

Draft Minutes
Regular Meeting of the
Advisory Traffic And Safety Board
December 9, 2008

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Colling called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Thomas Blackstone
Frank Cardimen Jr.
Ernest Colling Jr.
Paul Franklin
Allan Schneck
Michael Webber

Absent: Scott Hunter
Carl Moore

Also Present:
Janice Dearing, Recording Secretary
Marc Matich, Engineering Technician
Paul Shumejko, Transportation Engineer

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2008-0603

Minutes from the regular meeting of October 14, 2008 were presented for approval. A motion to approve them as presented was made.

MOTION by Blackstone

SECOND by Cardimen

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Absent: Hunter, Moore

Motion CARRIED

COMMUNICATIONS

2008-0590

Chairperson Colling said there were two letters included in the packet, one referencing No Parking sign requests, and the other in regard to the ordinance for snow removal from sidewalks. He suggested that the Board members read them at their leisure.

TCOS / NEW BUSINESS

2008-0587 Dutton Road Traffic Study

Chairperson Colling asked Staff to give background on the matter for the Board. Mr. Shumejko said there was a traffic study done for Dutton Road, which is in section four of the City. On October 28, 2008 the City received an email from Ms. Linda Raschke regarding traffic safety concerns along Dutton Road within the vicinity of Rainbow Drive to Tall Oaks Boulevard. Traffic counters were placed on Dutton Road about 800 feet west of Tall Oaks Boulevard during the period of Tuesday November 1st to November 14, 2008. The eastbound average daily traffic during this time period was 522 vehicles per day (VPD), with an 85th percentile speed of 35 mph. The westbound average daily traffic was 801 VPD, with an 85th percentile speed of 34 mph. The total average daily traffic was 1,323 VPD. Based on this speed data, the combined 85th percentile speed along Dutton Road within this vicinity is 35 mph. The speed limit conforms to the Michigan State Statute House Bill No. 5240, and is un-posted. This means that the speed limit is currently up to 55 mph, dependant on the conditions of the roadway along the gravel sections of Dutton Road. The Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) currently has 25 mph residential speed limit signs posted along Dutton, however these signs are not enforceable. The RCOC is waiting for further discussion on House Bill 5240 in the State Legislature prior to removal of the signage. There is also attached a breakdown of the vehicles with speeds identified and a correspondence from the RCOC.

Chairperson Colling asked Mr. Shumejko to explain to the Board members why the signs are not enforceable. Mr. Shumejko said that because of the State legislation that went into effect in 2006 the posting of speed limits along gravel roads is based upon access driveway points, other than in a platted subdivision where the speed limit is prima facie 25 mph. On a section line road or non-residential roads the speed limit is un-posted. The speed limit could be 35 mph or 45 mph based on several criteria including the number of driveway access points, because along Dutton Road there are relatively few access points.

Based on the study, the number of vehicles traveling less than 25 mph along this stretch was 1,174, or around 31 per cent. 2,212 vehicles were going 25 to 35 mph, which was around 59 percent. Those traveling at 35 to 45 mph were 365 vehicles, or about 10 percent. Those traveling between 45 and 55 accounted for eight vehicles, or .2 percent. None were identified as going over 55 mph. The traffic study also included a vehicle classification count. It identified 17 double axle vehicles traveling on Dutton at this location, although this type of count did not determine the number of double axle vehicles that are driving through verses those that are for local purposes. Traffic crash data was also obtained from the Traffic Improvement Association for the period of January 1, 2005 through January 30th of 2008, and revealed no reported crashes during this timeframe.

Since this section of Dutton Road currently has an un-posted speed per basic speed laws, City staff does not have any recommendations for further action.

A copy of a RCOC correspondence, dated February 9, 2007 regarding the removal of the Residential Speed Limit signs is also attached for review. Basically the Road Commission's response was that the "RESIDENTIAL SPEED LIMIT 25" signs they put in years ago will stay in place until they get further confirmation from the State Legislature. They don't want to remove the signs only to have to put them back in, because this law is still in the subcommittee at the State level. He believed that the only county that was affected by this ruling was Oakland County. Chairperson Colling asked for confirmation that Oakland was the only county that had this issue, and that currently as it stands the signs were staying up but were unenforceable. He noted that there was an Oakland County Deputy at the meeting, and asked him if the Sheriff's Department was aware of the unenforceable nature of the signs on Dutton Road. He responded that was correct. Chairperson Colling asked that unless a driver breaks the prima facie speed laws for surface conditions there would be no tickets issued. The Deputy responded that was also correct.

Mr. Franklin said Dutton Road is basically 26 Mile Road, and asked in terms of jurisdiction, is the south part of it Rochester Hills and part of it Oakland Township? Mr. Shumejko said it was all a Road Commission for Oakland County Road and they had jurisdiction over it. Chairperson Colling added that it was an Oakland County Road and the Oakland County Sheriffs Department patrolled it.

Mr. Webber asked that if that bill were not acted on by the end of the year, would they have to reintroduce it in the new year, meaning the process may take a while. Mr. Shumejko responded that the bill was approved as is, and then some legislators wanted it revised so a subcommittee was formed to look at the bill. As it stands right now it went into effect in 2006.

Chairperson Colling said he would like to open the matter up for public comment. He noted that he had received no speaker cards from the audience, and advised anyone who wished to make a comment on the traffic study for Dutton Road to fill out a card and give it to the recording secretary. Seeing no one that wished to speak, he closed Public Comment and opened the matter up to the Board.

Mr. Webber thought Ms. Rashke had made a good point regarding the intersection of Dutton and Brewster, and asked if the Road Commission had considered putting a traffic light there. Mr. Shumejko responded that he didn't think the warrants were met for traffic volume. One of the things the City tried to do from their end was to maintain the sight distances at the corner. Every so often the plant growth will impede the sight distance, especially when you are heading north on Brewster looking to the west. With the Forestry Department they try to maintain clear zones, but the warrants just aren't there. Regarding Dutton Road in general, we requested that the Road Commission look into the possibility of paving Dutton Road in this corridor. Then you can do a formal traffic study and set the speed based on the 85th percentile. Because it is a gravel road the surface conditions are always changing, and that is why they don't want to post the speed limit. If it was posted 35 mph and it rains tomorrow, 35 may not be a suitable speed to drive for the conditions of the roadway. By paving the road it would allow you to do an actual traffic study, then

come back and set the speed limit. Right now there is no funding source for it, and based on federal tax dollars the Road Commission has only enough money to pave one mile of gravel road per year within the County. Currently they have over 500 miles of gravel roads, and Dutton Road is not even in the 25-year plan for paving right now because the traffic volumes are low.

Mr. Franklin asked if there had been a significant increase in traffic since Dutton Road opened up through to Lake Orion. Mr. Shumejko said that he could not speak directly on it, but he thought there was an increase when Walton was under construction. However the most recent count that they did was after Walton was open between Squirrel and Opdyke, and the numbers were lower by around 700 vehicles per day than they were in the 2005 counts. While it did have some impact with drivers using Dutton Road or Adams to bypass the construction, now with Walton open it reduced some of the traffic volume.

Chairperson Colling stated he didn't believe they were being asked to take any action tonight on this. It could be taken as informational and so noted, or the Board could simply do nothing and move on to the next agenda item. He asked what the Board's pleasure was on the matter, and Mr. Blackstone suggested they move on to the next item on the agenda.

Chairperson Colling said it should be noted that they agreed with the recommendation of Staff to do nothing at this point in time as it is an Oakland County Road. Thank you for the information, and we will move on to the next item on the agenda, which is 2008-0588, the Thames Drive Traffic Study. He asked Staff to give background on the matter.

2008-0588 Thames Drive Speed Study

Mr. Shumejko said Thames Drive was in the Oakland View Subdivision in section 23 of the City. On October 31, 2008, the City received an email from Mr. Charles Smith regarding traffic safety concerns along Thames Drive, and a subsequent hard copy was received on November 6, 2008. The letter included a request to consider the installation of additional speed limit signage and/or the installation of pedestrian warning signs along Thames.

The current speed limit signage placement conforms to the City's practice of putting speed limit signs at the entranceway to subdivisions off their intersections with major roads. Per the attached map, a Speed Limit sign currently exists for the southbound direction as you enter Thames off Avon Road. The prima facie speed limit for residential areas is 25 mph. Speed Limit signs are not required within subdivisions; however, the City's practice has been to install speed limit signs at side street entrances off major roads to provide additional emphasis for drivers as they enter a subdivision off a main road.

Traffic crash data was obtained from the Traffic Improvement Association (TIA). During the period of January 1, 2003 through June 30, 2008 there was one reported crash that occurred on September 26, 2003 involving a vehicle hitting a parked car.

Staff has not yet had the opportunity to place traffic counters along Thames to verify the speed and vehicle counts, but based upon the existing signage and crash history Staff recommends that no further action be taken at this time. However Staff does recommend that we follow up with a vehicle count and speed study to be performed along Thames between Avon Road and Arms Court. Once the data is compiled Staff will compare the speed data with that of typical subdivisions within the City, which usually have 85th percentile speeds between 29 mph to 32 mph. The traffic count data will then be compared to that of the City's last traffic count along Thames to verify if any significant changes have occurred since then. The last 2002 traffic count resulted in Average Daily Traffic (ADT) of 572 vehicles-per-day (VPD). An ADT of 572 VPD is within the typical range, which can be upwards of 1,500 VPD for residential subdivisions.

Once the traffic speed data has been collected and analyzed, Staff will determine further actions that may be necessary including the placement of an additional speed limit sign for northbound Thames, just north of Arms Court. Also if the 85th percentile speeds are above the norm we will make a request to the Oakland County Sheriff's Office (OCSO) to provide speed trailers, followed by selective enforcement along Thames during the peak speeding hours.

Longer-term solutions and recommendations would be to implement a traffic-calming program that includes public educational awareness among neighborhood residents, and possibly the installation of speed humps along Thames. The installation of a five-foot wide concrete sidewalk on one side of the road would also alleviate pedestrian concerns and improve safety. However, it should be noted that there is currently no City funding available for sidewalk construction and the costs associated with the construction would be borne 100% by the adjacent property owners.

At this time we are requesting that no action be taken until we can do the follow up speed count. Based on the volumes we didn't find anything atypical for this stretch of roadway given the size of the subdivision and the interconnectivity among the various subdivisions.

Chairperson Colling stated that once again he did not have any cards from the audience, and asked if anyone wanted to be recognized to speak on this item. Hearing none he closed the public hearing and opened the matter up to the Board. He asked if there was a homeowners' association (HOA) for the subdivision that Staff had been in contact with. Mr. Shumejko wanted to point out that the resident who submitted the concern did not live on Thames but actually off of Avon Road. He said it was an older subdivision and he did not believe that they had a HOA. Chairperson Colling said he would make an additional recommendation that they find out if there is an HOA involved, so that we could contact them when we revisit this issue. He asked if Staff had anything else they wanted to add.

Mr. Schneck said as far as the cross section of the road, he imagined it complied with standards for local streets and Act 51 to become a local road, and asked whether it is an open ditch section through there. Are there adequate shoulders where pedestrians could walk, or do we maintain an aggregate shoulder? Mr. Shumejko responded that it had a 60-foot road right of way, and the width of the pavement itself was 22 feet. As in past practice it was paved through a special assessment years ago, and the standard has always been to

pave the road and then put the sodded area immediately adjacent. So it is a 22-foot wide paved road with probably a two-foot grass shoulder, which then immediately slopes off for the ditch line. Typically pedestrians are supposed to walk against traffic and bicyclists should ride with traffic, but based on the letter he was not sure if the proper procedure is being followed. It sounded as though the gentleman might be walking with the vehicles, which may play a part in the problem. But to answer Mr. Schneck's question, other than a few feet of lawn area, there would not really be an adequate shoulder to walk on.

Mr. Cardimen said from what he could tell it looks like it is one individual that is raising the issue, and based on data we are looking at it doesn't appear there is a serious problem. If there is a residential or pedestrian problem one of the key issues is to contact the people in that area to see if in fact they think there is a problem. If they do then the alternatives of funding a sidewalk and/or putting in streetlights have to be their responsibility.

Chairperson Colling added they were noticing problems of late caused by parents parking within the bus stop zones to drop their kids off. This creates a traffic hazard with drivers having to go around them when getting in and out of their subdivision. He requested that when they put their traffic counters in place he would like a study done monitoring the morning bus pick up to find out the behavior of drivers, where the kids are standing, and to look for any potential safety hazards. That will determine if there is a problem or not. He recommended to the Board that someone make the suggestion that we again move forward to the next agenda item with no action taken as requested. A Board member requested that they do so.

