



## MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and City Council  
FROM: Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator  
DATE: September 24, 2018  
SUBJECT: Response to Council Resolution R-18-275 – Resolution Regarding Citizen Input and Process for City Street-Related Improvement Projects

---

On July 2, 2018, City Council passed Resolution [R-18-275](#), Resolution Regarding Citizen Input and Process for City Street-Related Improvement Projects, which included the following requirements:

“RESOLVED, That City Council directs the City Administrator to develop and implement a process for City-initiated and AAPS-initiated street improvement actions (excluding routine street repair, maintenance, re-surfacing) that ensures up-front neighborhood input is obtained and notification is provided prior to implementation of any permanent street improvement;

RESOLVED, That the City Administrator report back to Council after consultation with the Transportation Commission on the citizen engagement process selected and how/when it will be implemented; and

RESOLVED, That in conjunction with any proposed lane reduction proposals, city staff shall provide council current traffic volume data including peak hour volumes and volume-to-capacity ratios as well as projections for safety improvements and traffic delays.”

The City of Ann Arbor Community Engagement Toolkit provides a standard process for staff to consider community impacts and interest in projects, to identify stakeholders, and to aid in developing a public engagement plan. Staff use the community engagement toolkit to shape the engagement process for capital improvement projects performed by the City. Whenever the Community Engagement Toolkit is used for a project that affects the City’s transportation network, the Transportation Commission is included as a stakeholder for the project. An overview of the Community Engagement Toolkit is attached to this Memo. Staff are willing to present additional information about the Community Engagement Toolkit to City Council, upon request.

This memo was also presented to the Transportation Commission at their September 12, 2018 meeting. A summary of the Commission’s feedback is attached. The feedback obtained from the Commission was incorporated into this memo.

Public engagement is handled differently depending on the type of project and the nature of the project impacts. Engagement processes outlined in this document are presented in categories of street improvements projects. Project requests that come from Ann Arbor Public Schools are handled the same way as other projects within these categories, with the exception that the AAPS Transportation Safety Committee (TSC) would also be included as a stakeholder in the engagement process.

### **Routine Street Repair, Maintenance, and Resurfacing**

As indicated in the Resolution, this category is excluded from this document. This category is presumed to include maintenance of existing pavement markings as well as sidewalk repairs.

### **Street Reconstruction Projects**

Where a complete reconstruction of the roadway is anticipated, public engagement will be conducted based on the plan developed from the Community Engagement Toolkit. As reconstruction projects are typically the most impactful, and represent the best opportunity for making major changes to the roadway, public input is critical and could take many different forms, depending on the project.

### **Utility Replacement Projects**

Although the primary focus of City-owned utility projects is not transportation related, they usually have an impact on the streets where the work is being done. Similar to street reconstruction projects, utility replacement projects will be conducted based on the plan developed from the Community Engagement Toolkit. While usually smaller than reconstruction projects, these types of projects often occur within neighborhoods and therefore require close communication with neighbors about the details of the project and its impact on their properties and daily routines.

### **Traffic Calming**

The City’s existing [Traffic Calming Program](#) defines a prescribed public engagement process. The Traffic Calming Program is governed by City Council Resolution. Modifications to this process are underway, and will be brought to City Council for final approval.

### **Lane Reduction/ “Road Diet” Projects**

Lane reductions (often referred to as “road diets”) are proven safety countermeasures in many circumstances, and can provide the opportunity to improve pedestrian crossing facilities and add bike lanes to a street. Lane reductions are often performed in conjunction with other capital improvement projects. Several corridors are specifically called out in the City’s Non-Motorized Transportation Plan as candidates for lane reductions. Prior to lane reduction

implementation, transportation engineering staff analyze conditions to verify that the proposed reduction will provide an appropriate level of service for all users.

Conditions and circumstances for this type of work vary significantly from location to location. The Community Engagement Toolkit will be used to determine the appropriate public engagement plan for each project.

Per Council's direction, staff will provide Council current traffic volume data including peak hour volumes and volume-to-capacity ratios as well as projections for safety improvements and traffic delays. Also, as requested by the Transportation Commission, staff will also provide other relevant data that is readily available, such as 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds.

### **Sidewalk Gaps**

Filling gaps in the City's sidewalk system is a goal consistent with the City's desires for greater sustainability and pedestrian mobility, and with the adopted Complete Streets philosophy. Filling gaps in the sidewalk system has recently been accomplished in three primary ways: as part of a larger capital project, as standalone sidewalk gap projects (often leveraging Federal funding), or through private development.

Sidewalk gap filling primarily affects the adjacent property owners. As such, the third category (development) typically does not require any additional public engagement by the City. For the first two categories, the Community Engagement Toolkit will be used to determine the appropriate public engagement plan.

