Evaluation and Planning "E"   DRAFT
Transportation Commission
April 17, 2019
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
- Other ideas _____
- _____
- _____
- _____