

[Draft] Ann Arbor Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force Meeting Minutes

06-06-14 Meeting 5-7pm, Ann Arbor Larcom City Hall Basement Conference Room

Members present: Vivienne Armentrout, Scott Campbell, Linda Diane Feldt, Owen Jansson, Anthony Pinnell, Sarah Pressprich Gryniowicz, Jim Rees, Kenneth Clark

Absent: Neal Elyakin

Staff present: Connie Pulcipher, Kayla Coleman, Eli Cooper

Meeting Called to Order: 5:02pm

1. Changes to agenda: None, unanimously approved
2. Notes from last meeting: No changes. Moved by Armentrout, seconded by Pinnell. 7 yes, 1 abstention (Clark)
3. Consultant selection: A consultant/facilitator, The Greenway Collaborative was chosen from three candidates. The funding for this position is up for a vote on City Council at the next meeting.
4. Eli Cooper gave a presentation on what the city has been doing WRT pedestrian safety and access.
5. Google groups committee reported on our Google Group and Google Drive services.
6. Priority issues brief discussion of how this committee is formulating a list of priorities from task force member submissions.
7. Discussion summary procedures – Kayla (or facilitator in the future) will provide meeting summaries, and Secretary will record motions and votes.
8. Connie gave a presentation on how staff is formulating a resource and stakeholder list for future outreach efforts.
9. Next steps discussion – there was a general discussion of how we should progress with the facilitator potentially joining us at the next meeting and future meetings.
10. Public Commentary:
 - a. Erica Briggs of Washtenaw Bicycling and Walking Coalition – appreciates the formation of the committee, recommends we reach out to other organizations, offered the resources of WBWC for the group.
 - b. Kathy Griswold – Concerned that the task force won't have been effective in the end, though she's hopeful the task force will be valuable in the end. Recommended we heed the advice of professional engineers. Noted that Ann Arbor has a problem with sight-distances.
 - c. Chris Hewett - Save our Streets. Meeting last night recommended buffered bike lanes, and speed limits reduced to 25mph in key areas with many driveways.

- Owen Jansson – asked about the Pedestrian Law Advisory committee formed by Michigan Representative Adam Zemke.

11. Meeting adjourned at 6:59pm. Minutes taken by Sec. Clark

APPENDIX to meeting minutes:

PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AND ACCESS TASK FORCE MEETING #3 DISCUSSION SUMMARY

Date: Thursday, June 5, 2014

Time: 5:00 to 7:00 PM

Location: Larcom City Hall, Basement conference room

Attendees: Task Force members present: 8; Vivienne Armentrout; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark; Linda Diane Feldt; Owen Jansson; Anthony Pinnell; Sarah Pressprich Gryniwicz; Jim Rees

Task Force members absent: 1; Neal Elyakin

Public Present: 5; refer to Attachment A for sign-in sheet.

City staff present: 3; Kayla Coleman, Eli Cooper, Connie Pulcipher

Re: Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force Meeting

Meeting Notes

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 provided information and responses they are shown in italics. Additional staff comments added after the meeting are denoted as “post meeting notes.”

- Approval of agenda
 - Unanimous approval of agenda (Attachment B).
- Approval of Meeting #2 discussion summary; moved by V. Armentrout, seconded by T. Pinnell, approved by all others (K. Clark abstained).
- Consultant selection update: *interviewed three consulting firms, the recommendation to contract with Greenway Collaborative will be considered at the June 16 City Council meeting.*
 - Extensive interview process was conducted: scoring sheets, interview of all three consulting firms, questions and deliberation.
 - City Council approval will require 8 votes.
 - Recommendation from Task Force chair that each Task Force member contact two people in each ward and ask that they email their councilmembers.
- Eli Cooper, Transportation Program Manager Q & A (presentation available at a2gov.org/pedsafety)
 - Are the statistics provided in the presentation based only on people within the City of Ann Arbor? Or people commuting from elsewhere? *The statistics are commuter based, not just from those living within Ann Arbor.*
 - If the pedestrian leaves the curb when a light is flashing red isn't that illegal? *Post meeting note: to be addressed in future discussions with Transportation Program Manager.*
 - Typically engineers have not been very receptive toward non-motorized transportation improvements. *Respectful, professional debate about the balance between moving cars and safe non-motorized transportation is ongoing.*
 - What would you be most excited about the Task Force focusing on? *I am excited that the Task Force exists. In 2003 and 2005 City Council dedicated 5% of ACT 51 funding to non-motorized transportation. In the 2007 Non-motorized Transportation Plan I realized that we are lacking in a much needed pedestrian focus. I would recommend that the Task Force look at our practices in the City and look at efforts nationwide to find the balance of pedestrian and bicycle emphasis areas.*