2008-0572 Arizona Avenue Speed Study

Mr. Shumejko said Arizona Avenue was in the Hitchmans Haven Subdivision in section eight of the City. On May 12, 2008, the City received a letter from Ms. Harper West regarding traffic safety concerns along Arizona Avenue. Traffic counters were placed during the period of Monday, September 30, 2008 to Friday, October 3, 2008 while school was in session:

Based on the data, at the first location, which is Arizona just north of Colorado, for the northbound there were 103 vehicles per day, and the 85th percentile was 29 mph. The southbound average daily traffic was 95 vehicles, with the corresponding 85th percentile speed of 29 mph. The total average daily traffic at this location was 198 vehicles per day.

The second traffic counter location was Arizona just south of Colorado, which identified 186 vehicles for the northbound direction, with an 85th percentile speed of 29 mph. In the southbound direction the vehicle count was 166 vehicles and the 85th percentile speed was 34 mph for a total average daily traffic at this location of 352 vehicles. Based on this data, the southbound 85th percentile speed along Arizona Avenue just south of Colorado Avenue is above the typical numbers for subdivision streets within the City. Typical 85th percentile speeds for residential subdivisions within the City are between 29 mph to 32 mph. The higher than typical 85th percentile speeds for southbound Arizona south of Colorado may be

attributable in part to the grade of the roadway in this vicinity. The City's Survey Technician surveyed and calculated the longitudinal roadway slopes along Arizona south of Colorado, which varied between three and 6.5 percent.

The traffic volumes along Arizona are relatively low for subdivision streets within the City, which may carry upwards of 1,500 VPD. Staff also gathered traffic crash data from the Traffic Improvement Association (TIA) along Arizona during the period of January 1, 2005 through June 30, 2008. There were two reported crashes that both occurred on December 2, 2005 near the intersection of Arizona and Colorado. Both crashes occurred during inclement winter weather conditions.

In the near term, Staff recommends forwarding the speed data information to the Oakland County Sheriff's Office (OCSO) and requesting the placement of speed trailers, followed by selective enforcement during the peak speeding hours of 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. Longer-term solutions and recommendations are to implement a traffic-calming program that includes public educational awareness among neighborhood residents, and for residents to pursue the installation of speed humps along Arizona. Staff has provided Ms. West with literature regarding the process for implementing speed humps. The 2009 proposed budget appropriates some shared cost for residents, with a 50/50 cost sharing. There is a limited amount of dollars, which will be given on a first come first served basis. The traffic volumes are relatively low, and Mr. Shumejko felt many of the southbound speeds in the 34 mph range are due in large part to the slope of the roadway. Once you get south of Colorado the road becomes straight for quite a distance. Mr. Shumejko thought in the past there had been requests to put an all-way STOP sign at the intersection, but it does not meet warrants for that.

Chairperson Colling asked whether his recommendation at this time was to do nothing. Mr. Shumejko said for the short term he recommended they request the Oakland County Sheriff's Department to do some selective enforcement during the peak violation periods. For the longer term it was made more challenging because there is no formal homeowners' association, which can unfortunately hinder the process of trying to get speed humps installed because it does require approval by a majority of residents affected by it.

Chairperson Colling stated there was one resident who wished to speak on the matter, and called Ms. Harper West to the microphone.

Ms. Harper West
155 Arizona Avenue
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-1559

Ms. West said she has been tracking this matter for several months. She came before City Council about a year ago to speak on this issue. She has contacted a number of residents in the subdivision, and has "flyered" most of the residents on Arizona, Colorado, and Oklahoma at least once if not twice. Sixteen residents have contacted her regarding it. Many of the people who have lived in the area for a long time have stories of speeding issues. Dennis Rothenstine who lives at the corner of Colorado and Arizona has had the experience of people failing to give way at the YIELD sign, sliding into his driveway, and

taking out his mailbox twice. If people are missing the YIELD sign and sliding off the roadway there are significant speeding issues. There's a school bus stop right at the corner of Colorado and Arizona, and as has been mentioned tonight the parents park their cars there twice a day and wait for the bus, creating a traffic hazard. There is no STOP sign there so people do not stop or slow down at all. She said she had lived there less than two years, but the speeding going southbound on Arizona is significant. Looking at the speed study it shows that 85 % of the cars are doing less than 34 mph, but what is the top 15 % doing? She thought there were people going close to 50 mph southbound on this road.

Mr. Shumejko responded that in the speed study 21 vehicles were going between 34 and 36 mph, 10 vehicles were between 37 and 39 mph, and four over 40 mph.

Ms. West said although four cars going over 40 may not sound like much, all it takes is one to kill a child. She runs and walks her dog on that road and in the rest of the subdivision all the time, and it is frightening to see how fast people go. When there are inclement conditions it is really difficult for vehicles to stop. People don't slow down when they see you walking or running, they continue on at 35 or 40 mph, which was especially discouraging to her. She noticed from the speed study that there is a significant increase in traffic in the section south of Colorado. She said she lives just south of Colorado and walks on it quite a bit, and the number of cut-through cars coming off of Brewster and Walton to avoid that intersection is significant. There are a number of residents that live on Colorado who were here tonight, and they see the same things. One of the residents who called just the other day has lived there for 44 years, and said immediately after the light was put in at Brewster and Walton the cut-through traffic went up significantly. She stood out by her mailbox one day and counted 47 cars within 15 minutes, and almost got hit by the speeding cars going by. She had numerous other comments from residents that she could share. The residents are very concerned. Although there is no homeowner's association, with a little bit of effort they could contact the residents and generate more concern. She was interested to see what the next steps are. She thought a lot of residents would like to pursue speed humps.

Chairperson Colling said in order to go forward with the speed humps they would need to get some sort of commitment from 51 % of her neighbors. It would require a special assessment district (SAD) or a homeowners' association to come up with the costs. He asked Mr. Shumejko if the costs would be around \$2,500. Mr. Shumejko responded that when you go ahead with speed humps you don't want to put in just one, you want to put them in a series for them to be effective. You are probably talking about two if not three mid block between each of those streets.

Chairperson Colling said he did not want to appear jaded, but their street had a low traffic volume compared to most in the City, and the 85th percentile speed is roughly 29 to 34 mph southbound only, which tells him that the topology of the downhill slope plays into this. The percentage of vehicles with excessive speeds is small. He did understand that it is dangerous, but it is difficult, to catch the two to three percent of drivers as you can't police the roadway 100% of the time.

Ms. Harper said the problem was that it had not been policed at all. She had called the Sheriff's Department, had come before City Council, had talked to the Mayor, and they basically say that the Sheriff's Department will not do residential enforcement,

Chairperson Colling said that they did do selective residential enforcement, and based on input from residents you can generally see some results. But the problem is that selective enforcement occurs at a specific period of time and the results are short-lived. Within a month or two after having been stung with a ticket people revert back to their old habits. From looking at the speed humps installed in Farmington Hills and elsewhere in Michigan they do provide some relief, but are not cure-alls. Even with the speed humps you could experience people that are just fools and are going to drive that way. Unfortunately you can't legislate against stupidity.

Ms. Harper asked if residents would be charged if they put in a STOP sign. Chairperson Colling responded that a STOP sign was not an option as there are not warrants there to put one in. Ms. Harper asked if there were traffic volume requirements that would have to be met. Chairperson Colling said the warrants could be for volume or hazard, and no such volume or hazard exists. Ms. Harper asked if speeding were not a hazard, and Chairperson Colling responded that a STOP sign was a traffic control, not a speed control device. Ms. Harper said that there are streets in the City that have STOP signs that are purely for speed control. On East Maryknoll going southbound there is a street that tees into East Maryknoll and East Maryknoll stops. There is no reason that street should stop according to your regulations, and yet East Maryknoll stops.

Chairperson Colling said he would have to look at the warrants and the history and see why that sign was put in. There were some members of City Council years ago that overrode the advice of staff and the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board and put STOP signs in places that were not warranted. As we review the signage within the City, when we find unwarranted signs we pull them out if we can.

Mr. Shumejko said in the latest revision of the Michigan Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD) it explicitly states that STOP signs shall not be used for speed control. Ms. Harper asked what the role of the STOP sign was. Mr. Shumejko responded that it was to assign right of way to a given street. In this case Arizona has the right of way versus Colorado. Ms. Harper said there was no STOP sign there. Mr. Shumejko said that was correct, because Arizona has the right of way it does not stop, and Colorado yields to Arizona.

Mr. Shumejko explained that limited sight distance was another factor that could be used to warrant a STOP sign, but basically the signs are used to assign the proper right of way for the street. One thing that may help alleviate some of the congestion at the Brewster intersection is that in this last year we entered into an agreement with the Road Commission for Oakland County to upgrade that signal. They will be installing the box span type signal similar to the one that was put in at Old Perch and Walton. Hopefully we will be able to maximize the signal timing better. Going southbound the right turn lane is probably under capacity. A lot of cars get queued up because they can't get into the right

turn lane, and people might be more inclined to use Oklahoma or Colorado to bypass that. Although he didn't think it was in the Capital Improvement Program yet, at some point they would like to extend that right turn lane to help alleviate the cut-through traffic.

Ms. Harper said she was at that intersection running every morning between 6:30 and 8:00 a.m., and at times the traffic backs up quite a way down Brewster. People don't want to wait, and so they find alternate routes. It would be good to take steps to help improve the situation. She asked if her next action should be to see if we could get residential support.

Mr. Shumejko suggested they hold a meeting at the staff level at City Hall and see if they could garner enough interested residents and come up with a game plan. Chairperson Colling advised them that when the Board discussed the matter they would make formal recommendations for them. Mr. Shumejko said as far as the funding there were a couple of options. It might not necessarily have to have subdivision-wide support, maybe just the residents of Arizona Avenue. Ms. Harper said it would be difficult to get the support of 51 percent of the entire subdivision as the people on Texas and Nevada probably didn't even drive down Arizona and so didn't care.

Chairperson Colling asked if there were anyone else in the audience who wished to speak on the matter.

Mr. Dennis Rothenstein
200 Arizona Avenue
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-1560

Mr. Rothenstein said he lived on Arizona Avenue right where Colorado dead-ends. He has only lived there since 2004 so he didn't know too much about the history before that, but ever since he had lived there it is actually a school bus stop. Depending on the year eight to ten children get on the bus. There is a YIELD sign when you are on Colorado coming to Arizona, and when you look to your left there is kind of a blind spot because it goes up over the top of a knoll in somebody's yard. The people coming around the corner are actually going downhill so they are going a little faster. He said so far there have been three accidents at the corner where cars have either ended up in his driveway, or in the tree, or his mailbox, or in the bushes next door. He felt if there were a STOP sign at the corner so people would have to come to a stop it would slow them down. Sometimes when it is icy people have done a doughnut and ended up in his driveway. He thought there was a safety factor, not only during icy conditions in wintertime, but since it was a good central location for a bus stop it would be a good idea to have something done about this corner before something happened.

At least twice a year something happens in his driveway. A STOP sign only costs around \$100 to \$200, and would prevent people from just going around the corner. They don't like to stop, they just buzz around even when there are kids at the corner. You can't control the kids; sometimes they are in the street. There are parents that stay at the corner and watch the kids in their cars and try to slow traffic down a little bit when kids are in the

area, but he thought that a STOP sign at the corner would slow a lot of the vehicles that are coming down the hill.

Mr. Franklin asked for clarification exactly where the bus stop was located. Mr. Rothenstine said if you take Colorado east to right where it intersections with Arizona his driveway is right there and the kids stand at the end of the street. Mr. Shumejko said he was familiar with the area, and that he had informally talked with the schools about possibly relocating that bus pick up point because of the T-intersection. Arizona Court might be a more appropriate spot, although it would be a further distance for the students.

Chairperson Colling thanked Mr. Rothenstine for his input, and said he would now like to turn this matter over to the Board for their comments. However another audience member came forward to speak.

Ms. Suzanne Kiczek
110 Arizona Avenue
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-1558

Ms. Kiczek said she lived on the bottom of the incline, and wanted to stress that here is a speeding issue here. She said she had lived there over 10 years, and many times when she is out mowing her yard there are cars that are going above 25 mph northbound and southbound on Arizona. Even today when she was out shoveling the snow in her driveway there was a van going northbound on Arizona that she knew was going at least 30-35 mph. She stood and watched it from Walton straight up to Colorado Court; it was zipping. There is also the bus stop off Arizona Court, and she has noticed when the children come off the bus their parents are standing there waiting for them. She wanted to stress that there are speeding vehicles going northbound and southbound, and there is limited sight distance uphill. She said she was even paranoid about going out into the street because of the traffic, and wanted to add her concerns.

Chairperson Colling asked if there were anyone else in the audience who wished to speak on this issue. Hearing none he closed the public hearing and opened the matter up to the Board members.

