



Washtenaw County
Department of Planning & Environment

November 10, 2008

Eli Cooper
City of Ann Arbor
Ann Arbor, MI 48107-8647

Re: City of Ann Arbor Transportation Plan Update

Dear Mr. Cooper:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the City of Ann Arbor Transportation Plan update. In accordance with the Municipal Planning Enabling Act, Public Act 33 of 2008, the draft was reviewed by the Washtenaw County Planning Advisory Board and the Board of Commissioners. The Washtenaw County Department of Development Services, Department of Parks and Recreation, Road Commission, Department of Public Health, Office of the Drain Commissioner and the Washtenaw Area Transportation Study (WATS) were also given the opportunity to comment on the update.

Staff reviewed the proposed update in the context of *A Comprehensive Plan for Washtenaw County (County Plan)*, plans of contiguous local units of government and the current *City of Ann Arbor Master Plan (City Plan)*. Staff found the proposed amendments to be consistent with the County Plan and the plans for the contiguous communities.

The Draft City of Ann Arbor Transportation Plan Update includes many important recommendations that support the County Transportation Goals to “strategically plan for and invest in a transportation network that meets the need of future residents and businesses while promoting our sense of place and protecting the environment.” The focus on the movement of people rather than cars encourages transportation choices and sustainability. The Draft Plan also positively references the Washtenaw Access Management Plan and recommends the use of transit-oriented development principles, which is supported by the County Plan Transportation Recommendation 2.5: Develop Density to Support Transit. These two areas of the plan demonstrate a commitment to collaboration, building on past planning efforts, and long-term support for a viable transportation system.

Although the following recommendations are not applicable to the consistency with the County Plan, we strongly encourage the incorporation of the following to enhance the overall plan:

- Throughout the Transportation Plan are future visions and recommendations for various corridors. Terms used when referring to these corridors include “enhanced transit corridors”, “transit enhancement corridors”, “corridors for

increased transit service”, “high priority corridors” and “signature corridors.” The difference between these terms, as well as to which corridors they refer, should be clarified.

- The Transportation Plan identifies four corridors with the “potential signature/high quality transit improvements”, the Plymouth/Fuller Road and State Street corridors were designated as having highest priority because they “have the highest UM/AATA ridership, connect to high use activity centers, and have potential redevelopment opportunities that could be driven by transit improvements.” Based on these criteria, as well as others that should be considered including congestion severity, crash data and AATA capacity, Washtenaw Avenue should be given equal or higher priority for transit improvement studies and implementation.
- The Transportation Plan discusses the completion of the Huron River Off-road Path. It is unclear if this also refers to portions of the Border to Border Trail, which is not otherwise mentioned in the Transportation Plan. If the Huron River Off-Road path refers to the Border to Border Trail, or a section of, it should be noted in text, as well as on a map.

The attached staff report provides additional background regarding county comments and agency comments are provided containing additional detailed recommendations. On behalf of the Planning Advisory Board and the Board of County Commissioners, I would like to thank you for your contribution to promoting a shared vision for Washtenaw County.

If the Department may be of assistance to the City as you work to implement the policies included in your plan, please call me at (734) 222-6809.

Sincerely,

Patricia Denig, Planning Services Director
Office of Strategic Planning
Washtenaw County

Attachments

Staff Report

Washtenaw Area Transportation Study comments



Washtenaw County Department of Planning & Environment

Staff Report

RE: Draft City of Ann Arbor Transportation Plan Update

Staff Report Date: November 10, 2008

Background

The Washtenaw County Office of Strategic Planning received the Draft City of Ann Arbor Transportation Plan on October 24, 2008. In accordance with the Municipal Planning Enabling Act, Public Act 33 of 2008, the County is to provide comments to the City, which must include two statements of consistency:

- A statement as to whether, after considering any comments received by contiguous local units of government, the proposed update is consistent with the plan of contiguous communities, as
- A statement as to whether the proposed update is consistent with the County Plan.

The proposed update was reviewed for consistency with *A Comprehensive Plan for Washtenaw County* (County Plan). The Washtenaw County Department of Development Services, Department of Parks and Recreation, Road Commission, Department of Public Health, Office of the Drain Commissioner and the Washtenaw Area Transportation Study (WATS) were also given the opportunity to comment on the document.

