

PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AND ACCESS TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS TO CITY COUNCIL

SEPTEMBER 2015



Photo credit: The Greenway Collaborative, Inc.

Mayor and City Council Members,

As the Chair of the Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force, I am proud and pleased to deliver our final report in response to the November 2013 Task Force charge. This exciting document highlights and prioritizes the needs and wishes of our community in the area of pedestrian safety and access. We hope that the Task Force report will add to your ongoing understanding of the pedestrian safety and access needs for Ann Arbor and provide guidance for future planning, decision-making, and funding.

Our report has been developed by very passionate and dedicated Task Force members which took very seriously the responsibility to engage the public in a deliberative process. The Task Force considered the opinions and ideas of well over 1,000 Ann Arbor residents participating through community meetings; focus groups; email communication; talking with our neighbors and friends; commentary at each of the Task Force meetings; web surveys; crowdsourcing maps; surveys through A2 Open City Hall; communications shared by council members; and, from previous reports and advisory groups.

We also received professional input from a City staff Resource Group, with primary guidance coming from Connie Pulcifer of the Systems Planning Unit. Connie was generous with her knowledge and expertise while at the same time making sure that the Task Force operated independently and creatively. Our consulting team, Norman Cox and Carolyn Prudhomme of The Greenway Collaborative, offered guidance as well as outstanding comprehensive and useful compilations and threading of community comments and ideas.

In addition, in researching pedestrian safety and access issues and solutions the Task Force consulted news reports and articles; professional journals; federal and state materials; practices being followed in other U.S. cities; and, benefitted from the professional knowledge and national/international travels of its members.

We hope that this report will be a part of your ongoing understanding of the pedestrian safety and access needs for Ann Arbor; that you will work to implement our recommendations; and, that pedestrian safety and access will be at the forefront of planning and decision making in the years to come.

The Task Force wants these recommendations to become reality and hopes that you will work to implement them through creation of a formal Pedestrian Safety Action Plan that recognizes pedestrian safety and access as an important component of City policy and practice and one that deserves a level of funding commensurate with its importance to the City and its residents. We are joined in that wish by so many of the citizens who participated and helped with our work. It was a transforming process for me as an individual. I was very much affected by the public commentary and opinions. How can we now work together with you, our elected representatives, in making that a reality? For many of us, we feel that lives depend on it. A city that encourages and fosters pedestrian activity benefits in multiple ways – physical and mental health, economic growth, less congestion, and more.

Thank you, Mayor Taylor and City Council members, for your support over the tenure of this project. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the City implements these recommendations.

In preparation for the September 14 Work Session we ask that you read the complete report before the meeting. Please be aware that additional information and detail is provided in the appendix, including a glossary so that we all understand the terms used. The appendix also includes hyperlinks to documents and other information that the Task Force used and found helpful. The Task Force has maintained a [Google Drive](#) that contains full documentation of our work and process.

At the September 14 Work Session we'll quickly introduce the report, highlight the recommendations, and leave plenty of time for your questions and concerns. And of course, Task Force members are available before and after our meeting for additional conversation.

Linda Diane Feldt
Chair, the Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is the result of a City Council resolution and the efforts of the Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force (the “Task Force”). It was aided by stakeholders throughout the community, meeting participants and members of the public who provided invaluable insight and feedback at public meetings and online. The recommendations put forth in this report would not have been possible without this input and engagement.

City Council members:

John Hieftje (mayor)

Ward 1:

Sabra Briere

Sumi Kailasapathy

Ward 2:

Jane Lumm

Sally Petersen

Ward 3:

Christopher Taylor

Stephen Kunselman

Ward 4:

Jack Eaton

Margie Teall

Ward 5:

Mike Anglin

Chuck Warpehoski

The Task Force acknowledges valuable assistance from The Greenway Collaborative and the following City of Ann Arbor staff, without whom this report would not have been possible:

Jamie Adkins

Kayla Coleman

Eli Cooper

Deb Gosselin

Craig Hupy

Nicholas Hutchinson

Jeffrey Kahan

Robert Kellar

Connie Pulcifer

Cynthia Redinger

John Seto

Cresson Slotten

Matt Warba

Respectfully submitted,

The Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force

Linda Diane Feldt, *Chair*

Ken Clark, *Secretary*

Scott Campbell

Neal Elyakin

Owen Jansson

Anthony Pinnell

Sarah Pressprich Gryniewicz

Jim Rees

Vivienne Armentrout, *resigned June 15, 2015*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Task Force Charge from City Council	1
Process Summary	2
Background – Putting it All in Context	3
Task Force Recommendations: Approach and General Comments	5
The Five Underlying Issues to Address	6
The Seven Symptoms	7
Overview of Recommendations	8
Goal – Vision Zero	9
Objective No. 1: Improve Pedestrian Access and Encourage Use	10
Objective No. 2: Improve Understanding of Traffic Laws and Local Expectations	13
Objective No. 3: Improve the Physical Conditions of the Roadway and Pedestrian Environment to Reflect Best Practices for Pedestrian Safety	16
Objective No. 4: Address the Safety and Access for All Users	19
Objective No. 5: Reduce Distractions and Minimize Consequences	21
Implementation Strategies	23
Recommended Data Collection	26
Appendix	27
Appendix A. Glossary of Terms	28
Appendix B. Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force Work Plan & Schedule	30
Appendix C. Current Crosswalk Language	49
Appendix D. Vision Zero Resources	50
Appendix E: Proposed Sidewalk Gap Prioritization Model	51
Appendix F. Multifaceted Public Outreach Campaign Ideas	53
Appendix G. Updating Non-motorized Plans’ Goals and Objectives	55

TASK FORCE CHARGE FROM CITY COUNCIL

On November 18, 2013 City Council passed Resolution R-13-367, which established a Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force (the “Task Force”) of nine members to explore strategies to improve pedestrian safety and access in the City of Ann Arbor and make recommendations to be considered in the subsequent development of a Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. The resolution states:

The Task Force will explore strategies to improve pedestrian safety and access within a framework of shared responsibility through community outreach and data collection, and will recommend to Council improvements in the development and application of the Complete Streets model, using best practices, sound data and objective analysis; the task force will also address sidewalk gaps and create a tool for setting priorities for funding and filling those gaps; the task force will also recommend whether pedestrian safety and access should be the focus of ongoing community scrutiny through the establishment of a standing committee on pedestrian safety.

PROCESS SUMMARY

The Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force (the “Task Force”) met monthly from April 2014 through August 2015 to identify issues, explore potential solutions and draft recommendations to improve pedestrian safety and access in the City of Ann Arbor. Four subcommittees were created to focus on specific topics and provide guidance to the Task Force.

The seventeen month process required extensive coordination and integration among the Task Force, a City staff Resource Group, stakeholder focus groups and the general public. The Task Force engaged the community through three rounds of public input. In addition to focus group and community-wide meetings the public engagement process included a web survey (939 participants) and a web-based mapping exercise to gather place specific comments (over 400 comments received). Public input was gathered at all meetings and there was extensive personal contact including outreach to the disability community, discussions with City Council members, and social media contact. Input from the public directly influenced development and prioritization of the Task Force recommendations.

Refer to Appendix B: Pedestrian Safety and Access Work Plan & Schedule for more details.

BACKGROUND – PUTTING IT ALL IN CONTEXT

City Council's charge to the Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force (the "Task Force") and the issues and strategies we have identified here in response to that request are a reflection of pedestrian safety and access discussions and trends taking place nationwide. A number of demographic changes are taking place that are driving changes in the way we view our roadways and the interactions between pedestrians and vehicular traffic. Here are some of the changes, which are impacting policy and practice¹ at the Federal, State, and local level:²

- An increasing number of people are choosing to live in cities rather than rural or suburban areas;
- An increasing number of younger people, especially among those opting for city living, are choosing not to own a car; others are choosing to delay/forego getting a driver's license;
- More people of all ages are choosing to walk or bike as a matter of convenience, recreation, personal health, and the environmental health of their community;
- As our population ages there will be an increase in the number of older drivers and pedestrians with age-related infirmities using our roadways and sidewalks.

The challenge facing Ann Arbor, and other communities throughout the nation, is how to provide and maintain an optimal level of pedestrian safety and access in the face of these on-going changes and the increased vehicular traffic of a growing population. As Anthony Foxx, U.S. Secretary of Transportation has stated:

"This is the safest time for transportation in history, except for pedestrians and bicyclists."

Given these trends the potential for incremental increases in the number of vehicle-pedestrian crashes is very real, and every community needs to be doing whatever it can to minimize this potential.

Ann Arbor averaged 55 pedestrian crashes per year for the five-year period 2010-2014; this was a 22% increase over the average of 45 pedestrian crashes for the previous five-year period 2005-2009. In addition, using those same two periods, the total number of incapacitating injuries resulting from pedestrian crashes increased 100% (22 to 44), and the total number of fatalities increased from 2 to 6. Although these numbers are not large in absolute terms, their upward trend signals the need for continued vigilance and upgrading of our pedestrian safety measures in light of the demographic changes noted above. And while Ann Arbor crashes involving pedestrians represent only 16% of all crashes in the City of Ann Arbor, pedestrians account for one-third (1/3) of the fatalities and almost one-quarter (1/4) of all serious injuries.

¹ Policy and practice changes in response to these trends includes the federal government's issuance of a guide on how to create a pedestrian safety and action plan and the funded research that supported development of that guide; passage of PAs 134 and 135 by the State of Michigan and the development of the 2012 Michigan Complete Streets policy; creation of the City of Ann Arbor Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force, and increased use of pedestrian signage and signaling, etc.

² Walljasper, Jay. 2015. The Safest Streets, Planning Magazine (May)

These figures illustrate the extraordinary vulnerability of our pedestrians as they navigate a very car-centric environment.

Based on the extensive public engagement process noted above, and on our own research, the Task Force strongly believes that the walking environment in Ann Arbor can and should be improved, making the City safer, more accessible, and more friendly for people of all ages and abilities who use our public roadways, sidewalks, and pathways. Here again, the input we received strongly correlates with national data. A detailed 2013 survey of Americans' attitudes² about walking found that four-fifths (4/5) of respondents want streets to be designed for safer walking, and three-fourths (3/4) want better enforcement of speed limits, even if both strategies result in slower driving. For any community, including Ann Arbor, a safer and more accessible walking environment enhances overall community attractiveness as a place to visit, live, and work, all of which contribute to economic prosperity; improves local environmental quality; and positively impacts citizens' personal health by broadening the opportunities to use non-motorized transportation.

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS: APPROACH AND GENERAL COMMENTS

Referring back to our charge from City Council, the issues identified and the recommendations made in this report are but a first step in the process of improving the walking environment in Ann Arbor. These recommendations – which cover a wide range of measures and were developed and prioritized based on public input we received – should be used in the development by City staff of a formal Pedestrian Safety Action Plan and we have included that next step as one of our formal recommendations.

Users of our public roadways, sidewalks, or pathways include vehicles, walkers, bicyclists and people using wheel chairs or other assist devices. The Task Forces' recommendations are directed towards establishing a physical and cultural environment where all modes of transportation may safely access and comfortably share the right-of-way. As a matter of terminology our report often refers to "pedestrians" and "walking" when discussing usage of sidewalks, crosswalks, and pathways. We use those terms in the broadest sense, i.e., to include all those using the pedestrian right-of-way, be they on foot, in a wheel chair, or walking a bike. In the process of addressing our charge from City Council it also became clear that pedestrian safety and access issues often dovetail with those involving bicyclists, and although we have clearly focused on the former we did consider the latter where the impacts involve both modes of transportation.

Five underlying issues have been identified as the root of pedestrian safety and accommodations concerns in the City of Ann Arbor. As an approach to modify behaviors and address conditions that negatively impact pedestrian safety and access, the Task Force has developed an associated objective to address each underlying issue and grouped recommendations around the identified objectives.

