A great example of a raised crosswalk in Holland, MI. With very minimal signage this crosswalk "says" and does a lot. This should be our model for *every* new crossing.



This is a new crosswalk in Ann Arbor on a similar road. It is a decent "band-aid' approach for existing streets, but it's been applied to an almost completely rebuilt street:



| – Let's Compare –  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul> <li>Drivers must at a minimum take their foot off the gas to go over the<br/>hump. This puts them in a great "ready to yield" mode.</li> </ul>  | • Drivers can go through this crossing as fast as they like because they need only slow down if the lights are flashing and they are willing to. Half the reason we need these lights is that they are visible far enough away that people driving 45mph have room to stop after they see them.                          |
| • The raised area is concrete instead of asphalt and at a continuous level to the sidewalk. This is literally a sidewalk across the street where cars are entering the zone of people on foot rather than people entering a car zone.  | <ul> <li>The physical space of the crosswalk is defined only by curb cuts.<br/>People on foot are entering a zone where cars clearly have dominion.<br/>A crosswalk is a space where we should be prioritizing people on foot<br/>and accommodating vehicles, not the other way round.</li> </ul>                        |
| <ul> <li>While there are street markings, if they become worn and faded, the<br/>crossing still reads as such. It looks the same all year round.</li> </ul>  | • The *primary* definition of the crosswalk is with street markings. If they become worn and faded, the crossing literally disappears (especially when in-street signage is gone in the winter). Street markings do not last more than a season or two without reapplication.  |
| • Because the crosswalk design stands on its own two feet, the signage is minimal (and it would still work with zero signs). No in-street signage makes street maintenance easier. Sweepers and plows can do their thing without installing and uninstalling signs twice a year. | <ul> <li>What we have here is the signage equivalent of screaming "SLOW<br/>DOWN!", but the physical design communicates no actual reason to do<br/>so. In previous years, we have had pylons at the bike lane which<br/>helped a little, but they seem to have been deleted from our standard.</li> </ul>               |
| <ul> <li>While providing proper drainage presents more of an up-front cost<br/>(though perhaps minimal on major street rebuilds), once in place this<br/>crosswalk is extremely low maintenance and remains a safe crossing<br/>for a very long time.</li> </ul>                 | • RRFBs are easier to add and cheaper than moving storm drains.<br>However, the city is left with <u>extensive</u> perpetual maintenance liabilities<br>when they <u>randomly don't work</u> or <u>get hit by cars</u> . When they don't fail<br>safe, they are worthless, and when they do fail safe, they are ignored. |