

**PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AND ACCESS TASK FORCE  
MEETING #8 – MEETING MINUTES**

**Date:** Wednesday, November 5, 2014

**Time:** 5:00 - 7:00 pm

**Location:** Basement Conference Room – Larcom City Hall

**Attendees:**

Task Force Members Present, 8: Vivienne Armentrout; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark; Neal Elyakin ; Linda Diane Feldt; Owen Jansson; Anthony Pinnell; Sarah Pressprich Gryniewicz; Jim Rees;

Public Present: Sabra Briere; Clark Charnetski; Robert Gorden; Kathy Griswold; Devante Hargrow; Eleanor Linn; Eric Lipson; Jane Lumm; Bob Oneal; Seth Peterson; Marilyn Tower; Adam Zemke; refer to Attachment B for sign-in sheet

City Staff Present, 3: Eli Cooper , Connie Pulcifer, Cynthia Redinger ,

Consultant Present (The Greenway Collaborative), 2: Norman Cox and Carolyn Prudhomme

**Re:** Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force Meeting

Meeting Called to Order: 5:00 pm

1. Introductions.
2. Changes to agenda: timing change, add a recommendation for winter maintenance (moved V. Armentrout, seconded S. Pressprich Gryniewicz - approved)
3. Public Commentary:
  1. Clark Charnetski – Plymouth several times per day. RRFBs are there and the laws have changed, and he sees that working quite well. He doesn't see a reason to repeal AA's ordinance, and would like the state law to be like AA. He's worked with disability groups for many years, and a big problem for them has always been making it safe for people to cross the streets.
  2. Bob O'neill – Onandaga @ Geddes, where a girl was recently killed. There is a hill to the left and it's hard to see because of that hill. He's been asked by his neighbors to ask that the city put in a crosswalk across Geddes. In the last week, a speed monitor was put in there, and he thinks that it has helped slow people to the speed limit.
  3. South of South U., she does most of her transportation by walking. Willard/Church/South U she loudly reminds people that there is a crosswalk there, and only about half of the vehicles stop.
4. Approval of Meeting 7 Discussion/Minutes - corrections – Public comment Liby Hunter (Elizabeth), Kathy Griswold made specific comments about line of sight. Approved with changes.
5. Snow Removal – discussion of how to handle the recommended changes to the snow removal ordinance. Moved by J Rees, seconded K Clark (original movers of the motion, approved as friendly) to postpone the committee's recommendation to the next meeting

pending staff consideration. 5,3, One abst.

6. Request from staff for guidance from the task force for priorities for proactive enforcement by community standards of winter snow clearing ordinance enforcement.
7. Crosswalk discussion – We had a presentation from Rep. Adam Zemke. working on a state crosswalk law.
8. Committees and members
  1. Consistency of Crosswalk Design Committee - Vivienne, Jim, Owen, Neal
  2. Education, Outreach, Enforcement, Laws Committee – Tony, Neal, Ken
  3. Budget, CIP Integration Committee – Vivienne, Ken
9. Public Commentary:
  1. Kathy Griswold – Appreciate everyone serving and the Task Force is making progress. We need to consider how we got here and we can take corrective action so we never get here again. In 1996, a sidewalk gaps was filled in a few months after a request was made. In 2007, a neighbor requested a similar sidewalk gap be put in, in the same neighborhood and it was put in in 2014. For the last 10-plus years we have not followed best practices and have underfunded infrastructure. A system needs to be put in place to identify needs. Money should put into CIP every year. Sight distance is very important. Objects at intersection or along a curvy road limit sight distance. Vegetation over the sidewalk makes it impassible and it is a problem more months of the year than snow and ice. Thrilled that we are going to be proactive with Community Standards snow and ice enforcement.
  2. Eric Lipson – When it comes to signage recommendations you do not want to get too tied down to a certain type of technology, for example say “RRFB or equivalent.” If you get tied down to a certain type of technology it could have cost implications and miss out on opportunities down the road. It may be helpful to put “no passing” signs at crosswalks. Vegetation is a problem; a woman was hit in a crosswalk in August, due to vegetation blocking visibility. Priority should be given to crosswalks at school; specifically at Edgewood near Pioneer High School. There need to be signs at all crosswalks that say “do not cross until all traffic clears”.
  3. Robert Gordon – When considering triggers at crosswalk please consider the old, the young and disabled communities.
  4. Seth Peterson – The slower the traffic the safer it is for pedestrians. As the City updates infrastructure traffic lanes should be narrowed as much as possible to encourage vehicles to slow down and make the crossing distance shorter. There should be a physical change in the road, such as narrowing the lane or grade change, at mid-block crosswalks that require motorists to tap their brake. The standard at every crosswalk should be that the vehicle slows down whether a pedestrian is present or not.
  5. Chris Hewett – With Save our Streets Ann Arbor. Do we have a process in place to engage stakeholder early when a corridor is going to be redone? On Madison, a few opportunities were missed because the contractor was already in place by the time there was some community outreach. We need to engage stakeholder upfront and early. Are we looking at Section 257627, Sections 2 and 3 on speeds and vehicle access points? On Seventh Street, according to the code, it should be 25 mph and it is 30 mph. The running speed is between 30 and 50 mph regularly on Seventh.

