

**From:** Scott Koll <[Scott@plymouthcantoncpa.com](mailto:Scott@plymouthcantoncpa.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 20, 2021 1:57 PM

**To:** Lenart, Brett <[BLenart@a2gov.org](mailto:BLenart@a2gov.org)>; Vander Lugt, Kristen <[KVanderLugt@a2gov.org](mailto:KVanderLugt@a2gov.org)>

**Cc:** Scott Koll <[Scott@plymouthcantoncpa.com](mailto:Scott@plymouthcantoncpa.com)>

**Subject:** Jackson Huron Transportation Plan

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.

Hello

On behalf of the Jackson/Huron Neighborhood Association we are submitting our comments and plans regarding the Jackson/Huron transportation plan.

We would like this included in tonight's meeting notes.

Thank You

Scott Koll

Jackson Huron Neighborhood Association

**Vision Zero Plan for the Jackson Huron Corridor (Maple to Main)**

To provide solutions for the Jackson/Huron corridor to further calm traffic, increase pedestrian and homeowner safety, inclusion in the "**Vision Zero Plan**" and designation as a "**Complete Street**".

**Short Term (0 – 3 years)****Immediate**

- Create a master plan for the corridor that can be incorporated into the **Vision Zero Plan**
- Classification of the Huron Jackson corridor as a **Tier 1 road**
- **Change in classification as "Vehicular" to "Complete Street"**
- 3 lane conversion of Huron from Revena to Arbana (minimal cost)
- Lower the speed to 30 from Maple to Main with enforcement (minimal cost)
- Additional "School" markers painted on Huron between 8th and 9th street

**1-3 years**

- Improved crosswalk at Jackson-Dexter-Revena. Add a crosswalk at Huron and Revena
- Pedestrian refuge islands along Jackson
- Crosswalk at Arbana, Grandview, Worden and Burwood-Collingwood (Vets Park)
- Crosswalk at West Park entryway and/or pedestrian island at Huron
- Traffic signal at Worden with crosswalk safety island
- Flashing School Safety Zone Signs with lower speeds at school start and finish times
- Flashing speed sign reminders along the Jackson/Huron corridor
- Large Smart signs on Jackson Avenue (E-W) at Grandview (eastbound traffic 'blind spot')
- Neighborhood markers(cues) at Maple and Delonis Center (railroad overpass) to alert motorists of our neighborhood
- Safety improvements at 7<sup>th</sup> and Huron
- Left turn signal at 7<sup>th</sup>
- Some sort of a buffer between the cars at the curb and people in their front yards

**Mid Term (4-10 years)**

- Extend the 3-lane conversion east from Arbana to Chapin with bike lanes
- City to take control of the US 23 and I94 business loop from Maple to Washtenaw
- Install cameras along the corridor to catch speed and red-light violators
- Park and Ride out on Jackson Road
- Intelligent traffic signals at Huron and 7<sup>th</sup>, Liberty and 7<sup>th</sup> and Miller and 7<sup>th</sup>. Improve flow of traffic.

Scott Koll

Jackson Huron Neighborhood Association

1319 W Huron Street

scott@plymouthcantoncpa.com

734 277 3925

**From:** Larry Deck <[ldeck1@aol.com](mailto:ldeck1@aol.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, April 19, 2021 11:44 PM

**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>; City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission <[TransportationCommission@a2gov.org](mailto:TransportationCommission@a2gov.org)>

**Subject:** WBWC comments on Transportation Plan

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.

To Planning Commission and Transportation Commission:

The Washtenaw Bicycling and Walking Coalition (WBWC) appreciates the city's work to involve the community in developing the impressive Transportation Plan.

### **Comment handling**

WBWC submitted comments on the draft Transportation Plan and appreciates the city's effort to address those comments by making changes in the earlier draft for inclusion in the April draft. Since there has been little time between the release of the April draft and the joint commission meeting on April 20, WBWC has not had time to respond as an organization. Therefore, I am responding as an individual WBWC board member to the April draft.

