

# Review Memo

To: Jeff Kahan, Planning and Development Services  
From: Cynthia Redinger, PE, PTOE, Public Services Area – Engineering  
CC: Via Trakit  
Date: May 29, 2018  
Re: SP18-005: 151 Hoover, Traffic Comments, third review

---

This site plan is recommended for Planning Commission action as long as the following comments are addressed.

## Transportation Impact Study:

- According to the Michigan Occupational Code, Act 229 of 1980, as amended, Section 339.2008: *(1) A plan, plat, drawing, map, and the title sheet of specifications, an addendum, bulletin, or report or, if a bound copy is submitted, the index sheets of a plan, specification, or report, if prepared by a licensee and required to be submitted to a governmental agency for approval or record, shall carry the embossed, printed, or electronic seal of the person in responsible charge.*
  - Reports submitted to the City must make note of the responsible person for the report development and be marked as DRAFT or carry of the seal of that person.

## Item addressed.

- The section designated “safety analysis” dos not provide an analysis of safety needs for the listed intersections. While several of the intersections show little to no crash history for the 5 year reviewed, tow of the intersections were reported to have 30 or more crashes for the analysis period. The analysis of these locations is limited to the average number of crashes experienced per year at these locations. This information is useless unless placed in context. The intent of a safety analysis in a TIS is to determine if an existing crash pattern exists that will be potentially made worse by the development. Please make this determination.
- Existing Conditions:
  - All analysis models must be provided to the City for review.
  - The study states that a LOS D is acceptable. Please note that Attachment D of the City’s Land Development Regulations states: *Proposals that will contribute traffic to streets or intersections that are or will be as a result of this proposal at a level of Service D, E, or F as defined in the Highway Capacity Manual may be denied by Commission and Council*

*until such time as necessary street or traffic improvements are scheduled for construction.*

- Please provide detailed description of the calibration and verification methods used for the Synchro/SimTraffic modeling. The results are not consistent with user experience of these intersections and known travel conditions. The City acknowledges that the consulting team is not local; however, a comparison of the model's results for State and Hoover with Google Maps-Traffic Layer, a free and publicly available resource, shows an inconsistency in the results with the "typical" traffic on a Wednesday during the PM peak.

**Models have not been submitted to date. Please submit for review through the planner of record.**

- Background traffic growth: As previously stated, the WATS model must be used to determine the background growth rate.

**Item has been addressed**

- Trip Generation: Insufficient information has been provided to verify trip generation results.
  - What was the 20% trip reduction based on? Actual trip generation (counts) may be used to develop trip generation reduction for existing land uses. Trip generation reductions may also be based on calculated trips using *Trip Generation* methodology. An arbitrary percentage applied without documentable basis is not acceptable.
  - Ann Arbor enjoys a journey to work mode share that differs significantly from the national average. The most recent five-year data available for the US Census, [www.census.org](http://www.census.org), show the following modal split:

Ann Arbor city, Michigan				
	Estimate	Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
Car, truck, or van -- drove alone	31,734	+/-923	54.60%	+/-1.4
Car, truck, or van -- carpooled	4,131	+/-422	7.10%	+/-0.7
Public transportation (excluding taxicab)	6,417	+/-591	11.00%	+/-1.0
Walked	8,516	+/-624	14.70%	+/-1.0
Other means	3,118	+/-357	5.40%	+/-0.6
Worked at home	4,198	+/-440	7.20%	+/-0.7

- As evidenced by this mode split, it would unreasonable to expect a site with excellent transit service and within walking distance of the City's largest employer to generate 100% vehicular trips. While the City is very interested in understanding the true nature of the transportation impacts of new development, including denser infill development, staff are interested in overly estimating vehicular trips while ignoring the needs of non-motorized transportation. Please revise your study accordingly.

**Item has been addressed.**

- The study states that “sufficient non-motorized facilities and established transit routes” are in place. Upon what authority is this statement made? Have facilities been evaluated against all planning documents previously expressed to the constant? Please document sources as the study later goes on to make non-motorized infrastructure improvement suggestions.

**Item has been addressed.**

- Trip Assignment & Trip Distribution: Insufficient data provided to evaluation the trip distribution. Please document assumptions and provide figures demonstrating trip distribution results.

**Item has been addressed.**

- Future traffic Level of Service Analysis:
  - As previously stated, analysis models need to be submitted for review. Further comment will be reserved until revisions and additional information requested is provided.

**See previous comments regarding the models.**

- Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities:
  - The NCHRP 562 tools are for non-motorized locations only.
  - Analyses of non-motorized facilities shall follow the same template as that of motorized facilities and shall include existing and proposed conditions.
  - This section in the study references bicycle facilities in the title but provides no information on the bicycle facility needs in this area.

**Item has been addressed.**

- Proposed site access: Please document the standards used to evaluate the sight distance for driveway access.

**The information provided in the study was not legible. Please provide an updated study with an enhanced image.**

- Appendix: NCHRP 562 Worksheet for Green & Hoover
  - Please explain why the answer of “YES” was chosen for question 1b: Pop.<10,000? Current population reports for Ann Arbor are in excess of 120,000 persons.
  - Please explain why the answer of “High” was chosen as for question 5a: Compliance.

**Items addressed.**

- General Notes:
  - Sufficient documentation of assumptions and choices must be made such that the analysis results could be replicated.

- The City of Ann Arbor has adopted Vision Zero through council action. Transportation impacts analyses, and reviews, must take these principles into account.
- It is standard for study documents to include figures documenting existing trips, future trips and proposed trips as well as trip distribution. Please include this type of documentation in the revised study submission.
- Please address outstanding comments from the first review.

**Items addressed.**