Mr. Cardimen introduced himself to Ms. West, and said he was president of the Hawthorne Subdivision Homeowners' Association. He said they also had a speeding problem and they had done two things that might also help in her case. The first was to bring in the Sheriff's Department to a homeowners' association meeting. He explained that they provided them with documentation and ways in which to communicate with the Sherriff's Department. Their subdivision now has a group who fills out a form when they see a speeder. This information goes to the Sheriff's Department and they respond to it. What they can't do is respond to a general remark, "There is speeding going on in my subdivision." He said that once you get some documentation in their hands they have found the Sheriff's Department to be very, very responsive.

The second piece is that as an association they have been fortunate to be able to bring people together. It didn't appear they had an association in the Hitchman's Haven Subdivision, but it did seem like they had an informal "getting together." If they felt that speed humps were absolutely essential as a calming device, then Mr. Shumejko and the City have a policy that must be followed. The policy requires a certain number of people that live along the road to approve it. Then your association must be fortunate enough to get the funding. You also have to remember that with the speed humps there will be more signs being put up in the yards to let people know they are there, so you get a little bit of environmental question as well about having more signage. He explained that his point is what you are experiencing is something that all of us take seriously. We understand the issues. Sometimes we can't do anything within the guidelines of the engineering requirements and the uniform codes, but in our subdivision we have had a very active program for over a year and a half now, and we are having very good success with law enforcement coming in because we provide data. He suggested that they call the substation, get the documentation, and then you can fax it, email, or call your information in. They have been extraordinarily supportive.

Chairperson Colling said he also lived in one of the oldest areas of the City, and there was no formal HOA for years. They don't have one in the sense that they have dues, but they get together when they really need to. He strongly urged that if they didn't have a HOA to form some sort of loosely knit group that is formal in the sense that you can use the City traffic-calming program. Secondly he requested that City staff review the school bus pick up zone again. He said he was starting to see a pattern within the City. He understood the love people had for their children and that they wanted to see them safely off to school, but what they don't realize is that by parking around the school pick up zone and at bus stops they are impeding traffic and causing a bigger problem. One solution might be to drop the kids off and have one appointed parent to stand there and watch them. He asked that Staff review the school bus stop for safety. A lot of times the school picks the location that is convenient for the bus driver, but it may not be the safest spot.

Mr. Franklin thought they should look at the relocation of the bus stop. North or south of the intersection would make it a lot safer. Chairperson Colling said staff could include that in their review when they make their study, but the problem is they can make a recommendation to the schools, but they have no sway. That is where the residents and the PTA come in. If they would prefer a different stop that is safer, backed up with traffic information that they had, they would be glad to work with parents and the school board to get some results.

Mr. Schneck suggested the use of speed trailers in the subdivision to provide some aid in enforcement, or education of the drivers that we are aware that there is a problem and that we are trying to take the necessary steps to get compliance. Chairperson Colling said we have had some excellent suggestions, and asked if anyone would like to make a motion.

MOTION by Cardimen to forward the speed data information to the Oakland County Sheriff's Office (OCSO) and request the placement of speed trailers followed by selective enforcement during the peak speeding hours of 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 7:00

p.m. Also to implement a traffic-calming program that includes public educational awareness among neighborhood residents, and for residents to pursue the installation of speed humps along Arizona.

Additionally the ATSB recommends:

- , To bring in the OCSO to a homeowners' meeting for suggestions and education on ways to deal with speeding concerns and enforcement.
- That the subdivision forms a group to explore the issue of speed humps.
- Staff review the location of the bus stop at the intersection of Arizona and Colorado Avenues for safety, and consider its relocation.
- Use of speed trailers and selective enforcement.

SECOND by Blackstone.

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Absent: Hunter

Moore

Motion is CARRIED

Chairperson Colling advised the audience members that this was the Board's formal recommendation to them, and that Staff or any member of the Board would work with them if they wished.

2008-0573 Bagley Drive / Dearborn Avenue Cut-Through Study

Mr. Matich stated that this was in regard to Dearborn Avenue cut-through traffic concerns in the Glidewell Subdivision from Auburn to Livernois. He read the narrative report Staff had prepared for the Board.

The DPS Traffic Division recently performed an updated traffic study for Dearborn Avenue and Bagley Drive within the Glidewell Subdivision, located at southeast corner of Section 28. This traffic study was initiated upon the Mayor receiving a signed traffic complaint from several area residents living on Dearborn Avenue and Bagley Drive (dated September 23, 2008). The nature of the traffic complaint relates to eastbound Auburn Road traffic cutting-through and using Dearborn Avenue northerly to Bagley Drive, then easterly on Bagley Drive to go northbound on Livernois Road during the afternoon weekday peak hour periods (from 4:30-6:30 p.m.). The traffic study included conducting 24-hour weekday average daily traffic volume counts and recording a two-hour manual license plate technique study on both Dearborn Avenue and Bagley Drive. It should be noted the Traffic Division conducted a similar cut-through traffic study in 2002 and forwarded the results to the Advisory Traffic Safety Board for review at their November 12, 2002 meeting. The ATSB at this time adopted a motion to have the Michigan Department of Transportation improve the intersection of Auburn Road and Livernois Road. The Road Commission for Oakland County reviewed and adjusted the traffic signal timing to allow more green time for eastbound Auburn Road at its intersection with

Livernois Road.

Existing Conditions

After examining the traffic complaint, the focal area of this study was on Dearborn Avenue and Bagley Drive. Automatic traffic recorders were placed on Dearborn Avenue (north of Auburn Road), and Bagley Drive (east of Dearborn and west of Livernois Road). The traffic counts were taken during the week of November 10, 2008 with pneumatic tube detectors placed in the roadway while school was in session. Counters were placed for a minimum of 48 hours to obtain an average daily traffic count during a typical weekday. The morning and evening peak hours were identified for Dearborn and Bagley from the machine counts. A license plate technique study was conducted during the most problematic times between afternoon peaks hours of 4:00 and 6:00 p.m. to identify the traffic flow patterns and directional cut-through traffic.

Traffic Studies

Mr. Matich advised the Board that the results of the license plate study were inadvertently put in with the Cone Avenue information in the packet. A traffic count map is provided within this report and indicates traffic count comparisons with the previous years of 2000, 2002, and 2008.

The traffic counts on Dearborn north of Auburn have remained pretty constant since 2000. In 2000 there were 559 Vehicles Per Day (VPD), in 2002 there were 563, and today we have 559. On Bagley west of Livernois we currently have 1,672 vehicles, which has gone up from the count in 2002 because school was not in session for Luther High Northwest School. We are not aware of resident complaints about speeding, therefore a speed study was not included as part of this traffic study.

Discussion and Options

From the traffic count data collected, Dearborn Avenue still has relatively normal average daily traffic volumes when compared to citywide averages, with no real change from the year 2002. However, 19% of the total traffic volumes for Dearborn Avenue can be contributed to northbound travel during the 4:00 – 6:00 p.m. peak hours. The root cause of this traffic complaint involves a lack of capacity for Auburn Road, and Auburn Road at its intersection with Livernois Road. It is increasingly difficult for eastbound Auburn Road to make left turns to go northbound on Livernois during afternoon peak hours. During the license plate technique study eastbound Auburn Road traffic was observed being queued back to Hartline Drive (1,600'+/-) from Livernois Road during the 5:15 p.m. period. Several eastbound vehicles were observed making left turns onto Hartline, Simpson, and Woodelm at this time. A cut-through problem between Auburn and Livernois can only be isolated to the evening peak hour periods. At present there are no road improvements scheduled for Auburn Road, however, the RCOC anticipates a preliminary engineering study for Livernois Road widening (Hamlin-South Boulevard) to be completed by the end of 2009. Until this occurs we have requested RCOC Traffic Operations to update the SCATS signal timing for the intersection of Auburn and Livernois and push signal phasing for eastbound left and through traffic during weekday afternoon peak period.

Action Requested

We suggest that the Traffic and Safety Board review the traffic complaints within the Glidewell Subdivision and make any necessary recommendations. Auburn Road is under the jurisdiction of the Michigan Department of Transportation, and any recommendations to MDOT for safety improvement or a traffic control order that would restrict turning movements from Auburn Road would have to be forwarded to MDOT for their disposition and action. Staff doesn't recommend adopting a traffic control to restrict left turns from 4:00-6:00 p.m. for Bagley Drive onto Livernois Road mainly because Lutheran High Northwest trips and peak hour also coincide with this time period. The posting of no left turns for Bagley Drive at Livernois Road would be an immediate action until Auburn Road and Livernois Road are improved, and would only be a means of treating the symptom and not the cause, which is the intersection of Auburn and Livernois. At this point we are asking the Board to review the complaints, but not to recommend any NO LEFT TURN signs because we feel it would have a domino effect, and would just push traffic onto other subdivision streets.

Chairperson Colling opened up the public hearing, asking those who wished to speak to keep their remarks under three minutes so that everyone would have a chance to speak.

Mr. William Perry
2843 Dearborn Avenue
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-4302

Mr. Perry asked to hear the traffic volume numbers again. Mr. Matich said for Dearborn just north of Auburn there were 559 vehicles. The total count was taken over a three-day period, and that was the total north and southbound average for the three days. On Bagley east of Dearborn we have 266 vehicles per day. At Bagley west of Livernois we have 1,672 vehicles per day (between the school driveway and Livernois).

Mr. Perry said you have Dearborn, a street that is basically two blocks long with over 500 cars running down there in a 24-hour period. How many people live on a two-block street, 50 or 75? There is five times that amount of traffic going down the street, and it is ridiculous. He asked what the peak times were, and said that you would find a big spike in traffic volumes between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m. on Dearborn and Bagley. He had previously had a long conversation with Mr. Shumejko about that. He said they sit there and watch the traffic every day, and it is literally a parade. You can tell when the traffic signal down by the school cycles because there is a two minute break and then ten to twelve cars go by. He saw that the next item on the agenda is traffic cutting through Cone Avenue and going out through the school parking lot. If you follow those cars they are going to go down Cone, cut through the school parking lot, onto Auburn, onto Dearborn, onto Bagley, day after day. We have no sidewalks, we can't walk our kids, we can't walk our dogs, and people are flying down the street. Something has got to be done. You say, "We can't put up a NO LEFT TURN sign here, we can't put up a NO LEFT TURN sign there," what exactly are you going to do? The residents are so fed up that everybody on the street signed the letter, and it only took 45 minutes to get all those signatures.

He acknowledged he had gone through his three minutes, but said we can't get a thing done; we can't get anybody to do anything. When one of their kids gets hit or somebody gets hurt on that street from all the traffic cutting through, are you going to sit there and wring your hands and say, "We should have done something about it." We have complained about it for years. It's every day, at 4:30 or 5:00; here they come. It's a parade, they are literally nose to tail, in groups of 10-12. He stood in his driveway for four minutes one day and counted 34 cars go by. Every time the traffic light cycles, as regular as clockwork, here they come. They get on Bagley, turn right, then go out and make that left on Livernois.

Mr. Matich said in their cut-through license plate study, of the traffic exiting Bagley to go on Livernois to make a left turn, there were a total of 97 vehicles making a left that were not school related, and a total of 85 going out of the school

Mr. Perry stressed that Bagley is only five blocks long, and the only reason the traffic is going in there is to take Bagley north to Livernois. There is no other way out. Mr. Matich wanted to let him know that a lot of the traffic is going to the school.

Mr. Perry said it was just ridiculous, and that something must be done. He noticed that all the other items on tonight's agenda, except Bagley and Dearborn, dealt with speeding. This tells him there is a serious problem with speeding in residential neighborhoods. It calls for enforcement. There are thirty people in this room and they are all talking about the people speeding down residential streets, and you're telling every one of them that you can't get enforcement for that. But that's exactly what we pay the Sheriff's department to do, to enforce the laws in the City.

Chairperson Colling explained that we are not saying it can't be enforced, what we are telling you is that it is impossible on a daily basis to have an officer in every subdivision in the City. We only have a limited number of police officers under the budget. It has been put before the voters several times to increase funding for police, and it just hasn't happened. Unless we have more officers we have a limited amount of people we can put on the streets at any given time. We can ask for selective enforcement and we will get it, but selective enforcement is only a very short-term fix for the amount of time that they are there.

Mr. Perry said he went to Allen Park quite a bit. You don't speed in Allen Park if you've got good sense because you will get a ticket. In Dearborn you will get a ticket. If you go to Sterling Heights and speed you will get a ticket. But you can come here and race down residential streets with no fear. It's a matter of enforcement and we need something done about it.

Chairperson Colling said they had his message loud and clear, and asked if he had anything else to add at this point. Mr. Perry responded no, he just wanted to see some action.