### **My comments**

For your reference, the WBWC comments dated March 4, 2021 are attached (four pages with the file name "Comments on Transportation Plan Draft"). There were 7 principal comments. I feel that 4 of these comments were addressed adequately (though some of these could be handled better) and that 3 of the comments were not addressed adequately. The attached one-page document entitled "Issues with Ann Arbor Response" explains what I see as deficiencies in those 3 responses and suggests how the issues could be easily addressed.

### **Action requested**

Please ask city staff to modify the April draft to address the 3 concerns highlighted in the attached "Issues with Ann Arbor Response":

- Distracted driving
- Bike facilities at intersections
- Border-to-Border Trail

If you have any questions, please call me at the number below or email me.

-- Larry Deck 734-971-7741

-- WBWC board member

Washtenaw Bicycling and Walking Coalition (WBWC) Comments on  
**Ann Arbor Transportation Plan Draft of November 2020**

## Comments on policies and process

### Level of project detail

While the draft plan has a lot of great information, it is heavy on philosophies but light on what projects to build, especially as compared to the 2006 Non-motorized Transportation Plan and the 2013 Update. It would be worthwhile to retain awareness of the good work that went into these plans without overly burdening or constraining current project implementers.

The draft plan has some good metrics for tracking progress (e.g., on page 63 and pages 170-181). And yet the opacity of the process for deciding what projects in the city's Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) will be built each year (and which will be deferred) hinders public awareness and city accountability. The recommendations below seek to retain historical continuity and maximize transparency with minimal burden.

### Recommendations:

- Refer in this plan to the 2013 update for historical context and project ideas.
- State in this plan that each year, city staff will make and circulate a new list of which CIP transportation projects will be built that year and which will be deferred.

### Distracted driving

While the draft plan has at least two strategies that deal with distracted driving (pages 134 and 148), there appears to be no discussion of it in the section "Address Dangerous Behaviors" (pages 34 through 51) except for a mention that distraction may cause careless driving (page 35). The plan describes 5 dangerous behaviors (speeding, failure to yield, impaired driving, disregarded traffic control, and reckless/careless driving) and analyzes ways to deal with them. A 2018 University of Michigan study led by Professor Fred Feng showed that 1 out of every 13 drivers passing a cyclist was distracted. Though difficult to deal with (and probably greatly underreported in crash statistics), distracted driving is a major safety problem that needs to be addressed. The recommendations below suggest a way to emphasize the issue without introducing a 6th dangerous behavior and reorganizing the whole plan section.

### Recommendations:

- On page 35, label the 5th dangerous behavior "Reckless/careless/distracted driving" and add sentences about the scale of the distraction problem and its relation to device use.
- On page 36, add "Distracted" to the "Reckless/Careless Driving" table heading, or replace "Careless" with "Distracted," and adjust references on subsequent pages to the heading.

### **Bike facilities at intersections**

In past projects, there has not been a consistent treatment of bike lanes and paths at intersections (e.g., the map on page 74 marks some intersections with bike lanes that disappear). And on illustrations of new intersection treatments for Washtenaw/Stadium (page 167), Washtenaw/Huron Parkway (page 168), Ann/Glen (page A4), and Packard/Platt (page A5), the treatment of bike facilities is unclear.

#### **Recommendation:**

- State in this plan that it is policy to maintain continuity of bicycle facilities through intersections.

### **Right turn on red**

In the context of improving biking safety at intersections, the draft plan mentions “No Turn on Red” signs as a tool (page 79). Although pedestrians as well as bicyclists are mentioned there, it may also be beneficial to mention the safety benefits in the context of high-crash locations. While a citywide or downtown-wide ban on right turns on red may have practical difficulties (though it may be worth investigating), the use of the signs at selected intersections with high levels of pedestrian and bicycle crashes can be beneficial. And of course a number of intersections already have these signs.