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm. Minutes taken by Sec. Clark

[Secretary note: for all of these meetings there will be two records of the meeting. These minutes are a record of official actions taken and public commentary. Ann Arbor City staff and/or the consultant on this project, the Greenway Collaborative, will produce a second record of the discussion points of the meeting, with more detail. Both of these records will be available on the Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force Google Drive repository, available through the City of Ann Arbor website at [www.a2gov.org/departments/systems-planning/Transportation/Pages/Pedestrian-Safety-and-Access-Task-Force.aspx](http://www.a2gov.org/departments/systems-planning/Transportation/Pages/Pedestrian-Safety-and-Access-Task-Force.aspx)]

**PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AND ACCESS TASK FORCE  
MEETING #8 - DISCUSSION SUMMARY**

*Note: This is not a direct transcription of the meeting discussion. The following summary has been developed from notes taken during the meeting; comments are paraphrased. Where staff and consultants provided information and responses they are shown in italics.*

- Approval of Agenda:
  - Unanimous approval of agenda with the addition of item 6a. Prioritization of Winter Maintenance, discussion of Jim's proposals under item #8 and some time adjustments. (Attachment C)
  
- Approval of Meeting # 7 Minutes and Discussion Summary:
  - Correct the spelling of the public commenters name to "Libby" as in Elisabeth.
  - Kathy Griswold public comment included the need for consistency in the ordinance and line of sight.
  - Unanimous approval with changes noted above.
  
- Local Winter Maintenance Policy Proposal
  - It was clarified that Appendix B of the meeting minutes from the Winter Maintenance Subcommittee Meeting on October 10, 2014, was prepared by V. Armentrout prior to the committee meeting and is not a committee document. *The document will be updated to clarify that this was not a product of the committee's meeting.*
  - The Winter Maintenance Subcommittee recommended the existing ordinance be amended to "Within 24 hours of the end of each accumulation of snow and/or ice greater than 1" regardless of the source or any subsequent accumulation, the owner.... No snow and/or ice shall be removed from private property and placed on a public sidewalk or street."
  - "Subsequent accumulation" is the key addition. Currently, if someone receives a citation for not shoveling and it snows within 24 hours of that citation, the citation is no longer valid. The proposed recommendation would remove that loophole.
  - " No snow and/or ice shall be removed from private property and placed on a public sidewalk or street" was noted in many other ordinances from other communities in the Midwest Region.
  - Community Standards personal is very limited, so there is a sense of urgency by the Task Force to remove the 24 loophole in the ordinance for this upcoming winter. The ordinance change is to maximize the effects of Community Standards enforcement.
  - The City should provide a way to let the City know when the "clock" has started ticking on the 24 hour snow removal period. It could be posted on the website, or provide optional phone and email notices.