THE FIVE UNDERLYING ISSUES TO ADDRESS

To improve pedestrian safety in Ann Arbor the following five root issues must be addressed:

1. **Too Often, Walking is Not an Available, Safe, Comfortable or Convenient Choice.** Our current transportation network places an emphasis on the mobility of motorized vehicles at the expense of pedestrian mobility and safety.
2. **Unfamiliarity and Misunderstanding of Traffic Laws and Local Expectations.** Much discussion has been focused on the discrepancies between the local crosswalk ordinance, the State of Michigan model (Michigan Vehicle Code) and the National model (Uniform Traffic Code). But the issue is more complex; pedestrians and motorists alike do not know, understand or follow even the state or national models. This issue is compounded by the large influx of daily commuters, visitors and the City's transient student population.

See Appendix C: Current Crosswalk Language for additional information.
3. **A Disconnect between Roadway User Expectations and Physical Conditions.** Even an alert driver who understands traffic laws and values pedestrian safety may be challenged by the conditions of our current roadway environment. In some situations a driver simply may not see the person waiting to cross the road or even the person within the crosswalk due to visibility issues.
4. **Failure to Consider the Perspective of All Transportation System Users.** Education and enforcement should go hand in hand to help raise people's understanding of the issues and establish an environment of mutual respect. Planning and design of transportation improvements need to take into consideration all users of the roadway.
5. **Distracted Roadway Users.** A study completed in a comparable university town found that distracted motorists are 15 times less likely to yield to a pedestrian in a crosswalk and about four times more likely to be involved in a conflict with a pedestrian.³ All distracted roadway users put themselves and other roadway users in danger. Pedestrians are the most vulnerable roadway users.

³ Brumfield, Ryan, and Srinivas Pulugurtha. "When Distracted Road Users Cross Paths." *Public Roads*. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Nov.-Dec. 2011. Web. 21 Apr. 2015. The study noted that distracted pedestrians in a crosswalk did not significantly increase their chances of a conflict with a motor vehicle.

THE SEVEN SYMPTOMS

The following seven behaviors have been identified through public engagement as some of the most important issues. These may be viewed as symptoms of the failure to address the five underlying issues:

1. **Motorists passing other Vehicles that are stopped for Pedestrians in a Crosswalk.** This behavior is most frequently seen on multi-lane roadways but also observed on two lane roads where cars enter the on-coming travel lane to pass. This behavior is both dangerous and illegal throughout Michigan and the United States.
2. **Motorists failing to stop for Pedestrians at Midblock Crosswalks.** This behavior is observed for pedestrians waiting at the edge of the roadway as well as for pedestrians fully within the crosswalk or standing on a crossing island.
3. **Motorists failing to stop for Pedestrians at School Crosswalks.** Marked school crosswalks are not immune to symptoms 1 and 2.
4. **Motorists failing to yield to Pedestrians when Turning at Intersections.** This happens at traffic signals where the pedestrian has the “Walk” light and at stop signs when the pedestrian is in the crosswalk and clearly has the right-of-way.
5. **Inconsistent Signing, Marking and Signaling of Crosswalks.** Participants in the stakeholder and public meetings have expressed confusion over what rules apply to the various crosswalk configurations and questioned why some crosswalks with seemingly similar characteristics are treated very differently.
6. **Snow and Ice Accumulation on Sidewalks and Crosswalks Inhibiting Pedestrian Travel.** A single un-cleared property, ramp, crosswalk or crossing island can make an entire route impassable, place pedestrians in danger or inhibit pedestrian travel altogether.
7. **Motorists Speeding in Residential Neighborhoods.** Residential streets are experiencing motor vehicle speeds that are inappropriate for a space shared by bicyclists and pedestrians. This situation has a negative impact on the quality of life and safety of residents.

OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is an overview of the how the recommendations are structured.

GOAL

Zero traffic fatalities

OBJECTIVES

The following objectives directly respond to the five underlying issues:

- 1. Improve Pedestrian Access and Encourage Use**
- 2. Improve Understanding of Traffic Laws and Local Expectations**
- 3. Improve the Physical Conditions of the Roadway and Pedestrian Environment to Reflect Best Practices for Pedestrian Safety**
- 4. Address the Safety and Access for All Users**
- 5. Reduce Distractions and Minimize Consequences**

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

Approaches to achieve the key objectives in a timely manner

RECOMMENDED DATA COLLECTION

Key data points that will be helpful in implementing the recommendations

APPENDIX

Provides a glossary of terms, background information about the Task Force process, and detailed information and preliminary ideas for selected recommendations

GOAL – VISION ZERO

The City of Ann Arbor should embrace the Vision Zero concept and the following four principles upon which it is based:

- **Ethics:** Human life and health are paramount and take priority over mobility and other objectives of the road traffic system
- **Responsibility:** providers and regulators of the road traffic system share responsibility with users;
- **Safety:** road traffic systems should take account of human fallibility and minimize both the opportunities for errors and the harm done when they occur; and
- **Mechanisms for change:** providers and regulators must do their utmost to guarantee the safety of all citizens; they must cooperate with road users; and all three must be ready to change to achieve safety.

When implementing vision zero, the solutions should be evidence based and the priorities for improvements guided by data. See Appendix D: Vision Zero Resources for additional information.

OBJECTIVE No. 1**IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND ENCOURAGE USE****PRIORITY RECOMMENDATIONS**

◆ Denotes top priority recommendations.

◆ **A. Implement Best Practices for Complete Street Planning and Design.** The City should always strive to implement best practices for pedestrians through complete street planning in all new construction, reconstruction, resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation and preventive maintenance projects to the highest degree possible given the project scope. In addition to referencing the American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHTO) and Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) guidelines, The City should utilize the National Association of City Transportation Official's (NACTO) *Urban Street Design Guide* and *Urban Bikeway Design Guide* when planning and designing roadways as well reference the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) design interpretations and recommended guidelines.

◆ **B. Land Use Planning that Promotes Pedestrian Travel.** As part of the Master Plan revision process, the City should incorporate the following strategies to promote an increase in pedestrian travel: (1) a fine-grained mix of land uses that place common trip origins and destinations within easy walking distance; (2) enhanced pedestrian connectivity throughout the City via the establishment of a dense pedestrian network; (3) building and site design guidelines that encourages retail use, compact-land use and architectural details that provide an engaging environment to pedestrians at the street level; (4) strategically placed parking structures that facilitate walking to multiple destinations; (5) park and walk lots on the edge of downtown; and, (6) utilizing existing parking lots in City parks as part of a park and walk program.

C. Develop Placemaking Street Design Guidelines. The City should develop design guidelines and strategies that build upon local characteristics and provide visual cues to roadway users beyond typical signage and pavement markings. These guidelines should include: (1) techniques to highlight pedestrian crossing locations through landscaping, lighting and other means; (2) establishing appropriate scaled roadside environments that support pedestrian activities; (3) providing amenities that enhance the pedestrian experience; (4) providing buffering between motorized travel lanes and pedestrian spaces to improve pedestrian comfort; and, (5) utilizing various road and roadside design treatments that slow motorized travel to the desired speed.

- ◆ **D. Prioritization System to Eliminate Sidewalk Gaps.** Improve pedestrian connectivity by filling the sidewalk gaps in the City. Towards this end, the City should implement the sidewalk prioritization system developed by City staff with input from the Task Force that is included in Appendix E: Proposed Sidewalk Gap Prioritization Model.

- ◆ **E. Enhance and Maintain Pedestrian Network Connectivity.** As part of the plan review process, the City should require that all new development and redevelopment projects address pedestrian connectivity. Existing pedestrian connections (such as sidewalks and pathways) should be maintained and improved, including informal pedestrian connections. Areas with poor pedestrian connectivity should be remedied to the degree possible including exploring expanding connections through adjacent properties.

- ◆ **F. Improve Pedestrian Access through Crosswalk Placement and Spacing.** The City should follow NACTO guidelines for crosswalk placement and spacing. Crosswalks should be supplied on every side of all intersections unless there is a compelling reason other than cost or motorist inconvenience to omit them. No Existing crosswalk should be removed without first performing the same engineering study that would have been required to install that crosswalk.

The public should be informed of proposed additions and removals of crosswalks, including notice being sent to addresses within a certain distance of those crosswalks. A process needs to be put in place for residents to request a crosswalk to be added.

The City should adopt guidelines for maximum distance between crosswalks on every road. These distances may vary from place to place, for example a shorter distance might be appropriate in a residential or downtown area, and longer on multilane highways. The distance between crosswalks should not exceed 500 feet without the approval of the full Street Design Team (see Implementation section for more information on the Street Design Team).

G. Improve Crosswalk Maintenance. Maintain, in optimal condition, all pedestrian crosswalk signage, pavement markings, lighting and warning beacons so they remain highly visible to motorists and useable by pedestrians of all abilities.

H. Provide Safe and Accessible Pedestrian Routes in all Construction Zones.

The City should ensure through building codes, fees, policy and enforcement that a direct, safe and accessible pedestrian route is provided in all construction zones, including providing a protective shed where appropriate. All pedestrian construction routes should comply with the Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD) and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. When construction requires the relocation of a transit stop or interferes with access to transit in any manner, the City shall coordinate with the transit provider to ensure that safe and barrier free access is maintained during the entire course of construction.

In accordance with best practices, when space is limited, a sidewalk diversion into the roadway on the same side of the street as the sidewalk should be provided rather than a sidewalk detour to the other side of a street. A pedestrian construction route should take precedent over on-street parking and all but one through motor vehicle lane in each direction when creating barrier free sidewalk diversions.

I. Maximize Crossing Time for Pedestrians at Pedestrian Signals. At all signals, unless an engineering study has been done based on pedestrian crash history, pedestrians should get a walk signal at the same time (or a bit sooner) as adjacent motorists get a green signal, and that pedestrian walk signal should be as long as the green signal minus the pedestrian crossing interval (when the signal changes to flashing don't walk). Push button activation should only be used to extend the pedestrian walk signal phase (and presumably the roadway green signal), or to shorten the cross-traffic green phase to provide a pedestrian walk signal sooner. Push buttons should only be used to provide exceptional pedestrian crossing opportunities – the signal system should automatically and by default provide walk signals in every phase cycle.

J. Provide Accessible and Responsive Pedestrian Push Buttons at Signals.

When a pedestrian is required to push a button to activate a crossing signal, the following two conditions should be mandatory: (1) provide audio, visual and tactile feedback when the button is pushed; (2) the "Walk" phase is called as soon as possible and given the same consideration in timing as vehicular actuation.

OBJECTIVE No. 2**IMPROVE UNDERSTANDING OF TRAFFIC LAWS AND LOCAL EXPECTATIONS****PRIORITY RECOMMENDATIONS**

◆ Denotes top priority recommendations.

◆ **A. Preserve the Pedestrian Crosswalk Law.** The City should preserve the language in its current crosswalk ordinance that requires motorists to stop for and yield to pedestrians at or within a marked mid-block crosswalk or an unmarked crosswalk at an intersection. The City should also advocate to State officials to promote pedestrian safety and access statewide and ensure that local control over this issue is not overruled by a new state law.

B. Adopt the Uniform Vehicle Code Definition of a Crosswalk. Ann Arbor should adopt the Uniform Vehicle Code (UVC) definition of crosswalk:

1-118-Crosswalk

- A. That part of the roadway at an intersection included within the connections of the lateral lines of the sidewalk on opposite sides of the highway measured from the curbs or, in the absence of curbs, from the edges of the traversable roadway; and in the absence of a sidewalk on one side of the roadway, that part of the roadway included within the extension of the lateral lines of the existing sidewalk at right angles to the centerline.*
- B. Any portion of the roadway at an intersection or elsewhere distinctly indicated for pedestrian crossing by lines or other markings on the surface.*

◆ **C. Regular Enforcement of Pedestrian Crossing Laws.** The City of Ann Arbor Police Department should provide regular enforcement of motorist and pedestrian laws. This should include enforcement efforts at both crosswalk and non-crosswalk locations. The safety of pedestrians is a basic part of the safety of our community, and it should not require special funding from the City or scheduling on the part of our public safety officers. This should be considered a part of basic policing. At this point there should be at least four designated and advertised crosswalk enforcement operations per year, in a manner recommended by the FHWA. It may be reasonable to reduce or increase the number of enforcement operations in the future, depending on the results of crosswalk enforcement operations, and crash history in the City.

