monitored speed detection and enforcement, red light running cameras and other automated approaches to enforcement, however these options are currently prohibited under state law. Some might consider driver/vehicle intimidation of pedestrians and cyclists as harassment or assault.

Due to staffing limitations, much of traffic enforcement is complaint driven. There is a database used to manage traffic complaints. Ann Arbor has roughly 400 traffic complaints/year. Most of these are related to speeding and intersection violations such as running stop signs. The city currently has 6 radar signs available to address speeding complaints, 4 can be set up by officers, 2 require signs and signals staff to set up. Other complaints include unsafe operation in school zones such as turning violations and parking issues, and oversized truck traffic. Crosswalk complaints are down.

General Needs & Challenges Surrounding This "E" (for Ann Arbor)

Challenges

- Staffing: The AAPD is understaffed, and traffic enforcement currently has 3 of its allotted 6 officers.
- State law: Michigan State law prohibits several tools and techniques that have been effective elsewhere, including DWI checkpoints, camera monitored speed detection and enforcement, and red light running cameras.
- Many drivers in Ann Arbor are commuting in from elsewhere, with different norms and expectations regarding sharing the road with cyclists and pedestrians.

Overlaps with the 6Es

Evaluation: What kinds of metrics exist right now around enforcement?

What kinds of metrics are other cities gathering that we are not that might be useful? When it comes to crashes and fatalities we are dealing with a relatively small data set. All crashes are reported up to the state, and there is a publicly facing website (<https://www.michigantrafficcrashfacts.org/>)

Equity: Do we track enforcement by race (who is being stopped, who is being ticketed?) By neighborhood? Age?

Engineering: Enforcement and Engineering also have strong lines of communication, working together to identify areas that have required enforcement where it might be possible to engineer a solution. Are there ways to improve these processes?

Education: Enforcement and Education seem like they should be tightly coupled when it comes to transportation/transit issues. Does education have a clear home in city government the way engineering does, with clear collaborators for enforcement?

Background Research

Relevant Existing City of Ann Arbor or State of Michigan Programs/Initiatives

1) Program: Changing Driver Behavior study, aimed at improving stopping rates at crosswalks. Primarily a research study, run by university faculty, in collaboration with the city

Strengths/benefits: Had a positive impact on stopping rates, provided useful data

Deficiencies/needs: Needs and priorities of academic researcher different from those of the city.

Engineering

Julie Boland

Engineering is responsible for the planning, creation, modification, and maintenance of the transportation infrastructure. Engineering works toward creating a complete system that supports safe and convenient walking, biking, riding (bus or train), and driving. Important components include pavement conditions, signs, pavement markings and other treatments, lighting, and traffic signals. These elements should lead to well-connected transportation networks, consisting of quiet neighborhood streets, sidewalks and crosswalks, conventional and protected bike lanes, shared use trails, ample parking for non-motorized vehicles, and policies to ensure connectivity and maintenance of these facilities.

Current State

General Needs & Challenges Surrounding Engineering for Ann Arbor

-
- Pavement conditions are poor in many areas, frustrating both drivers and bikers.
- Crosswalks are common, but serious pedestrian-vehicle accidents continue to occur, sometimes within existing crosswalks. Concerning issues include inconsistent crosswalk markings/signage, inadequate crosswalk lighting, and high prevailing driving speed, as well as distraction. Crosswalk safety is important for both pedestrians and bus-riders, including special populations such as school children and the disabled.
- Biking networks are under-developed, such that bike commuters often need to bike on streets with “sharrows” or no markings at all rather than in dedicated bike lanes. This limits the number of potential bikers who feel comfortable enough to use their bicycles for transportation. Even where there are marked bike lanes, some bikers feel more comfortable on the sidewalks than in the streets.
- Bicycles and scooters that can be rented for very short periods of time are relatively new options in our multi-modal system. Most often, these users do not wear helmets, making them especially vulnerable to cars.
- The AAATA provides a valuable resource with its bus system, which continues to improve. Remaining gaps include late night and holiday service--which is important for persons who work late and on holidays—and some areas outside the current hub/spoke service model.
- While Ann Arbor has been developing initiatives to make pedestrians and bikers feel more welcome and bus routes have been expanded, some problems of mode equity persist. For example, during construction projects, pedestrian access may be closed while vehicle access is maintained. Another example is that bus-riding to Briarwood mall is de-incentivized by placing the bus stops far from the mall entrances.

