

Advisory Committee Survey Results
November 13, 2007

	Strongly Disagree		No Opinion	Strongly Agree	
	1	2	3	4	5
1. The Ann Arbor Transportation Plan should promote transit, biking, and walking				4	15
2. The Plan should focus on investments to make those modes more attractive instead of investing in congestion relief through road widening	1	1		5	12
3. A number of options are being considered that would make transit a <u>more satisfying choice</u> . What are your opinions of the following:					
a. Promote greater density along key transit corridors to create ridership.				5	14
b. Promote transit-oriented design along key corridors (buildings closer to street, taller buildings, etc, rather than landscaping and parking in front of buildings) to create identity.			1	3	15
c. Restrict auto-related uses (such as drive-thrus, auto service uses, etc) along key corridors.		3	4	3	9
d. Give developer incentives for transit-oriented development				7	12
4. The City should encourage increased densities to support transit, even if it may result in more congestion		1		11	6
5. In consideration of costs, potential ridership, and attractiveness, which form of "signature" transit service do you believe has the most realistic potential along select major corridors like Plymouth, Washtenaw, or State Street (i.e. initial impression)	Comments: it all depends on density recommendations – I prefer fixed rail yet out of traffic. a-c 1 to 5 years; d-e 5-10 years.				
a. More frequent bus service (same facilities)	2	3	1	6	6
b. Commuter Rail	3	4		5	5
c. Bus Rapid Transit		2	2	5	9
d. Streetcar		2	3	6	7
e. Light Rail Transit	1	7	3	4	2
6. Based on your initial impression, which Land Use/Transportation alternative package would best meet your expectations for transportation in Ann Arbor (circle one), and which the least (cross out one):					
	Best		Worst		
a. Alternative 1-current planned land use with a variety of transportation management tools			16		

b. Alternative 2-moderate density increases and mixed use development to support some increase levels of transit	2		1		
c. Alternative 3-additional density increases and regulations to support a more robust transit system	5				
d. Alternative 4-additional density increases and design guidelines to support a comprehensive transit system for the City.	13		1		
7. At this point, some transportation management tools are part of each alternative. How do you feel about the following:					
a. Developer incentives to reduce peak hour employee auto trips.	1	3	4	5	6
b. Developer incentives for employees to use transit (e.g. purchase passes, additional compensation).		1	2	4	12
c. Roadway widening.	6	8	2	2	1
d. Intersection widening.	5	4	4	4	2
e. Incident management to clear stalled vehicles, inform motorists of congestion and parking availability, and advise alternate routes, etc.		3	1	8	7
f. A better and increased mixture of uses and more compact uses to encourage walking/biking versus automobile trips.			1	8	10
8. Ann Arbor typically requires developers to prepare a traffic impact study. Should these studies be expanded to evaluate all transportation modes (example: demonstrate how development will be pedestrian and transit friendly versus just mitigation of auto impacts).		1		8	10
9. Due to right-of-way limitations along the roadways that have the best potential for a "signature" transit system implementation may require some travel lanes be exclusive to only transit. How do you feel about replacing a traffic lane with a dedicated transit lane?	1		2	7	9

Additional comments:

- I would like to see a short term expansion of the SCOOT system and other improvements to the signals in the area. Improved signal systems do reduce congestion.
- Short Term: Ann Arbor has neglected the basics of traffic management. SCOOT needs to be rapidly expanded city-wide. Nothing else we can do will reduce congestion, fuel use and emissions as much or as cheaply. Long Term: Can't do a transportation plan independent of land use. Need a paradigm shift to integrate transportation and land use into a single plan. Without better understanding of where land use and zoning are going, transportation can only be guidelines, not a plan.