Summary of Update in context of County Plan

The Draft City of Ann Arbor Transportation Plan Update includes many important recommendations that support the County Transportation Goals to “strategically plan for and invest in a transportation network that meets the need of future residents and businesses while promoting our sense of place and protecting the environment.” The focus on the movement of people rather than cars encourages transportation choices and sustainability. Some examples of supportive recommendations include road diet feasibility studies, the coordination of traffic signals to reduce idling, parking management and pilot projects for new road designs and concepts. The specific recommendations to assess the interchange at US23 and Washtenaw Avenue addresses safety and improve non-motorized access are supported by multiple community plans and studies.

Recommendations which directly enhance public transit service and encourage land uses which support transportation options were also found throughout the plan. Signal prioritization equipment on AATA buses, improved stop amenities and queue-jumping lanes, and coordination with future commuter rail projects. Employing land use patterns which support transit and other alternative forms of transportation contributes to the

sustainability of the region, and is compatible with the recommendations of the County Plan.

Creating plan guidelines and/or land use practices to support Transit Oriented Development (TOD) overlay-type district, in addition to developing a form based code to “more strictly regulate form and character to support transportation improvements citywide” are two of the more significant recommendations of the plan. This is supported by the County Plan Transportation Recommendation 2.5: Develop Density to Support Transit. Washtenaw County encourages the creation of a TOD zoning district which “restricts additional auto-use development, gas stations and large shopping centers with vast parking lots, and encourage compact development with smaller parking lots, promote residential and employment densities which support transit, minimum height requirements, move toward form-based, density bonuses within ¼ mile of certain transit routes” as indicated in the Transportation Plan. The Mid-term recommendation to “increase density along enhanced/signature transit corridors to an average of 25-40 re/ac” on Page 3-15 is a strong goal toward achieving this vision.

Throughout the Transportation Plan are future visions and recommendations for various corridors. Terms used when referring to these corridors include “enhanced transit corridors”, “transit enhancement corridors”, “corridors for increased transit service”, “high priority corridors” and “signature corridors.” The use of a variety of terms which appear to be often referring to the same corridors makes portions of the Transportation Plan confusing. If there is a difference, it should be more clearly defined, and be consistent throughout.

Of the four corridors identified with the “potential signature/high quality transit improvements”, the Plymouth/Fuller Road and State Street corridors were designated as having highest priority because they “have the highest UM/AATA ridership, connect to high use activity centers, and have potential redevelopment opportunities that could be driven by transit improvements.” Based on these characteristics, Washtenaw Avenue should be placed at higher priority than State Street. This point is supported by WATS and discussed in the attached review.

Data shows AATA boardings along Washtenaw Avenue (1449) to be higher than those along State Street (983), and also higher traffic volumes. State Street has higher overall boarding numbers because it counts park and ride boardings. However, if the recommended short-term projects to add park and rides to Washtenaw Ave were put in, the boardings would likely be the highest in the County. Further, Chapter 5 says “AATA routes including the #2 Plymouth and #4 Washtenaw corridors – are experiencing overcrowding in the AM and PM peaks. Without transit investment, it is expected that ridership will increase between by 4,000 to 10,000 riders due to future population and employment growth, which will overwhelm most routes on the AATA system based on the existing service. Buses that accommodated passenger loads comfortably with two buses an hour just a few years ago could expect crush loads during AM and PM peaks if current trends continue with no changes to the AATA schedule or transit investment by the community.”

Washtenaw has more redevelopment and infill development potential than State Street, connects the two largest urban areas and many in Washtenaw County, and also has a higher critical crash rate than State Street. Factoring in congestion data which rates Washtenaw Avenue as severe, and Plymouth Rd as slight to moderate, further supports giving Washtenaw Avenue higher priority for corridor transit improvement studies. It is unclear why degree of congestion, although used as a criteria in the Multi-Modal Analysis Methodology detailed in Appendix D, is not used in prioritize transit corridor improvements.

The Transportation Plan discusses the completion of both the Washtenaw Shared Use Path and the Huron River Off-road Path. Indication of the location and extent of the Washtenaw Shared Use Path would make this recommendation more useful to the reader. Additionally, the Border to Border Trail is not mentioned in the Transportation Plan. If the Huron River Off-Road path refers to the Border to Border Trail, or a section of, it should be noted in text, as well as on a map.

Page 4-14 lists bus routes. Washtenaw Avenue data should be changed to accurately reflect the AATA bus route along this corridor is #4 not #3.