- Can you clarify the details and differences with the Complete Streets legislation at the State and local level? *Complete streets is a term that describes what the City has actually been doing since the 1970s. Within the City of Ann Arbor past practice has been to seek a non-auto approach, focusing on the environment, sustainability and human health. There has been a national movement to put pressure on state Departments of Transportation (DOTs). The Michigan Complete Streets Statute requires a Complete Streets approach be considered, and have said that they will only fund Transportation enhancement and similar projects in communities with a Complete Streets policy. The City of Ann Arbor has created a resolution for a Complete Streets policy to meet the State requirements.*
- Is 5% of ACT 51 funding still being dedicated to non-motorized transportation? *The funding toward non-motorized transportation for the City of Ann Arbor has ranged from 5% down to 3% but the upcoming budget cycle includes 5%.*
- There has been discussion among Senate and House of Representatives about increasing the funding for ACT51.
- Have the effectiveness of Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) been studied? It seems that some people don't know how to properly interact with them. People know how to stop at a red light, but do they know what to do at a rectangle light? How do the RRFBs function with multiple lanes of traffic? *Intent of the flashing is to draw attention to the motorist that something else is going on. The yellow light warns that there is a pedestrian that wants to cross, but the beacon is not the stop sign, it is just to draw attention. There is a study from Western Michigan University that the RRFB is more effective than the HAWK in terms of compliance, and that is consistent with results that have been observed nationwide. The results from Ann Arbor within this study were dramatically different than the rest of the state.*
- I would have guessed that a HAWK signal was more effective because drivers are more familiar with responding to a red light, but not familiar with the flashing rectangle. With the HAWK by the YMCA there are not controls on 3rd Street and Chapin. *A HAWK signal is used where the cross street traffic doesn't have a high enough traffic threshold for a traffic signal.*
- What is the color of the beacons, are some white? *In Ann Arbor the HAWK beacon lights are red and yellow; the RRFBs are only yellow.*
- What are the standards and practices for consistency of crosswalk implementation? There are many different signs and paintings for crosswalks. Is there standardization for these within the city, or at the state or federal level? *The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) is the federal standard that has to be adhered to. Michigan has developed the Michigan Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD), the Michigan manual addresses some items that the federal manual is silent on. Application of the standards in the MMUTCD and MUTCD are largely based on engineering judgment. There are many different crosswalk styles and signage.*
- There are also differences in the color of yellow on the signs. Are we making an effort to standardize this? *The standards for retro-reflectivity of roadside signage have changed over time. Due to signage expense, we don't change all at once but we replace signs as needed.*
- Regarding the “Local Law” pedestrian placards, do these comply with the MMUTCD? *Yes, it is within the local law that you are allowed to use that sign.*