D. Targeted Enforcement Aimed at Improving the Yield Rates at Crosswalk Locations.

In conjunction with a public outreach campaign, the City should utilize targeted enforcement aimed at improving the percentage of motorists stopping for and yielding to pedestrians at or within crosswalks. Locations would be determined based on reported and observed safety concerns. Targeted locations should employ current best practices for crosswalk marking and signage.

E. Stricter Enforcement for High Risk Areas.

Strict enforcement and increased fines should be employed for traffic violations in school zones and other high risk locations such as park and recreation facilities, college campuses, hospitals, senior centers and shopping centers. Permanent speed indication signs and supplemental warning signage should be employed in such areas.

F. Motorist Education through Enforcement.

Based on best practices outlined in the FHWA's *How to Develop a Pedestrian Safety Action Plan*⁴, ongoing enforcement of motor vehicle violations that endanger pedestrians is an important tool for continually educating all drivers. Penalties for violations should be such that officers are not hesitant to issue violations based on the approach that more frequent citations with lower penalties are a more effective deterrent than fewer citations with a higher penalty.

G. Pedestrian Education through Enforcement.

Police interaction with pedestrians should focus on education and warnings rather than citations.

H. Community Buy-in. Elected officials, prosecutors, and police officers should all be brought into a discussion on how to effectively support increased enforcement of motor vehicle violations that endanger pedestrians. They should work towards developing a unified strategy and messaging similar to that used with drunk driving or safety belt use.

I. Walk Defensively Program. The City should develop and publicize a program for safe walking education that reaches adults and school age children. A program that encourages pedestrians to employ extra vigilance in situations that may place them in harm's way should be developed and actively publicized. This campaign would specifically address that although pedestrians have priority, they should not assume that a motorist can see them or that a motorist will always stop for them in a crosswalk. The campaign will also emphasize motorist's rights and vehicle capabilities.

J. Provide Education Materials to Driver Education Programs. The City should provide education materials to local driver's education companies to communicate the importance of motorists stopping for and yielding to pedestrians at or within a crosswalk.

⁴ U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, *How to Develop a Pedestrian Safety Action Plan*, Publication FHWA-SA-05-12, March 2009 Revision. The information in Chapter 5 also provides the support the enforcement based recommendations C, D, E, F and G. Available online at http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/ped_focus/docs/fhwasa0512.pdf

Education materials should highlight the responsibilities of motorists at Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (HAWKs), Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons (RRFBs) and roundabouts. The City should advocate through its lobbyist and State Representatives that this information be included in the State's driver education materials.

◆ **K. Provide a Sustained Public Outreach Campaign.** The City and the recommended pedestrian champion (see Implementation Strategies) should initiate and support a multifaceted, ongoing outreach effort targeting residents, students, out of town commuters and visitors. The campaign should emphasize that use of our roadways is a shared responsibility. Pedestrians are legitimate users of the roadway, and the campaign should focus on increasing the percentage of motorists who stop for and yield to pedestrians at all crosswalks and other pedestrian safety and awareness issues as deemed appropriate. This outreach effort would engage public, private and institutional entities to integrate simple positive and memorable messages into their existing correspondence and interactions with their clientele. See Appendix F: Multifaceted Public Outreach Campaign Ideas for a preliminary list of ideas.

L. Zone Treatments to Address Identified Problems or Barriers to Pedestrian Safety. In areas that have been identified as having a disproportionately high number of pedestrian safety concerns, the City should initiate and support temporary signage and outreach materials to address identified problems or barriers to safety. Treatments could include mobile message boards and/or temporary banners.

M. Implement Gateway Treatments. At the non-freeway roadway entrances to Ann Arbor, the City should post regulatory signage that concisely summarizes the City's crosswalk ordinance requirements and related penalties. In conjunction with the regulatory signs, other outreach measures, such as temporary banners and mobile message boards should be utilized to support the messages of the public outreach campaign in a positive manner.

N. Set Priorities for the Sidewalk Snow Removal Ordinance Enforcement. The City should proactively enforce sidewalk clearance using the following priority areas: (1) within a ¼ mile of schools; (2) high volume bus stops; (3) established school pedestrian routes; (4) shopping districts; (5) near health care facilities; and (6) areas with known people with disabilities.

O. Establish Sidewalk Snow Removal Enforcement Appeal Process. To improve enforcement consistency, the City should use an administrative referee or hearing board (as is utilized by Ypsilanti and Madison, WI) to consider appeals to violations of the Sidewalk Snow Removal Ordinance. A description of what consists of "hardship" that would allow individuals to escape sanctions in the ordinance needs to be developed.

OBJECTIVE No. 3**IMPROVE THE PHYSICAL CONDITIONS OF THE ROADWAY AND PEDESTRIAN ENVIRONMENT TO REFLECT BEST PRACTICES FOR PEDESTRIAN SAFETY****PRIORITY RECOMMENDATIONS**

◆ Denotes top priority recommendations.

◆ **A. Adopt Design Guidelines that Promote Crosswalk Consistency.** The City should develop and adopt context sensitive design guidelines that provide consistent regulatory and warning messages for motorists and pedestrians. These guidelines should be based on applicable research and reflect current best practices. The City should set up a process to evaluate the understanding and effectiveness of various crosswalk treatments and adjust practices accordingly.

◆ **B. Improve Sight Lines Between Pedestrians and Motorists.** Provide sight lines that permit motorists to see pedestrians at or within crosswalks from a safe stopping distance at all crosswalks and in particular roundabout crosswalks. Towards this end, a citywide evaluation of existing conditions should be conducted and monitored on a regular basis. The evaluation should address vegetation, utility poles, controller boxes, topography, road geometry, etc.

◆ **C. Improve Lighting at Pedestrian Crossings.** Using best practices, such as the [FHWA Informational Report on Lighting Design for Midblock Crosswalks](#), provide lighting levels that permit motorists to see pedestrians at or within crosswalks from a safe stopping distance at all crosswalks and roundabout crosswalks under nighttime and low light conditions. Towards this end, a citywide evaluation of existing conditions should be conducted and monitored on a regular basis.

◆ **D. Utilize Active Warning Beacons at Crosswalks on Multi-lane Roads and Locations with Poor Visibility.** Provide active warning beacons (Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons, Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons or similar) at all unsignalized crosswalks on any road with three or more lanes or two or more lanes in the same direction; at roundabout crosswalks; or, in other locations where motorists may have difficulty detecting pedestrians at or within crosswalks. Where the safe stopping distance exceeds the night vision limit (typically on roads 35 mph or above), employ a combination of the following as necessary to remedy the issue: (1) reduce the speed of the roadway; (2) provide active warning beacons; and/or, (3) add full crosswalk signalization. Towards this end, a citywide evaluation of existing conditions should be initiated and the City should institute a process to re-evaluate mid-block crosswalks as

conditions change. These recommendations should not be used as a reason to remove or not install a crosswalk.

E. Utilize Advance Stop Bars at Unsignalized Mid-block Crosswalks. Mid-block pedestrian crosswalks traversing multiple lanes of traffic traveling in the same direction represent an especially hazardous situation for the pedestrian and should incorporate a number of features to alert motorists to the presence of a crosswalk and specifically drawing attention to a pedestrian who is currently crossing or waiting to cross the road. In addition to the use of active warning beacons or stop signals recommended in Objective 3D and 3K, respectively, the City should use advance stop bars as provided for in section 3B.16 of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). Advance stop bars should be utilized at all newly installed unsignalized mid-block crosswalks that cross a multilane roadway and should be retrofitted to all such existing crossings. When retrofitting existing crossings, priority should be given to those crossings where the motor vehicle speed limit is the highest. As noted in the MUTCD:

When drivers yield or stop too close to crosswalks that cross uncontrolled multi-lane approaches, they place pedestrians at risk by blocking other drivers' views of pedestrians and by blocking pedestrians' views of vehicles approaching in other lanes.⁵

F. Utilize Pedestrian Crossing Islands. Provide pedestrian crossing islands at all unsignalized marked crosswalks on arterial and collector roadways where the speed limit is 30 mph or greater and on two lane roads where traffic flow is such that there are not sufficient gaps for a pedestrian to cross without excessive delay. If not feasible, measures should be taken to lower speeds. Implementation priority should be given to roadways with three or more lanes, and in no case should a pedestrian be expected to cross more than three lanes without a pedestrian crossing island.

G. Reduce Conflicts by Restricting Turning Movements. Restrict right-on-red and left-on-red turning movements in cases where motorists do not have sufficient sight lines to safely make the turning movement without blocking crosswalks and/or in cases where there is a documented history of conflicts between turning vehicles and pedestrians. Enact a district wide elimination of right-on-red and left-on-red turning movements in the downtown.

H. Evaluate and Implement Alternative Signalization Approaches for Intersections with High Conflicts. In areas where there are significant conflicts between right-on-green motor vehicles and pedestrians in the crosswalk, evaluate and implement

⁵ Chapter 5 (Selecting Safety Solutions) of "How to Develop a Pedestrian Safety Action Plan", U.S. Dept. of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Publication FHWA-SA-05-12, March 2012 Revision, pp 58-59, provides strong supporting evidence for the use of advance stop bars or yield lines and signage for crosswalks on multi-lane streets. Use of RRFBs or red-flashing stop signals at all unsignalized crosswalks on multi-lane streets should be combined with the use of advance stop bars and signage at these locations.

alternative signalization approaches for the intersection that eliminate this conflict. These may include pedestrian scramble signals.

I. Coordination of Transit Stops and Crosswalks. The City and transit providers should continue to coordinate the placement of crosswalks and transit stops. The City and transit providers should jointly assess the safety and accessibility of transit stops and concur on the solution when changes are needed due to new development, construction, changes in transit service or user complaints.

J. Widen Shared Use Pathways. Existing 8' wide or narrower pathways that are designated to be shared by pedestrians, bicyclists and other non-motorized users should be widened to meet current American Association of State highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guidelines (10' to 14' wide). For pathways with heavy use by both pedestrians and bicyclists, the City should consider pavement markings or dual path configurations together with accompanying signage to delineate separate spaces for bicyclists and pedestrians.

K. Evaluate Red Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons. The City should apply to FHWA for permission to experiment and evaluate the effectiveness of using a red rectangular rapid flash beacon mounted below 'Stop Here for Pedestrian' signs (R1-5c and R1-5b) in comparison to the standard yellow rectangular rapid flash beacon mounted below the Pedestrian Warning Sign (W11-2). In such cases the 'Stop Here for Pedestrian' sign should be placed 20 to 40' in advance of the crosswalk and utilized in conjunction with a stop bar.

L. Sidewalk Drainage. As consistent with the ADA, sidewalks should be designed, constructed and maintained in such a manner as to avoid the accumulation of water and formation of ice on the sidewalk.

M. Ramp Drainage. Ramps should be designed, constructed and maintained in such a manner as to avoid the accumulation of water and formation of ice at the base of the ramp.

OBJECTIVE No. 4**ADDRESS THE SAFETY AND ACCESS FOR ALL USERS****PRIORITY RECOMMENDATIONS**

◆ Denotes top priority recommendations.

◆ **A. Make the Transportation System Accessible for All.** The City should embrace the challenge of making its transportation system fully accessible to persons of all abilities. The City should continue to engage the Commission on Disability Issues on the design of specific pedestrian improvements, ordinances and expand the use of best practices that promote safe, comfortable and convenient travel for individuals who rely on pedestrian networks for their daily transportation needs.

B. Minimize Conflict between Bicycles and Pedestrians. Cyclists using sidewalks are a serious perceived and real threat for pedestrians. The Task Force recommends that City Council make changes to further encourage cyclists to use the roadway instead of sidewalks, including providing additional facilities; accessing bike parking from the street; improving the City's ordinance on driving in bike lanes to increase the penalty; enforcement of the ordinance against driving in the bike lanes; enforcement of the laws regarding safe passing distances; and clearing of bike lanes, particularly in the winter. Where a dedicated bicycle lane is provided in the roadway and the sidewalk is typically congested with pedestrians, adult bicycling on the sidewalk should be prohibited with the exception of adults accompanying young children on bicycles.