A strong point of the Transportation Plan is the reference to the Washtenaw Access Management Plan and the inclusion of specific implementation steps in both Chapter 3 and in Appendix A. Specifically, the recommendation to establish a protocol for an access management study prior to design of street project and establishing “standards in a City draft access management ordinance” to be consulting early in the development process will provide regular opportunities for addressing congestion and safety issues highlighted in the study. Planning for better management of corridor development and access management is supported by County Plan Transportation Objective 2: Maximize the capacity of the existing urban and suburban transportation systems.

Review of Plan in Context of Contiguous Community Master Plans

- Northeast (Ann Arbor Township): The Ann Arbor Charter Township General Development Plan states road improvements should be designated to support land uses, and should be consistent with the policies of the Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti urban areas. Both plans stress the importance of access management, and in many cases the policies of the Township plan are taken directly from the 1990 City of Ann Arbor Transportation Plan. The Township Plan mentions future widening of Plymouth Road, but does not mention its potential use as a transit corridor. Overall, the City Transportation Plan is compatible with the goals and policies related to transportation within the Township Plan.
- South (Pittsfield Township): Pittsfield Charter Township’s Comprehensive Plan places emphasis on providing a “balanced and coordinated multi-modal transportation system. Pittsfield designates Washtenaw Avenue and State Road as key corridors which call for transit friendly development design. Map 9 illustrates planned non-motorized pathways along major transportation corridors and connecting public recreation areas, community centers and schools. These

goals and recommendations closely align with those of the City Transportation Plan.

- Southwest (Lodi Township): The Lodi Township General Development Plan places emphasis on connecting residential areas with interconnected streets, sidewalks and multi-use paths so that uses are not isolated from each other. The township plan also encourages focusing development near existing infrastructure while minimizing curb cuts to encourage sustainable land use patterns and minimize negative impacts to roads and the environment. Such objectives to accommodate alternative modes of transportation and efficiently use existing infrastructure is also present in the City of Ann Arbor Draft Transportation Plan Update. These plans are consistent with each other.
- Northwest (Scio Township): The Scio Township Master Land Use Plan Draft 2008 sets a goals to create a township-wide non-motorized network and provide a variety of transportation choices. The Township Plan includes a Jackson Sub Area Plan with the vision of the corridor developing as commercial and mixed use, allowing for higher density residential, and redevelopment with an emphasis on encouraging pedestrian travel and public transit. This is compatible with the City Transportation Plan's designation of Jackson Avenue as a corridor with potential for future transit improvements.

Other Department and Agency Comments

Washtenaw Area Transportation Study (WATS): See attached

Statement of Consistency

Washtenaw County Office of Strategic Planning find the Draft Ann Arbor Transportation Plan update consistent with the Comprehensive Plan for Washtenaw County, and those of adjacent communities.

W
A
T
S



WASHTENAW AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY

705 NORTH ZEEB ROAD 2ND FLOOR
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48103-1560
PHONE: (734) 994-3127 FAX: (734) 994-3129
WEBSITE: WWW.MIWATS.ORG
E-MAIL: WATS@MIWATS.ORG

Planning Reviews

Community: City of Ann Arbor

Date Received : 10/29/08

Complete Master Plan Update:

Complete Zoning Plan Update:

Master Plan Amendment:

Zoning Plan Amendment:

Other: Transportation Plan Update

Sections reviewed: x Goals x Policies x Land Use Recommendations

 x Transportation Recommendations _____ Other

Land Use Implications:

WATS commends the City of Ann Arbor for examining the important issue of land use and its link with transportation in the Transportation Plan Update. The use of the different land use densities and their impacts are important factors in the usefulness of this plan.

Transportation Component Implications:

The City has taken a comprehensive look at transportation for this plan update. However, several inaccuracies should be corrected before the plan is approved.

WATS offers the following recommendations for consideration by the City.

POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

- CITY OF ANN ARBOR • ANN ARBOR TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY • ANN ARBOR TOWNSHIP • CITY OF CHELSEA • VILLAGE OF DEXTER •
- DEXTER TOWNSHIP • EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY • MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION • NORTHFIELD TOWNSHIP • PITTSFIELD TOWNSHIP •
- CITY OF SALINE • SCIO TOWNSHIP • SOUTHWEST WASHTENAW COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS • SUPERIOR TOWNSHIP • UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN •
- WASHTENAW COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS • WASHTENAW COUNTY ROAD COMMISSION • CITY OF YPSILANTI • YPSILANTI TOWNSHIP •
- EX OFFICIO: FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION • SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS •

AN INTERMUNICIPALITY COMMITTEE ORGANIZED UNDER ACT 200 OF PUBLIC ACTS OF MICHIGAN (1957)
REPRESENTING WASHTENAW COUNTY

Page 1-1 paragraph 3, Although the City of Ann Arbor has a civic minded creative populous, they are by no means the only community in this county with that. Describing Ann Arbor as “the place” presents a negative connotation to the rest of the County. The City should consider using “a” in place of “the”.

Page 1-10 Table 1-2: Potential Funding Sources. Under federal programs, the Federal Highway Trust fund incorporates the next five funding programs. Under the state programs, the Comprehensive Transportation Fund (CTF) is not listed as a possible source of funding.

Page 1-11 First paragraph, second sentence – the meaning of the sentence is unclear. There must be something else that should be added.

Page 3-2 Medium priority corridors – The last sentence indicates that “Some projects ...are actually recommended to advance during the short-term time frame and are listed as such here”, however, there is nothing that distinguishes corridors with projects in the short-term time frame.

Page 3-3 Second paragraph, the last sentence is written in the negative and the City should consider “The recommendations made here in this chapter should be implemented with a coordinated effort between the stakeholders, citizens, and government agencies”, eliminating “not” and “out”.

Page 3-4 Table 3-1 Short-Term Recommendations Roadway Improvements, number 8, the City should consider adding WATS as a lead agency as they have been advocating for the expansion of this service for more than six years.

Page 3-5 Table 3-1 Short-Term Recommendations, Intersection Improvements and Policies, number 5 and 6 as well as other locations in this table, the cost is listed as minimal/ internal staff and other times it is listed as internal staff. This begs the question whether it is always considered a minimal cost if staff perform the work or if those without the word minimal indicates significant cost that is undetermined.

Page 3-5 Table 3-1 Short-Term Recommendations, Transit, number 1, this is a joint project but only AATA is listed.

Page 3-5 Table 3-1 Short-Term Recommendations, Transit, number 3, this project should have a joint lead with MDOT as they are the owner of the roadway.

Page 3-6 Table 3-1 Short-Term Recommendations, Transit, number 7, this includes improving stop amenities but also should include the provision of non-motorized facilities such as sidewalks along Washtenaw. This also might be a good candidate for a joint lead with MDOT.

Page 3-7 Table 3-1 Short-Term Recommendations, Park and Ride, number 1, There is no mention of the need to provide transit service to the new lots.

Page 3-9 Transit Improvements, the first sentence indicates that the City will conduct an alternatives analysis but Table 3-1 indicates that AATA is the lead.

Page 3-10 Transit Improvement, third full paragraph, last sentence should include the provision of transit service to the new park and ride lot.

Page 3-12, Table 3-2 Mid-term Recommendations, Intersection improvements, number 1, the widening of Ann Arbor-Saline at Eisenhower and I-94 works against the effort to make this interchange crossing more non-motorized friendly and the use of transit as an alternative.

Page 3-12, Table 3-2 Mid-term Recommendations, Intersection improvements, number 2 and 3 have the Minimal cost/internal staff issue again.

Page 3-14, Table 3-2 Mid-term Recommendations, Transit improvements, number 10, station will also host AMTRAK service and there is no support for extending the Ann Arbor to Detroit Service to Chelsea and Jackson to allow those work trips an alternative as shown on the map.

Page 3-14, Table 3-2 Mid-term Recommendations, Park and Ride improvements, number 1, this recommendation should also include the provision of transit service.

Page 3-17, Transit, paragraph 4 should include the AMTRAK service when referencing the new station.

Page 3-20, Table 3-3 Long-Term Recommendation, Access Management, number 2, cost is indicated to be none but internal staff . This usage is inconsistent throughout the tables.

Page 3-22, 1st paragraph, the meaning of the first sentence is unclear and needs a subject.

Page 3-26, Table 3-8, Same issues with Federal Highway Trust fund not being a program as noted for Table 1-2 and under state of Michigan Programs, CTF is overlooked.

Page 3-29, Table 3-9 the title should include VMT as well as VHT and CO as it is provided in the table.