Mr. Andy Roye
2830 Dearborn Avenue

Rochester Hills, MI 48309-4301

Mr. Roye said he would keep it short. He lives on Dearborn Avenue and works two jobs. When he gets home from work from his first job, he has a couple of hours to spend with his kids. He can't go with them on a bike ride because the traffic is ridiculous. He makes his kids stop their bikes when a car comes and wait on the side of the road until the car passes by. It would take them an hour to go an eighth of a mile. When he leaves in the morning there is no traffic on Dearborn, but sure enough when he comes home that's when all the heavy traffic shows up from Auburn. He suggested a NO THROUGH TRAFFIC sign be installed. He knew it could not be enforced constantly, but every once in a while the Sherriff can follow people through, and if people see others getting tickets it would help. Every car that stops coming down their street would be an improvement. Sometimes you have to take baby steps to get to the main objective. He would like to see some signs of progress in stopping the cut-through traffic.

Chairperson Colling asked if anyone else would like to speak on this item, and hearing none he closed public comment and opened it up to the Board. He said he had experienced some of the frustration these folks had at that signal. The traffic stack up for the left-hand turn northbound onto Livernois in the evening is atrocious. You can sit there for a couple of lights. Also the intersection at Auburn and Livernois needs to be improved on Auburn Road as well. He had his car sideswiped there last winter by a guy who tired to jump the curb to go around him to make a right hand southbound onto Livernois. If there was adequate right turn stacking as well as left turn stacking so we could clear traffic through the intersection, he believed it would make the intersection more accessible and reduce the stacking problem. The engineering to add to that right turn lane would be minimal. Even though it is a State road it would only need about four feet of pavement and moving the curb and it would be there. He strongly urged that we contact the State on kind of an emergency basis to see if something can be done to add the right turn capability there. They overbuilt the shoulder on Auburn Road, and it shouldn't be that hard to do a restripe and a little bit of work. He wasn't sure if anything else could be gained out of SCATS to improve the intersection.

Mr. Matich said that the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) had reported back to him that are going to push a few more seconds of green time for eastbound. They do a tradeoff between northbound and eastbound traffic; they are competing against the clock and it's a 120 second cycle right now. Northbound has the same congestion problem as eastbound. They told him they were out there today monitoring the traffic, and they are going to push a few more seconds. Mr. Matich said that while we were doing the study we did notice that once the Auburn Road traffic was only backed up to Walsh, we didn't see the traffic coming down Bagley as much. We think if we can make it so the queue doesn't back up past Walsh we won't see the need for people to spill into the subdivision and try to use the subdivision streets.

Chairperson Colling said that was going to be his comment, because quite frankly he is against putting NO LEFT TURN signs in this area only because it will be similar to Medinah up on the north end by Adams a few years ago. Every time we put in a sign to

prohibit left turns the problem moved to another street within the subdivision. We eventually had to post five NO LEFT signs to keep it from happening. We don't want to just move the problem to somebody else in your neighborhood. The other issue here is the school itself. It has a driveway that people can use without going out on Livernois, and some folks are going to use that.

Chairperson Colling said he knew that Lutheran High School tries to be a good neighbor. He recommended that in this particular case that Lutheran High devise some kind of program with a sticker that goes in the windows of parents' cars if they are driving to pick up kids, and also on the cars of student drivers, so that if you see a car speeding through your subdivision with that sticker you know it is someone from the high school. You might have to go to the school and talk to them about it, but they need to be good neighbors. If the drivers coming through your subdivision are not being good neighbors, you want to be able to tell the school about it with some degree of certainty. This is a voluntary program that comes under traffic calming, and maybe staff can even get involved with it. It is not meant to penalize Lutheran High, the students, or the parents, it is merely to try to identify where the problem is coming from. We can reduce the cut through if we can get the traffic stacking down in the left hand turn lanes so people use Auburn Road instead of cutting through your subdivision by virtue of the right hand and left hand turn lanes that we spoke of earlier, but there is nothing we can do about the people going to the school. He suspected that even if we made Livernois and Auburn perfect there would still be a certain amount of school traffic going through the subdivision. Chairperson Colling said those were his personal recommendations, and then opened the matter up for discussion by the Board.

Mr. Cardimen said the problem is Auburn and Livernois. How do we continue to put pressure on the agencies that have jurisdiction on those two roads to fix the problem? He thought the feedback they had gotten from RCOC on changing the signal timing should lower the queue in the short term, but maybe they should put up signs restricting left turns during peak hours on all the streets. He said he was being facetious, but perhaps we should just to put the pressure on the responsible road agencies. When traffic continues to back up and they get a lot of complaints from residents they might try to find a better solution to that intersection.

Chairperson Colling said if the residents of the subdivision want to put up with that restriction on their freedom to get to their own homes he would entertain it, but he warned that it would not only impact the people trying to cut through, it would also force the subdivision residents to go through the signal all the way up to Auburn Road and turn on East Bagley to get to their houses. He said he did not want to put them through that unless it is what they really want. It can be done, they can limit left turns everywhere, but it is going to impact you the homeowner as well. He strongly urged them to think about it before asking the Board to act in that manner.

Mr. Franklin asked if they had similar problems on Hartline, Simpson, and Walsh. Mr. Matich responded that for the license plate study they only did two intersections during the peak hours. The previous study that was done in 2002 showed 29 cut-through vehicles in

the two-hour period, so residents have been living with the same condition since then.

Chairperson Colling asked Mr. Franklin to look at the map included in the packet. He explained that if they could keep the traffic from stacking up past Walsh, the study shows that the cut-through traffic would be lessened. The best they can hope for is that by increasing the signal time they will accomplish that. He asked if there was adequate lane stacking at the intersection, and Mr. Matich responded that there was also a capacity problem.

Mr. Cardimen stated that therein lies the problem. How do we get MDOT to commit to a plan to build more lanes for us on Auburn Road so we don't have problems in our neighborhoods?

Chairperson Colling thought that the engineering he had mentioned earlier would be a solution; however even with the extra wide shoulders along Auburn the State has been reluctant to utilize them because they are not built to the same standards as the roadway itself. He thought that with minimum engineering and expense it could be done, but due to the state of the budget he was not sure they would get any response. He suggested that we point out that it is a significant improvement that would dramatically increase the safety factor at that intersection. The question is whether they would be responsive or not. Maybe our State Representatives could get involved, as the problem is strictly funding.

Mr. Franklin said he has been on Livernois going north during rush hour and it was extremely backed up. He wondered what effect a roundabout like the one proposed at Livernois and Hamlin would have on moving traffic. Chairperson Colling said from working on the Master Thoroughfare Plan he knew that is not being looked at. The fact of the matter is that we could cut down the traffic on Auburn Road if the needed improvements for capacity were done on M-59. According to the Master Thoroughfare plan the improvements for capacity are to go to M-59.

Mr. Shumejko said it is more complicated than adding a little bit of lane width at this intersection because there are some right of way issues and the need to upgrade the signal. The Road Commission recently received an earmark for 1.2 million to do another preliminary engineering study at Livernois from Square Lake Road in Troy up to Avon Road in Rochester Hills. It is expected to be completed by the end of 2009, and to identify the capacity problems throughout the whole corridor. They realize that there is probably insufficient funding to do the improvements across the whole corridor. Over the long term they are talking 20 years, and in the interim (the next five to seven years) they will isolate intersection improvements to get the capacity through them. Even after the study is completed there is no funding source for any construction work beyond the study.

Mr. Cardimen said that if we are talking about right of way then we have a different problem, but if not he would like to challenge MDOT and the Road Commission to see if they can't at least get this on the priority list. Chairperson Colling said as far as he can tell it is only two feet that keeps us from adding the right turn lane capacity that we're talking about. He thought that most of the right of way might be there. Mr. Shumejko said if the

intersection were modified the signal would have to be upgraded as well with box span, which would push the poles out. It would need ADA upgrades with ramps too.

Mr. Schneck said he had heard a lot of comments, and as had been stated Auburn Road is an unmarked State trunkline. He said he was not speaking for the State, but having worked for them and having Auburn Road under their jurisdiction there were some proposed improvements on M-59 that would provide that additional capacity. As the State is coming under some hard economic times the Governor put forth an initiative to preserve first, which means they are going to take care of the road system that is currently constructed. The improvements along M-59 have been designed, and he thought if funding broke loose it would follow the hierarchy of road systems. It would go to the highways first, then possibly to the unmarked trunk lines.

One thing that hasn't been mentioned is that the State has approached the City and offered to give Auburn Road back to them, which he didn't feel was in the City's best interest. As far as improvements at that particular location, he was interested to know if there were any proposed redevelopment at that intersection, as often times that provides a City or agency the opportunity to acquire right of way at no cost based on an improved site plan.

Chairperson Colling said the property on the northeast corner that used to be the Total Gas Station is being redeveloped as a 7-11, but it is not changing the property parameters whatsoever. There is fixed ownership that is not going to change on all four corners. The only corner where there is any possibility of acquiring property is the southwest corner because it is not as fully developed as the others. He thought it was school property.

Mr. Schneck said oftentimes if it is in the best interest of the motoring public and they don't have any future use for a particular property, property could be donated. Property donations can then be used as a match in a project. There are a couple of sources of funding, and possibly the State would entertain a tri-party agreement, with funding from the City, funding from the Road Commission for Oakland County, and funding from the State. If they could demonstrate based on the crash history that there is a safety issue, there currently is a call for safety projects, and/or congestion mitigation air quality funding is available. They are different funding sources, and you have to fill out applications and apply. Based on the discussion we have had this evening, obviously there is a congestion problem, and unfortunately people are peeling off into the neighborhoods to get to their destination.

Chairperson Colling said he agreed with Mr. Schneck in principle, but unfortunately even if we were to start that funding process today it could be two to three years out if not longer before they could do any physical breaking of ground and mitigation of the issue. He felt the residents needed some sort of alleviation now. His suggestion should be pursued, but should be a long-term objective. Right now he thought they should look at the short-term situation.

Mr. Cardimen offered that the Road Commission's retiming was part of a short-term solution. His question was have we made contact with MDOT about the possibility of

bringing in a bulldozer and making the improvements? If we can prove there is a problem and this could be a relatively inexpensive short-term fix, have we communicated this to MDOT?

Chairperson Colling responded that we have communicated to MDOT that there is a problem at every major intersection along Auburn Road in the City: Auburn and Dequindre, Auburn and John R, Auburn and Livernois, Auburn and Adams. The problem is there is no funding. He said he had no answer as to how we go forward and get them to move off dead center. We need to point out to the State we are having problems that are causing dangerous traffic situations; there is a hazardous situation that is getting worse. He was more concerned about what action we should take, if any, regarding left turns in this area. What we are doing is trading the residents' access to their own homes at specific times of day to basically block traffic. The only way to do it without playing musical chairs with the subdivision streets is to post them all, which he was reluctant to do.

Mr. Matich said another action that they asked the Board to review was a series of speed humps along Bagley. Chairperson Colling responded that once again it is like musical chairs. We can't afford to put enough speed humps on all seven subdivision streets. Mr. Matich said they were recommending putting them on Bagley alone, which is related to the school traffic. Chairperson Colling said he had a problem with that because we would be asking these citizens to pay half the costs, but unless the City was willing to pick up the whole tab he was not going to foist it on them. This situation is not of their making, and not at their request. If we want to put two speed humps on Bagley it would be fine, but it should be fully City funded because the problem is due to the thoroughfares. We could go to the Lutheran School and ask them to kick in, but with school budgets the way they are and it being a private school, he thought the odds were slim to none they would contribute.

He still liked the idea he had suggested earlier about getting the school to cooperate with some sort of identifying sticker that can be seen on the cars, perhaps in the rear window. What he is trying to do is isolate the problem. Like any other problem you're trying to solve you have to find out what factors are causing it. If the speeding is due to the cut through traffic, then we address that specifically with enforcement. If the parents going to the Lutheran school are causing the speeding we can track that, but right now we don't know where it is coming from.

Mr. Schneck thought as the gentleman had stated earlier that it was not so much the speed of vehicles that was the problem, but the volume of traffic during certain time periods of the day that made it so pedestrians could not utilize the roads. Chairperson Colling replied that he mentioned both speed and volume.

Mr. Schneck asked if Dearborn Road was designated as a safe route to school, and was used by students to walk to a bus stop or school. He explained there is a funding program called Safe Routes to School. It can be used for capital improvements if walking surfaces need to be provided, or if there needs to be selective enforcement. If the problem is about traffic volume and the utilization of safe areas for pedestrians and non-road users, what you're trying to do is keep them off the street and away from motorized traffic.