C. Encourage Bicycles to stay off the Sidewalk in the Downtown. Provide an east-west bicycle highway through the downtown in order to keep bicycles off the sidewalks.

D. Install and Maintain Rumble Strips at Roundabouts and at Mid-block Crosswalks. The City should uniformly install and maintain rumble strips in advance of crosswalks at roundabouts and mid-block locations as an audible warning for all pedestrians.

E. Implement a Sidewalk Snow Removal Education Campaign. The City should engage in a multifaceted, multi-media public education campaign just prior to each winter season. The education campaign should underscore the importance of clearing snow and ice from sidewalks, crosswalks and crossing islands for the mobility and safety of all pedestrians. Special attention should be focused on the needs of school children and people with disabilities that rely on those systems for their daily transportation needs. The education campaign should specifically address who has the responsibility for clearing bus stops and bus shelters. All education materials should be easy to understand and include supporting graphics where applicable. These messages should be included on City publications, online messages, water bill,

WasteWatcher, and the City's website. Resources should also be provided to City Council members who are communicating to their constituents.

As part of the annual winter season education campaign, the City should provide, to all residents and business owners, an easy to understand explanation with supporting graphics of their responsibilities in regards to the sidewalk snow ordinance. The information should define the penalties for non-compliance, as well as available assistance for individuals with physical and/or financial hardships. Available resources, such as free sand/salt mixes provided by the City, should be noted. The materials should clearly convey that each property owner bears the ultimate responsibility for clearing the sidewalk in cases where contracted services or volunteer parties are utilized. Education materials regarding various methods of clearing a sidewalk should be provided. The pros and cons of various ice melt and traction materials or products should be provided with cost, environmental, effective temperature and pet safety considerations addressed.

◆ **F. Strengthen the Sidewalk Snow Removal Ordinance.** The City should amend the existing sidewalk ordinance (Chapter 49) to address winter maintenance requirements to: (1) eliminate the enforcement "loophole" that exists when new snow occurs within the clearance window of a previous snow fall; (2) provide a single warning to violators each winter season rather than one per snowfall; (3) clarify responsibility for clearing bus stops and bus shelters; (4) define the property owner as the ultimate responsible party; (5) require that all accumulation be cleared; (6) stipulate that all properties be cleared as soon as practicable but no later than 12 hours after the end of each accumulation.

◆ **G. Improve Road Snow Removal Practices to Eliminate Snow Piles on Pedestrian Routes.** The City should investigate solutions and associated costs to amend its current street snow clearance practices. The goal should be to eliminate impassable snow piles left in the crosswalk, sidewalk ramps, crossing islands and bus stops. City practices should be such that an accessible pedestrian route is provided in a timely manner concurrent with the clearance of the streets. The City should place a high priority on implementing the preferred solution.

◆ **H. Research Feasibility of City Undertaking Snow and Ice Removal on Public Sidewalks.** The City should undertake and assess the financial, operational feasibility and level of community support of the City undertaking snow and ice removal on the City's public sidewalk system.

I. Provide Ice Mitigation Resources. The City should increase the availability and distribution points of the free sand and salt mix so there are distribution points in each ward and most residents are within 1-2 miles of a distribution point.

J. Establish a Sidewalk Snow Assistance Removal Program. Create an assistance program that includes public and private non-profit partnerships. Disabled residents and other residents who meet a definition for assistance can locate and use low or no cost help.

OBJECTIVE No. 5**REDUCE DISTRACTIONS AND MINIMIZE CONSEQUENCES****PRIMARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

◆ Denotes top priority recommendations.

- ◆ **A. Implement a Distracted Driving / Walking Campaign.** The City of Ann Arbor, through a multifaceted multi-media campaign, should utilize existing resources to raise awareness of the dangers of distracted driving and distracted walking.
- ◆ **B. Implement Local Ordinance that Bans the Use of Hand-held and Hands Free Devices by Vehicle Operators.** The City should enact and enforce an ordinance that bans the use of hand-held and hands-free devices by all operators of motorized vehicles or bicycles (police excepted) and make the use of such a primary enforced law.
- ◆ **C. Implement Arterial and Collector Traffic Management to Encourage Driving Speeds of 30 mph or Less.** Measures should be routinely employed on arterial and collector roadways as necessary to minimize the likelihood of death or severe injury to pedestrians crossing the road. Towards that end, all arterial and collector roads that have a posted speed limit greater than 30 mph or where the 85 percentile speed is greater than 30 mph should be evaluated for geometric, signal timing and roadside improvements that have been shown to reduce the speed of motor vehicles. The desired state is to have the 85 percentile speeds and the road designed for travel at 30 mph or less.
- ◆ **D. Implement Local Road Traffic Management to Encourage Driving Speeds of 25 mph or Less.** Measures should be routinely employed on residential streets and school zones as necessary to minimize the likelihood of death or severe injury to pedestrians within, or crossing, the road. Towards that end, any residential street where the 85 percentile speed is greater than 25 mph or a school zone where the 85 percentile speed is greater than 25 mph during school hours should be evaluated for geometric, signal timing and roadside improvements that have been shown to reduce the speed of motor vehicles. The desired state is to have the 85 percentile speeds and the road designed for travel at 25 mph or less.
- E. Work toward Lower Speed Limits Citywide of 25 mph or Less.** To minimize the likelihood of death or severe injury to all users of the roadway and to increase reaction time resulting from distracted driving, the City should work toward posted speed of all non-freeway roads in the City of Ann Arbor being 25 mph or less.
- F. Lobby for Greater Local Control Over Speed Limits.** The City should advocate at the State legislative level for providing municipalities with additional flexibility and authority to

exercise control over the administration of traffic safety measures such as speed reduction (New York City has done this in conjunction with their Vision Zero Program).

G. Partner with Research Institutions. The City should partner with research institutions to develop and test various engineering, education, ordinance and enforcement solutions targeted towards minimizing distracted driving.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1. ADVOCACY AND OVERSIGHT

A. Identify a Pedestrian Champion. The City should designate an authoritative public official to champion and promote pedestrian safety and access throughout the city; and provide them with adequate funding and staff support.

B. Establish a Standing Committee that Specifically Addresses Pedestrian Safety and Access. The City should establish an ongoing official board or committee to address pedestrian safety and access issues and to oversee the implementation of the recommendations included in this document. This committee should include representatives of the University of Michigan to coordinate City and University initiatives. This committee could also be expanded to include all non-motorized transportation.

2. PLANNING

A. Prepare a Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. The City should prepare a comprehensive Pedestrian Safety Action Plan based on the FHWA model that incorporates the recommendations included in this document.

B. Update Goals and Objectives in Related City Plans. As part of the plan update process; the City should update the Goals and Objectives of the City's Non-motorized Transportation Plan and Transportation Master Plan.

See Appendix G: Updating Non-motorized Plans' Goals and Objectives for more information.

C. Develop Implementation Scenarios for Recommendations in this Document. Based on the recommendations included in this document, the City should develop an estimate of the costs and locations for improvements. These may be used to consider funding and implementation scenarios.

D. Develop a Street Design Process/Approval Process. A process similar to that outlined in the Downtown Street Design Manual, should be employed citywide. Systems Planning, Field Operations, Planning & Development, and the Ann Arbor Area Transportation Authority (AAATA) (the full Street Design Team) should all be involved in designing our streets. Existing pedestrian facilities should not be removed without the agreement of the full Street Design Team.

3. FUNDING

Our recommendations are addressing unmet or under-met needs, and all of these things take money. Funding is simply the largest, over-arching issue that determines what can be accomplished over what timeframe, whether it be the planning, engineering, and installation of physical measures to improve pedestrian safety and access; education and publicity campaigns to change driver and pedestrian behavior, or increased enforcement of traffic laws.

The Task Force believes that the identification of funding mechanisms to support increased pedestrian safety and access is a next-stage question that requires research and discussion beyond the time, resources and knowledge levels currently available to the Task Force. The issues to be addressed are multiple and complex, for example:

- What funding mechanisms are currently available to address pedestrian safety and access needs and what new mechanisms might be identified through further research and creative thinking?
- What percentage of transportation spending, or what dollar amount, should be allocated to pedestrian safety and access?
- How should allocated funds be divided between infrastructure needs, enforcement needs, and informational and educational needs?
- How should spending be allocated and prioritized over time given that this spending needs to address both on-going and one-time or irregular expenses?

The Task Force recommends that the identification of funding mechanisms be given the highest priority in the development of a Pedestrian Safety Action Plan in conjunction with a standing committee on pedestrian safety and access. Further, though we fully realize the continuing budgetary challenges posed by a constrained revenue stream and escalating costs for new and on-going services, we nevertheless urge the City to increase its funding for pedestrian safety and access infrastructure and enforcement. In our recommendations we have embraced the Vision Zero concept as an overall goal, and if Ann Arbor is to achieve that goal, and achieve the overall level of pedestrian safety and access envisioned in our recommendations, it will require a mix of city-, state-, and federally-derived funds, including perhaps, new, on-going, sources of funding that would be dedicated to pedestrian safety and access measures. Increasing the allocation of City funds devoted to achieving that goal would be a helpful first step.

And finally, the Task Force hopes that where the installation of pedestrian safety measures such as crosswalk RRFB's primarily or exclusively serve the University faculty/student/staff population that the University will step forward as a major financial participant in the installation.

The following recommendations provide a general direction that will need to be expanded in the Pedestrian Safety Action Plan.

A. Develop Prioritization System and Yearly Budget for Road Safety Design Funding. The City should develop a prioritization system and yearly budget for traffic

management measures with an emphasis on proximity to schools, pedestrian crash history, professional evaluation and reported incidents.

B. Provide Incentives to Keep Pedestrian Routes Open During Construction.

The City should re-evaluate the costs to developers for closing a pedestrian route for construction relative to the cost for keeping it open, and should adjust fees as necessary to give the developer an incentive to keep a pedestrian route open.

The City should consider waiving the meter bag fee when metered parking spaces are being closed for the purpose of providing a place for pedestrians to walk at a construction site.

C. Evaluate a Millage for Funding Pedestrian Improvements. The City should evaluate the following options for funding pedestrian safety measures:

- a) A stand alone, short duration .125 mills millage for funding crosswalk improvements throughout the city. At this rate a two year millage would raise just over \$1 million.
- b) As part of the Street and Sidewalk Repair and Reconstruction millage renewal in 2016, increase the sidewalk portion to .2 mills, and include crosswalk improvements as part of the street/sidewalk repair and reconstruction. This would result in an increase of .075 mills, or just under \$350,000 per year. This would result in 10% of the road infrastructure funding directed towards pedestrian safety improvements.

RECOMMENDED DATA COLLECTION

Understanding that there are limited resources available, the Task Force has identified the following data resources that would be helpful in evaluating existing conditions and determining future improvements:

1. Data inventory of pedestrian slip and fall injuries as it relates to winter sidewalk maintenance. Hospital records may be a resource in acquiring this information.
2. A comparison analysis of sidewalk gap data and crash data to identify if there are any patterns associated to pedestrian crashes where sidewalks are not present.
3. An analysis of vulnerable populations in relation to pedestrian crashes, such as crashes involving children or seniors.
4. Crosswalk analysis to identify spacing between existing crosswalks, including marked and unmarked crosswalks, to determine where additional mid-block crosswalks may be needed.
5. Pedestrian counts in consistent locations over time.
6. Text based UD10 versions of all of Ann Arbor's pedestrian crashes.
7. Provide a succinct overview (e.g. one page brief) of the American Community Survey (ACS) data showing pedestrian travel over time in Ann Arbor. U.S. Census data should be incorporated to illustrate changes in the percentage of trips over time.
8. Use data collected by Washtenaw Bicycling and Walking Coalition (WBWC) as a resource.

APPENDIX

- A. Glossary of Terms**
- B. Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force Work Plan and Schedule**
- C. Current Crosswalk Ordinance Language**
- D. Vision Zero Resources**
- E. Proposed Sidewalk Gap Prioritization Model**
- F. Multi-faceted Public Outreach Campaign Ideas**
- G. Updating Non-motorized Plan Goals and Objectives**

APPENDIX A. GLOSSARY OF TERMS

The following terms and acronyms are used in this document. You may also refer to the [MDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Terminology Booklet](#) for additional descriptions with example images.