Page 4-3, WATS Transportation Improvement Program, Replace the first Sentence with “The WATS is a local Transportation Management Area and covers the City of Ann Arbor.” Add “Short term commitments for” to the beginning of the third sentence. Note that this plan used the 2008-2011 TIP.

Page 4-4, The correct titles of the WATS reports are “2030 Long Range Transportation Plan for Washtenaw County” and Transit Plan for Washtenaw County”.

Page 4-6, Figure 4-1, this figure is impossible to read.

Page 4-7, Existing Conditions, the first paragraph does not mention taxi, private bus such as Greyhound or the Michigan Flyer.

Page 4-7, Roadway Network Capacity, the fourth paragraph speaks to volume to capacity, is this 24 hour or peak hour?

Page 4-12, Crash Analysis, this analysis was coordinated with the Access Management crash analysis; were the intersections used for this plan? Should the intersections be listed here under Access Management analysis?

Page 4-15, Table 4-1 Top weekday boarding locations for AATA stops in Ann Arbor, there are acronyms here that are not explained; BTC, BTC Mall, E, N, and S. These should be explained.

Page 4-16, M-Ride, second paragraph, routes are listed by number alone. Please include the name of the route in addition to the number.

Page 4-16, AATA Ridership statistics, the second sentence needs to be completed and the survey results included. The next paragraph indicates that the results of the most recent survey are in Appendix C but I did not find them.

Page 4-18, Figure 4-7 displays both the AATA and UM routes but Figure 4-8 displays only UM. Why not list both separately? Should Pioneer be listed as a transfer location? Should the State Street lot be shown as a shared lot?

Page 4-20, Non-motorized Facilities, third paragraph, consider the addition of “with non-grid street design” to the end of the first sentence.

Page 4-24, Transportation Policy, the programs and policies listed in the first paragraph, while all started within the City, were not all initiated by the City as stated.

Page 4-27, Conclusions, second paragraph, the last sentence includes “accidents” and the city should consider using crashes instead as is standard in the State.

Page 6-2, Vehicular, Corridor Congestion, third paragraph, the WATS TIP used was “2008-2011” not 2006-2010 as stated.

Page 6-3, Table 6-1. It would be helpful to list the improvements that led to the future conditions. Consider moving the paragraph at the bottom of page 6-5 to the bottom of 6-3 for clarity.

Page 6-8, Figure 6-2, Single Point Urban Interchange, the City should be careful in this recommendation as the increase in the number of slip ramps will dramatically reduce access and safety for non-motorized trips across this interchange. The City should consider the removal of all slip ramps to improve access for non-motorized users.

Page 6-8, second paragraph, second sentence uses “Stadium Road” and it should be Stadium Boulevard. Same on page 6-9 in the first full paragraph. Also in Table 6-7.

Page 6-11, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), first sentence, consider the use of Transportation Network instead of road network as there are many ITS improvements that could benefit the Transit system.

Page 6-12, bullets, consider the addition of ITS for park and ride lots that identifies the number of spaces available on the freeway.

Page 6-12, Table 6-8, Consider adding the difference to this table so that readers will not have to flip back and do the math.

Page 6-14, Traveler Choices, first paragraph, third sentence, consider adding the words “during the peak hour” for clarity.

Page 6-14, Traveler Choices, bullets, consider adding “Providing workforce housing near employment” as a TDM program.

Page 6-15, Access Management, Consider adding “and Safety” to the last sentence after capacity.

Page 6-18, Washtenaw Corridor Queue Jump locations, the Second Intersection should be called Washtenaw/Yost as there are two Arborland Drives.

Page 6-19, Washtenaw Corridor Queue Jump locations, the intersection of Washtenaw/Platt is not currently signalized.

Page 6-19, North Main Corridor Queue Jump locations, The intersection of M-14/Main is not currently signalized.

Page 6-26, Park and Ride Options, first paragraph, second sentence, the park and ride system is not primarily for the City residents as the AATA Park and Ride Study indicated that most of the users were from the County but outside the City.

Page 6-26, Park and Ride Options, fifth paragraph, last sentence, consider adding “where there is an existing MDOT carpool lot”

Page 6-26, Park and Ride Options, sixth paragraph, second sentence, consider adding “and Jackson” after Washtenaw and change County to “Counties” as more than 8,000 employees travel into Washtenaw from Jackson.