#### **Recommendation:**

- Mention the addition of “No Turn on Red” signs at intersections with numerous crashes as a potential safety tool, perhaps in the discussion of high-crash locations (pages 30-31) and/or in the section on implementation strategies (pages 170-181).

### **Table of contents**

Some of the page numbers in the table of contents are incorrect.

#### **Recommendation:**

Fix the page numbers.

## Comments on projects

### **Border-to-Border (B2B) Trail**

Projects to complete the B2B Trail in the city were shown and discussed in the 2013 Non-motorized Plan Update but are not shown in the 2020 draft. The trail appears to be mentioned on only three pages, not in relation to finishing the trail, but only in regard to connections to it (pages 66, 71, and 140).

Page 71 contains the sentence, “Off-street shared-use paths work well for corridors not well served by the on-street bikeway network as well as for sections within the network that facilitate long-distance commuting.” This sentence misrepresents the role of shared-use paths in the transportation system. They complement on-street facilities and are an integral part of the overall system. Some off-street paths are along streets (e.g., those along Huron Parkway) and some are mostly away from streets (e.g., the B2B Trail). In either case, the path may be the main link that ties the trip ends together. As to the B2B Trail, it is the backbone of Washtenaw County’s non-motorized system and a component of the Iron Belle statewide trail system.

The B2B-related projects are important for the continuity and safety of the non-motorized transportation system. They appear to address what are referred to in the plan as “Tier 1” and “Tier 2” “Focus Corridors.” Projects that need to be shown (as shown and discussed in the 2013 plan) are the following:

- The connections in the Fuller / Maiden Lane area under the four bridges and across the Huron River with a new bicycle / pedestrian bridge. These projects will give continuity to the B2B Trail and avoid treacherous street intersections. These projects have been planned for over 30 years and were endorsed again by City Council in 2015.
- The connection between Bandemer Park and Barton Park / Huron River Drive under the railroad. This long-planned project is a vital B2B link and addresses a safety issue. The city’s active participation is needed to complement the countywide effort to build this link.

### **Recommendations:**

- Show these B2B projects on maps as high priorities and discuss their importance.
- Add a page or two discussing the B2B Trail and its relation to the local and countywide transportation system.

### **Map on page 9**

This map of capital projects lacks vital projects like the B2B projects noted above.

### **Recommendation:**

- Show the B2B projects on the map.

## Maps on page 64 & 65

These maps of a bike network have some useful features but also raise many questions. For example:

- Why are the sidepaths along Huron Parkway shown as “existing,” while those along Eisenhower and Plymouth are shown as “proposed”?
- Why is no treatment proposed for the important facility gaps on Jackson Road at I-94 and on Washtenaw Avenue between Huron Parkway and US-23?
- Why is Pontiac Trail shown as “Existing All Ages and Abilities” (AAA), while Packard north of Eisenhower is shown as “Proposed AAA”?
- Why is the B2B Trail along Fuller not shown as a “Trail”?
- What qualifies parts of Barton Drive and Hill Street to be shown as “Existing AAA”?
- Why are the important existing trails through Doyle Park not shown as such?
- Is Glen Avenue intended to be shown (as it appears) as an “All Ages and Abilities” bike route? It’s hard to imagine a treatment that would make that possible. However, there is an alternative in the area that would work using West Medical Center Drive and connections to it.

### Recommendations:

- Explain or eliminate the apparent inconsistencies.
- Qualify the maps, perhaps with a footnote, saying something like, “In some cases, the route may diverge slightly from the corridor shown.”
- Show existing and planned B2B projects on the maps.

## Campus-to-Campus (C2C) Bikeway

The draft December 2020 report of the U-M President’s Commission on Carbon Neutrality (PCCN) proposes “a workable Central-to-North Campus bike route” (page 56 of the PCCN draft). WBWC has circulated a detailed proposal for a route that would tie in to the B2B projects mentioned above. The 2013 Plan Update discussed a campus-to-campus link but suggested a high-stress route rather than the low-stress route that is possible.

