Cespedes, Christopher

From: City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission

Sent: Friday, March 14, 2025 12:06 PM

To: Cespedes, Christopher

Subject: FW: Collaborative Model of Public Engagement has not been implemented on

Wallingford Road yet but could be the path forward with your help / Traffic Study Data

from a cool source

Attachments: Residents that Oppose Wallingford Curve Reconfiguration - Google Docs.pdf; Visual

Representation of Oppo - Google Docs.pdf; avg_cars_per_hour.png;

speed_histogram.png

From: Gina Katz < @gmail.com> Sent: Saturday, March 1, 2025 10:20 PM To: Disch, Lisa < @a2gov.org>; Harrison, Cynthia < @a2gov.org>; Mallek, Jon < @a2gov.org>; Watson, Chris < @a2gov.org>; Radina, Travis < @a2gov.org>; Ghazi Edwin, Ayesha @a2gov.org>; Eyer, Jen < @a2gov.org>; Akmon, Dharma < @a2gov.org>; Briggs, Erica @a2gov.org>; Cornell, Jenn < @a2gov.org>; City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission <TransportationCommission@a2gov.org> @a2gov.org>; Dohoney Jr., Milton < Cc: Roberts, Jordan < @a2gov.org>; Hutchinson, Nicholas @a2gov.org>; Peter Katz < @gmail.com>

Subject: Collaborative Model of Public Engagement has not been implemented on Wallingford Road yet but could be the path forward with your help / Traffic Study Data from a cool source

Dear Councilmembers and Transportation Commissioners.

The "Narrowing of the Wallingford/Harding Intersection Project" is currently opposed by 171 Burns Park and Ives Woods residents (list of residents & map attached). This is not only because residents find it ridiculous this intersection would be flagged for traffic calming while there are some very dangerous intersections and roads in our neighborhood with petitions waiting in queue and have been for years. There is such strong opposition and disgust around this project because of the extreme lack of community engagement.

As the owner of one of the 100 year old houses that sits on this curve, whose property would be significantly altered, no one from the city knocked on our door to tell us this was happening. In September, our neighbor told me that the project manager was in the middle of the street with some other city workers and informed her (a resident of Wallingford for 30 years) that our street needed traffic calming and that the curve would be turned into a corner. So, before any communication took place with residents we were already being told our curve was going to be turned into a corner by a city engineer.

At the end of this email there is a diagram that is referenced in meetings when R-23-330 was being debated a few years ago. Many council members agreed a "collaborative model of public engagement" was key and council's intention was not for city employees to ignore the majority of residents. At the onset of this project, residents were not informed. We were told our curve would be corner. That does not seem to fit into the "collaborative model of public engagement."

During a virtual community engagement meeting in November via Zoom, my husband and I (one of only two property owners whose homes are directly impacted by these drastic changes to our road) were blocked from making comments at the meeting by the community engagement officer. Again, that behavior does not seem to fit into the "collaborative model of public engagement."

Just over 50 people opposed the first plan for the Wallingford curve. By the time of the next community engagement meeting last week where we were told our input was taken into consideration there were over 150 people and 106 households who opposed any change in the curve. That includes every resident that lives on Wallingford Road. Our input after the first meeting was not taken into consideration as the second drawing ruined the curve of Wallingford as much as the first. After the second meeting and seeing the new plan, we are now at 171 people and 111 households that oppose the drawings for the Wallingford/Harding intersection.

Whether we agree or disagree that the space between the sidewalks needs to be adjusted, what is fact is that unelected city officials came into our neighborhood, told us our safe street was unsafe and because of R-23-330 it is their right to impose their designs onto our roads without our input. That absolutely does not fit into the "collaborative model of public engagement." Calling a meeting a "community engagement meeting" but not collaborating with the community does not mean the community has been engaged. It was not until the very end of the in person meeting last week, when leadership took over, that the conversation went from contention to collaboration and talk of compromise.

That being said, we would like Council to consider removing the word "Narrowing" from the "Narrowing of the Wallingford/Harding Intersection" portion of the Capital Bid and remove the drawings included as well. This will give us time to work with engineering leadership to come up with a collaborative solution. The 171 Burns Park and Ives Woods residents do not approve of either drawing because they are a drastic change to a street that has no traffic and were created without actual collaboration with the community.

As a brief aside because this local kid is amazing and you might want to hear about him: Sebastian Bagley is a high school Senior at Pioneer who lives in Ives Woods. He reached out to us because he wanted to use data to show the Council that traffic calming is not necessary on Wallingford Road. He put a high tech camera in our 2nd floor window and did his own traffic study on Wallingford over a 6 day period. He wrote code and created a program that counted cars and used matrices and lasers to calculate speed. Attached to this email are two of his graphs but two data points I would like to share are that the average number of cars that drove down Wallingford Road each day during the 6 day period was 274.7 cars and the 85th percentile for speed was 15.17mph. This data would indicate that residents know their neighborhood, Wallingford Road is not highly traveled and when it is, speed is not an issue. If anyone is interested in connecting with Sebastian to learn more about his data, his practices and all that went into this process, let me know and I will connect you to him. He will gladly share it all with you.

If the city is going to insist the steps between the sidewalks that cross Harding are too many, this community, including kids like Sebastian, would like to be engaged per your own community engagement model.

Thank you for your consideration, Gina Katz

IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation



IAP2's Spectrum of Public Participation was designed to assist with the selection of the level of participation that defines the public's role in any public participation process. The Spectrum is used internationally, and it is found in public participation plans around the world.

	INFORM	CONSULT	INVOLVE	COLLABORATE	EMPOWER
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION GOAL	To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.	To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.	To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.	To place final decision making in the hands of the public.
PROMISE TO THE PUBLIC	We will keep you informed.	We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will look to you for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.	We will implement what you decide.