

Hess, Raymond

From: City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission
Sent: Monday, November 22, 2021 11:57 AM
To: 'Ken Clark'
Cc: Hess, Raymond
Subject: RE: Reasons we should reject additional lanes on Med Center Drive Bridge (unless it's to add bike lanes)

Ken,

Thank you for contacting the City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission. Your feedback will be provided as a communication item on the December 15 Transportation Commission Agenda. Transportation staff are also copied here so that they are also aware of your comment regarding the Medical Center Drive Bridge planning considerations.

Have a Happy Thanksgiving.

Respectfully,

Eli Cooper, A.I.C.P.

Transportation Program Manager
City of Ann Arbor | Guy C. Larcom City Hall | 301 E. Huron, 4 th Floor · Ann Arbor · MI · 48104
734.794.6430 (O) | Internal Extension 43710
ecooper@a2gov.org | www.a2gov.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail, and any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain information that is confidential and protected from disclosure under the law. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail, and delete/destroy all copies of the original message and attachments.
Thank you.

From: Ken Clark <kenclark@ameritech.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 8:11 AM
To: City of Ann Arbor Transportation Commission <TransportationCommission@a2gov.org>
Subject: Reasons we should reject additional lanes on Med Center Drive Bridge (unless it's to add bike lanes)

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.

Commissioners,

I watched the discussion of the Med Center Drive bridge at your 11/17 commission meeting, and had some thoughts.

- It's good to bring up induced demand in any discussion of road expansion, but since the clear goal of the University in this case is to increase traffic, it's less valuable to point out here. They're planning and desiring to increase traffic - that's their goal in this.

- If you want to point out the emperor has no clothes here, you should note that the University is utterly ignoring their greenhouse gas emissions from transportation. They're pretending their only responsibility is their fleet operations, when

they should be accepting some responsibility for every car/truck trip to and from University facilities. What's their plan to replace all parking spots with EV-only? What's their plan for reducing car/truck trips? They're the lion's share of the transportation emissions problem for Ann Arbor, and the University is shirking any consideration of their problem.

- Ann Arbor's adopted methods to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation are to cut VMT in half by 2030 and increase bicycle trip share to 25%. This proposal is diametrically opposed to both of those methods.

- The maximum capacity of a single lane is 2000 vehicles per hour, at 25-30mph. (See here: <http://www.placemakers.com/2013/03/14/walkable-streets-ii-the-documenting/> and the graph at section 3.) The problems with capacity on this bridge have nothing to do with the bridge. The bottlenecks in this area are the intersection before it and Med Center Drive after it. Med center drive is one lane per direction with numerous stops and lights. And while the University would like to claim the bridge is an issue, a much bigger problem is the steep grades on the hill the medical center rests on. The grades limit their ability to change East Med Center, or they probably would have done it already. They could make a much bigger change by adding more turning pockets and getting rid of the stop signs on East Med Center. They'd rather pretend that the problem is the bridge, when the capacity problems are before and after the bridge.

- Someone should have asked why the two lane roundabout concept was dropped. We currently have four lanes on that bridge, but two of them are used for turn lanes/storage for NW-bound Med Center Drive. If you had a roundabout at that Med Center/Maiden Lane / Fuller intersection, you wouldn't need any turn lanes on the bridge. They must have some reason for dropping that roundabout, but it's probably not a very good reason, and it should be revisited. It probably has to do with "confusion", when MDOT has done a good job of making roundabouts more common, and people have largely figured out how they work now. If the problem is capacity, point back to our 50% reduction in VMT goal.

- Our second method to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation is to increase bike share. The University is *HORRIBLE* at accommodating cyclists. The only bike parking for the main hospital is a small, usually full, totally exposed to the elements pad, right next to a massive parking deck. There are no bike lanes leading to the medical center. Look at Euclid Ave. in Cleveland near the Cleveland Clinic, and you'll see bike lanes. That's the main road entrance to the front of the hospital. But U of M has serious blinders to the concept of biking for transportation, and doesn't consider it a serious topic. When I bike to my appointments at the hospital (the main way I get there, as a number of you do to), I share the road with the motorists, because there are no bike lanes around it. For that matter, the bike lanes on Wall Street were recently removed, and there are no bike lanes on Maiden Lane either. The University seems to be on a perpetual mission to eliminate bike accommodations, while the city is trying to improve bike facilities.

Overall, I'd recommend the city pass on this University "offer". There's plenty of capacity on the bridge now, it's not the bottleneck, and the University is trying to subvert our city goals with this proposal. It's very much not in our best interests. We should rehab the bridge as it is now, or figure out how to add bike lanes instead.

Thanks for your consideration,
Ken Clark