Chairperson Colling responded that it was a private school, and he was not aware of any of the subdivision children that attended it. He didn't think it was a designated safe walking route. Parents drive their children to Lutheran High North, as it is a private school. There may be bus stops on Dearborn for children that attend other schools.

Mr. Shumejko advised the Board members that in the packet for the next agenda item he had included the letter that he had sent to all the schools last year concerning Safe Routes to School.

Mr. Cardimen addressed Chairman Colling, saying we have two problems. There is a short-term problem to try to help alleviate some of the issues, and he said he would like to see the Board move forward and decide whether to follow the recommendation of Staff. He strongly urged the Board to request a follow up on the changes that are going to be made by the Road Commission to see if the problem continues. He also suggested, if we haven't already, to get a meeting together with MDOT and all of the key parties including TIA and the Road Commission, and get the point across that this is a pretty serious situation. Maybe in the short long-term we can solve the problem.

Chairperson Colling suggested that they craft a motion. He liked the idea of a meeting between MDOT, the Road Commission, and the City of Rochester Hills. He said he would like to adopt Staff's suggestions for the short term. Within 60 days of the changes to the traffic signal he would like data back before the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board. He would like the homeowners that are here tonight to be notified, who could then notify the rest of their homeowners' group. Then he would like to look at some long-term solutions with MDOT based on what was discussed here. He also stated that he would like the City through the Traffic Calming Program to work with these homeowners and Lutheran North to see if they can come to some sort of accommodation. He recommended an educational program with the parents that are dropping off their kids and driving through the subdivision, so they will respect the people whose homes they are driving past.

Mr. Perry indicated to Chairperson Colling that he had something to add. Chairperson Colling said he didn't normally reopen public comment for an agenda item, but said he would give him a couple of minutes.

Mr. Perry said they had talked about the intersection of Livernois and Auburn, and problems with how the left turn lane stacked up. He suggested that they put the left turn arrow at the beginning of the cycle, which he felt would relieve a lot of the congestion. Chairperson Colling said there were also right and left turn issues that impede traffic getting through, and those are some of the things they would be discussing with MDOT when they got them to the table. Mr. Perry added that there are several bus stops within the subdivision.

Mr. Cardimen asked if he could make a motion on the matter. Chairperson Colling said Board members had made a lot of suggestions. He asked the recording secretary to include what had been discussed as recommendations to Staff for this. Mr. Cardimen said he had

written down the items:

1. Adopt Staff's immediate proposal.
2. Staff response to the change in the Road Commission's retiming, and get back to the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board in 60 days
3. Set up a meeting with MDOT, the Road Commission, and City of Rochester Hills for some solution and/or evaluation of Livernois and Auburn.
4. Contact the school to get them involved in the conversation.
5. Evaluate speed humps along Bagley, what it would cost to the City to do this, or just an evaluation of the response from the residents along that roadway to assess whether speed humps really are a viable option.

MOTION by Cardimen

SECOND by Blackstone

Chairperson Colling asked for a roll call vote.

Blackstone	Aye
Cardimen	Aye
Colling	Aye
Franklin	Aye
Schneck	Aye

Absent:	Hunter
	Moore

Chairperson Colling advised those in attendance that the matter would be back before the Board when the 60 days were past and they had some data from retiming the lights to see if it helped the situation. At that point in time if it hasn't, the only action they can recommend immediately is NO LEFT TURN signs. They can also ask for selective enforcement, which they will do as a matter of course in any event. He asked Staff to notify the residents when the light timing was done so they would know it had been accomplished, and thanked the residents for their input.

2008—0574 Cone Street / Avondale Middle School Through Traffic

Mr. Matich read the staff report, saying it dealt with cut-through traffic concerns in Belle Cone Gardens Subdivision in section 33 of the City. .

On October 17, 2008, the DPS - Traffic Division received a traffic survey from Ms. Lorene Waldorf regarding concerns about cut-through traffic along Cone attributed to parents utilizing Cone as a student drop-off/pick-up point near the gated access at the north end of the street. City traffic counters were placed at the following locations per the attached map during the period of Tuesday, November 11, 2008 to Friday, November 14, 2008 while school was in session and to indentify when the school gated driveway

was open to traffic.

The traffic studies that we did were on Cone north of Alsdorf, Cone south of Alsdorf, and Alsdorf west of Cone. We did the northbound and southbound directions, and also eastbound and westbound for Alsdorf. We also did the speed data. We found the speeds to be 24 mph for the 85 percentile for Cone north of Alsdorf. South of Alsdorf it was 29 mph, and we did not do one on Alsdorf west of Cone.

In summary, the following staff comments are provided to assist with the clarification and responsibility concerns addressed by the Cone Avenue community area residents as listed within their Traffic Information Survey (dated 10/17/08):

• *Cone Avenue, was obviously never plotted or intended to be a through street:*

Belle Cone Gardens Subdivision was platted with Cone Avenue. designated as having an 86' right of way from South Boulevard northerly to its subdivision limits. This right of way exceeds our typical 60' local right of way and therefore classifies Cone Avenue as a collector road. Cone Avenue. runs north and south, is roughly a ½ mile east of Crooks Road and west of Livernois Road. A traffic signal is provided at the Avondale School Driveway / Cone extension intersection with Auburn Road.

• *Too many parents and cut through traffickers are aware the swing gate is now open and utilize it. It has become an all day thoroughfare.*

The existing school gated access for ingress and egress traffic north of Cone Avenue and south of Avondale Middle School circle driveway is controlled by Avondale School District solely, and not the City. The City Traffic Division is not aware of the provisions or restrictions regarding the use of this gate by Avondale School District. Staff does not condone the use of Cone Avenue via Avondale School Driveway to gain access to Auburn Road by means of the traffic signal; however staff also does not deem this traffic movement as posing a safety problem. We encourage traffic to use the traffic signal as we feel that is a safer means of getting in and out of the subdivision. Having the gated school access open to traffic helps to balance the traffic throughout the subdivision and posing a safety problem. Additionally, the latest vehicle count data is consistent with typical volume ranges for residential subdivisions of similar size and appears to indicate that much of the traffic is attributable to residents within the subdivision.

• *There are no yield or stop signs along Cone Avenue, from South Boulevard to Alsdorf, to control the continuous flow of traffic, especially during the hours of 7a.m. to 8 a.m. and then again at 2:15 to 5 p.m.*

The streets for Belle Cone Gardens subdivision are platted by means of a street grid pattern with various intersections have alternating regulatory traffic controls, STOP and YIELD signs. Since Cone Avenue is considered a residential collector road and carries higher amount traffic than other local roads, it was determined to be the preferential roadway and therefore has been signed to have the right-of-way.

•There is a terrible blind spot around the curve of the drive\road into schools from Cone Avenue access:

This complaint was forwarded to our City Forestry Department and all tree and brush vegetation has been cleared from back of street curb to the front property line for 3295 Cone Avenue. It should be noted that the City right-of-way at this location is limited to six feet from the existing back-of-curb. Brush was cleared and removed on the Avondale School property located inside of the road curve. This complaint will need to be reinspected during the summer of 2009.

•There is not a cross walk or crossing guard for students to cross the drive/road safely:

No public sidewalk exists for Cone Avenue. Avondale Schools has only has a partial sidewalk and not a continuous sidewalk located along the east side of the school driveway from Cone to Auburn. No sidewalk is provided along the west side of the school driveway except at two designated sidewalk crossings from the Meadow Creek Subdivision. No school crossing guard is provided since students walk within the roadway and not at a designated crossing.

•The swing gate is not staked down when open:

The Traffic Division has received previously reported incidents regarding the school gate being a hazard when not completely swung open. These complaints were forwarded to the Avondale School District. Apparently the school gate doesn't lock when open and as a result the wind will cause the gate to partially close. This issue needs to be addressed by the Avondale School District and has been forwarded on for their review.

•Many cars and buses exceed the speed limit:

From the recent Cone Avenue speed studies, high speeds were not prevalent at the time of the study.

Recommendation:

Staff requests the ATSB to review the above traffic complaints and discuss the procedure and operations of the gated access school driveway (located north of Cone Avenue) with Avondale School liaison personnel, who were invited to attend tonight's meeting and discuss the operation of the gate. Also, discuss the options for constructing a five-foot wide concrete sidewalk along Cone Avenue, including the use of federal funds from the "Safe Routes to School Program" or by means of a Special Assessment District among adjacent property owners. A copy of email correspondence from a previous Pathway Committee Meeting regarding sidewalks is attached for reference.

Chairperson Colling said he was disappointed that no representative was present from the Avondale Schools. He felt it was another example of a school building something with no

oversight or zoning requirements. What they have done is created a default roadway with an uncontrolled access gate that people use for what it is, an extension of Cone Avenue all the way to Auburn Road. It is being used as a public street. He made the observation that he did not know what they could do about it short of barricading the end of Cone and reducing the access. He opened the matter up for public comment, requesting that in the interest of giving everyone a chance to speak that they limit their remarks to three minutes.

Ms. Cheryl Kennedy
3690 Cone Avenue
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-4370

Ms. Kennedy said she had lived on Cone 20+ years. She had been there since it was a dirt road, been there for the assessment of the road, been there when they put the gate in. We were told it would never be open to the public, it was for emergency vehicles only and was a required safety measure by the City. At first it was pretty much kept closed, then Crooks Road happened. The school decided to keep it open because it was the only way to get buses in and out. Now there is a concern with Livernois being redone, which will make it even worse. You can see from the speed study that 40 cars were going over 30 mph, which is unacceptable. You are calling this a collector road. What is a collector road? It was never supposed to be a through street. We are paying an assessment to get the road paved. Will the City help us repave it because we are a collector road with all the cars and buses going through?

It is a mess. Short of sitting in our driveways screaming at cars to slow down, she has walked out in the road to slow people down. She has parked cars on both sides of the road and has had buses stop and stare at her to move a car so they could get through. These were Avondale buses as well as other school buses going to sporting events.

Chairperson Colling asked her for confirmation that the gate was now being left open 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Ms. Kennedy said that it was. Chairperson Colling asked if the majority of traffic is people using it as a public roadway, or people taking their kids to school. Ms. Kennedy responded most of it is people taking kids to school, although there probably is some cut through. She felt they should be using Auburn Road.

Chairperson Colling asked if in her estimation the traffic was predominately during the hours that are school pickup and drop off times. Ms. Kennedy said yes for the majority of traffic, but there are still cars coming through at lunchtime. Chairperson Colling asked if she looked out her window at 10:00 p.m. on a Saturday night, do people drive through then. Ms. Kennedy said she had seen a couple, but most of the traffic is school related. She added that doing an assessment in the summer is not going to help.

Mr. Stewart Kowalski
3476 Cone Avenue
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-4368

Mr. Kowalski asked where on Cone south of Alsdorf the traffic count was done for this most recent study. The closer you get up to Alsdorf the traffic is starting to slow down because the road curves there. As you go further south on Cone they are flying down the street, and in the evening at the end of their run the buses are sometimes the worst offenders. If you are out there at 7:30 a.m. and somebody is late getting their kids to school you don't want to be anywhere near the road. The closer you are to the start of school the worse the traffic is in regard to speed. There might be fewer cars, but they are flying to get their kids to school on time.

Mr. Shumejko said that the traffic counter was put 330 feet south of Alsdorf. Mr. Kowalski said that would be about halfway down the block. The further out you go the worse the traffic is. He has had his cars parked on the road before, and buses call and make them out to be the bad guys when they are trying to protect themselves. The worst offenders are the parents taking their kids to school and the school bus drivers.

Mr. Brian Wesp
3812 Cone Avenue
Rochester Hills, MI 483809-9374

Mr. Wesp said he had lived in the neighborhood his entire life, 27 years. He just bought the house on Cone around two years ago. He has an eight-year-old daughter that he stands at the bus stop with every morning and every afternoon, and is right at the corner of Cone and Grace. It is mostly school traffic, and south of Ruby they absolutely fly. A lot of cars are probably doing 45 mph, buses too. It is not just the middle school, but also the upper elementary that are both on the access road.

He was also concerned that Grace currently yields to Cone. He thought a good fix to the problem would be to have Cone yield or stop for Grace. Another reason is that Grace goes down a hill there, and especially this time of year it gets all icy and cars can't stop. He is right at the corner and almost every day he sees near misses because people can't stop on Grace to yield to Cone. Cone is just a residential road in a small neighborhood. It shouldn't have the kind of speeds or amount of traffic that it does. Even if the School did close the gate, and for many years it was closed, parents are still going to drive all the way down Cone up to the gate, drop their kids off, turn around and come back. You are still going to have the problem of the traffic volume, but you can control the speed or the route that they take. If you put a STOP sign on Cone at Grace they won't be able to fly through that intersection.