As required by City Code, construction of new sidewalks is completed through special assessments. The City's established process for special assessments includes four progressive Council Resolutions, one formal Public Hearing, and also one "administrative hearing", which typically takes the form of a public meeting with affected property owners sometime prior to the final Resolution.

### **Major Crosswalk Improvements**

This type of work includes the installation and improvement of major midblock crosswalks, such as the installation of Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) and "Gateway Treatments" (in-road pedestrian crossing signs).

Such improvements are implemented by engineering staff to improve pedestrian safety. General community input was received through the engagement efforts associated with the creation of the Crosswalk Design Guidelines. Community input is not planned for each individual crosswalk installation/improvement.

### **ADA Sidewalk Ramps, Pedestrian Islands, & Curb Bumpouts**

This type of work includes bringing sidewalk ramps into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), which is required by Federal law; as well as the installation of pedestrian

islands and curb bumpouts. These similar improvements are lumped together into one category, as they are typically smaller projects with similar impacts.

Curb bumpouts increase the visibility of pedestrians waiting to cross the street, shorten the crossing distance, and provide a safer pedestrian environment. They are typically implemented to address an identified pedestrian safety need. They are designed to maintain stormwater drainage, and snow plow operators have ample experience with these types of devices. Because these improvements are made within the street, and typically at an existing intersection, they do not have any substantial effect on adjacent private property, or on legal parking spaces. Likewise, pedestrian islands are designed in such a way that they do not have significant impact on driveway access, and thus have minimal effect on private property.

The impact of ADA sidewalk ramp work is similar to that of bumpouts, however due to the necessary adjacent sidewalk work, could have more of an impact on the adjacent property.

As the impacts on these types of projects are mostly limited to the adjacent property owners, in the future staff will reach out to these property owners and provide them with an opportunity to give their feedback in advance.

#### Attachments (2)

cc: Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator  
Nick Hutchinson, City Engineer  
Raymond Hess, Transportation Manager

# City of Ann Arbor

## Community Engagement Process 1-page Overview

### Step 1 – Prepare to Meet With Your Internal Team.

Lead Contact: [your name] \_\_\_\_\_

Team Member Names	Affiliation (city department or organization name)

### Step 2 – Develop Your Community Engagement Action Plan.

★ What is your P<sup>3</sup>? | Who will your P<sup>3</sup> impact? | Why are you doing this P<sup>3</sup>? | When will your P<sup>3</sup> take place? | Etc.

★ Anticipated Level of Impact/Interest Will the interest/impact in the P<sup>3</sup> be shared by many residents, or more localized?

X	Level of Impact/Interest	Criteria
	High Impact/Interest – Citywide	Project impacts a wide range of area/people in the city. • High level of real or perceived impact/interest.
	Low Impact/Interest – Citywide	Project impacts a wide area/range of people in the city. • Lower level of real or perceived impact/interest.
	High Impact/Interest – Local Area/Neighborhood	Project impacts a local area or specific neighborhood, user group, facility or service. • High level of real or perceived impact/interest.
	Low Impact/Interest – Local Area/Neighborhood	Project impacts a local area or specific neighborhood, user group, facility or service. • Lower level of real or perceived impact/interest.

★ Plan your engagement strategies, using the menu of options.

### ★ Step 3 – Refine Key Stakeholders List and Define Roles.

Customize the prepopulated **stakeholder worksheet template** to indicate which internal departments and external organizations will be vital allies, and also to specify the role(s) they may play in the success of your P<sup>3</sup>.

### Step 4 – (Post Engagement) Record and Analyze Engagement Outcomes.

This **internal document** provides the valuable opportunity to reflect on the effectiveness of the strategies used, the impact your key stakeholders made, participation rates, etc.

P<sup>3</sup> = Project/Policy/Program

★=City project lead will work with consultant (if applicable) to capture additional insight in these areas/steps.



**Citizen Input on City Street Related Improvement Projects  
R-18-275**

Staff provided a draft response to R-18-275 for consultation with the Transportation Commission on September 12, 2018. Feedback from the Transportation Commission has been incorporated into the final staff response to R-18-275.

Commission comments included the following:

- Maple Road Lane Reduction – Concern that this is an example of bad communications - residents were asked for feedback after the fact rather than consulted ahead of time.
- AAPS Coordination –Concern that the process for AAPS-initiated projects is not clear.
- Traffic volume peak hour data – Request that staff provide Council additional materials not requested such as the number of vulnerable users in an area and 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed to better illustrate the conditions during off-peak hours and the challenges for pedestrians and cyclists.