Additional Considerations

- A systems-level approach to setting transportation priorities is needed. Transportation improvements should be distributed equitably among different neighborhoods and parts of town.
- Ann Arbor's road network includes roads owned and maintained by three different entities: the city, the state, and the county. Thus, the city cannot autonomously modify all transportation routes within the city.
- Within the city council and the population, there are differing views about how to balance the needs of drivers and non-motorized transportation.
- Ann Arbor's streetlight network includes lights owned and maintained by the city and lights owned and maintained by DTE.
- There is a large influx of drivers from outside of town into Ann Arbor each day. This makes bicycle and pedestrian safety along the arteries particularly challenging. One issue contributing to this problem is the lack of affordable housing within Ann Arbor.

Background Research

Relevant Existing City of Ann Arbor or State of Michigan Programs/Initiatives

- 1) The City has adopted a Vision Zero Goal, with no traffic-related deaths or serious injuries. Two key components of Vision Zero are data-driven engineering and a systems approach.
- 2) The City has adopted sustainability goals. Transportation is an important component of this. Initiatives that increase biking, walking, and bus-riding will make Ann Arbor a more sustainable city. Greenhouse gas emissions will be reduced and the citizens who use these modalities will experience health benefits.
- 3) The State has adopted a Complete Streets criterion for infrastructure planning. However, the perception is that the State is still automobile-centric, as exemplified by "vehicle service level" criteria. City Engineers should (and do) take a more balanced approach, considering all forms of transportation, as well as sustainability.

Programs/Initiatives in Other Cities/States

- 1) There are a number of other cities that have adopted Vision Zero with positive results. Some of these cities are similar in size and make-up to Ann Arbor, e.g., Boulder Colorado, and can serve as a model for us.
- 2) Kalamazoo recently opted to return a state-owned road to local control. This is a possible model for resolving disputes with the State.

Next Steps

Questions to Consider

- The Speed Reduction Task force put together an impressive report, with recommendations well aligned with Vision Zero goals. How are those recommendations currently being implemented? To the extent that they aren't being implemented, why not?
- How much flexibility do we have to augment vehicle level of service with other metrics, so that we don't privilege automobile transportation over other modes?
- Do we have any provisions in zoning code to encourage non-motorized access, such as bike parking?
- Ideas – How to Improve This "E" (high-level policy targets, goals, metrics, innovations)
- We need high quality, systems-level data, with appropriate context, to establish forward-looking priorities across the system (e.g., existing crosswalk and crosswalk lighting conditions, historic crash patterns, prevailing traffic speeds, predictive analysis). Collection of data should be as equitable and complete as possible. For example, relying solely on police reports of crashes under-reports the actual number of collisions and near-misses, possibly in systematic ways.

Attachments

Attachment A: Transportation Commission Ordinance

1:207. - Transportation Commission.

(1) The Transportation Commission is established to foster excellence in the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of a sustainable and resilient multimodal transportation network for the City of Ann Arbor. The Transportation Commission will serve as an advisory body to the City Council and the City Administrator on transportation policy with a focus on accessibility, mobility, equity, and safety for all citizens.

(2) The Transportation Commission shall consist of 11 voting members. Appointments should be of individuals who, insofar as is possible, have an interest in the various forms and modes of transportation needs of the community. Members shall be appointed by the Mayor and approved by the City Council unless otherwise stated.

(a) To support a holistic evaluation of the community's concerns, the voting members of the Transportation Commission shall be as follows:

1. Six members of the public.
2. One owner or operator of a transportation business operating in Ann Arbor.
3. One member of the Planning Commission, appointed by the Planning Commission.
4. One member of the Commission on Disability Issues, appointed by the Commission on Disability Issues.
5. One individual appointed by the board of the Ann Arbor Area Transportation Authority.
6. One member of the City Council.