Chairperson Colling said from what he knew of that area there wasn't much of a turnaround. Mr. Wesp said that originally it was a two-lane road at the gate which was closed, and everybody turned there and wore out the grass. So they put down asphalt and widened it so there was enough room to turn around there. He thought people would still drive down that road, drop their kid off, and then come back down Cone.

Mr. Wesp said someone had mentioned crossing guards, crosswalks, and sidewalks, but this is a residential neighborhood and you don't need a crossing guard in a residential

neighborhood. Those are for major roads. Chairperson Colling responded that there are crossing guards for schools built in residential neighborhoods when it is deemed necessary. There are crossing guards within the subdivision for University Hills Elementary. Generally speaking it is safer not to mix pedestrian traffic with the roadway. Rochester Hills has had a policy, mistakenly so in his opinion, where to preserve the rural nature of the area they did not require sidewalks for quite some time. It is now the policy of the City for any subdivision constructed to be built with sidewalks, because it is statistically safer for residents and pedestrians.

Mr. Wesp said he understood that, but due to the traffic on Cone especially during school arrival and dismissal times, even if you were on a sidewalk in the winter it could still be unsafe. They fly down that road probably at 40 mph. Chairperson Colling said that his take on it is that the sidewalk is five feet wide and usually at least three feet back from the right of way. You are far enough removed that unless a car was totally out of control and rolled up on somebody's lawn statically it is much safer. Mr. Wesp said about a month ago he woke up at 4:00 a.m. because that exact thing happened. At his house at Cone and Grace there are not many kids that walk to school, but there are six kids that wait at the bus stop, and in the afternoon eight kids that get off the bus. He and another parent stand out there and try to get the cars to slow down, but they don't stand in the road either because they don't want to get hit. He thought that the traffic flow needed to be changed by putting a STOP or YIELD sign on Cone at Grace and Ruby.

Chairperson Colling said he would try to quickly give the definition of a collector road. It is a term that has more to do with Act 51 monies for federal gas tax money than anything else. What defines a collector road is its right of way. Cone Avenue has a wide right of way; he believed it was 86 feet, which allows them to build a much wider roadway. A collector road is designed to be one that traffic uses through the subdivision, or the surrounding area funnels into to get out on the main roads. Cone does serve that purpose for access to South Boulevard for this particular subdivision. In his neighborhood Culbertson by Reuther Middle School is designed as a collector road. It is no wider than Cone, and it runs the length from Auburn Road down to Milton and wraps around out on to Auburn Road. It is a very similar situation. It has more to do with the fact the City gains money from tax dollars to support the roadways that are designated as collector roads.

Mr. Wesp asked if what he was saying was that you couldn't put a YIELD or STOP sign on Cone at Grace because it is a collector road. Chairperson Colling responded what he was saying was that the traffic warrants to put in a STOP sign were not met. The *Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices* specifically prohibits us from using a STOP sign as a speed control device. Because there is more traffic on Cone than there is on Grace or Ruby, you are asking me to put in an unwarranted STOP sign, which means I am using it to control speed.

Mr. Wesp said it would also control flow and drivers might take other north/south roads over to Alsdorf, which would also cut down on speed because they are turning on different roads. Grace currently yields to Cone, and Grace is on a hill that is constantly icy because it is not plowed.

Chairperson Colling this said was not the first time this particular subdivision and the intersection of Grace and Cone had been before this Board. He said he had been on the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board since its inception in 1985, and it is probably the fifth time it has been before us. We have revisited the signage on this road several times, and it is a matter of warrants. The traffic warrants state that if you have this set of conditions this is the traffic control that is warranted. Unfortunately in this particular situation there are no warrants that would cause Ruby or Grace to have the right of way over the traffic on Cone. There is nothing in his bag of tricks that allows him to put in an unwarranted STOP sign to change the flow of traffic to try to control speed. What we have to do is control the behavior. There are other ways we can do this, and we can certainly look at them. He did not believe that a STOP sign was the answer.

Mr. Wesp asked what he thought was the solution. Chairperson Colling responded that he would like to get the comments from the other residents of the subdivision who would like to speak, and then open the matter up to the Board. Then they would give him that answer.

Ms. Lorene Waldorf
3900 Alida Avenue
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-4247

Ms. Waldorf said she lived on Alida, which is four blocks west of Cone. She was the one who originally put forth the traffic complaint. She had been to the school, and was very disappointed that there was no one representing them at this meeting. Two years ago they changed superintendents and opened the swing gate because of the construction on Crooks.

Chairperson Colling asked if when she spoke to the school they told her that was the reason the gate was opened up. Ms. Waldorf said it was why it was originally opened two years ago, and now that we have changed superintendents and the principal at the middle school they have decided to have it open because of busing and budget cuts. The Avondale Meadows Elementary that is on Auburn, and Avondale Middle School that is behind it consolidated their busing. Both schools start and end roughly ten minutes apart from each other. There are over eleven hundred students between the two schools. They opened the gate to control traffic, and Livernois is an issue too. The gate was originally opened specifically to let buses through. It was actually manned by students, and they would only let buses through. Now it is opened and closed at the whim of the school.

Mr. Cardimen asked if the gate was controlled by the Avondale School District, and was told that it was, and was on their property. He asked if Cone Avenue was a City road, Mr. Shumejko responded that it was up to the gate, and near the school entrance the City owned half the right of way. The east side of the road is public, and the City has six feet beyond the back of curb. On the west half of the road we just have rights to the actual physical pavement of the road, and it is private property to the west of it

Ms. Waldorf said due to budget cuts the subdivision had lost busing for students to the upper elementary and the middle school. Chairperson Colling asked if when the school

district controlled the gate so that only buses got through, was there a problem with it at that point? Ms. Waldorf responded there was certainly a problem to some degree. Chairperson Colling asked Ms. Waldorf to explain, asking if the problem was with parents or congestion at the gate. Ms. Waldorf said at that time it wasn't as bad as it is at present. Now with both schools starting and ending at close to the same times and the gate being open, it is a constant flow of traffic. Chairperson asked if they were using the same buses for students at both schools, and making the students wait ten minutes, which Ms. Waldorf said was correct.

Ms. Waldorf said that it is just a nightmare. The school claims they need the gate open for the convenience of the parent drivers. Her major issue is that there are no sidewalks, and nowhere for the children to walk, consequently most of us must drive our children because it is not safe. The school could not give her the number of children in the subdivision that are required to walk, but she said she would get with them to find out. She understood what was said about not having the findings for a sign on Cone. She didn't feel that it would be for speed control, but it would help the flow of traffic. In the morning it is a constant flow, and these children have to use Cone to walk to school.

Chairperson Colling said he understood that. Ten years ago on Springwood Lane off of Livernois the City Council decided to put STOP signs mid block, against recommendations. It was for the same reasons, a situation with a school. Afterwards they did a very detailed speed study, and found that the STOP signs increased the speeds. Drivers sped more mid block to make up for the time they lost stopping at the unwarranted STOP sign than they did without the signs. He said he was unwilling, knowing that data, to install the signs in a situation that is already hazardous for kids, when people will speed even more between signs.

Ms. Waldorf said she also understood that, but there has to be something in place on this road to stop the continuous flow of traffic in a residential area. Chairperson Colling said he was not sure that they could stop the continuous flow, but they could control the speed and make it a safe situation, which he thought should be their objective.

Ms Waldorf said someone had brought up the crossing guard issue; and to get across that driveway there is a big blind spot. If there are two buses coming and going, there is nowhere for the kids to walk. There is no sidewalk there, and there is a huge blind spot. Mr. Shumejko asked if she were talking about the east side of the road, and if the blind spot was due to the shrubs and trees. Ms. Waldorf confirmed that was where she was talking about, and said the road was made that way to deter people from going straight through. Mr. Shumejko said they tried to do what they could, but as he had said earlier we only have six feet that we can legitimately clear. The Forestry Department went out to trim back the brush and overgrowth in that area, but we can't go onto the private property, and it is a private residence on the north end.

Ms. Waldorf asked if the City has any property on either side of the drive, specifically the west side. Mr. Shumejko said as he had mention before, the property owner owns to the centerline of the road, so the City just has the prescriptive rights to the actual paving

surface. He wasn't sure if on the west it was subdivision open space or a private residence. The City has a limited right of way for the east half, up until you get to the school property. From that point north it is all private at the NO THROUGH TRAFFIC, BUSES ONLY sign. Ms. Waldorf asked if the City had put that sign up. Mr. Shumejko said that they had not, and actually it was not a standard sign and was not enforceable.

Chairperson Colling asked Ms. Waldorf to finish her points, as he would like to call up the next speaker and then open the matter up to the Board. Ms. Waldorf said her question is, what can the City do to help us?

Chairperson Colling responded that he would like to get the comments from the last resident who had filled out a card to speak, and then open the matter up to the Board to answer her question.

Ms. Francine Ignasiak
3424 Cone Avenue
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-4368

Ms. Ignasiak said she has lived in the neighborhood for seven years, and it really wasn't a problem until Avondale left the gate open all the time. It is open non-stop. The problem she had is that yes, it is primarily school traffic, but it is both the buses and the parents bringing their kids to school. She wanted to hear the Board's ideas on what action they could take against the schools since they have chosen to be bad neighbors. She said they were endangering the residents, and they had seen accidents, they had seen cars turned over in people's front yards. A sidewalk wouldn't save your life in that instance, and she had seen it happen twice. She has seen fissures in her road right out in front of her driveway. She lived two houses away from the opening where the gate is. The road is deteriorating and we will see major problems this summer. You won't see that two streets over because they don't get the traffic that Cone Avenue does.

Ms. Ignasiak said she couldn't get out of her driveway this morning for five minutes. She said that the bus driver glared at her when she said, "You know what, get out of my way because I am going." She had to get out. She has noticed that her neighbors are parking on the street because they are fed up. Every resident is parking on the street to slow traffic down. She said we have car insurance; we will use our own cars to barricade our kids and our neighbors to keep them safe. If that is what we have to do we will all get our cars out on the street. She said she hated to put it that way but it is the school that is to blame. If the school would simply shut that gate and keep it locked we would be safe.

Ms. Ignasiak mentioned legal action, and said that she would like to hear the Board's ideas on what they could do to the school to make it painful enough to make them keep that gate closed. She added that was all she had to say.

Chairperson Colling said at this time he would close public comment because the Board members were anxious to come up with some solutions for them. He said he could only remember one instance in the entire time he had been on the Board when they had put a

barricade up on a roadway, but in this particular situation he was inclined to make this number two, and he would tell them why.

1. We have had numerous issues with both Rochester Community and Avondale schools cooperating with the City in trying to alleviate traffic problems like this.
2. We are at the mercy of a quasi-governmental organization below the school board, which we have no means to force to do anything.

He said he was seeing a pattern here, and had driven the street. He was fortunate enough not to be run over by the buses, but he has seen them travel at a good clip down it. This is a situation where the school district has greatly impacted the lives of our residents for their own convenience. He said he was reluctant to put the life of a child at risk from careless drivers. He didn't even like the idea of people driving down the road, turning around, and dropping kids off. It shouldn't even be a drop off point because it is too restrictive with not enough right of way

Although it may seem draconian, he proposed that they recommend to Staff that they put in a breakthrough barrier, which is one that can be broken through by a police or fire vehicle but effectively blocks the roadway. From Alsdorf to the barrier on both sides of the road post signs saying NO STOPPING, STANDING, PARKING. He thought that was the only way we can put the traffic where it belongs, out to Livernois or Crooks, up to Auburn Road, and down to the school.

He explained he was talking about a barrier on the roadway at the appropriate place determined by Staff, and he wanted to eliminate that area as a drop-off point for parents, which would also include residents of the subdivision. He felt that was the only way he could get traffic out of the subdivision.

Mr. Cardimen said that he was in agreement on the barricade, but wondered if there is a back off position to start with. That means that Staff contacts the superintendent of the schools and gives them the edict. If they are not willing to participate in or support it, then we put the barricade up within a certain period of time, whether it is a week, two weeks, or thirty days.

Chairperson Colling said he is not going to be friendly about this; he is going to go with the nuclear option. It is either this, or here is what you can do to stop it if it's not what you want. The barricade should be where the school property begins. And he is still going to post the street NO STOPPING, STANDING, PARKING, as he doesn't want it used as a drop-off point. If the school wishes to open the gate and have it manned and only let buses through that is fine. Other than that it is locked 24/7. If they don't do that, then the barricade goes up along with the signs. Two choices, and that's all they are going to get. In his opinion there is nothing in the way of signage, nothing in the way of behavior, there is nothing in selective enforcement that is going to make these people, that are essentially abusing the good nature of this neighborhood, comply.