Page 6-27, Transit Conclusions, last paragraph, although the Plymouth/Fuller carries the highest ridership and has development opportunities, the Washtenaw Corridor has the second highest ridership and considerable development potential as identified by the Washtenaw County Planning and Environment Department. The State Street corridor should be considered third in an effort to support the employees coming from the east that are critical to the economic prosperity of the City of Ann Arbor.

Page 6-28, Transit Conclusions, first full paragraph, the Washtenaw Corridor should be considered for both signal priority and queue jumping as this high ridership corridor is currently operating over capacity and has significantly higher ridership than the State Street Corridor per Table 4-2, page 4-15 and in June 2008 carried 41.5 passengers/service hour compared to 33.8 for State Street.

Page 6-29, Wally Stations, paragraph one, first sentence. The report by RL Banks was a feasibility study not a preliminary engineering study and it suggested three locations for Ann Arbor stations not two (RL Banks Subtask 2.2, page 3).

Page 6-29, Wally Stations, paragraph two, second sentence. The three locations are Plymouth near Barton, either Washington or William Street and Hoover Avenue on the University of Michigan Athletic campus. (RL Banks Subtask 2.2, page 3).

Page 6-32, Figure 6-10: Non-motorized Travel Potential, there is no reference for the data on which this figure is based. The text references a follow up memo but the actual name and date of the memo is not stated.

Page A-1. Policies and Ordinance Models, the use of the vehicular level of service (LOS) of “C” during peak hours actually works against the City’s goal to move towards alternative modes of travel, the reduction of single occupant vehicles and likely results in more water runoff impacts due to widening in an effort to reach this LOS. Additional widening of intersections also will have detrimental impacts to the walkability of the community.

Page A-2, Bicycle level of service, the City should consider adding an additional bullet that recommends the provision of bike parking on development and redevelopments of sites as a component of LOS.

Page A-3, Transit level of service, last bullet is unclear if you mean the ease of travel along sidewalk parallel to the street or the ease of movement between building front and street sidewalk and stop.

Page A-4, Existing Traffic Conditions, second bullet, which functional classification system are you using? National, state or separate? WATS recommends use of the National Functional Classification system as it determines eligibility for federal funds and should represent the use of the road and to some degree the development potential of the adjacent land.

Page A-5, Existing Multi-modal Conditions, bullet one, WATS recommends including the location of ADA ramp information.

Page A-5, Existing Multi-modal Conditions, bullet four, WATS recommend including the frequency of service as well as location of route and stop.

Page A-5, Background Transportation Conditions, fifth bullet, the WATS TIP is a four year document.

Page A-6, Mitigation, fourth bullet, the inclusion of mixed use is also an option to reduce trips.

Page A-6, Mitigation, WATS recommends the City add a bullet that would include provision of more than the required bike parking.

Page A-7, Dimensional Requirements, fourth bullet, the replacement of the word “for” in the second line with “where” or “and” would help clarify the meaning of this recommendation.

Page A-7, Dimensional Requirements, sixth bullet, the addition of the following should be considered: “ in exchange for additional bike parking or improved pedestrian amenities such as building canopies or plantings near the road to provide a separation between autos and pedestrians.

Page A-7, Model Regulations: Access Management, second sentence, the access management plan covers BLI-94, BRUS-23 and M-17. The route does not become M-17 until east of US-23 which is outside the City of Ann Arbor.

Page B-8, The actual name of the WATS report is “2030 Long Range Transportation Plan for Washtenaw County”.

Page C-1, Roadway Network, paragraph two, Principal Arterials are not the highest NFC category. The addition of “highest non-freeway classification” to replace the word “top” would make this statement correct.

Page C-1, Roadway Network, paragraph two, I-94, US-23 and M-14 are not principle arterials. Replace them with some of the following: Stadium, Plymouth, Packard/Eisenhower.

Page C-1, Roadway Network, paragraph three, Packard and Eisenhower are not minor arterials, replace with Liberty, Fuller or Dhu Varren.

Page C-1, Roadway Network, paragraph four, Geddes and Seventh are not Collectors, replace with Pauline, Green, Newport, Ashley or First.

Page C-1, Roadway Network, paragraph five, Ann Street is not always a local street, replace with Catherine, Washington or S. University.

Page C-17. Figure C-8, Why isn't Pioneer a transit center? What is the definition of a transit center?

Page D-26, The CTF is left off of the description of transportation funding available. It is a sub fund of the MTF just as is the State Trunkline fund.

Page E-3, The Steering Committee members does not include Ryan Buck who many meetings in my absences.