Follow-up Form Responses from Packard Bikeway Task Force Kick-off Meeting - November 16, 2020

Please enter your name:	affiliation:	Based on what you know at this preliminary stage, what is your best long-term vision for bicycle infrastructure along Packard Road and what is the timeline for achieving it?	What specific challenges exist? What are the "immovable objects" (figuratively speaking)? When I say we'd like more or better bike facilities on Packard what is top of mind for you and/or your organization?	How can we as a wide array of advocates, municipalities, organizations, and implementers come together to meet this need?	What short term improvements can be made in the meantime to improve existing conditions?	How do short term opportunities align or conflict with long term visions?	What can your organization bring to this effort?	organizations bring to this effort? Who needs what from whom?	Any additional thought or concerns?
Raymond Hess	City of Ann Arbor	A high comfort bike facility (protected/buffered bike lane or sidepath)	Curb work will lead to expensive and long term improvements. Anything that can be done within (or adjacent) to the existing roadway could be advanced more expeditiously. Healthy Streets revealed notable opposition to a lane reduction on E Packard.	Coordination among the different jurisdictions could be coordinated by a regional body like WATS. Procuring funding (TAP?) for a large project could keep the project moving.	Sharing the lane on E Packard is an uncomfortable experience even for seasoned cyclists. As such, I don't see a lot of merit to sharrows and share the road signs.	I'm afraid an interim treatment (e.g. sharrows) will lead to lack of further action (i.e. "we've already done something out there and don't need to do anything further").	Implementation within the City's jurisdiction.	The utility of the project is greatest when all of the jurisdictions can come together, agree on a solution, and coordinate implementation. Ann Arbor has many other priorities and if this doesn't provide a regional connection (because there is a missing link), the project is of less interest.	Thanks for herding the cats:)
Mike Hoffmeister	Ypsilanti Township	I believe that Ypsi Township needs to fill the gaps of a multi-use path within its jurisdiction.	ROW and partnerships with privately owned property may be an issue. There is probably a reason why there are already gaps in the trail now. Also, making this a priority for our Board will be a challenge; although I don't think it's too expensive.	Joint grant applications. Perhaps utilize WCRC grants for trail funding.	Sidewalk resurfacing and crack repair. That's fairly easy to complete.	I wouldn't want to dump too much money into a short term fix if the real goal is a long term project.	Perhaps some joint funding efforts, engineering relationships, etc.	Cannot answer this at this time with what we know.	
Nathan Voght	Washtenaw County OCED/ReImagine Washtenaw	I'd like to see great biking infrastructure along here, as it's ripe for it. However, we should talk about overall east/west bike networks, as Washtenaw is planned for biking, too. I don't think it has to be either-or, but we should talk about whether that even needs to be part of the conversation.	Working with four-six jurisdictions/entities will be the biggest challenge, and then funding. I've found this out for Washtenaw. If we want people to feel safe riding, and get out there to ride, this corridor needs to be well-designed and built for safe blike travel - however best that can be achieved.	I've found that political will and buy- in is key. What wasn't talked about at our meeting was, who is leading this initiative, how it came about, and are all the partners at the table (WCRC, for example) WILLING partners in this? Is this a WBWC task force, first and foremost? Have the four political jurisdictions formally asked WBWC to lead this? I'm just stressing here the need for political support and leadership behind this		They don't. In the long-term, a more major endeavor will be required, most likely, to build the kind of bike network the community wants along here. Without moving curbs, or doing a lane reduction, it's just paint and signage at this point	least. I already work with all of	(elected official) support for	I'm super excited that we're looking at this, because Packard is a low-hanging fruit as far as potential to be a major east/west commuting route
John Waterman	PEAC	Reduced lane size, barriered cycle track and sidewalk on both sides that surpasses ADA standards thoughout the corridor. 5 to 10 Years	Nothing is immovable it just may cost more than some leaders are currently ready to spend. The challenge is making investing in nonmotorized travel a priority. Comfortable cycling experience, which includes space and separation	Outreach to groups and individuals with stakeholder meetings. Developing a vision and having groups sign on.	Narrowing travel lanes	Some may believe that the short term solution is enough. When asked for a bigger project down the road these individuals will say, "what more do they want? We gave them wider bike lanes."	disabilities being able to travel between Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti by	You have taken a leadership role, which I think is the biggest challenge.	The should be the primary nonmotorized path between Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti with a Platt Road spur to Saline. We should consider this a nonmotorized Freeway to connect 3 communities and funded as such.
Bonnie Wessler	City of Ypsilanti								There are a few excellent opportunities along this corridor. Some thoughts: -There's a lot of talk about this not being a "low-stress" route. There is no "low stress" route connecting Ann Arbor and Ypsi apart from the B2B. This is the lowest-stress non-recreational route, and we can focus on "making" this a low-stress route for bicyclists and peds. (I suppose it's possible that Clark/Hogback/Geddes might fit the bill too- but that's far hillier, has less infrastructure, and challenging to legibly map/sign.) -Whether the north path or the south path should be pursued first might be best determined by MDOT's assessment of the condition of the 23 bridge (is the north sidewalk even open just now?) -Apart from mentioning the need/desire for 11' lanes (at least around stops and turning movements), I heard very little consideration for transit (also FYI, Forest had his hand up a few times and you didn't call on him-you might want to make Zoom norms a bit clearer at the beginning, are people expected to unmute or be called upon). As we add bike lanes along high- volume roads, we really, really need to find good and accessible options for bus stops in/adjacent to bike lanes, and that will require coordination with (and perhaps leadership from) AAATAThere are several schools along this corridor - in Ypsi, we have the high school and Estabrook; in YTown there's Carpenter (I think), and possibly more. Ypsi is in the very beginning stages of working with SR2S; this could be something that's done with other schools as well.
Forest Yang	AAATA	a separate off-street bike lane to minimize conflicts and maximize safety for both cyclists and bus operations	safety concerns of a narrow bike lane or a narrow traffic lane (buses require 11 ft of lane width for safe operations).	integrated planning approach	not to have a narrow bike lane marked beside a narrow traffic lane where frequent transit service is being provided		to ensure safe operations of buses and bike lane and balance the need of non-motorists and bus riders		to achieve a successful outcome, this project needs to consider the safety of all roadway users including cars, cyclists, pedestrian, and buses, also to maximize the roadway capacity for moving people, not just # of cars, bikes or buses
	I.	1	1	1	1	1	I .	1	