

South State Street Transportation Alternatives October 22nd Public Event Results

Overview:

The South State Street Transportation Study team held a public event on October 22nd, 2015 at the Courtyard Marriott in Ann Arbor. The event included two separate meetings. The first was a Stakeholder Roundtable which was followed by a public open house.

The Stakeholder Roundtable meeting was oriented towards stakeholders including business and property owners along the corridor. The meeting included a presentation of the issues and opportunities found along S. State Street from Ellsworth northerly to Oakbrook Dr. Three concepts were presented for review:

- Alternative 1: Narrow median roadway with direct left-turns
- Alternative 2: Narrow median roadway with roundabout intersections
- Alternative 3: Wide median roadway with indirect (“Michigan”) left-turns

Each of these alternatives share some common design features, including incorporation of continues sidewalk and bike lanes along State Street, and bus pull-outs at transit stops. The presentation used during the meeting is attached.

In addition to the presentation and dialogue the stakeholders were provided comment forms and asked to provide feedback for the team’s use. The second meeting running from 4:30 to 7:30 PM was an open house format available for the general public to review materials and provide feedback. Several information boards and detailed corridor maps were available. The public was able to interact with the team in direct conversation. Citizens provided comments on the corridor maps as well as completed feedback forms. The team received 24 total response sheets combined from both the stakeholder portion of the meeting and the general public.

Feedback:

Based on feedback obtained through dialogue, comment forms and notations on the figures available for comment, a summary of feedback was assembled. Broadly stating Alternative 1 (narrow median) and Alternative 3 (wide median) were identified as the most preferable alternatives by both the public and stakeholder groups, while Alternative 2 (narrow medians and roundabouts) was the least preferred alternative for both groups. Tables 1 and 2 present the rankings from each of these groups, respectively.

Table 1: Alternative Preference Ranking (Public)

Alternative	Average Ranking (1 being the preferred option)
1	1 (tie)
2	3
3	1 (tie)

Table 2: Alternative Preference Ranking (Stakeholder Group)

Alternative	Average Ranking (1 being the preferred option)
1	1
2	3
3	2

Stakeholders defined the pedestrian and transit improvements as their top project goals. While pedestrian and vehicular improvements were tops for the public. Land use was the least important goal as expressed by the public, while entry treatments was ranked lowest priority by the stakeholders. Tables 3 and 4 summarize the goal rankings for the public and stakeholder groups, respectively.

Table 3: Project Goals Importance (Public)

Number indicates total number of responses by goal

Goals	Most Important	Less Important
Safety	3	2
Entry	3	2
Pedestrians	7	1
Bicycles	4	2
Transit	1	3
Vehicles	6	2
Access	3	3
Land use		4

Table 4: Project Goals Importance (Stakeholder Group)

Number indicates total number of responses by goal

Goals	Most Important	Less Important
Safety	3	
Entry	1	4
Pedestrians	5	
Bicycles	3	1
Transit	5	
Vehicles	2	1
Access	2	2
Land use		2

During the discussion, the groups expressed interest in using different alternatives for north and south of the interstate. This was based on their recognition of differences between the Right of Way available and development/land use alongside of the two segments of the corridor. All Participants noted the importance of pedestrian access and improvements as a priority.

Public Comments

The following is a summary of written comments provided by attendees of the public meeting:

- “Consider cut-through traffic through mall in models, NB State to NB S Main is heavy in the evening”
- “State/ Research Park needs left turn bike lanes if #1 or #3. Get rid of weird cross state and come back. Strongly consider roundabout here. Roundabout at Ellsworth locks up due to light.”
- “Get rid of loop ramps. Make it right turn. MUCH safer for bikes and pedestrians.”
- “Building shared use path along tracks (Stimson to Ellsworth) is really important.”
- “I like the third option most since it will allow for pedestrians at an acceptable distances and does not add much more of traffic delays.”
- “Center lane north of Eisenhower must remain open since there is a tremendous amount of traffic uses it for left turn beyond the first 30 feet.”
- “Please do not restrict traffic (especially north of Eisenhower)”
- “All 3 options are a huge step forward for pedestrians and cyclists, which is very encouraging.”
- “Really, really, wish the Oakbrook cut-through could be added. From a selfish perspective, this would save time from having to use Eisenhower to go west from State.”
- “Entering State Street from 94 was fairly easy at approximately 6 PM on a Wednesday evening. However, if you didn’t know you were getting off at the main exit for Ann Arbor, it’s possible it could be passed by. It lacks the “wow” factor for identification of the City. A business traveler’s perspective.”
- “More crosswalks needed (frequent hotel stays)”
- “Stop lights at the intersections.”

Stakeholder Comments

The following is a summary of written comments provided by attendees of the stakeholder meeting:

- “Vehicular travel time is important, but behavior change is more important to accommodate all users.”
- “South of 94 alternative 1 seems more supportive of needs”
- “Shortest crossings are needed”
- “North of 94 alternative 3 seems more appealing”
- “Want on record access to pedestrians on both sides of the bridge and sidewalks full length of the corridor”
- “Bus transportation and covered stops should be #1 priority”
- “Roundabout at State and Ellsworth is often a total mess”
- “All medians should be planted and signage at entry”
- “Pedestrians should be able to cross State safely, but there is less need for pedestrians to move north-south along State”
- “Alternative 1 south of 94”
- “Alternative 3 north of 94”
- “Alternative 3 looks the best”