



Michigan/Grand River Avenue
Transportation Study

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #24

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT



TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #24

From: URS Consultant Team

To: CATA Project Staff and Technical Committee

Topic: Community Involvement

1.0 Introduction

The Michigan / Grand River Avenue Transportation Study hosted a series of public open houses November 9-11, 2010 to present the results of the Detailed Evaluation of Corridor Alternatives. Table 1 shows the number of participants while following sections provide representative examples of comments as well as statistics.

Table 1: November 2010 Open House Participation

Date/Time	Venue	# of Participants Who Signed In
November 9, 2010 <i>11:30 am – 1:30 pm</i>	MSU Campus International Center Spartan Room C	30
November 9, 2010 <i>5:00 pm – 7:00 pm</i>	Lansing Center Rooms 203-205	21
November 10, 2010 <i>11:30 am – 1:30 pm</i>	Hannah Community Center East Lansing	37
November 10, 2010 <i>5:00 pm – 7:00 pm</i>	Hannah Community Center East Lansing	26
November 11, 2010 <i>5:00 pm – 7:00 pm</i>	Meridian Township Hall	25
	TOTAL	139



2.0 Sample of Submitted Comments

The following are a sampling of comments that represent and articulate the range of issues and perspectives that were submitted at the open houses. While there were many comments in favor of the Modified BRT Alternative, some expressed skepticism about the benefits versus the costs. Many comments addressed concerns related to impact on downtown East Lansing, specifically the loss of green space and the ability to make left turns. Other important themes addressed traffic impacts, pedestrian movement/ safety and commitments to bicycle facilities. A number of comments expressed preferences or suggestions related to implementation and operations (e.g., wanting to ensure faster travel, landscaping in the corridor, and service to particular locations).

Support for Modified BRT Alternative

- *The modified BRT model looks to be the most cost-effective public transportation method for the Michigan / Grand River Corridor. It is a great improvement over the current CATA bus Route 1.*
- *Overall, I think this study and the ideas/potential solutions are very exciting.*

Skepticism for Potential Project

- *I like public transit and occasionally use it, but it's not presently clear to me that this proposed development will be such a great improvement over the present system, or lower-cost, enhanced-present system, to rationalize the cost.*

Longer-Term Vision

- *Eventually, if BRT proves successful, I would like to see streetcars return to Lansing!*

Service Planning & Implementation

- *I think the most important issue is improving speed along the corridor.*
- *Would be helpful to emphasize a plan for connecting neighborhoods to the mainline service, e.g., neighborhood loop connections.*

Concern over Cost Feasibility

- *The annual operating and maintenance should be addressed. Support of millages is getting harder to swallow.*



Concern over Loss of Green Space in Downtown East Lansing

- *The replacement of green space with concrete in downtown East Lansing has a negative impact on the city.*

Access to Downtown East Lansing

- *Keep all lanes (left turn lanes) accessible into downtown East Lansing.*

Integration of Bicycle Facilities

- *Attention to the transitions between Grand River corridor bike lanes and adjacent dedicated non-motorized routes will be very important.*
- *I still think safe passage for bicycles on the corridor is an issue and would like that to be remembered.*

Pedestrian Safety Concerns

- *When Grand River was rebuilt in 1995, pedestrian movements and green space were two of the highest priorities of the University and the City. There is limited to no mention of these aspects in information presented.*
- *Continue to be concerned with potential impacts and lack of consideration for pedestrians when reviewing objectives and goals.*

Traffic Flow Concerns

- *My main concern is that if a bus lane is added – that may restrict the movement of traffic. Drivers might revert to driving through the neighborhood.*

Engaging the Public

- *...but you need to talk with those of us in affected neighborhoods by visiting and being walked around to see the problems.*

3.0 Categorization of Comments

Project staff translated comments into brief statements that could be categorized and grouped for ease of references and to determine themes.



Support for Modified BRT Alternative

- General support for alternative (3)
- Positive ridership potential (2)
- Concurrence with planning/analysis (2)
- General support for process (2)
- Support goals
- Liked materials presented
- Will support economic development at Frandor w/ park-and-ride

Skepticism for Potential Project

- Skeptical re: development benefit
- Skeptical of population/job support

Longer-Term Vision

- Build ridership for eventual streetcar
- Future electrification

Service Planning & Implementation

- Concern re: encouraging new ridership
- Time/schedule reliability concern
- Need more stops but with faster travel
- Connecting service
- Real time info
- ITS
- Need for speed and ridership increase
- Support addition of stops on Northwind and Brookfield
- Suggests Lansing to Hagadorn service
- Run service directly into Meijer and Meridian Mall
- Need landscaping
- Wants improved stations

Concern over Cost Feasibility

- Capital cost feasibility concern (3)
- Operating cost/difficulty in obtaining support for transit tax increase
- Fare cost concern
- Cost vs. benefit skepticism

East Lansing CBD

- Maintain left-turns into East Lansing CBD (5)
- Concern over loss space/median in East Lansing CBD (4)

Integration of Bicycle Facilities

- Directness of westbound bicycle traffic to East Lansing
- Bicycle safety
- Want bike lanes on Michigan
- Want buses with bikes

Pedestrian

- Safe pedestrian crossings (4)
- Pedestrian crossing safety w/ median stations

Traffic

- Traffic flow concern (4)
- Cut-through traffic concern (2)
- Concern over lane reduction
- Suggests use of flex lane
- Believes diverting traffic to Kalamazoo and Saginaw will be positive

Social, Environmental and Economic Concerns

- Noise
- Impact on homes
- Impact on residents
- Disruption



4.0 Conclusions

Based on the review of the comments received during the November 2010, it is determined that each of the alternatives received some degree of support from the public.

Table 2: Evaluation Criteria: Community Involvement

Consistency with Plans	Rating	Definition	
Alternative received only positive comments.	●	Good	Alternative meets criterion very well
Alternative received a mixture of positive and negative comments.	◉	Fair	Alternative meets criterion sufficiently
Alternative received only negative comments.	○	Poor	Alternative significantly does not meet criterion

Table 3: Evaluation of Alternatives Based on Community Involvement

Alternative	Ranking of Alternative
Baseline	◉
BRT	◉
LRT	◉
Streetcar	◉