Because of the potential for improved facilities to increase the already heavy bicycle and pedestrian use in this area, thereby replacing existing motorized travel, the C2C project and the related B2B projects can contribute to achieving the goals of both the PCCN and the A2Zero Plan for reducing vehicle miles and CO2 emissions.

### Recommendation:

- Show (or at least discuss) a low-stress bike route between the campuses.

# Issues with Ann Arbor Response

to WBWC Comments on Draft Transportation Plan  
Prepared by Larry Deck -- Revised April 19, 2021

## Comments addressed inadequately

**Distracted driving** -- Did not implement simple suggestions, and attempted to explain why in “Plan responsiveness summary.” But the suggestions still apply.

**Bike facilities at intersections** -- Did not implement simple suggestion because of technical issues with the way it was worded. A simple statement that it is city policy to develop a continuous bicycle network may address the WBWC concern.

**Border-to-Border (B2B) Trail** -- While it is appreciated that some of the maps from the 2013 Transportation Plan Update were inserted in Appendix B to show projects needed to close gaps in the B2B Trail, they are presented as “Long-Term Opportunities.” They are in fact near-term needs, are straightforward though not cheap to build, and would improve conditions on what the plan identifies as a “Tier 1 Capital Project,” a “Tier 1 Focus Intersection,” and a “Tier 2 Focus Corridor.” They would improve safety around the busy Fuller / Maiden Lane intersection, where thousands of pedestrians and hundreds of bicyclists travel every day. These projects have been planned for over 30 years and were endorsed again by City Council in 2015.

The larger problem is that the plan does not reflect the key role of the B2B Trail in the non-motorized transportation system. The trail appears to be mentioned on only three pages, not in relation to finishing the trail, but only in regard to connections to it. The plan should discuss the central role of the B2B Trail and its relation to the local and countywide transportation system, at least with a sentence or two and preferably more.

The “Plan responsiveness summary” asserts that within Ann Arbor, the B2B Trail is “largely complete.” This is misleading, since there are 3 important gaps, each of which results in unsafe conditions.

## Comments addressed adequately (though some could be handled better)

**Level of project detail** -- Historical context & CIP process

**Right turn on red**

**Inconsistencies in maps** (now pages 61-62)

**Campus-to-Campus Bikeway** -- While it is appreciated that a sentence was added to the plan to mention the need, it is unfortunate that the plan does not at least mention that a bikeway could share facilities with the B2B projects to magnify the value of the investments. Better yet, the plan could show the straightforward opportunity to build the bikeway.



From: Peter Roth terHorst <[prterhorst@gmail.com](mailto:prterhorst@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 11:09 AM  
To: Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>; City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission  
<[TransportationCommission@a2gov.org](mailto:TransportationCommission@a2gov.org)>  
Cc: Cooper, Eli <[ECooper@a2gov.org](mailto:ECooper@a2gov.org)>  
Subject: comments about A2's Vision Zero plan

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.

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in response to the notice I received in my email today, titled "Ann Arbor Moving Together Towards Vision Zero," that the city is accepting comments today for the Ann Arbor Transportation Plan Update.

As a lifelong motorcyclist, I find it quite distressing that I can find no mention of motorcycles or other motorized two-wheel transportation, such as motorscooters, in the city's various Vision Zero documents. And yet there is plenty written about non-motorized transportation, i.e., bicycles. It leads me to the conclusion that the city has given no consideration to motorcycles and motorscooters -- legal forms of transportation -- in the city's planning process.