AASHTO – American Association of State Highway & Transportation Officials.

Arterial Road– See functional classification.

Collector Road– See functional classification.

Crossing Islands – a raised median within a roadway typically set between opposing directions of traffic that permits pedestrians to cross the roadway in two stages. A crossing island may be located at any crosswalk. These are also known as refuge islands.

Crosswalk – the area of a roadway that connects sidewalks on either side at an intersection of roads (whether marked or not marked) and other locations distinctly indicated for pedestrian crossings by pavement markings.

FHWA – Federal Highway Administration

Functional Classification – the process by which streets and highways are grouped into classes, or systems, according to the character of traffic service that they are intended to provide. There are three highway functional classifications: arterial, collector and local roads. All streets and highways are grouped in one of these classes, depending on the character of the traffic (i.e., local or long distance) and the degree of land access that they allow

Arterial: Provides the highest level of service at the greatest speed for the longest uninterrupted distance, with some degree of access control. (i.e., Washtenaw Ave.)

Collector: Provides a less highly developed level of service at a lower speed for shorter distances by collecting traffic from local roads and connecting them with arterials. (i.e., S. Seventh St.)

Local: Consists of all roads not defined as arterials or collectors; primarily provides access to land with little or no through movement. (i.e., S. Revena Blvd.)

Local Road – See functional classification.

Mid-block Crosswalk – a crosswalk identified through pavement markings that is not located at the intersection of roadways.

MDOT – Michigan Department of Transportation

MMUTCD – Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices. This document is based on the National Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). It specifies how signs, pavement markings and traffic signals are to be used.

Mode – distinct types of transportation (cars, bicycles and pedestrians are all different modes of travel).

NACTO - National Association of City Transportation Officials.

Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon – See warning beacon.

Rectangular Rapids Flash Beacon – See warning beacon.

Roadway – the road in its entirety including bike lanes, crosswalks, crossing islands etc.

Roundabouts – yield-based circular intersections that permit continuous travel movement.

Scramble Signals – also known as a “Barnes Dance” or a “Pedestrian Scramble” is where all vehicular traffic is stopped and pedestrians are permitted to cross any crosswalk, including crossing the intersection diagonally, at the same time.

Shared Use Path – a wide pathway that is separate from a roadway by the minimum an open unpaved space or barrier or located completely away from a roadway. A shared use path is shared by bicyclists and pedestrians. The Gallup Park Path is an example of a shared use path.

Signalized Crosswalk – a crosswalk where motor vehicle and pedestrian movements are controlled by traffic signals. These are most frequently a part of a signalized roadway intersection but a signal may be installed solely to facilitate pedestrian crossings. These do not include warning beacons.

Warning beacon – warning device used at non-signalized locations or mid-block crosswalks to assist pedestrian in crossing at a marked crosswalk.

Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon – also known as HAWK (High intensity Activated crossWALK), is a pedestrian-activated device used to warn and control traffic at a non-signalized location to assist pedestrians in crossing at a marked crosswalk. The beacon head consists of two red lenses above a single yellow lens. The beacon head is “dark” until the pedestrian desires to cross the street and activates the device.

Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacon – abbreviated as RRFB, are user-actuated amber LEDs that supplement warning signs at unsignalized intersections or mid-block crosswalks. They are typically activated by pedestrians manually via a push button but may also be activated passively by a pedestrian detection system. RRFBs use an irregular flash pattern that is similar to emergency flashers on police vehicles.

APPENDIX B. PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AND ACCESS TASK FORCE WORK PLAN & SCHEDULE⁶

Community Outreach & Engagement Strategy

Seeking input from the members of the community and discussing issues with city staff was a major component of the Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force (the “Task Force”) effort. Due to the complexity and breadth of the work plan, a subgroup of the Task Force, along with City staff, participated in the competitive process of reviewing proposals and interviewing consultant facilitators to assist with their effort. The Greenway Collaborative was chosen by the selection committee to facilitate the involvement of the following groups.

- **Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force**
City Council appointed members with a broad range of perspectives.
- **Resource Group**
City staff representing several disciplines.
- **Stakeholders**
Including individual citizens; neighborhood associations; citizen-based organizations; public officials; public agencies; private sector groups; media outlets.
- **Public/Community**
Any and all city residents, stakeholders and others interested in providing input toward formulation of the Task Force recommendations.

The roles and responsibilities for each of these groups are described below.

1. Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force

As stated in the November 18, 2013, City Council resolution (R-13-367): *the City Council will appoint a Task Force that will consist of nine (9) residents, and shall include representatives from organizations that address the needs of school aged youth, senior citizens, pedestrian safety, and people with mobility impairments. The Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force will explore strategies to improve pedestrian safety and access within a framework of shared responsibility through community outreach and data collection, and will recommend to Council improvements in the development and application of the Complete Streets model, using best practices, sound data and objective analysis*

⁶ Text in Appendix B “Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force Work Plan & Schedule” has been prepared by City of Ann Arbor staff.

The Task Force also provided guidance on the best approaches for engaging other stakeholder groups and the broader public over the course of their effort.

Early in the process the Task Force determined that some of their work effort would be best accomplished by subcommittees who then reported back to the full Task Force for final deliberation and decision making. Four subcommittees were formed:

- Winter Maintenance Subcommittee
- Crosswalk Education/Outreach/Enforcement/Law Subcommittee
- Crosswalk Budget/CIP Subcommittee
- Crosswalk Consistency Subcommittee

The full Task Force met 18 times during the 17-month period. All meetings of the full Task Force and its subcommittees were posted in the lobby display case at City Hall, posted on the Task Force webpage, and on the city's online calendars. The Open Meetings Act rules were followed for all meetings.

2. Resource Group

The Resource Group, composed of City staff, provided background information and data, analysis expertise and supported and assisted the Task Force with other components of their 17-month work effort.

Typically, the Resource Group met prior to Task Force meetings and/or stakeholder or city-wide meetings to review materials, prepare background documents and to discuss recommended format for Task Force public engagement activities.

Typical Resource Group activities related to the Task Force work effort components included:

- Assisting with a stakeholder analysis and Community Outreach and Engagement Plan; corresponding with stakeholder groups and managing contact distribution lists.
- Assisting with agenda preparation for Task Force, stakeholder, and city-wide meetings.
- Advertising public meetings or other project events (e.g., press releases, newsletters, social media posts).
- Coordinating meeting logistics (e.g., space reservation, equipment provisioning).
- Reviewing content prior to public distribution (e.g., meeting presentations and written materials/communications).

- Updating information and resources on the city website (a2gov.org/pedsafety).
- Providing technical expertise and interpretation of data and background information; attend Task Force meetings when needed.

3. Stakeholders

Stakeholders included a range of groups and community members with an interest in, or involvement with, pedestrian safety issues and whose input was important to the development of Task Force recommendations. Engagement methods for stakeholders included focus groups and interviews designed to offer special opportunities to review and comment on materials during the issues identifications phase.

A list of stakeholders invited to participate is provided.

4. Public/Community

The general public participated in the process through a series of three (3) city-wide meetings during the 17-month period.

Additionally, over 400 participants identified locations of specific issues on a web-based map and over 900 participants prioritized and refined identified issues using an online survey during the issues identification phase of the process.

Finally, over 100 participants shared feedback using the City's online discussion forum, A2 Open City Hall, about which Task Force recommendations were most important to them during the draft recommendations phase of the process.

Work Plan

The Task Force work plan was composed of seven tasks: (Work Plan Schedule and Outline Agendas & Work Plan provided for more detail)

- Task A: Identify Goals & Objectives
- Task B: Develop Community Outreach & Engagement Plan
- Task C: Ongoing Communications
- Task D: Determine Data Types & Issues Identification
- Task E: Analysis & Prioritization
- Task F: Safety Solution Alternatives & Funding Options
- Task G: Pedestrian Safety Action Plan Elements

Pedestrian Safety and Access Stakeholder Focus Groups
Invited Stakeholders

Non-profit Groups, Environmental Organizations and Neighborhood Associations
Allen Creek Greenway Conservancy
Ann Arbor Tree Conservancy
Ann Arbor Center for Independent Living (AACIL)
Community Action Network (CAN)
Get Downtown
Recycle Ann Arbor
Registered City of Ann Arbor Neighborhood Associations
Save our Streets (SOS)
Washtenaw Biking and Walking Coalition (WBWC)
Boards, Commissions, Agencies and Public Groups
ALT Committee
Ann Arbor Area Transit Authority (AAATA)
Ann Arbor District Library (AADL)
Ann Arbor Public Schools (AAPS)
Ann Arbor Public Schools Bus Transportation (Coordinated through Washtenaw Intermediate School District)
Ann Arbor Public Schools Crossing Guards (Coordinated through City of Ann Arbor Police Department)
Ann Arbor Public Schools Transportation Safety Committee
Ann Arbor Railroad (AARR)
Commission on Disability Issues
Concordia University
DTE Energy
Historic District Commission (HDC)
Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT)
Planning Commission
University of Michigan Architecture Engineering & Construction
University of Michigan Dean of Students
University of Michigan Government Relations
University of Michigan Parking and Transportation Services
University of Michigan Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning
Washtenaw Intermediate School District
Business Organizations/ Commercial Neighborhoods
Ann Arbor Area Convention & Visitors Bureau
Downtown Development Authority
Kerrytown District Association
Main Street Area Association
S. University Area Association
State Street Area Association
Washtenaw Area Apartment Association (WAAA)

Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force (PSATF) Work Plan Schedule

	April '14	End of April '14	June '14	July '14	Aug '14	Sep '14	Oct '14	Nov '14	Dec '14	Jan '15	Feb '15	Mar '15	Apr '15	May '15	Jun '15	Jul '15	Aug '15	End of Aug '15	Sept '15
Meeting Topics:	Task F: Safety Solution Alternatives & Funding Options																		
	Task E: Analysis & Prioritization																		
Resource Group Meetings	Task D: Determine Data Types & Issues Identification																		
	Task C: Ongoing Communications																		
PSATF Meetings	Task B: Develop Community Outreach & Engagement Plan																		
	Task A: Identify Goals & Objectives																		
Stakeholder Focus Group	Task F: Safety Solution Alternatives & Funding Options																		
	Task E: Analysis & Prioritization																		
Community-at-large Meeting	Task D: Determine Data Types & Issues Identification																		
	Task C: Ongoing Communications																		
Surveys & Online Feedback Opportunities	Task D: Determine Data Types & Issues Identification																		
	Task C: Ongoing Communications																		
Crowdsourcing Maps	Task D: Determine Data Types & Issues Identification																		
	Task C: Ongoing Communications																		
Task Force Work Approach & Timeline Open Meetings Act Agenda Development	Meeting #1, Thur. Fri. April 4 pm																		
Officers Nominations, Documents retrieval, Consultant Selection			Meeting #2, Thur. Mon. April 28 pm																
Stakeholder List, Consultant Selection			Meeting #3, Thu. June 5 pm																
Goals & Objectives	Tue. July 8		Meeting #4, Thu. July 17 pm																
Community Outreach & Engagement	Wed. Aug 6		Meeting #5, Wed. Aug 20 pm																
Data Types	Mon. Aug 25		Meeting #6, Wed. Sep 3 pm																
Winter Maintenance	Mon. Sep 22		Meeting #7, Wed. Oct 1 pm																
Crossing the Road	Mon. Oct 27		Meeting #8, Wed. Nov 5 pm																
Sidewalks and Shared Use Paths	Mon. Nov 24		Meeting #9, Wed. Dec 3 pm																
Complete Streets Part 1	Mon. Dec 22		Meeting #10, Wed. Jan 7 pm																
Complete Streets Part 2	Mon. Jan 26		Meeting #11, Wed. Feb 4 pm																
Planning and Engineering Recommendations	Mon. Feb 23		Meeting #12, Wed. Mar 4 pm																
Education, Enforcement & Legislation Recommendations	Mon. Mar 23		Meeting #13, Wed. Apr 1 pm																
Operations, Funding & Implementation Recommendations	Mon. Apr 27		Meeting #14, Wed. May 6 pm																
Review Draft Recommendations	Mon. Jun 22		Meeting #15, Wed. Jun 3 pm																
Finalize Recommendations	Mon. Jul 27		Meeting #16, Wed. Aug 5 pm																
Final Approval			Meeting #17, Wed. Aug 5 pm																
Presentation at City Council																			

PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AND ACCESS TASK FORCE OUTLINE AGENDAS

The Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force met 18 times over the course of sixteen months. The following document outlines meeting agendas and attendance for all 18 meetings.

