

From: Stephanie Preston
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2017 9:36 AM
To: Coleman, Kayla
Subject: crosswalk ordinance preliminary recommendations

I have reviewed the materials and have been following the crosswalk situation for the past year including the Be Safe campaign and the driver behavior study.

Here is my opinion (recommendations bolded):

I have seen similar ordinances in other cities work extremely well, even in college towns where there are a lot of out of town people. In these other cities, if someone sees someone at a curb they immediately stop and the person passes and there is a cultural feeling that the city prioritizes pedestrians. If you are caught not stopping there is a significant fine and word spreads fast once someone in a social group gets one of these fines. There is no extreme danger to pedestrians as a result of this rule. Of note, most of the cities where I have seen this working the cars are in a "downtown" mode and are probably not traveling much over 35MPH. I have seen it on larger, faster roads in Sweden where the cars still do stop every time--so we know from that at least that people are capable of doing so even when the roads are fast if the education and enforcement and uniformity is strong.

Thus, the statements that other people make that such an ordinance is dangerous per se I view as false.

In my opinion, it is dangerous in *Ann Arbor* because of a systematic failure of the city to prioritize and fund education and enforcement so that people are all aware of the rule and know that they are expected to follow it, with punishments if they do not.

It is logically irrational to have a rule that expects people to stop without any education or enforcement. This is exacerbated by more general problems with speeding in Ann Arbor. Once people are traveling over speeds of about 35 MPH it becomes difficult and dangerous to stop suddenly for a pedestrian--resulting in those rear end crashes and cars *commonly* swerving around a stopped car into a crossing person or bike (happened this month at Huron High).

It appears from the materials we received that the ONLY education that has occurred since 2011 has been in the past year. Note that the Be Safe campaign is fairly focused on victim blaming (don't look at your phone, don't wear black) and does not actually clarify confusion about the ordinance. It is not viable to change the way that everyone in America dresses. Focusing any attention on that is a waste of time and money.

This lack of education is *further* exacerbated by the signs at the actual crosswalks that say that you must stop for someone in the crosswalk, which is in direct opposition to the rule that they should stop for the person at the curb. I am not even sure how you can enforce a citation in court if the person can legally claim that the signage at the site says otherwise.

The recent driver behavior study is a help, but just a one time effort for enforcement will not do it. People will forget, new people will come in, people will become complacent, etc.

I recommend that we fund a *real* and sustained education campaign just on the following items:

-You have to stop for the person at the curb.

- You must be vigilant on the roads for cars ahead of you to be stopping for peds.
- Under no circumstances can you swerve around a slowing/stopped car near a crosswalk.
- Peds and bikes must make sure the car is already stopped before they start walking since you cannot assume.
- Peds and bikes must activate flashers where present.

After a real and serious campaign that is not ridiculous is undertaken, money needs to be left in place for some ongoing education, given the high rate of turnover in our town.

In addition, we need to increase our capacity for enforcement. The current staff is simply overwhelmed with complaints of locations with high speeds and they do not have the manpower or the number of speed feedback signs necessary to even put a dent in the high speed problem and crosswalk compliance. The Chief of Police claimed at a recent city council meeting that they don't even want more money because he cannot hire new people. If the police cannot figure out how to staff their department to the level necessary to enforce basic safety rules then maybe we need a new chief who can figure it out. Perhaps additional funding is not only needed for the extra staff salaries and benefits but for a training program as well? This is a nice city to be an officer in and we need to attract and keep fresh and well trained staff.

In addition, we need to fund a way for driver enforcement like was done in the driver behavior study to be routine, not just a one time thing.

In addition, we need to systematize a real, concerted and effective coordination with the University and other large employers to educate their students and employees. Engagement and collaboration with the university is poor. I receive no emails about this issue and I have worked there for 12 years. A sustained committee of people who handle (actually, successfully) UM and A2 communications and coordination needs to aggressively address this issue with at least twice a year salient reminders since turnover is high. Education can be added to new student and new staff orientation. There are so many things that can be done.

I want to make it clear that this is not just an issue of "this ordinance" or "that ordinance". NEITHER level of ordinance is currently working. Cars are not even stopping when people are waiting at the curb. Estimates from the driver study are gross overestimates of compliance because they occur when additional people and vehicles and usually police cars are present--which of course makes more people stop out of confusion and fear.

Where I live, I could stand on Geddes for a long time and cars just stream by unless I do something drastic like point right at them or start walking in front of them while looking them in the eye etc.

Thus, even if you repeal this A2 ordinance you will be left with the exact same problem. The ordinance is not the problem. The widespread disregard of pedestrian-car interaction by the city, the cars, and the pedestrians is the problem, and the city is not doing enough to resolve this conflict. Blaming people or cars is silly if they don't know the rule and they don't have any incentive to do better. People will clearly try to get where they are going as quickly as possible and prioritize their own convenience unless there is a strong enough countermeasure to this salient motivation. Coupling these recommendation with road design changes to decrease speeds is necessary.

I would support putting more money into this issue so that it can be done properly. The current mode is not sufficient to uphold the ordinance OR to uphold the weaker state law.

Thank you for considering this important issue.

Sincerely,
Stephanie D. Preston