

Cespedes, Christopher

From: City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2023 9:30 AM
To: Cespedes, Christopher
Subject: FW: Attached: Request from Brooks St. residents (XXXX block) for no sidewalk across from existing sidewalk and reasons why

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

From: XXXX Dharma XXXX@a2gov.org
Sent: Tuesday, February 7, 2023 5:53 PM
To: XXXX Morrison XXXX@comcast.net; City Council CityCouncil@a2gov.org; City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission <TransportationCommission@a2gov.org>; XXXX Nicholas XXXX@a2gov.org; XXXX, Theresa XXXX@a2gov.org
Subject: Re: Attached: Request from Brooks St. residents (XXXX block) for no sidewalk across from existing sidewalk and reasons why

Ms. Morrison,

Thank you for sharing your thoughts on this matter with City Council. I serve as Council liaison to the Transportation Commission and wanted to respond with my perspective on a few things in your attached letter.

1. First off, I understand the desire to preserve trees (my neighbored sadly lost much of its mature tree canopy to the Emerald Ash Borer several years ago), and am very glad the City is able to install the sidewalk while preserving these trees.
2. The rating of the gap on Brooks Street: In the Sidewalk Gap Prioritization Model (the rating system of which is shared here: <https://a2gov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9039169&GUID=4021C3D6-F011-4AAF-8C3A-2B5C6907BBBC>), gaps are broken up into segments for scoring purposes. The gap on the east side of Brooks south of Bydding Rd. is all one gap in the model. The block south of Robin could in theory be split out and scored separately from the block to the north. However, the resulting score change would be minimal, moving it from the bottom of the “High” priority range to the top of the “Mid-High” range. Regardless, it should be noted that the gap priority scoring is only meant to help inform decision-making and should not be considered an “answer” in and of itself. This change in scoring would not have impacted the recommendation to fill this gap as part of this project, because it is more cost-effective to install sidewalks at gap locations when associated with broader construction activities as is the case here. This reduces the construction impact on residences, and the City benefits from economies of scale since the project is larger than just sidewalk. In addition, AAATA identifies this location as an important gap to fill as it relates to their routes. I noticed there is at least one bus stop along an area without a sidewalk on the side of the stop, forcing those who rely on the bus to walk in the street.
3. The idea that City should score any street with an existing sidewalk on one side should automatically become the overriding factor designating it as a low or lowest priority. While it is one factor in the current scoring and weighting system, there is very good reason not to treat it as the deciding factor,

including that continuous sidewalk networks improve mobility for all pedestrians. They are particularly important for pedestrians with disabilities and provide access for all types of pedestrian travel to schools, work, parks, transit stops, etc. A sidewalk on only one side forces pedestrians to either walk in the street or cross the street twice to get to the side with a sidewalk and back again, placing them into potential conflicts with automobile traffic.

4. Proximity to schools and the suggestion that the City should distinguish between schools where children are walking vs. "commuter schools". The presence of sidewalks is a proven determinate over whether parents let their children walk to school or not. In fact, a study of the California Safe Routes to School program has shown that providing sidewalks is one of the most effective engineering measures in encouraging children to walk to school [Boarnet et al., 2005]. As well, I don't think the line between "commuter" school and "local" is a very clear one.

I can't speak for my colleagues, but in closing, I support our commitment to filling gaps and think our prioritization model is being applied wisely to address these gaps sensibly and with regard to deploying tax dollars most responsibly.

-Dharma

--

Dharma XXXX
Councilmember, Ward 4

From: Susan XXXX <XXXX@comcast.net>

Sent: Friday, January 27, 2023 3:25 PM

To: City Council <CityCouncil@a2gov.org>; City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission <TransportationCommission@a2gov.org>; XXXX, Nicholas <XXXX@a2gov.org>; XXXX, Theresa <XXXX@a2gov.org>

Subject: Attached: Request from Brooks St. residents (XXXX block) for no sidewalk across from existing sidewalk and reasons why

Some people who received this message don't often get email from susanmorrison@comcast.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

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.

See attached request signed by homeowners/ residents at XXXX to XXXX Brooks Street.
Please call if you have any questions.
Susan Morrison (XXXX) and Thomas Blessing (XXXX).