## Attachment A: Meeting #8 Discussion Summary

- Wording is ambiguous – what does the end of each accumulation mean? Does it start when the snow is 1” or when the snow has definitely stopped and there is 1” of snow on the ground? *The Task Force should clarify the intent and resources at the City could polish the recommendation and turn it into an ordinance that will stand up to scrutiny.*
  - The time aspect was discussed by the Winter Maintenance Subcommittee, however the beginning point for the 24 hour limit was not discussed. A number of other cities provide a “time certain” ordinance, such as, “all snow should be removed by 6 am”. Those would be attractive, as they would allow City Staff to send out notices and it is clear as to when the snow must be removed.
  - The Winter Maintenance Subcommittee framed the ordinance recommendation based on what could be enacted for the upcoming season with minimal changes, therefore the “time certain” language was not included, but should be considered at some point.
  - The confusion on when the 24 hour time period begins is in the current wording of the ordinance; it is not something that the Winter Maintenance Subcommittee changed. This is probably a source of confusion for City Staff already.
  - The ordinance recommendation is not currently written in the proper format to be submitted to Council. *City Staff will review and revise the proposed ordinance amendment recommendation.*
  - The Task Force would like to review and vote on the ordinance recommendations prior to it going to Council after City staff provides its review.
  - The Task Force would like to review the proposed recommendation from City staff prior to the next Task Force meeting. *It cannot be guaranteed; it will depend on timing and process with City Staff on whether that deadline can be met. Staff may also request there may be some public vetting of this ordinance.*
  - Realistically, is there enough time for these changes to go into effect for the upcoming winter? *It is understood that there is a strong desired to act quickly, however the process can slow things down. City staff will provide an anticipated time frame at the next meeting.*
  - **K. Clark moved to postpone to the next meeting, the Winter Maintenance Subcommittee recommendation pending review and proposed changes from City Staff. Approved.**
  - **C. Pulcifer will notify L.D. Feldt immediately of City Staff’s time frame for review once determined.**
- Prioritization of Winter Maintenance
    - *At the last meeting, Officer Schroeder noted that Community Standards will be taking a more proactive approach to handing out snow removal violation citation this upcoming season. It has previously been a complaint driven approach. This year they are going to dedicate some officers for a proactive approach. This is an opportunity for the Task Force to provide guidance on what the priorities are for providing proactive enforcement.*

## Attachment A: Meeting #8 Discussion Summary

- It was agreed that this task should be given to the Winter Maintenance Subcommittee.
- The Winter Maintenance Subcommittee should provide a report at the next Task Force meeting regarding winter maintenance enforcement priorities which will then be passed on to City staff.
- Should this group also consider public education and information outreach efforts beyond what is currently being done to remind property owners of their responsibility? *The subcommittee may discuss this.*
- *O. Jansson has been added to the Winter Maintenance and V. Armentrout requested that she no longer be part of this subcommittee.*
- When are we going to address other issues, such as who is responsible for clearing ramps? *It is expected that there will be ongoing meetings for the Winter Maintenance Subcommittee as additional near term and long term considerations arise.*
  
- State Representative A. Zemke gave a brief presentation on the status of state crosswalk law. Below are some of A. Zemke's key points from that discussion:
  - There is an effort to provide standardization across the state of pedestrian safety ordinances relating to crosswalks. By not having a state law, a boundless range is created.
  - The array of crosswalk ordinances across the state is quite vast, which is confusing for both motorists and pedestrians.
  - A conversation between representatives from different communities across the state evolved to a first draft of a crosswalk bill.
  - The bills were sent to the Legislative Service Bureau in September to be legally drafted.
  - Preliminary versions of the four bills include the following items:
    - Defining crosswalks and the various types of crosswalks
    - Defining crosswalk markings to be compliance with the Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD)
    - Defines that all vehicles must stop, rather than yield to pedestrians in the crosswalk area
    - There should be a minimum of one traffic control device in each direction at a crosswalk to post what the law is for both vehicles and pedestrians.
  - The bills have not been released from draft yet so they do not have legislative numbers.
  - The scope of the crosswalk has not yet been defined.. There were discussions on having the crosswalk markings extend beyond the curb for a paved entryway of a crosswalk.
  - The only time there is an issue with state and local law is when they conflict. A confliction would arise when you have a more lenient ordinance. Most likely, if the state law says "yield", Ann Arbor would still be able to require vehicles to "stop".