MEETING #1

Date: Friday, April 4, 2014

Time: 2:00 - 4:00 pm

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

Attendees: Task Force members present: 9; Vivienne Armentrout; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark; Neal Elyakin; Linda Diane Feldt; Owen Jansson; Anthony Pinnell; Sarah Pressprich Gryniewicz; Jim Rees

Public Present: 4; Dave Askins, Kathy Griswold, Donna Estabrook, Lou Case

Council members present: 1; Sabra Briere (Ward 1)

City staff present: 2; Kayla Coleman, Connie Pulcipher

1. Introductions
2. Proposed Work Approach & Timeline
 - a) Study Area
 - b) Task Force Authority
 - c) Task Force Charter
3. Recommendations for April 7 City Council Meeting
4. Project Information Retrieval
 - a) Project Webpage
 - b) Cloud-based Document Storage
5. Meeting Logistics
 - a) Open Meetings Act Requirements
 - b) Agenda Development
 - c) Preferred Meeting Times
 - d) Meeting Locations
6. Next Steps
7. Public Commentary

MEETING #2

Date: Monday, April 28, 2014

Time: 3:00 – 5:00 pm

Location: 6th floor conference room – Larcom City Hall (301 E. Huron Street)

Attendees: Task Force members present: 7; Vivienne Armentrout; Scott Campbell; Linda Diane Feldt; Owen Jansson; Anthony Pinnell; Sarah Pressprich Gryniewicz; Jim Rees

Task Force members absent: 2; Kenneth Clark; Neal Elyakin

Public Present: 4; Donna Estabrook, Larry Deck, Nancy Kaplan, Dave Askins

City staff present: 2; Kayla Coleman, Connie Pulcipher

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Meeting #1 Summary
3. Request for Proposals (RFP) update
4. Officers: Chair and Secretary
 - a) Roles and Responsibility
 - b) Nominations
5. Project Information Retrieval
 - a) Project Webpage
 - b) Cloud-based Document Storage
6. Meeting Logistics
 - a) Roberts Rules
 - b) Agenda Development
 - c) Preferred Meeting Times
7. Next Steps
8. Public Commentary

MEETING #3

Date: Friday, June 6, 2014

Time: 5:00 – 7:00 pm

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

Attendees: Task Force members present: 8; Vivienne Armentrout; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark; Linda Diane Feldt; Owen Jansson; Anthony Pinnell; Sarah Pressprich Grynewicz; Jim Rees
Task Force members absent: 1; Neal Elyakin

City staff present: 2; Kayla Coleman, Connie Pulcifer, Eli Cooper

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Meeting #2 Summary
3. Consultant Selection update
 - a) Pre-City Council Meeting Communications/Talking Points
4. Eli Cooper, Transportation Program Manager Q & A
5. Google Groups Committee Update
6. Priority Issues Synthesis & Organization Committee Update
7. Meeting Logistics
 - a) Discussion Summary Procedures
8. Stakeholder and Resource Group Explanation
9. Next Steps
 - a) Agenda items for next meeting
10. Public Commentary

Resource Group Participation:

Eli Cooper, Transportation Program Manger

MEETING #4: Goals and Objectives

Date: Thursday, July 17, 2014

Time: 5:00 – 7:00 pm

Location: Program Room – Traverwood Library (3333 Traverwood Drive)

Attendees: Task Force members present: 9; Vivienne Armentrout; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark; Linda Diane Feldt; Owen Jansson; Anthony Pinnell; Sarah Pressprich Gryniewicz; Jim Rees; Neal Elyakin

Public Present: 1; Steven Kronenberg

City staff present: 1; Connie Pulcipher

Consultant present (The Greenway Collaborative): 2; Norm Cox; Carolyn Prudhomme

1. Approval of Agenda Introductions
2. Approval of Meeting #3 Summary
3. Work Plan Understanding
 - a) Addressing Task Force Priorities within the Process Framework
 - b) Building an Annotated Outline for the Pedestrian Safety Action Plan
4. Goals & Objectives
 - a) City Council Resolution to Appoint a Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force
 - b) City of Ann Arbor 2013 Non-motorized Transportation Plan
5. Crowdsourcing Tools
6. Next Steps
 - a) Set Future Meeting Dates
 - b) Community Outreach & Engagement Plan
 - c) Homework
7. Public Commentary

MEETING #5: Community Outreach & Engagement

Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2014

Time: 5:00 - 7:00 pm

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

Attendees: Task Force members present: 8; Vivienne Armentrout; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark; Linda Diane Feldt; Owen Jansson; Anthony Pinnell; Sarah Pressprich Gryniewicz; Jim Rees
Task Force members absent: 1; Neal Elyakin

Public Present: Larry Deck

City staff present: 1; Connie Pulcipher

Consultant present (The Greenway Collaborative): 2; Norm Cox; Carolyn Prudhomme

1. Approve Agenda
2. Meeting #4 Discussion Summary
3. Public Comment Proposal
4. Approve amendments to PSAP Annotated Outline
5. Community Engagement Strategy
6. Initial List of Priority Issues
7. Sample Resources and Issues Documents
 - a) Winter Maintenance
 - b) Sidewalk Gaps

8. Next Steps & Homework
 - a) Work Plan and Draft Outline Agendas
 - b) Data Types
 - c) Confirm Attendance for Next Meeting
9. Public Commentary

MEETING #6: Determine Data Types

Date: Wednesday, September 3, 2014

Time: 5:00 - 7:00 pm

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

Attendees: Task Force members present: 8; Vivienne Armentrout; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark; Linda Diane Feldt; Anthony Pinnell; Sarah Pressprich Grynewicz; Jim Rees; Neal Elyakin
Task Force members absent: 1; Owen Jansson

Public Present: 3; Kathy Griswold; Marilyn Tower; Seth Peterson

Council members present: 1; Sabra Briere (Ward 1)

City staff present: 7; Eli Cooper; Deb Gosselin; Nick Hutchinson; Jeff Kahan; Connie Pulcifer; Cresson Slotten; Matt Warba

Consultant present (The Greenway Collaborative): 2; Norm Cox; Carolyn Prudhomme

1. Introductions
2. Approve Agenda
3. Public Commentary
4. Approval of Meeting #5 Discussion Summary
5. Approve amendments to PSAP Annotated Outline
6. Data Types Q & A Panel
 - a) Crash Analysis Data
 - b) Pedestrian Counts
 - c) Sidewalk Inventory
 - d) Crosswalk Inventory
 - e) AAATA Data
 - f) Lighting Inventory
 - g) Existing Projects and Programs
 - h) Design Manuals and Standards
7. Next Steps & Homework
 - a) Draft Outline Agendas and Work Plan
 - b) October 1st Task Force Meeting
 - c) Confirm Attendance for Next Meeting
 - d) Next Round of Issues and Resources Briefs

Resource Group Participation: Staff Discussion Panel for Q & A Panel

Cresson Slotten, Systems Planning Unit Manger

Deb Gosselin, Systems Planning Engineer

Matt Warba, Assistant Manager Field Operations Services

Eli Cooper, Transportation Program Manager

Jeff Kahan, City Planner

Nick Hutchinson, Project Management Manager

MEETING #7: Winter Maintenance

Date: Wednesday, October 1, 2014

Time: 5:00 - 7:00 pm

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

Attendees: Task Force members present: 8; Vivienne Armentrout; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark; Linda Diane Feldt; Anthony Pinnell; Sarah Pressprich Gryniowicz; Neal Elyakin; Owen Jansson

Task Force members absent: 1; Jim Rees

Public Present: 4; Larry Deck; Kathy Griswold; Seth Peterson; Paul Tinkerhess

Council members present: 1; Sabra Briere (Ward 1)

City staff present: 3; Robert Kellar; Connie Pulcipher; Lawrence Schroeder

Consultant present (The Greenway Collaborative): 2; Norm Cox; Carolyn Prudhomme

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Public Commentary
4. Approval of Meeting #6 Discussion Summary
5. Approve amendments to PSAP Annotated Outline
6. Local Winter Maintenance Example Program
 - a) Snow Buddy Presentation by Paul Tinkerhess
7. Winter Maintenance Near-term Action Items
 - a) Snow Buddy Evaluation Options
 - b) Enforcement of Existing Ordinance Through A2 Fix It Promotion
 - c) Education & Outreach Brainstorming Session
8. Winter Maintenance Long Term Policy Discussion
 - a) Issues with Existing Ordinance
 - b) Model Ordinances from Other Communities
 - c) Recommended Ordinance Modifications
 - d) Prioritization
9. Next Step
 - a) Draft Outline Agendas and Work Plan
 - b) Upcoming Public Engagement
 - c) Confirm Attendance for Next Meeting
 - d) Crosswalk Issues and Resources Brief addressed at November Meeting
10. Public Commentary

Resource Group Participation:

Robert Kellar, Communications Specialist

Lawrence Schroeder, Community Standards Representative

MEETING #8: Crossing the Road

Date: Wednesday, November 5, 2014

Time: 5:00 - 7:00 pm

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

Attendees: Task Force members present: 9; Vivienne Armentrout; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark; Linda Diane Feldt; Anthony Pinnell; Sarah Pressprich Gryniwicz; Neal Elyakin; Owen Jansson; Jim Rees

Public Present: 9; Clark Charnetski; Robert Gorden; Kathy Griswold; Devante Hargrow; Eleanor Linn; Eric Lipson; Bob Oneal; Seth Peterson; Marilyn Tower

State Representatives Present: 1; Adam Zemke

Council members present: 2; Sabra Briere (Ward 1); Jane Lumm (Ward 2)

City staff present: 3; Eli Cooper; Connie Pulcipher; Cynthia Redinger

Consultant present (The Greenway Collaborative): 2; Norm Cox; Carolyn Prudhomme

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Public Commentary
4. Approval of Meeting #7 Discussion Summary
5. Status of amendments to PSAP Annotated Outline
6. Winter Maintenance Policy Proposal
 - a) Prioritization of winter maintenance enforcement
7. Crosswalk Brief Follow-up Discussion
 - a) Crosswalk Laws
 - i) Presentation by State Representative Adam Zemke
 - b) Consistency of mid-block crosswalk design, beacons, signing and marking
 - c) Education/outreach/enforcement
 - d) Budget/CIP Integration
8. Action Items
 - a) Subcommittee formation and direction
 - b) Approach to recommendations for City Staff and Council
9. Round 1 Public Engagement
 - a) Stakeholder Focus Groups
 - b) Survey and Crowdsourcing Maps
 - c) Community Wide Meeting
10. Next Steps & Homework
 - a) Confirm Attendance for Next Meeting
 - b) Next Round of Issues and Resources Brief
11. Public Commentary

Resource Group Participation:

Eli Cooper, Transportation Program Manager

Cynthia Redinger, Traffic Engineer

MEETING #9: Sidewalks and Shared Use Paths

Date: Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Time: 5:00 - 7:00 pm

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

Attendees: Task Force members present: 8; Vivienne Armentrout; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark; Linda Diane Feldt; Sarah Pressprich Grynewicz; Neal Elyakin; Owen Jansson; Jim Rees
Task Force members absent: 1; Anthony Pinnell

Public Present: 1; Kathy Griswold

Council members present: 1; Sabra Briere (Ward 1)