Mr. Webber said he appreciated all the comments tonight, and he certainly thought it was a problem created by the school district, but he asked Mr. Shumejko if we as a City have had any interaction at all with the school district. Mr. Shumejko said Avondale Community Schools has always been a little tricky. They had a pretty good relationship with Rochester Community Schools, but Avondale has been unresponsive on past issues. They had sent notices out to six staff members from the superintendent down to the principal, but had not gotten any acknowledgement that they would attend tonight's meeting.

Chairperson Colling said correct me if I am wrong, but before this gate was first put in they even asked for a light. We realized this might be a problem and we wrote to the School Board. He didn't think they even got a reply at that point. Mr. Shumejko said he was not sure if by site plan the schools have a right explicitly stated there that gives them access. Chairperson Colling said it is also a road, and we can barricade the public road.

Mr. Shumejko said another issue to consider is off the new subdivision, Meadow Creek, there is a catwalk in between Fantail Drive that connects to the school. Previously we had a situation where parents were actually driving through the pathway to get to the school. He was not sure if that would become the new drop off. Chairperson Colling said if that occurs, then it is obviously a traffic violation that we can deal with. Mr. Shumejko said he meant the drop off and pick up problem might just shift over there. Chairperson Colling said the school has a huge roadway, and there is a lot of asphalt there. They can create a drop off zone between the two schools. These kids are not sugar, they are not going to melt, and they can walk the distance from that point to either school. There is more than enough room to build it. If there turns out to be a legal issue why for some access reason we can't build a barricade, then he would look at it, but right now to be quite frank about it, he could think of no other alternative that would work in this case.

Mr. Cardimen made a MOTION to accept and enact the suggestions that have been made.

Chairperson Colling asked if we had support for the motion, and Mr. Schneck seconded the motion. Chairperson Colling asked if there was any further discussion.

Mr. Franklin asked if there were any houses south of the gate close to Alsdorf. Chairperson Colling said there are none that would be affected by the NO STOPPING, STANDING, PARKING signs, other than parents dropping their kids off. Mr. Franklin suggested that the barricade could be as close to Alsdorf as possible. Chairperson Colling said he would like to put it a little bit further up there because he didn't want vehicles stopping there and turning left on Alsdorf. He opined that if we put the barricade at the school property or up by the curve, then post both sides of Cone NO STOPPING, STANDING, PARKING, we have created a fully enforceable situation. If parents go down that little section and stop to drop off a kid, they are in violation and it is a ticketable offense.

Mr. Cardimen asked if he was correct that part of the motion was that we will contact the schools and give them the edict Chairperson Colling had suggested, that if they don't have

guards manning the gate and keeping it closed, within X number of days, the barricade goes up.

Chairperson Colling said he didn't care if the school manned the gates by radio control, he didn't care if they had a guy with a switch in a little booth up by the school with binoculars, he didn't care how they did it, but they have to control access.

Mr. Cardimen said they needed to give them a certain time frame to accomplish this, and he hoped it was a short time frame. He hoped the Board says, "Within 48 hours if it is not accomplished, then we are moving." Mr. Shumejko asked if they were requesting that the gate be kept closed at all times, and Chairperson Colling clarified that the request was that the gate be kept closed at all times, with the exception of letting buses in and out.

It was remarked that even with the gate closed, parents would still come to drop off their kids. Chairperson Colling said they would not, because the NO STOPPING, STANDING, PARKING signs would eliminate the drop-off point.

Mr. Franklin asked why the buses needed to access the school from the south. Chairperson Colling said that they didn't have to. Mr. Shumejko explained that the Fire Department requires alternate access points for a site. Chairperson Colling said they got around the Fire Department's rule with the breakaway barrier. It will not stop a fire truck, because they know what it is, but it is going to stop an individual. He realized they were taking a hard-line stance with the school district, although they had not done that in the past. He thought the situation created left us no alternative. Mr. Matich questioned whether they had the authority to close off an access point from a public road.

Mr. Blackstone said he had a comment on the procedure of carrying this out, and that he would like to see the letter sent to the superintendent laying out our concerns and stating what we would like to see done. If there is no verbal or written response in a timely manner we could look at further action.

Chairperson Colling asked for suggestions from the Board members as to what the time frame should be for a response from the school Board, given the fact that the principal might have to take it to his board at a regularly scheduled meeting. He asked if they felt thirty days would be adequate.

Mr. Blackstone thought it should be 30 days maximum. If there is no verbal or written response within that time there should be a visit by the Traffic Engineer to the Superintendent. Chairperson Colling suggested that they make it simple. If there is no response within 30 days to schedule further discussions, the City will initiate action to barricade the street.

Mr. Cardimen recommended they use a return receipt requested letter. Chairperson Colling added that they also need to inform them that the no stopping, standing, and parking on the City roadway will be enforced. It will not be used as a drop off zone because of the poor

turn around capability and the congestion that it causes. It will be signed appropriately to stop that.

It was asked if the gate was on the school's property. Mr. Matich said it was, and they had it surveyed. He added that under Act 51 we collect gas tax money from the State of Michigan, and we cannot just put up a barricade and still collect the Act 51 money from the State without relinquishing that road. Physically it is much easier to put a barricade in front of the existing gate. Chairperson Colling responded that would be fine. He said he didn't have a problem with that, but he wanted the entire roadway from Alsdorf to where you put the barricade posted NO STOPPING, STANDING, PARKING.

Mr. Shumejko clarified that their request to the school would be to keep the gate closed at all times other than for emergency access, and to have them provide a Knox box on it so the fire department has a key to unlock it as necessary. He also asked if it should be sent as a certified letter, giving them 30 days in which to respond. Chairperson Colling responded that was the recommended alternative.

Mr. Schneck asked if when they redeveloped the site a traffic impact study was done; so based on the previous concern about the impacts to Livernois and Auburn, this action would make that situation worse. Chairperson Colling said there was never a traffic impact study done because the school board didn't advise us of their plans. They went ahead and built without a study, they essentially operated in a vacuum and created a problem that has our residents upset and leaves it to us to solve. They were a good neighbor for a number of years and kept the gate locked, but that is not the case any longer. We can only present them the alternatives we have that are effective at this point. Selective enforcement is a band-aid, and will not solve the problem. We have a situation where if the school were a better neighbor we wouldn't have this issue. Even if the school decides to put a fire department lock on the gate and leave it permanently closed, he still would post in NO STOPPING, STANDING, PARKING, all the way up on both sides of that roadway and ask the Oakland County's Sheriff Department to enforce it because it is creating a traffic situation that is untenable to the residents. He said he didn't know what else he could do, adding that he was open to suggestions.

Mr. Schneck said he could appreciate the idea of the school board not abiding by any sort of development rules, whether it is along the State trunk line or within the City proper. The concern is that based on the previous item, by doing this there will be an impact to the intersection of Livernois and Auburn, which we are trying to get addressed with the State and the Road Commission for Oakland County. He opined that adding three seconds to the signal timing is nothing. He wanted to be sure that when we move forward with this particular decision we will be going back and revisiting the other situation.

Chairperson Colling said we have not left the school board without options. He stated that they could decide to do as follows:

- Abide with part two of what we are offering them, and have that gate controlled in the morning, with the NO STOPPING, STANDING, AND PARKING signs

limiting the traffic coming into that area to buses, with the cooperation of the Oakland County Sherriff's Department.

- They can notify their PTA and parents' association that if you try to drop your kid off there you're going to get a ticket, and you're not going to get out of it.

If we have a problem with buses speeding up and down the street, if the school board gets a couple of tickets these bus drivers will stop it. He said he was willing to go that route if the school board is willing to work with us, but if they totally ignore us they get the barricade and the whole nine yards.

Mr. Schneck said that was where the confusion lies. His understanding was there was a letter to be drafted and delivered via certified mail that it was the understanding of the City that the breakaway barrier was to be used for that reason only, it was never supposed to be open. Chairperson Colling said what was in place now was not a breakaway barrier but a gate. The breakaway barrier is what we are proposing to put in if they don't work with us.

Mr. Matich stated he did not know how the idea originated that the school said the gate would be kept closed full time. There was no site plan approval by the City for this school because they go to the State of Michigan. If they made a commitment and told the residents the gate would be kept locked, that was not to the City's understanding. He was sure that many of the residents that live in the half-mile area would love to see the gate maintained open so that they don't have to go out on the major arterial roads to get back into the school. They feel it is a safer route to go through the subdivision to pick up and drop off their kids. He thought they should also have a chance to voice their concerns.

Mr. Shumejko asked if they should stipulate some petition requirements that a majority of the residents in the subdivision are in favor of keeping the gate closed. Chairperson Colling said no, because the majority of the residents in the subdivision are not affected by this. You are not going to put the rights of one homeowner against another.

Mr. Shumejko maintained that they are affected if they have to make a left on Livernois to head north to take their child to school. Chairperson Colling said if they lived on June or Tamm Avenue they would not have any choice. They would have to go out onto Crooks to Auburn and down that way. They have public road access to get the school, and the gate was never open until the last two years. It is due to a change in administration, a change by the school board that is affecting the residents. He could not say to these folks in good conscience, "You have to suffer with this so someone living down the block can drive through the subdivision to get to school instead of going around." He didn't feel it was ethical.

Mr. Cardimen asked if he could call the question, and Chairperson Colling responded that he could. There was a motion on the floor, and unless anyone wished to make changes to it, he wanted a roll call vote.

Schneck: Aye
Franklin: Aye

Colling: Aye
Cardimen: Aye
Blackstone: Aye
Absent: Hunter
Moore

Chairperson Colling addressed the audience, saying you have heard what we are going to try to do. We will work with the Avondale School Board if they will work with us. If they will not, this will be our recommendation; but it is a recommendation only as this Board has no power to act. Our City Council Representative, Mr. Webber, has listened to all your discussion. He represents the Board to the Council, and this will be made as a recommendation to City Council if we have to act. He asked Staff to notify the residents if and when it does come before City Council so they could represent themselves there.

Chairperson Colling asked Mr. Webber if he would like to make a comment. Mr. Webber said he thought they had worked through the issue tonight as best they could. He agreed that when we do have a bad neighbor it calls for drastic measures. He hoped Mr. Staran could talk about some of the legal aspects, but he said he would push Council President Hooper to put it on the agenda and get the process rolling.

Chairperson Colling thanked the residents for coming to the meeting. He said he didn't know what the outcome would be, and reiterated that the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board is only empowered to make recommendations. He felt that in this particular case it was pretty cut and dried, and hopefully we can affect some kind of a solution.

Mr. Shumejko said Staff would work on the letter to give the school notification. He suspected that then they would request a meeting, and in that case would they meet just with Staff or would Board members also be represented at the meeting? Chairperson Colling proposed that if they wanted to have a meeting that they attend a regularly scheduled meeting of the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board and discuss it in a public forum. He asked the people in attendance if they would be willing to delay the action for thirty days or so until they could get it on an agenda to have an open forum.

After hearing comments from those in attendance, Chairperson Colling asked if they could request some selective enforcement for the street. A motion to do so was made by Mr. Cardimen. Mr. Schneck seconded the motion.

MOTION by Cardimen
SECOND by Schneck

Ayes: All
Nays: None
Absent: Hunter
Moore

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

2007-0463 Valley Stream Drive No Left Turn
TCO TM-25

Request for Traffic Order TM-25, “NO LEFT TURN” from eastbound Valley Stream Drive onto Livernois Road at their intersection between the hours of 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Shumejko read the staff report. At the August 14, 2007 Advisory Traffic and Safety Board (ATSB) meeting, City staff brought forth the request from the Valley Stream Homeowner’s Association to install a “No Left Turn” (NLT) sign for eastbound Valley Stream Drive at Livernois. The request originated from concerns related to “cut-through” traffic resulting from the eastbound Walton Boulevard traffic turning left onto Rochdale Drive north to Greenleaf Drive to Valley Stream Drive to head north on Livernois Road. The HOA stated that vehicles use Rochdale Drive N to get to NB Livernois to avoid having to use the median island turnaround at Walton and Livernois.

Due to the construction work along University Drive in the City of Rochester, the ATSB, along with staff’s recommendation, approved the installation of the NLT sign between 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. on a temporary basis throughout duration of the construction project via TCO-25. The TCO was issued on July 11, 2007. At the August 14, 2007 ATSB meeting, several requests were made to staff to complete prior to bringing this issue back to the board:

1. That a compliance study be done within the next two weeks.
2. Request enforcement by the Oakland County Sheriff’s Department (OCSO).
3. The sign be installed until construction is completed on Walton Boulevard/University, approximately November 2008. At that point a review of the intersection and surrounding area is made to see if the traffic flow is working as expected. If not, the appropriate study is done to determine what will resolve the situation.
4. Gather the traffic crash data.
5. Verify that the sight distance at the intersection is adequate, as well, as for the crest in Livernois Road.

