The seventh set of advisory committee meetings for the I-375 Improvement Project were held on September 17, 2019 at the Crain’s Communications Office in Brewery Park. In attendance at the meetings were representatives from the community, churches, businesses, and government. The Government Advisory Committee (GAC) was attended by seven and the Local Advisory Committee (LAC) was attended by 17.

MDOT, the City of Detroit, and the project team were in attendance to present the agenda and project updates. At this set of advisory committee meetings, the agenda touched on coordination with stakeholders, refinement of alternatives, and traffic. At this meeting the project team presented the four practical alternatives, 5A Direct Left, 5A Indirect Left, 5B Direct Left, and 5B Indirect Left.

Since the December 2018 GAC/LAC meetings, the project team has been coordinating with the City of Detroit and other stakeholders to make refinements to the Practical Alternatives. The team shared refinements to the Practical Alternative, including the new interchange design 5B. It was shared that the 5B alternative is still being analyzed but preliminary highlights include greater local connectivity, slightly longer travel time to access the boulevard, some additional traffic re-routing to Brush and Woodward during peak hours, more land available for redevelopment, and lower cost for construction and maintenance.

At the GAC meeting, discussion covered the northbound I-75 to eastbound Gratiot Avenue connection, non-motorized connections to Eastern Market, and the new termini of Madison Avenue. The LAC meeting discussed the Montcalm Street extension and how it could be utilized for non-motorized movements. The attendees at the meeting demonstrated a general consensus in favor of option 5B, specifically how it will improve connectivity.

At the GAC meeting, discussion covered the northbound I-75 to eastbound Gratiot Avenue connection, non-motorized connections to Eastern Market, and the new termini of Madison Avenue. The LAC meeting discussed the Montcalm Street extension and how it could be utilized for non-motorized movements. The attendees at the meeting demonstrated a general consensus in favor of option 5B, specifically how it will improve connectivity.

The next agenda item discussed indirect (Michigan left) versus direct lefts, including traffic and non-motorized impacts of both options. The layout of the Boulevard with both direct and indirect lefts was shared, followed by some slides on the safety and operational analysis between them. The GAC members discussed the refuge island width, landscaping, pedestrian crossing times, leading pedestrian intervals, and concerns that motorists will not like traveling further to make an indirect left-turn and the additional travel time on the Boulevard. The LAC meeting discussed parking impacts, non-motorized and motorized connectivity, and travel time along the Boulevard.

There were concerns about non-motorized and motorized connections across Monroe Street that exist with the direct left-turn and not with the indirect left-turn. Currently, there are bicyclists that go down Monroe Street and want to access Lafayette Street easily and a non-motorized connection would facilitate that movement. The direct left-turn option provides a better non-motorized connection. There was also
a question asked about adding “No Turn on Red” signs for the side streets that approach the Boulevard due to the proposed cycle track. They indicated that the signs could improve safety for cyclists utilizing the cycle track along the Boulevard.

There was also concern about vehicular access into and out of the Greektown area with the indirect left-turn option. There was also another concern raised about vehicles exiting the BCBS garage, especially during the evening peak period. The garage has approximately 1,800 spaces and there would be a lot of additional vehicles looping the block with the indirect left-turn option. These additional vehicles would end up utilizing the city grid network with the indirect left-turn option instead of just utilizing the Boulevard with the direct left-turn option. Holy Family Church also raised the same concern since their members also utilize the parking garage.

The last portion of the meeting addressed any remaining questions or comments over the Practical Alternatives presented and invited attendees to share items of interest from their respective organizations. Attendees expressed interest in the amount of developable land and its future use, construction phasing concerns, especially tied to I-94, and the importance of better visualizations of the project through 3D animation. Members shared that the Eastern Market Study will be released soon, the City of Detroit transportation master plan is underway, SEMCOG has a multi-modal toolkit kicking off soon and that the Greektown Neighborhood Partnership is releasing their new framework for the neighborhood.

The meeting concluded with a schedule update that includes a new round of one-on-one stakeholder meetings.
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• Welcome
• Introductions of Advisory Committee Members
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  ◦ Interchange Practical Alternatives
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Study Area
## Project Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action ...</th>
<th>... Element(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>Address infrastructure condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>Address obsolete interchange design and deteriorated bridges and roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>Address existing and future transportation needs and roadway safety for all users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve</strong></td>
<td>Improve vehicular and non-motorized connectivity to surrounding area and existing and planned transit services (which may result in improved community health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>Enhance access to enable future development and other place-making opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition ...</th>
<th>... Element(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating</td>
<td>Deteriorating bridge and pavement conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdated</td>
<td>Outdated geometric conditions, such as ramp widths and curvature, which result in elevated crash rates and congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking Connections</td>
<td>Lacking vehicle and pedestrian connections to the East Riverfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>Poor connectivity and confusing access to down-town destinations through I-75/I-375 and Gratiot Avenue Connector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>Congestion and safety issues along Jefferson Avenue Corridor due to high volumes and inefficient left turning movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Environment</td>
<td>Poor environment for transit and non-motorized travel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
Coordination with Stakeholders

Since 2016, the team has met with numerous business, educational, community, faith-based, and civic stakeholders.
Since last we met...