City staff present: 3; Deb Gosselin; Nick Hutchinson; Connie Pulcipher

Consultant present (The Greenway Collaborative): 2; Norm Cox; Carolyn Prudhomme

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Public Commentary
4. Approval of Meeting #8 Discussion Summary
5. Round 1 Public Engagement Update
6. Subcommittee Updates
 - a) Prioritization of winter maintenance enforcement
 - b) Sidewalk maintenance ordinance
 - c) Crosswalk Education/Outreach/Enforcement/Law Subcommittee
7. Approve Correspondence regarding postponed City Council resolutions related to pedestrian safety and access
 - a) Crosswalk Law
 - b) Vegetation
8. Sidewalk Prioritization Overview by Deb Gosselin and Nick Hutchinson
9. Discussion and Action Items
 - a) Sidewalk Gaps Prioritization
 - b) Shared Use Paths
 - c) Connector Sidewalks
 - d) Vegetation – encroachment and sight lines
 - e) Funding & Policies
10. Next Steps
 - a) Next Round of Issues and Resources Brief
11. Public Commentary

Resource Group Participation:

Nick Hutchinson, Project Manager

Deb Gosselin, Systems Planning Engineer

MEETING #10: Complete Streets Part 1 (Bicycle-Related, Traffic Management, Work Zone-Related)**Date:** Wednesday, January 7, 2015**Time:** 5:00 - 7:00 pm**Location:** Basement Conference Room – Larcom City Hall (301 E. Huron Street)**Attendees:** Task Force members present: 7; Vivienne Armentrout; Scott Campbell; Linda Diane Feldt; Sarah Pressprich Gryniewicz; Neal Elyakin; Anthony Pinnell; Jim Rees

Task Force members absent: 2; Owen Jansson; Kenneth Clark

Public Present: 4; Kathy Griswold; Richard Hausman; Barbara Lucas; Eric Lipson

City staff present: 3; Eli Cooper; Cynthia Redinger; Connie Pulcipher

Consultant present (The Greenway Collaborative): 2; Norm Cox; Carolyn Prudhomme

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Public Commentary
4. Approval of Meeting #9 Discussion Summary
5. Discussion and Action Items
 - a) Traffic Management
 - b) Work-zone Related
 - c) Bicycle-Related
6. Update on the Proposed Sidewalk Snow and Ice Ordinance
7. Snowbuddy Update
8. Subcommittee Updates
 - a) Crosswalk Budget/CIP Subcommittee
9. Next Steps
 - a) Next Round of Issues and Resources Brief
10. Public Commentary

*Resource Group Participation:**Eli Cooper, Transportation Program Manager**Cynthia Redinger, Traffic Engineer***MEETING #11: Complete Streets Part 2 (Land Use/Site Design, Transit-Related)****Date:** Wednesday, February 4, 2015**Time:** 5:00 - 7:00 pm**Location:** Basement Conference Room – Larcom City Hall (301 E. Huron Street)**Attendees:** Task Force members present: 5; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark; Linda Diane Feldt; Anthony Pinnell; Jim Rees

Task Force members absent: 4; Vivienne Armentrout; Owen Jansson; Neal Elyakin; Sarah Pressprich Gryniewicz;

Public Present: 5; Kathy Griswold; Barbara Lucas; Eric Lipson; Larry Deck; Seth Peterson

City staff present: 3; Eli Cooper (via phone); Jeff Kahan; Connie Pulcipher

Consultant present (The Greenway Collaborative): 2; Norm Cox; Carolyn Prudhomme

1. Introduction
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Public Commentary
4. Approval of Meeting #10 Discussion Summary
5. Discussion and Action Items
 - a) Land use/site design
 - b) Roundabouts
 - c) Transit-related
 - d) U of M Council for Disability Update
6. Update on the Proposed Sidewalk Snow and Ice Ordinance
7. Subcommittee Updates
 - a) Winter Maintenance Subcommittee
 - b) Crosswalk Consistency Subcommittee
 - c) Crosswalk Education/Outreach/Enforcement/Law Subcommittee
 - d) Crosswalk Budget/CIP Subcommittee
8. Next Steps
 - a) March 3rd Task Force Meeting
 - b) Updated Pedestrian Safety Action Plan Working Outline
 - c) Planning and Engineering Recommendations – Roles and Responsibilities
 - i) Winter Maintenance
 - ii) Cross the Road
 - iii) Sidewalks and Shared Use Paths
 - iv) Traffic Management
 - v) Bicycle Related
 - vi) Transit Related
 - vii) Work-zone Related
 - viii) Land use/Site Design
 - ix) Roundabouts
9. Public Commentary

Resource Group Participation:

Jeff Kahan, City Planner

Eli Cooper, Transportation Manager

MEETING #12: Planning and Engineering Recommendations

Date: Wednesday, March 4, 2015

Time: 5:00 - 7:00 pm

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

Attendees: Task Force members present: 7; Vivienne Armentrout; Scott Campbell; Linda Diane Feldt; Sarah Pressprich Gryniwicz; Anthony Pinnell; Jim Rees; Kenneth Clark

Task Force members absent: 2; Owen Jansson; Neal Elyakin

Public Present: 6; Kathy Griswold; Eric Lipson; Larry Deck; Seth Peterson; Clark Charnetski; Eleanor Linn

City staff present: 1; Connie Pulcipher

Consultant present (The Greenway Collaborative): 2; Norm Cox; Carolyn Prudhomme

1. Introduction
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Public Commentary
4. Approval of Meeting #11 Discussion Summary
5. Update of First Reading of the Proposed Sidewalk Snow and Ice Ordinance
6. Subcommittees
 - a) Meeting Procedures and Cancellations
 - b) Confirmation of Attendance at Future Meetings
7. Proposed Process to Consider Draft Recommendations
 - a) Potential Motion to Evaluate Draft Recommendations
8. Discussion and Consideration of Draft Recommendations
 - a) See Draft Recommendation Worksheet
9. Next Steps
 - a) Process for Resource Group input on Task Force draft recommendations
 - b) April 1st Task Force Meeting – Education, Enforcement and Legislation
 - c) Round #2 Public Engagement
10. Public Commentary

MEETING #13: Education, Enforcement and Legislation Recommendations

Date: Wednesday, April 1, 2015

Time: 5:00 - 7:00 pm

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

Attendees: Task Force members present: 8; Vivienne Armentrout; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark; Linda Diane Feldt; Sarah Pressprich Gryniowicz; Anthony Pinnell; Jim Rees; Owen Jansson
Task Force members absent: 1; Neal Elyakin

Public Present: 7; Kathy Griswold; Larry Deck; Barbara Kritt; Jason Wagryn; Kevin Kelliner; Alice Hancock; Collin Cannart

City staff present: 1; Connie Pulcipher

Consultant present (The Greenway Collaborative): 2; Norm Cox; Carolyn Prudhomme

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Public Commentary
4. Approval of Meeting #12 Discussion Summary
5. Update of Second Reading of the Proposed Sidewalk Snow and Ice Ordinance
 - a) Follow-up meeting with A2 Commission on Disabilities Issues
6. Subcommittees
 - a) Meeting Procedures and Cancellations
 - b) Confirmation of Attendance at Future Meetings
7. Public Engagement Round #2 Update

- a) Stakeholder Focus Groups on 3/12
- b) Community Wide Meeting on 3/25
- c) Potential A2 Open City Hall Survey
- 8. Review of Approved Process to Consider Draft Recommendations
- 9. Discussion and Consideration of Draft Recommendations
 - a) See Draft Recommendations Worksheet
- 10. Resource Group Input on Planning and Engineering Draft Recommendations
- 11. Next Steps
 - a) May 6th Task Force Meeting – Funding, Operations, Evaluation (Chief Seto to Attend)

MEETING #14: Operations, Funding and Implementation Recommendations

Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2015

Time: 5:00 - 7:00 pm

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

Attendees: Task Force members present: 7; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark; Linda Diane Feldt; Anthony Pinnell; Jim Rees; Owen Jansson; Neal Elyakin

Task Force members absent: 2; Vivienne Armentrout; Sarah Pressprich Gryniewicz

Public Present: 5; Kathy Griswold; Seth Peterson; Richard Hausman; Clarkj Charnetski; Eric Lipson

City staff present: 2; Connie Pulcifer; Chief Seto

Consultant present (The Greenway Collaborative): 2; Norm Cox; Carolyn Prudhomme

- 1. Introductions
- 2. Approval of Agenda
- 3. Public Commentary
- 4. Approval of Meeting #13 Discussion Summary
- 5. Enforcement Discussion with Chief Seto
- 6. Update of the Proposed Sidewalk Snow and Ice Ordinance
 - a) Commission on Disability Issues Resolution
 - b) Response to City Council for June 1, First Reading
- 7. Review of Approved Process to Consider Draft Recommendations
- 8. Discussion and Consideration of Draft Recommendations
 - a) See Draft Recommendations Worksheet
- 9. Review of First Pass of Consolidation of Draft Recommendations
- 10. Draft Outline Agendas & Work Plan – June, July and August Meetings
 - a) Approval Process for Final Report
 - b) Schedule Task Force Meeting at end of August
- 11. Public Engagement
 - a) Review of Round 2 – Community Wide Meeting on 3/25
 - b) Approach for Round 3 Public Engagement
 - i) Subcommittee for A2 Open City Hall Survey
- 12. Next Steps
 - a) June 3rd Task Force Meeting

b) Upcoming Subcommittees

13. Public Commentary

*Resource Group Participation:**Chief Seto, Safety Services Area Administrator***MEETING #15: Review Draft Recommendations****Date:** Wednesday, June 3, 2015**Time:** 5:00 - 7:00 pm**Location:** Basement Conference Room – Larcom City Hall (301 E. Huron Street)**Attendees:** Task Force members present: 7; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark; Linda Diane Feldt; Anthony Pinnell; Jim Rees; Owen Jansson; Sarah Pressprich Gryniwicz

Task Force members absent: 2; Vivienne Armentrout; Neal Elyakin

Public Present: 4; Kathy Griswold; Larry Deck; Seth Peterson; Quan Du

City staff present: 1; Connie Pulcipher

Consultant present (The Greenway Collaborative): 2; Norm Cox; Carolyn Prudhomme

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Public Commentary
4. Approval of Meeting #14 Minutes and Discussion Summary
5. Update of the Proposed Sidewalk Snow and Ice Ordinance
 - a) Approval of Draft Letter to City Council
6. Draft Outline Agendas and Work Plan
7. Round 3 Public Engagement
 - a) A2 Open City Hall Survey
 - b) Community Wide Meeting on July 8th
8. Refine and Vote on Recommendations to Include in Final Draft
 - a) Consensus issues ready for a vote
 - b) Proposed amendments ready to discuss and vote
 - c) Areas that need further attention
9. Next Steps
 - a) July 1st Task Force Meeting
10. Public Commentary
11. Moratorium on Crosswalk Removal

MEETING #16: Review Draft Recommendations**Date:** Wednesday, July 1, 2015**Time:** 5:00 - 7:00 pm**Location:** Basement Conference Room – Larcom City Hall (301 E. Huron Street)**Attendees:** Task Force members present: 6; Scott Campbell; Kenneth Clark; Linda Diane Feldt; Anthony Pinnell; Jim Rees; Owen Jansson

Task Force members absent: 2; Neal Elyakin; Sarah Pressprich Gryniwicz

Public Present: 4; Kathy Griswold; Larry Deck; Seth Peterson; Linda Evans
 City staff present: 1; Connie Pulcifer
 Consultant present (The Greenway Collaborative): 2; Norm Cox; Carolyn Prudhomme

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Public Commentary
4. Approval of Meeting #15 Minutes and Discussion Summary
5. Draft Outline Agenda's and Work Plan
 - a) A3 Open City Hall Feedback Opportunity & Community Wide Meeting on July 8th
6. Moratorium on Crosswalks
7. Refine and Vote on Recommendations to Include in Final Draft
8. Next Steps
 - a) August 5th Task Force Meeting
9. Public Commentary
10. Continuation of item #7 as necessary

MEETING #17: Finalize Recommendations

Date: Wednesday, Aug 5, 2015

Time: 5:00 - 7:00 pm

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

Attendees: Task Force members present, 6; Scott Campbell; Linda Diane Feldt; Owen Jansson; Anthony Pinnell; Sarah Pressprich Gryniewicz; Jim Rees;

Task Force members absent, 2: Neal Elyakin; Kenneth Clark;

Public present, 4: Kathy Griswold; Seth Peterson; Larry Deck; Linda Evans

City Staff present, 1: Connie Pulcifer

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

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Public Commentary
4. Approval of Meeting #16 Minutes and Discussion Summary
5. A2 Open City Hall Feedback Opportunity & Community Wide Meeting
6. Draft Introduction Letter from the Chair
7. Public Engagement Appendix Addition
8. New Recommendations
9. Enforcement Reorganization
10. Prioritization
11. Next Steps
 - a) August 17th Task Force Planning Meeting for September 14th Work Session
 - b) August 26th Task Force Meeting – Approve Final Recommendations Report
12. September 14th City Council Work Session
13. Public Commentary

MEETING #18: Final Approval

Date: Wednesday, August 26, 2015

Time: 5:00 - 7:00 pm

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

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Public Commentary
4. Approval of Meeting #17 Minutes and Discussion Summary
5. New Recommendation
6. Final Report Review for Content & Style
7. September 14 Work Session – Presentation and Q & A
8. Public Commentary

APPENDIX C. CURRENT CROSSWALK LANGUAGE

Section 10:148 of Chapter 126, Traffic, of Title X of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor

10:148. - Pedestrians crossing streets.