- There are locations where streets are lacking crosswalks, no way to get across. Are there traffic warrant guidelines for implementation of crosswalks? *Crosswalk implementation is based on planning, engineering, common sense and cost. Crosswalks are not marked in areas where pedestrian activity is very low or non-existent. There is cost and maintenance associated with pavement markings and signage. Where there has not historically been a crosswalk, or a change in the conditions and there has not been a request for a crosswalk, then it may be unlikely to see a crosswalk incorporated. The Task Force may suggest that when the City conducts public meetings for a project that they engage with the people along the corridors to see where a crosswalk is needed.*
- Shouldn't it be routine that ramps for a crosswalk be added when a project is done without residents specifically requesting it? *It would be a waste of tax payer dollars to build a ramp where people aren't crossing. People don't cross everywhere.*
- There seem to be various locations where unmarked crosswalks might exist and different locations around the City that seem inviting to pedestrians that there are not crosswalks.
- *Post meeting note: additional questions and comments may be directed to Eli Cooper via email at ecooper@a2gov.org or by phone 734-794-6430 x43710*
- Committee updates:
 - Google group
 - Scott Campbell identified as the contact person for Google site troubleshooting.
 - When sharing materials with Task Force members, email notification that files have been uploaded is ok, but attachments should not be sent via email; rather, embed the link to the uploaded page in the body of the email.
 - Identified desire to establish an email address where the task force can receive communications from the public; the public will not be able to send to the address that is used internally among task force members (aa-ped-safety-and-access-task-force@googlegroups.com)
 - Priority Issues Synthesis & Organization
 - Task Force member priorities have been grouped into topics.
 - This will be prepared to share with the consultant.
- Meeting logistics: *We will continue to send a meeting summary and allow a window to propose revisions. An updated summary and the meeting agenda will be sent as an “agenda packet” approximately one week before the next meeting.*
- Stakeholder Database: *The City's stakeholder analysis spreadsheet was briefly reviewed. The Task Force will work with this in more detail in the future.*
- Other discussion
 - Future agenda item: ‘Communications’ or ‘New business;’ an opportunity to bring up other items not on the agenda.
 - Task Force members may continue suggesting future agenda items via email. Agendas will continue to be developed by Linda Diane Feldt and Connie Pulcifer, and will include the future consultant pending contract approval.
 - The Task Force may consider creating a space on the Google drive (such as a “parking lot”) where ideas could be documented that aren't yet ready for discussion.
 - There is so much information out there; this is a large and complicated system. Task Force members acknowledged not wanting to latch on to one thing too quickly, but also

not wanting to miss opportunities to dive into these topics. Need to figure out where can we most effective so that we don't just "stand on the edge."

- The consultant may be able to help us focus our approach. The consultant needs to be provided with the full list of priorities that have been developed by the task force, so that these priorities can be the starting point to focus our approach.
 - Task Force members expressed an interest in an informal meeting to introduce the consultant; perhaps a Task Force retreat.
- Public comment:
 - Erica Briggs (representative of the Washtenaw Bicycling and Walking Coalition (WBWC)): Very excited about the establishment of the Task Force and would like to see this as a permanent group. Other communities across the country have permanent task forces on pedestrian safety. May be worth reaching out to other pedestrian and non-motorized task forces and advisory committees to discuss what has worked well from their experience. WBWC is available as a resource to the Task Force and willing to share past research completed.
 - Kathy Griswold: Expressed concern that the work of the Task Force will be a "feel good" experience and not effective at make real changes to improve pedestrian safety. Observations so far provide hope that some real will happen from this Task Force. Support that Norm Cox of Greenway Collaborative will be an excellent consultant for this group. Sight distance issues in Ann Arbor are on-going, there is a need to reach out to other communities who have a sight-distance ordinance and learn from them.
 - Chris Hewett (representative of Save our Streets): Reported back from the Seventh Street Transportation Workshop, held Wednesday, June 4. One of the requests heard at the Seventh Street meeting is for buffered bicycle lanes and a 25 mph speed limit near downtown.

Attachment A: Sign in Sheet

Marilyn Turner

Erica Briggs

Larry Deck

Kathy Grunwald

Chris Hewitt

Attachment B: 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

MEETING AGENDA—PEDESTRIAN SAFETY & ACCESS TASK FORCE

Task Force Meeting #3

Thursday, June 5

5:00 – 7:00 pm

Larcom City Hall, Basement Conference Room

Chair: Linda Diane Feldt

Secretary: Ken Clark

1. Approval of Agenda (CP) 5 to 5:05 pm
2. Approval of Meeting #2 Summary (CP) 5:05 to 5:10 pm
3. Consultant Selection update (CP) 5:10 to 5:15 pm
 - a. Pre-City Council Meeting Communications/Talking Points (LD)
4. Eli Cooper, Transportation Program Manager Q & A (EC) 5:15 to 6:15 pm
5. Google Groups Committee Update (JR?) 6:15 to 6:20 pm
6. Priority Issues Synthesis & Organization Committee Update (SC) 6:20 to 6:25 pm
7. Meeting Logistics (KC) 6:25 to 6:30 pm
 - a. Discussion Summary Procedures
8. Stakeholder and Resource Group Explanation (CP) 6:30 to 6:45 pm
9. Next Steps (CP) 6:40 to 6:50 pm
 - a. Agenda items for next meeting
10. Public Commentary (3 minutes/speaker)