## Attachment A: Meeting #8 Discussion Summary

- xEducational guidelines are also needed;. for example, the Secretary of State does not provide sufficient detail of a driver's responsibilities at crosswalks..
- The goal is to introduce this legislation as part of the lame-duck session with Chairman Schmidt as the primary sponsor for one of the pieces of legislation.
- Crosswalk placement and distance between crosswalks was not discussed. The concern is that we do not want to mandate a community to put in crosswalks.
- *A subcommittee may be able to look at these bills in in more details and in relation to Ann Arbors crosswalk law and provide feedback.*
- A.Zemke can be contacted at [adamzemke@house.mi.gov](mailto:adamzemke@house.mi.gov)
  
- Consistency of Crosswalks
  - O. Jansson sent out an email regarding correspondence he had with A. Zemke on crosswalk markings and the language that already exists in the MMUTCD. Items from that document could be incorporated into the crosswalk consistency discussion.
  - Is it legal to remove crosswalks at intersections by removing the crosswalk ramps? What is the justification and is it based on engineering judgments or legal rulings?
  - J.Rees's proposal to provide 500' foot distance between crosswalks should be incorporated into the crosswalk consistency discussion.
  - It would be helpful if there was an annotated graph or cheat sheet that helps describe common terminology.
  - There are many different types of corridors; there should be a high probably that a vehicle will stop no matter what type of corridor is being crossed.
  - Compliance with signalization increases with consistency in the type of signal being used.
  - Some elderly people have mentioned that they would like to have a push button that is timed with a red stop light at crosswalks. *Warrants relate to traffic signals that are specified in Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). The introduction of the red light for pedestrians was part of the struggle that led to the half-signal or HAWK, which is a beacon and not a signal. These beacons were created to advise vehicles that a pedestrian is crossing the road or wanting to cross. The beacons are different because they are at a dark state until activated. The official traffic control device is only installed when warrants are met as established in the MMUTCD which is based on the MUTCD. The HAWK devices are also very costly to install and maintain. The rectangular rapid flash beacon is popular because they are less expensive than the HAWK and provide the same amount of yielding by vehicles when compared to other devices.*
  - What is the process if the City gets a request to improve or upgrade a beacon or signal at crosswalk? *An engineering study is completed that looks at speeds, motor vehicle volumes, pedestrian volumes, and yielding rates. Then the appropriate design is determine and funding identified.*
  
- Crosswalk Education/Outreach/Enforcement/Law

## Attachment A: Meeting #8 Discussion Summary

- We have been told that a several items have been referred to the Task Force from Council; did we formally receive anything? *Neither the Task Force or staff received a formal directive from Council to review the crosswalk ordinance resolution that was postponed until January 2015. Staff will follow up and provide direction.*
- K.Clark provided some specific questions in his October 3<sup>rd</sup> email regarding to enforcement that he would like addressed.
- Crosswalk Budget/CIP
  - This topic should be addressed separately from other crosswalk issues. It has major implications.
  - Do we have standards for stop bars at crosswalks? *The MMUTCD has specifications that require a specific sign must be present for the stop bar to be warranted.*
  - We need to think about how much money should be spent on signs and what it is worth if it will save a life.
  - It would be helpful if we had information from City staff on what they have already done regarding budget for crosswalks. *City Staff can share information on why certain practices are affected by funding.*
- Subcommittees
  - Crosswalk Consistency Subcommittee (design, beacons, signing, and markings)
    - Members: V. Armentrout, N. Elyakin , O. Jansson, J. Rees
  - Crosswalk Education/Outreach/Enforcement/Law Subcommittee
    - Members: K. Clark, N. Elyakin, A. Pinnell
  - Crosswalk Budget/CIP Subcommittee
    - Members: V. Armentrout, K. Clark
  - Winter Maintenance Subcommittee
    - Members: K.Clark, S. Pressprich Gryniewicz, O. Jansson, T. Pinnell
    - V. Armentrout withdrew from subcommittee
  - *A chair of a subcommittee is not required; however, someone should be designated to prepare a discussion summary and report back to the Task Force.*
  - *The subcommittees should focus on the “intent” and the “why”; finely drafted ordinances and resolutions are not needed.*
  - *Procedurally, any recommendations from the subcommittee would come back to the Task Force and then the Resource Group for review.*
  - *L.D. Feldt will identify when additional support and review is needed from the Resource Group.*
  - *For all subcommittee meetings, C. Prudhomme will help set-up the meeting date and the meeting will be posted in City Hall. All subcommittee meetings are open to the public..*
- Communication Protocol



