

Hagadorn Road Study

Grand River Avenue to Haslett Road

2nd Stakeholder Committee Meeting

7/11/07

Topics

- Recap 1st meeting
- Your comments from 1st meeting
- Other comments received
- Comparison of two options
- Questions
- Advocacy
- Instructions for small group work
- Next steps

1st Meeting Topics

- Givens

- The Hagadorn Road Conversion Study will evaluate options to improve transportation facilities for all users of Hagadorn Road between the intersections of Haslett Road and Grand River Avenue.
- All stakeholders will be given an opportunity to voice their opinions, and all opinions will be considered.
- Any changes to Hagadorn Road must meet approved design standards and be consistent with commonly-accepted safety and traffic engineering principles.

1st Meeting Topics

- Givens (cont.)
 - Any Hagadorn Road adjustments near the Grand River Avenue intersection must ultimately be approved by the Michigan Department of Transportation, which has jurisdiction over Grand River Avenue (M-43) and the Ingham County Road Commission (ICRC), which has jurisdiction over the south leg of the intersection.
 - After receiving a recommendation as the result of the Hagadorn Road Conversion Study, the Transportation Commission will make the final decision (subject to the approval of City Council) on how to proceed with Hagadorn Road between Haslett Road and Grand River Avenue.

1st Meeting Topics

- Goals

- Consider the safety and practicality of the traveling public including vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian travel;
- Adequately accommodate current traffic volumes and concerns along Hagadorn Road and side streets, while accounting for any future traffic projections;
- Be fiscally responsible;
- Consider the concerns of the Transportation Commission, City Council, MDOT, ICRC, schools, the traveling public, business owners, residents, and Michigan State University;
- Look for “win-win” solutions.

1st Meeting

- Charge of the Stakeholder Committee
 - Identify options and benefits/drawbacks
 - Identify issues and questions for technical analysis
 - Consider technical information
 - Advocate for best option
 - Participate in consensus building exercises
 - Report back to Transportation Commission

Your Comments - 1st Meeting

- Partial Summary - See handout for more details
- Cut-through traffic/rerouting
- Pedestrian friendliness
- Bicycle accommodation
- Traffic flow
- Side street and driveway delays
- Safety/crashes
- Traffic calming/consistency with residential setting
- CATA needs
- All comments were considered during analysis

Other Comments Received

- Apx 40-50 comment letters, emails, etc.
- Web survey
- Comments very similar to what was heard at 1st Stakeholder meeting
- See handout for more details
- Additional correspondence received up until today
- All were considered in analysis

Comparison of Options

- Option A: 4-Lane Cross Section with Modifications
 - Keep existing 4-lane cross section
 - Construct 8' wide multi-use paths on both sides of Hagadorn
 - Add marked pedestrian crossings
- Option B: 3-Lane Cross Section with Bike Lanes
 - Convert to one NB and one SB travel lane
 - Create continuous center left turn lane
 - Add designated NB and SB bike lanes
 - Add marked pedestrian crossings
 - Intersections at Haslett and Grand River are unchanged (i.e., lanes are kept the same)
 - Construct segments of 8' wide multi-use paths
 - Possibly use traffic calming in neighborhoods

Comparison of Options

- No Build Option
 - No changes, keep existing conditions



7/11/07
Hagadorn Road Study





7/11/07
Hagadorn Road Study



Comparison of Options

- Comparative Table – see handout for details
- Traffic operations – signalized intersections
 - 3-lane slightly better at Burcham, same at others
 - 4-lane not optimized at Burcham
- Traffic operations – unsignalized intersections/drives
 - 4-lane far superior
 - 3-lane – massive delays – does not meet minimum acceptable standards
 - 3-lane – offset intersections are a concern (3 locations)
- Traffic operations – road segments
 - 3-lane speeds lower, less left-turn conflicts
- Cut-through traffic
 - 4-lane slightly better?

Comparison of Options

- Bicyclists
 - Both options accommodate bicyclists
 - Ped/bike vs. Auto/bike conflicts
- Pedestrians
 - 3-lane is better
- Bus Accommodation
 - 4-lane is better
- Safety Improvements
 - 3-lane is better
- Cost
 - 3-lane is better (\$160k vs. \$240k)

Comparison of Options

- ROW Impacts
 - 3-lane is better
- Context Sensitivity
 - 3-lane is better

Questions on Technical Analysis?

7/11/07
Hagadorn Road Study



Stakeholder Group Advocacy

- What you want fellow stakeholders to consider
- Please limit yourself to 2-3 minutes
- Speaking is optional
- Do not repeat same comments others have made, just reference previous comments
- Not discussion or debate, just statements

Small Group Work

- 4 groups are formed by drawing numbers
- Each group will:
 - discuss pros/cons of options - advocacy
 - score each option from 1-10 (1 is worst, 10 is best)
 - Identify a spokesperson
 - Report out to the whole group when completed
 - State if you reached consensus or not (very important)
 - “Hybrid” options can be recommended
- Definition of consensus
 - Consensus is not the same as unanimity. Consensus is achieved by allowing everyone to have an equal opportunity to persuade others to his / her point of view, and by a willingness to go along with what the rest of the group wants to do if he / she is unable to do so.

Next Steps

- DLZ prepares Summary Report
 - Includes all comments received (actual comments and summaries), materials used in meetings, results of small group work, technical analysis results
- Submit report to Transportation Commission, possibly make presentation
- Decision process with Transportation Commission and City Council