- Need strong public outreach (starting ASAP) to educate about the inherent environmental friendliness of density within city limits. Another up-front effort needed in further exploring TDR/PDR opportunities to help densify (and if not downtown, at least node areas surrounding town) and create a real greenbelt and local food supply opportunity. Density in the city is not an antidote to sprawl in itself – I think we really need to push TDR/PDR to address this, and perhaps just as importantly, pre-empt the anti-development crowd. I think density numbers need to be benchmarked with existing successful transit systems and kept in the plan to give planners the leverage to up densities in nodes/corridors.
- Comments:
 - 1) Overlay recreational and commuter options along creeksheds and rivers to downtown and university
 - 2) Confirm university and private sector job growth based upon creative class penchant towards, “if you build it they will come.” Jobs and living appeal of Ann Arbor will be greatly enhanced if Alternatives 3 or 4 were in place.
 - 3) Create marketing plan to sell this to Ann Arbor-ites. Sell on basis of recreational, healthy, earth-friendly benefits.
 - 4) Show benefits and costs of this thinking/planning with our peer cities, i.e. Madison, Boulder, etc.
 - 5) Your high density infill uses don’t take many sites into account, e.g. Pontiac Trail between P.T. and US-23; Lowertown, DTE riverfront property, new Amtrak site, MSD/TDD below hospital could be additional 500-1000 du and office.
 - 6) Densifying downtown could be an additional 2-5000 du and several million square foot of office/retail.
 - 7) Discuss with Lou Farris about Traverse City/Petoskey to Ann Arbor tourism link.
- Comments:
 - 1) The text descriptions of alternatives 2-4 do not address the N/S or E/W rail proposals; does this mean they would not include them?
 - 2) We need definitions, scale and criteria for LOS regarding delays.
 - 3) We must ensure disability access to ALL high-frequency, commuter-rail and other signature transit stations, stops and vehicles! Connectivity to “in-town” busses and A-ride is imperative!
 - 4) Regarding enclosed bar graph, I think I understand that we want different modes of signature transit “within” versus “between” high density areas, right? Signature compliments existing bus?
 - 5) Do commuter rails depicted on 2030 map show existing train rails?
 - 6) I have a concern about prohibition of “non-transit-friendly” development along signature corridors; define this. Can the new McDonald’s and Kroger still front Plymouth Road but have parking and drive-thru in the rear or off Nixon Roads?
 - 7) I like incentives to use transit better than intentional disincentives to use of one’s own vehicle. Focus on incentives.
 - 8) It appears that a difference between 2 and 3 is continuation of the commuter rail west and south from downtown in option 3, right? Also, a difference between 3 and 4 looks like connections to Ypsi and Ann Arbor’s west suburbs, right? Connectivity is vital!
 - 9) Many of the criteria included in “transit-oriented-corridors” are also disability friendly, killing two birds with one stone. I wonder, however, why TOC equates to higher automobile congestion; is this necessary? Where roadbeds allow, can we widen AND designate transit lanes to accommodate transit AND car culture?
 - 10) Intensified TOC’s MUST include opportunities for ALL pedestrians of ALL abilities to cross and navigate. Mid-block crossings can be difficult or impossible for many of us with disabilities!
 - 11) I am concerned that we are working with the premise that we should regulate land use based on the type of transit we choose; I think transit type will encourage development type. Isn’t the purpose of transit to move people within a

community, rather than to define a community based on prior transit choices? I tend to like alternatives 3 and 4, but would like to see them implemented via incentives rather than through disincentives and prohibition.

12) I agree with sacrificing automobile lanes for transit lanes ONLY when necessary. I strongly prefer ADDITION of transit lanes! We can affect transportation efficiency through transit WITHOUT obliterating advantages of car-culture upon which some must rely!

13) If you're pro-growth (and I am) option 4 makes, by far, the most sense, if not as a near-term goal, then at least as a guiding vision.

14) Formal Commission on Disability Issues survey is forthcoming.

- I feel you are on the right track. From a transportation company, our main concern is to ensure our trucks can have access to areas to deliver freight that supply the restaurants and businesses that supply the public.
- A need to present comparable cities to Ann Arbor with land use and transit planning strategies.
- Plan needs to make a better connection to environmental issues, like land preservation, air pollution, climate change and energy use. Plan needs some economic indicators (“\$1 in transit investments = \$6 in development,” etc.)
- The community's view of density is evolving. The community may not be at alternative #4 now, in 5-10 years alternative #4 may well be viewed as a moderate approach.
- More emphasis and clarity on continued parking availability in the city center for “visitors” and short stay. Without that, the economic/commercial viability is lessened and available to only worktime commuters and downtown residents.
- I recommend being proactive in terms of guiding how land use and transit coincide. People will use alternatives to driving alone when they are frequent and convenient. Let's have that here quickly and then move forward from there. Increase service to park and ride lots. Increase service frequency. Increase density.