## **Attachment A: Meeting #8 Discussion Summary**

- Email correspondence from the public and City Council will be placed in a reference folder on the Google Drive.
  - The Greenway Collaborative will send out a weekly digest to notify the Task Force of correspondence that has occurred over the past week. A link to the folder where the documents are located at will be provided in the email.
  - All documents should be dated.
  - PDF documents are preferred.
  - Personal emails will be redacted from documents that are posted to the Google Drive, as this is a public website.
- 
- **The next meeting will focus on sidewalks and shared use paths. A reminder will be sent out to the Task Force to review the Sidewalk Gap Brief and provide any additional questions they have on sidewalks or shared use paths. The Task Force will have until the EOB on November 12<sup>th</sup> to email their questions to C. Prudhomme via Google Drive.**

Attachment B: Sign-in Sheet



CITY OF ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN  
Public Services Area/Systems Planning  
301 E. Huron Street  
P.O. Box 8647, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107

Web: [www.a2gov.org/pedsafety](http://www.a2gov.org/pedsafety)

SIGN-IN SHEET - PEDESTRIAN SAFETY & ACCESS TASK FORCE

TASK FORCE MEETING #8

Date: Wednesday, November 5, 2014

Time: 5:00 - 7:00 pm

Location: Basement Conference Room - Larcom City Hall (301 E Huron Street)

NAME

1. Marilyn Taven
2. Clark Charnetski
3. Robert Gordon
4. Eleanor Linn
5. Bob O'neal
6. SETH PETERSON
7. Kathy Griswold
8. Eric Lipson
9. Jana Linn
10. Subu Boina
11. Devante Hargrow
12. \_\_\_\_\_
13. \_\_\_\_\_
14. \_\_\_\_\_
15. \_\_\_\_\_

**Attachment C: Approved Agenda**



**CITY OF ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN**  
**Public Services Area/Systems Planning**  
**301 E. Huron Street**  
**P.O. Box 8647, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107**

**Web:** [www.a2gov.org/pedsafety](http://www.a2gov.org/pedsafety)

**APPROVED AGENDA - PEDESTRIAN SAFETY & ACCESS TASK FORCE**  
**TASK FORCE MEETING #8**

**Date:** Wednesday, November 5, 2014

**Time:** 5:00 - 7:00 pm

**Location:** Basement Conference Room – Larcom City Hall (301 E Huron Street) \*

Chair: Linda Diane Feldt

Secretary: Ken Clark

1. Introductions 5 – 5:05 pm
2. Approval of Agenda 5:05 – 5:10 pm
3. Public Commentary (3 minutes/speaker, limit three speakers) 5:10 – 5:20 pm
4. Approval of Meeting #7 Discussion Summary 5:20 – 5:25 pm
5. Status of amendments to Pedestrian Safety and Access Plan Annotated Outline 5:25 – 5:30 pm
6. Winter Maintenance Policy Proposal 5:30 – 5:45 pm
  - a) Prioritization of winter maintenance enforcement
7. Crosswalk Brief Follow-up Discussion 5:45 – 6:40 pm
  - a) Crosswalk Laws
    - i) Presentation by State Representative Adam Zemke Presentation (15 minutes)
    - b) Consistency of mid-block crosswalk design, beacons, signing and marking (15 minutes)
    - c) Education/Outreach/Enforcement (15 minutes)
    - d) Budget/CIP Integration (10 minutes)
8. Action Items 6:40 – 6:50 pm
  - a) Subcommittee formation and direction
  - b) Approach to recommendations for City Staff and Council
9. Round 1 Public Engagement 6:50 – 6:55 pm
  - a) Stakeholder Focus Groups
  - b) Survey and Crowdsourcing Maps
  - c) Community Wide Meeting
10. Next Steps 6:55 – 7:00 pm
  - a) Confirm Attendance for Next Meeting
  - b) Next Round of Issues and Resources Brief
11. Public Commentary (3 minutes/speaker)

*\*This meeting will be recorded and rebroadcasted by Community Television Network*