- Winter/Spring 2019
  - Met with FHWA
  - Indirect Left Turn Analysis

- Spring/Summer 2019
  - Stakeholder Meetings
  - New Interchange Concepts

- Summer 2019
  - Stakeholder Meetings
  - Refine New Concepts
Interchange Options
5A and 5B

Interchange Option 5A

Interchange Option 5B
I-75/I-375 Interchange Option 5A
EXISTING I-375/I-75 INTERCHANGE

Existing southbound I-75.

Gratiot Connector

Existing northbound I-75.

Gratiot Connector
Redesign I-75 to be the through-traffic movement.

Gratiot Connector removed.
I-75 Connections to the North

NB Boulevard onto Northbound I-75 entrance ramp on the **LEFT**

Southbound I-75 exit to the Boulevard on the **LEFT**
Ramps to and from Brush Street

Southbound I-75 exit to Brush Street

Brush Street entrance to Northbound I-75

Gratiot Connector removed
Ramps to and from Gratiot Avenue

Gratiot entrance ramp to NB and SB I-75

I-75 exit ramps to Gratiot and Madison
I-75/I-375 Interchange Option 5B
Gratiot Avenue and Boulevard

- No Left Turns Allowed
- Dual Right-Turn Lanes
Brush Street and Montcalm Extension

Brush Street entrance ramp to NB I-75

Montcalm extension to Eastern Market

Potential NB Boulevard connection to Montcalm
Boulevard and Service Drive

Pedestrian Signals

Developable land

Two Phase Signals
I-75 Connections to the South

- NB Boulevard entrance to SB I-75
- NB Boulevard entrance to NB I-75
- NB I-75 exit to Boulevard and Eastern Market
Eastern Market / Gratiot Connection

SB I-75 exit ramp

SB Service Drive to Brush and Woodward

Connection to Gratiot and Eastern Market

NB I-75 exit ramp to Gratiot and Eastern Market

Developable Land
I-75 Connections to the North

Entrance ramp from the Boulevard to NB I-75 on the **RIGHT**

SB I-75 ramp to the Boulevard on the **RIGHT**
Boulevard Options
Examples: Direct and Indirect Left Turns
5A: **Direct** Left-Turn Boulevard Option
10-ft sidewalks proposed along the new local road.

25-ft sidewalks proposed along the Boulevard.

Proposed **two-way bicycle facility** between Gratiot Avenue and the Riverfront.

Existing **Lafayette bike lanes connected** across the Boulevard to downtown.
New connection across the Boulevard provided at Clinton to improve connectivity.

Local road stops at Monroe Avenue.

Accommodate two-way traffic at Macomb Street.
Truck access provided for loading dock and on-street parking maintained.
5B: Direct Left-Turn Boulevard Option
Intersection with Gratiot Avenue

Same as Interchange Option 5A

Madison closed at Gratiot. Vehicles can use Beaubien or Brush for access.
5A: *Indirect* Left-Turn Boulevard Option
Indirect Left-turns (Michigan Lefts) added for Clinton, Macomb, Monroe, and Lafayette

Median Width is 44-feet

Direct Left-turn for Eastbound Lafayette

Direct Left-turns at Larned and Jefferson

Legend:
- New/Modified Roadway
- Shoulders
- Medians
- Sidewalk
- Bike Facility
- New Bridge
- Existing Bridge
- Land Available for New Uses
- Proposed ROW
New Local Road still proposed with 10-foot sidewalks.

No Pedestrian Crossing at Monroe

Pedestrians would cross in two stages instead of one stage

Vehicles exiting parking facility and wanting to go north would need to loop the block on Congress or exit onto Congress.
5B: Indirect Left-Turn Boulevard Option
Indirect Left-turn was moved north of Clinton to reduce conflicts.

Same as Interchange Option 5A

Intersection with Gratiot Avenue

Madison closed at Gratiot. Vehicles can use Beaubien or Brush for access.
Direct versus Indirect Left Turns
Studies show that pedestrian refuge islands result in a 46% reduction in pedestrian crashes.
Vehicular Safety

- Studies show that fewer conflict points reduces the number of crashes

![Diagram showing direct and indirect left-turns](image)

Direct Left-Turns increases number of conflict points

Indirect Left-Turn decreases number of conflict points
Vehicular Flow

- Studies show a **20-50% improvement** in throughput during peak hours at intersections with indirect left turns.
Vehicular Access and Circulation

Indirect Left-Turn

Direct Left-Turn

Direct Left-Turn option has better access and circulation options
4 Practical Alternatives

- 5A WITH DIRECT LEFT-TURNS
- 5B WITH DIRECT LEFT-TURNS
- 5A WITH INDIRECT LEFT-TURNS
- 5B WITH INDIRECT LEFT-TURNS
Each of the alternatives must be screened against various criteria to determine which alternative offers the most improvement.

- Meets the Purpose & Need
- Enables Development & Placemaking
- Connectivity to businesses, jobs, and homes
- Construction and Maintenance Costs
- Safe and connected access for all users

Preferred Alternative
Next Steps

• Continue analysis of the four practical alternatives
• Hold stakeholder one-on-one meetings in the next few months
• Present new information to LAC / GAC in fall
• Potentially hold a public meeting in early winter
• Select a Preferred Alternative
• Finalize Environmental Assessment by early spring
• Hold Public Hearing in spring
• Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) in summer
Questions?
Local Items for Sharing