(b) The City Administrator, the Transportation Manager, and the Chief of Police shall be nonvoting members of the Transportation Commission. The City Administrator shall designate staffing to support the Transportation Commission.

(c) The Regional Transit Authority of Southeast Michigan, the University of Michigan, and the Ann Arbor Public Schools may each appoint one nonvoting member to the Transportation Commission.

(d) Unless otherwise stated in this subsection, voting members of the Transportation Commission shall be appointed to three-year terms, which shall be staggered so that approximately one third of the terms expire each year. Initial terms may be for less than three years so that the terms are staggered. The City Council member shall be appointed for a one-year term in the same manner as for City Council committee appointments. Members appointed by other City boards or commissions shall continue to serve until they are no longer members of the appointing board or commission or until the appointing board or commission appoints a different member. The member appointed by the board of the Ann Arbor Area Transportation Authority shall continue to serve until the board appoints a different member.

(3) The Transportation Commission shall have the following powers and duties:

(a) Advise the City Council and City Administrator on:

1. Transportation grants.
2. Streets and highways.
3. The use of, restrictions on, and upkeep of public rights-of-way.
4. Bus and rail service.
5. Pedestrian and bikeway programs and projects.
6. Safety-related programs and projects.

- 7.Regulation of vehicles for hire, including taxicabs, transportation network and ride-sharing entities, pedicabs, and other transportation vehicles; and all related matters including permits, annual permits, franchise permits, transportation franchise requests, renewals, rate adjustments, and hours of operation.
- (b) Provide comments to the Planning Commission, City Council, Downtown Development Authority, and the Ann Arbor Area Transportation Authority on transportation policy, and the impact of proposed projects to the same.
 - (c) Recommend to the City Council and the City Administrator priorities and budget allocations related to transportation.
 - (d) Provide recommendations on the City’s transportation master plans including the City Transportation Plan and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan.
 - (e) Report annually to the City Council and the City Administrator regarding the activities of the Transportation Commission, which shall reflect the effectiveness of the city’s transportation strategy process and make recommendations for any changes thereto.
 - (f) Make proposals and recommendations to achieve and maintain a holistic and inclusive transportation ecosystem that meets the mobility needs of all people, including the mobility-impaired.
 - (g) Form special purpose task forces and subcommittees to carry out the business of the commission.(h) Perform other duties as directed by City Council.

(Ord. No. 16-26, § 1, 11-21-16; Ord. No. 18-23, § 1, 9-17-18)

Attachment B: Commissioner Involvement in City Process

Linda Diane Feldt (Chair)

May 30, 2019 to Present

Member of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) for the City of Ann Arbor Comprehensive Transportation Plan Update.

Robert Gordon (Former Vice-Chair)

March 20, 2019

Appointed to represent the Transportation Commission on the Energy Commission’s EV Readiness Subcommittee.



Thanks For Reading!

Over the past year the commission greeted new members, made recommendations on both local and state laws, and engaged with numerous projects affecting residents across the city, including road resurfacing, traffic calming, crosswalks, and lane evaluations. Thank you for taking an active interest in the Transportation Commission and we hope to see continued community engagement into the coming year.

“As the representative of the Commission on Disability Issues on the Transportation Commission, I have played the role of liaison between the commissions. As such, I have helped keep both commissions up to date on issues of shared interest, and have helped shape Commission actions regarding these and other issues. Despite membership turnover, the commission has played an active role in City transportation issues, including controversial issues such as road reconfigurations and crosswalk laws. I appreciate the effort our membership has put in this year, and look forward to helping ensure this carries over to next year and beyond.”

- Tim Hull



Commissioner
Photo



Commissioner
Photo

“This last year and change on the Transportation Commission has opened my eyes to the importance of volunteer commissions in Ann Arbor’s government. At Transportation Commission meetings, residents have the opportunity to learn about the wide range of transportation related projects and initiatives happening in the city and the region, from the world’s largest connected vehicle test environment to efforts to improve safety for children walking to school. The Commission also gives road users of all kinds a voice in city government, and I am routinely impressed by the commitment of my fellow volunteers to consider the needs of everyone in our city, regardless of their mode of transportation.”

- Molly Kleinman

Please visit a2gov.org/TransportationCommission for more information.