From the master plan  
([https://www.a2gov.org/departments/engineering/transportation/Documents/2009\\_A2\\_Transportation\\_Plan\\_Update\\_Report.pdf](https://www.a2gov.org/departments/engineering/transportation/Documents/2009_A2_Transportation_Plan_Update_Report.pdf)),

I found the following stated goals that are served by motorcycles and motorscooters. My comments appear in CAPS:

1. Provide effective access and mobility for people and goods, with minimal negative impacts for all.  
MOTORCYCLES AND MOTORSCOOTERS ARE LESS EXPENSIVE TO OWN AND OPERATE THAN CARS AND SUVs, ENSURING INCREASED MOBILITY FOR RESIDENTS.
2. Protect and enhance the natural environment and energy resources, and the human and built environment.  
MOTORCYCLES AND MOTORSCOOTERS CONSUME LESS FUEL, EMIT FEWER GREENHOUSE GASSES AND CAUSE FAR LESS WEAR-AND-TEAR ON ROADWAYS.
3. Promote a safe, secure, attractive, and productive transportation system.  
MOTORCYCLES AND MOTORSCOOTERS CAN REDUCE TRAFFIC AND PARKING CONGESTION.
6. Ensure that meaningful public involvement will be part of any transportation project in the City of Ann Arbor.  
IF TRUE, THEN MOTORCYCLISTS AND MOTORSCOOTER RIDERS SHOULD BE PART OF THE CONVERSATION.

8. Promote green transportation improvements to reduce vehicle emissions.  
SEE ITEM 2 ABOVE.

At this point, I can only conclude the city's planners do not consider these vehicles legitimate forms of transport and further, may even desire to see them eliminated altogether. That would be a grave error. There is a coming technology convergence with electric bicycles and hybrid and electric motorcycles and motorscooters that can be a boon to transportation planners. Don't miss this opportunity!

Please make a sincere effort to be sure all forms of motorized two-wheel transportation are included in the city's planning processes. I would be more than happy to be a participant, if that is deemed appropriate.

Thank you for your time,

Sincerely,

Peter terHorst  
707 Princeton St  
Ann Arbor, MI 48103  
360-316-9818

**From:** Phillip Barr <[pbarr@umich.edu](mailto:pbarr@umich.edu)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 20, 2021 11:27 AM  
**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>  
**Cc:** Jonathan Levine <[jnthnlvn@umich.edu](mailto:jnthnlvn@umich.edu)>  
**Subject:** A2 Transportation Plan Comment

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.

Hello,

Please consider making AATA buses free or at least giving all residents passes for xxx rides free every year.

Taxpayers pay a lot and most do not use the services. The cost of handling cash is not insignificant. More ridership is good.

Sorry I have not read the full plan yet and apologize if zero bus fare is already in there. Just thought I'd get this comment in there.

I'm an avid avid biker and generally support bikability initiatives. I'd like to see better bikability along platt south of washtenaw.

One more thing. Recycling is a sad disaster. Unsorted recycling is a failure. Let try some pilots with sensible site sorting dropoffs at sites throughout city neighborhoods. Our neighborhood would be eager to pilot.

I'll stop now as this is turning into a rant.

Thanks,

Phil Barr  
13 Heatheridge 48104  
7347174040

**From:** Monica Knowles <[monicacknowles@hotmail.com](mailto:monicacknowles@hotmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 20, 2021 8:54 AM

**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>; City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission <[TransportationCommission@a2gov.org](mailto:TransportationCommission@a2gov.org)>

**Subject:** Miller Avenue Improvements for Bicyclists

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.

In looking at your proposed improvements, it appears you only have the designated bike lane only on the south side of the street. Is this going to be like the bike lane on William Street? I am not a fan of bike lanes that are only on one side of the road. In fact, I think they are a little dangerous and that while they will be effective for one direction of traffic, most cyclist, certainly experienced cyclists, will continue to ride in the road.

Additionally, I don't see a plan for the Miller Road east of 7th. A lot could be accomplished if this road was repaved.

Monica Knowles  
248 505 4454