(a) When traffic-control signals are not in place or are not in operation, the driver of a vehicle shall stop before entering a crosswalk and yield the right-of-way to any pedestrian stopped at the curb, curb line or ramp leading to a crosswalk and to every pedestrian within a crosswalk, when the pedestrian is on the half of the roadway on which the vehicle is traveling or when the pedestrian is approaching so closely from the opposite half of the roadway as to be in danger.

(b) A pedestrian shall not suddenly leave a curb or other place of safety and walk or run into a path of a vehicle that is so close that it is unsafe for the driver to yield.

(c) Every pedestrian crossing a roadway at any point other than within a marked crosswalk or within an unmarked crosswalk at an intersection shall yield the right-of-way to all vehicles upon the roadway.

APPENDIX D. VISION ZERO RESOURCES

Vision Zero – Wikipedia Definition

A concise consensus definition of Vision Zero that lists four principals and links to vision zero initiatives around the world.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vision_Zero

Vision Zero Initiative

The Vision Zero concept originated in Sweden. Sweden's national program has many relevant resources.

<http://www.visionzeroinitiative.com/>

Toward Zero Deaths

This is a United States based national partnership. It includes a strategy, communication plan, marketing resources, etc.

<http://www.towardzerodeaths.org/home.php>

Michigan's Toward Zero Deaths

Department of Transportation and the Michigan State Police Toward Zero Deaths have a state specific safety campaign modeled after the national program.

http://www.michigan.gov/mdot/0,4616,7-151-9615_11261_45350_66595---,00.html

New York City's Vision Zero

New York City recently posted a one year report on their new Vision Zero initiative.

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/visionzero/pages/home/home.shtml>

APPENDIX E: PROPOSED SIDEWALK GAP PRIORITIZATION MODEL

At the December 3, 2014, Task Force meeting, staff presented tentative criteria to be utilized in creating a prioritization model for the filling of sidewalk gaps. The Task Force provided input and indicated general agreement in support of staff efforts.

Following the December Task Force meeting, staff utilized Task Force input to further refine the sidewalk gap prioritization criteria. Employing the same method utilized in the City's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) each proposed criterion was discussed in detail and a rating methodology and scale established. To the extent possible, rating scales have been integrated with the City's Geographic Information Systems (GIS) database to reduce the manual effort to determine the prioritization score for each existing sidewalk gap.

Upon reaching consensus on prioritization criteria and rating scales, relative weights were assigned to each criterion. The resulting staff-recommended Sidewalk Gap Prioritization Criteria rating sheet and associated rating weights are provided below. Identified criteria will be utilized to establish priorities for filling sidewalk gaps. Scheduling of new sidewalk construction as a capital improvement project will be dependent on funding availability and coordination with other infrastructure improvements such as road reconstruction projects.

SIDEWALK GAP CRITERIA WEIGHTING

CRITERIA ITEM	Weight for Model
Proximity to Schools	100
Proximity to Transit	90
Proximity to Affordable Housing	60
Proximity to a Library, Government Office, Major	80
Classification of Adjacent Road	55
Requested By Citizen or Other Group	40
Near-Term Opportunity in City's Non-Motorized	30
Gap Length	35
City-Owned Parcels	35
Pedestrian/Auto Incidents	30

SCORING		Sidewalk Gap Prioritization Criteria			
1	Proximity to Schools	1 Greater than ½ mile from a school	3 Greater than ¼ mile to ½ mile from a school	6 ⅛ mile to ¼ mile from a school	10 Less than ⅛ mile from a school
2	Proximity to Transit	1 Greater than ¼ mile from an AAATA or school bus stop or train station	3 Greater than ⅛ mile to ¼ mile from an AAATA or school bus stop or train station	6 300 feet to ⅛ mile from an AAATA or school bus stop or train station	10 Less than 300 feet from an AAATA or school bus stop or train station
3	Proximity to Affordable Housing	1 Greater than ½ mile from an affordable housing facility	3 Greater than ¼ mile to ½ mile from an affordable housing facility	6 ⅛ mile to ¼ mile from an affordable housing facility	10 Less than ⅛ mile from an affordable housing facility
4	Proximity to a Library, Government Office, Major Commercial Attractor, or Park	1 Greater than ½ mile from a library, government office, major commercial attractor, or park	3 Greater than ¼ mile to ½ mile from a library, government office, major commercial attractor, or park	6 ⅛ mile to ¼ mile from a library, government office, major commercial attractor, or park	10 Less than ⅛ mile from a library, government office, major commercial attractor, or park
5	Classification of Adjacent Road	1 Adjacent to a local street	6 Adjacent to an Urban Collector		10 Adjacent to an Arterial Street
6	Requested By Citizen or Other Group	0 No petition	7 Requested by citizen or general citizen group		10 Requested by an individual or group which represents the barrier-free community
7	Near-Term Opportunity in City's Non-Motorized Transportation Plan	1 Not identified in Figure 5.1E in Plan as a Near-Term Opportunity		10 Identified in Figure 5.1E Plan as a Near-Term Opportunity	
8	Gap Length	1 Total length created by adjacent gaps is greater than 330 feet	5 Total length created by adjacent gaps is greater than 150 feet and less than 330 feet		10 Total length created by adjacent gaps is less than 150 feet
9	City-Owned Parcels	0 Not adjacent to a City-owned parcel	10 Adjacent to a City-owned parcel		
10	Pedestrian/Auto Incidents	0 No pedestrian/automobile incidents within the past 5 years within 300 feet of gap	5 Within 300 feet of One (1) pedestrian/automobile incident within the past 5 years		10 Within 300 feet of more than 1 pedestrian/automobile Incident within the past 5 years

APPENDIX F. MULTIFACETED PUBLIC OUTREACH CAMPAIGN IDEAS

The following are some preliminary ideas in regards to developing a multifaceted public outreach campaign centered on pedestrian safety.

The goals in reaching out to Ann Arbor visitors include increased awareness of:

- Local crosswalk law
- Pedestrian and bicyclist culture
- Pedestrian safety in the downtown area (related to congestion, pedestrian crossings, etc.)
- Benefits of combining motorist travel with bus service to reduce driving and congestion
- Areas that experience high density pedestrian volumes
- Special considerations around schools, health facilities, day care centers
- Awareness of vulnerable populations including disabled, handicapped and young walkers and pedestrians.
- Increase compliance with local laws pertaining to drivers and pedestrians
- Decrease road rage, friction, and unpleasant encounters between pedestrians and drivers

There are a number of significant populations who can be targeted for education:

- Visitors to the University of Michigan (UM) Health Service
- UM students, faculty and staff
- Large employers
- Football fans and other sporting event patrons
- Convention attendees i.e. The Plumbers and Pipefitters and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) trainings,

Methods to use in public outreach campaign may include: Public service announcements (PSAs) at football, hockey and basketball games; notices sent with appointment slips for health care providers; notices at businesses, hotels, cab drivers, gas stations; website links for merchants; Convention and Visitors Bureau; District Courts; Get Downtown, and the AAATA websites and bus schedules; articles and PSAs in local newspapers including the high school newspapers; advertisements on busses, garbage trucks and recycle trucks; information available in UM residence halls; signage at City limits; information at bus and Amtrak stations; QR codes; major event programs and pamphlets; and, community events including the art fairs, Top of the Park and Summer Festival, concerts, movie festival, etc.

At the state level, driver's education training must be updated to reflect an increase in awareness of pedestrian safety and access throughout the state. Crosswalk education and the importance of being a non-distracted driver must be emphasized.

The following ideas were generated through stakeholder meetings:

- Educational campaigns would be most important in the fall for new arrivals, and in the spring for distracted driving but should continue year round.
- A catchy slogan, maybe even rhyming, would be very helpful to use in most venues. The focus would be on pedestrian safety and driver awareness.
- Working in close partnership with the Ann Arbor Public Schools, and UM is critical to the success of any educational effort. One or two people can be identified from those groups to partner with. Other major employers can be a priority.
- Keep up the educational efforts of A2FixIt and encourage reporting of non-urgent issues through that application.
- Regular articles and reminders in WasteWatcher, the Tree Town Log, on the City website (a2gov.org), at special city events (e.g. Green Fair)
- Once a slogan has been found, an educational effort would be to hand out reflective clothing and lights (for pedestrian and bicyclists) with that slogan. The police can hand out lights to bicyclists violating the laws on using lights instead of tickets, kids are a target for receiving "rewards" possibly from crossing guards and in Safety Town. Useful safety equipment can be part of visitor's bags for conferences, possibly with a sponsor's message as well if needed.
- To ensure continuous messaging and education, to be available to speak to groups, and to actively promote educational goals, an ongoing committee or group needs to take on responsibility for the process. Representatives would include stakeholders, especially representatives from the UM, Ann Arbor Public Schools (AAPS), the biking community, business owners, the Task Force, city government, and other. The group might be city sanctioned, independent, or under the umbrella of an existing group. A joint city/UM effort might be the most effective.

APPENDIX G. UPDATING NON-MOTORIZED PLANS' GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The FHWA guide on “How to Develop a Pedestrian Safety Action Plan” was referenced throughout this process. On page 64, the guide notes that clear goals are needed for a pedestrian plan to be successful in reducing pedestrian crashes and increasing the number of pedestrian trips.

Plan Framework

From a broad view, a Pedestrian Safety Action Plan is nested under the City’s Non-motorized Transportation Plan, Transportation Master Plan and Complete Streets Resolution. Based on FHWA direction, the Task Force reviewed the existing vision, goals and objectives from the City of Ann Arbor 2013 Non-motorized Plan to determine if they sufficiently address reducing the number of pedestrian crashes as well as increasing the number of pedestrian trips.

When the vision, goals and objectives were created for the City of Ann Arbor 2013 Non-motorized Plan, they were based on surveys, refined by public meetings and went through a thorough vetting process.

The Task Force review of the City of Ann Arbor *2013 Non-motorized Transportation Plan Update* vision, goals and objectives found that it addresses some aspects of pedestrian safety and projects an increase in pedestrian trips, but seems to be lacking a discussion of enforcement of pedestrian laws, safety related to winter access, and a year-round perspective. The Task Force would like to see a better integration of these elements into the city’s goals and objectives when it comes to time to revise the Non-motorized Transportation Plan.

Proposed Amendments to the City of Ann Arbor *2013 Non-motorized Transportation Plan Update*

The Task Force recommends the City of Ann Arbor *Non-motorized Transportation Plan Update* amend the vision, goals and objectives to address the following:

1. Enforcement of laws that affect pedestrians;
2. Recognizing that there is an improvement in pedestrian safety with the increase in the number of pedestrians, thus increasing the number of pedestrian trips is one means to improve pedestrian safety;
3. Noting the difference between mobility and accessibility;
4. Increasing accessibility for pedestrians with physical disabilities; and,
5. Planning for a year-round/ 24 hour-a-day / 7 day-a-week pedestrian transportation network; specifically addressing accessibility and safety issues related to winter maintenance and after dark travel by vulnerable and disabled pedestrians.