Compliance studies were done for the left turn movements:

<u>Date/Time</u>	<u>LT Vehicles</u>	<u>RT Vehicles</u>	<u>Total Vehicles</u>
05/28/2008	30* (40.5%)	44* (59.5%)	74
11/11/2008	23 (41.8%)	32 (58.2%)	55

* Includes one Bus

Chairperson Colling asked if these were illegal left hand turns with the sign up, and Mr. Shumejko confirmed that they were.

Mr. Shumejko continued with the Staff report. “OCSO has provided selective enforcement on a very limited basis due to staffing levels and prioritization schedules. Traffic crash data was obtained from the Traffic Improvement Association (TIA) for the period of January 1, 2005 to August 31, 2008. The data revealed that two (2) crashes occurred in October of 2007 that were both attributed to an animal collision. The intersection sight distance was investigated off Streamwood Drive looking north toward the crest in the hill along Livernois. The measured available safe sight distance was measured to be 503 feet. The minimum required safe corner sight distance for a two-lane road with a posted speed of 40 MPH is 445 feet per the Road Commission standards. The 503 feet of available sight distance also meets the minimum safe sight distance for a two-lane road with a posted speed of 45 MPH at 500 feet.

Construction of University Drive concluded this past October. Recent traffic counts were taken during the period of Tuesday, November 11 to Thursday, November 14, 2008.

<u>Location</u>	<u>EB (VPD)</u>	<u>WB (VPD)</u>
Green Leaf	310	108
Valley Stream Drive	328	243

Summary

Based upon the high non-compliance rates for eastbound Valley Stream Drive vehicles complying with the “No Left Turn” restriction signage and the relatively low traffic volumes along Valley Stream when compared with those of other typical subdivisions, which may be as high as 1,500 VPD, staff recommends the removal of the NLT sign.

Staff did send out meeting agenda notices to all of the residences within Valley Stream Subdivision about the scheduled ATSB meeting. It should be noted that prior to its installation, staff did indicate to the HOA that the installation of traffic signage usually has minimal affect in changing driver behavior and often times is ignored. The effectiveness of signage invariably comes down to the level of enforcement, which the Oakland County Sheriff’s Department (OCSO) can realistically only be expected to enforce periodically due to staffing commitments and prioritizations. Staff has and continues to encourage the HOA to pursue the installation of speed humps, as these provide a permanent feature in roadway to help reduce speeds and potentially decrease cut-through traffic.

Conclusion

Staff requests the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board to support rescinding TCO TM-25, and the Board recommends the City Council approve rescinding the TCO.”

Mr. Shumejko said that they had also included correspondence from two residents, Patricia Connolly and Robert Hoffman, requesting that the signs be removed, the non-compliance study data, and a map. .

Chairperson Colling opened that matter up for public comment, saying he had received two cards from residents who wished to speak. He called the first up to the microphone.

Mr. Dennis Teschendorf
1240 Greenleaf Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-1723

Mr. Teschendorf said he had listened to the numbers in the data presented tonight and the low volume of traffic, which he was not sure could be attributed to the NO LEFT TURN sign. Prior to that in three additional studies the traffic volumes were more in the neighborhood of 550. He believed that when Livernois was being worked on the number of vehicles was in excess of 2,000. The sign has reduced, or at least it is the perception in the neighborhood that it has reduced, the amount of cut through, high speed, uninvited traffic. It has not stopped it completely, but it definitely has had an effect to improve the neighborhood.

It does create some concerns about making a left-hand turn for those that care, but as you are saying if you really want to make a left-hand turn you can because the police aren't enforcing it. The fact that the sign is there does seem to have a deterrent factor. It is like one of those NO THROUGH TRAFFIC signs that you don't enforce, but if you have a conscience you don't do it.

He said they have noticed that a lot less traffic seems to be cutting in off of Walton, on to Rochdale, down Greenleaf, cutting around to Valley Stream and then back on to Livernois and out to avoid the Michigan left at the intersection of Walton and Livernois. Even though your numbers suggest low traffic, we applaud you for putting in the sign that has caused that. We think you have done an excellent job, but we think you have left out a lot of important facts as far as how the sign has greatly reduced the traffic from the previous three studies you have done over the past seven years. He has gotten a lot fewer complaints from residents, and it has quieted down all the issues at their neighborhood board meetings. It works, it is a good sign, and it does cut down on cut-through traffic. It has benefited the neighborhood, and he thought a majority of the residents preferred it.

Mr. Franklin asked him what route he took to get from his house to shop at Papa Joes. Mr. Teschendorf responded that he went to Livernois, made a right turn to the Walgreen's Store, made a Michigan left and continued on. He agreed with Mr. Shumejko's data and had witnessed many cars making a left turn there, but he tried to set the example and make the Michigan left, which takes him all of 30 seconds more.

Ms. Shelby MacFarlane
1375 Oakrock Lane
Rochester Hill, MI 48309-1728

Ms. MacFarlane said she had to disagree with the previous speaker. All the residents are not in agreement, which is why you have a 40% non-compliance rate. If you make your Michigan left you have to go a quarter mile down and a quarter mile back. The problem began when they put the new intersection in and they put a boulevard there, which was unnecessary. Then they set it up so that no one could make a left turn off of Walton onto Livernois. A Michigan left ordinarily is not a problem, except where you turn to make your Michigan left you are coming out at the same point people are coming out of the Kroger shopping center at a light. So you have a situation where there are near misses with people making their right and people making their left, and during rush hour heavy traffic there are a whole lot of people who naturally want to avoid that mess and go to Rochdale and cut through the subdivision.

Chairperson Colling asked her if she was talking about going eastbound on Walton Boulevard and making that turn around, which she confirmed. She thought if they put in a left turn signal there and allowed people going east on Walton to make their left onto Livernois it would create a much better traffic flow, and would also solve the problem in the subdivision. Whether they could do this or not, or even bring it up to the powers that be she was not sure, but that that NO LEFT TURN sign is an impediment more than it is a help. She agreed that now Walton Boulevard is open all the way down University Drive, the sign should be removed. Not everyone agrees that it should be there. She lives on the street that leads to Long Meadow School, so between buses and cars, she knows what traffic is.

Chairperson Colling asked if there was anyone else present who wished to speak.

Ms. Jacquelin Weinberg
1009 Valley Stream Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-1730

Ms. Weinberg said she was at tonight's meeting with her neighbor, Ms. Gertrude Glazier, and they happened to live right at Valley Stream and Livernois. She said she was the first house on Valley Stream Drive, and the side of Ms. Glazier's house faces that intersection. It has been a huge inconvenience having the sign there. As frustrating as it was to have all the traffic coming through the subdivision during construction, the fact that we have the sign there which is not enforced, if you pull up there and you want to go north on Livernois you have to feel guilty about doing it. She figures with her luck she would be the one that does get the ticket. She said she went north on Livernois a lot, especially between the hours of four and seven, not just Monday through Friday but on the weekends as well. It is a hindrance. Cars are also backed up in front of her house, which makes it hard to get out.

The situation has improved since the construction is over with, and the pattern of people cutting through has decreased. She felt that removing the signs at this point would be an enhancement to the subdivision rather than a hindrance.

Ms. Glazier asked who did the traffic surveys. Mr. Shumejko responded that City staff did. They put the traffic counters out to collect the traffic volume data. Mr. Matich parked along the side street in the subdivision and manually did the compliance study. Ms. Glazier asked if the study would determine which way the traffic was traveling on Livernois. Mr. Shumejko replied that the manual study was visually done. Mr. Matich sat out there in a car and recorded the information.

Mr. Matich said the no left turn restriction is for a three-hour period and he sat there from 4:00 to 6:00. He noted on the report that three cars making the right actually made a U-turn on Livernois to go back to the west.

Chairperson Colling announced he would close the public hearing at this point. He addressed Mr. Shumejko and Mr. Matich, saying that one factor they had not thought about that may account for the reduced amount of cut-through traffic was the reopening of Squirrel Road. Mr. Shumejko said there were a lot of variables, including the closing of Whole Foods.

Chairperson Colling said at this point the only advantage he could see to the no left turn restriction was that it made it a safe egress on to Livernois. He recommended that the Board go ahead and approve the recommended traffic order with the stipulation that they revisit the matter and see if the accident data significantly increased for this intersection. If there is a situation whereby making that left turn is increasing the accident rate he would put the NO LEFT TURN sign back in. Mr. Shumejko stated that there were no accidents except two car/deer collisions. Chairperson Colling said if there was no significant increase in accidents it showed the sign was not warranted.

Mr. Blackstone moved that they adopt the staff recommendation with no revisiting it in a year. Chairperson Colling asked if there was support for that, and Mr. Franklin seconded the motion.

Ayes: All
Nays: None
Absent: Hunter
Moore

Motion is CARRIED

There was some confusion after the vote as to whether the matter would be revisited in a year or not. Chairperson Colling asked Mr. Blackstone why he had not wanted to revisit it, and he responded that he did not feel it was necessary. Mr. Schneck added that there was no crash data or safety data to support the sign to begin with. It was asked why the sign was placed there in the first place. Typically you go through some analysis, such as the crash history: Chairperson Colling said there was construction going on at the time which created extreme backups at that point with people wanting to go north. We were creating a traffic hazard we felt was going to greatly affect accident rates, so we put the NO LEFT TURN sign in to prohibit it. Driver behavior is such that now people are making the

Michigan left. By revisiting it in a year he wanted to be sure that removing the sign doesn't increase the accident rates.

Chairperson Colling stated they had the approval, and at this point they had finished all the items on the agenda. He wanted to take some time for Any Other Business because he had a situation he would like Staff to investigate as soon as possible. At the intersection of Sibley Avenue and Dequindre Road he almost hit a student waiting at the bus stop because parents are parking at the STOP sign and blocking access to Dequindre. About three weeks ago we had a very intense fog in the morning. It was so bad that in his subdivision you couldn't drive above ten or 15 mph, and as he approached Dequindre he saw two vehicles with hazard lights flashing. The fog was so thick he couldn't see the school bus coming down Dequindre until it was right on top of the intersection. Of course he was watching the car as he went around it, and as he was doing so a kid flies out of the car, and runs directly into the path of his truck. He jammed on the brakes and missed her by a matter of inches.

He thought it was an incredibly unsafe and stupid practice to park at the intersection of a major thoroughfare to drop your kids off, and put flashers on, indicating a hazard. If this is going to continue we will have to post NO STOPPING, STANDING, PARKING, or at least contact the school to advise the parents not to do that. They are at the intersection denying access in or out of the subdivision. He is asking the Board, do we post this NO STOPPING, STANDING, PARKING? How do we get around this?

Mr. Shumejko asked if there were NO PARKING signs down Dequindre. Chairperson Colling said he was referring not to Dequindre, but to Sibley. Dequindre runs north and south and Sibley tees into it. People are parking right at the STOP sign. Mr. Shumejko agreed it was a prevalent problem.

Mr. Blackstone suggested that they ask Staff to evaluate it and report back to the Board at the next meeting. Chairperson Colling said that would be fine, he was just discussing the matter. Mr. Schneck thought that you had to look at where the bus stops are located citywide. He didn't feel it was safe to have them along major thoroughfares. Chairperson Colling said he didn't disagree, but added we have no control over it as the school districts set the bus stops. Because of budgetary constraints and fuel costs they no longer want to drive through the subdivisions, except in the case of elementary school children. Almost all high school and middle school bus stops are outside the subdivisions, and the students have to walk to a collector road or major thoroughfare. What's happening is that you have parents that, for whatever reason, don't trust a high school kid to walk to a bus stop, and instead of driving and dropping their kid off and continuing on they are sitting there waiting. Maybe it is to provide comfort, maybe it is because it is cold outside, but he thought it was a safety hazard to sit at a STOP sign and force traffic to go around you.

Mr. Shumejko asked how many feet they were from the STOP sign. Chairperson Colling responded that they are right in front of it. Mr. Shumejko that could be enforced just by the Michigan Vehicle Code.

Mr. Schneck asked if bus stops have to be permitted. Chairperson Colling thought that contacting Rochester Community Schools would do no good. He thought even if the cars are 20 feet back from the STOP sign it would still be a problem because you are maneuvering in the other lane to get around them, and blocking somebody's ingress as you are trying to make egress. Short of enforcement or a total parking and stopping restriction, he didn't know what could be done.

Mr. Schneck said as Mr. Shumejko had mentioned, in the Motor Vehicle Code there are certain standards, guidelines, and protocol as far as parking within a certain distance from hydrants, so many feet from an intersection, and so many feet from a regulatory traffic control device such as a STOP sign. It comes down to enforcement. You can put up as many signs as you want, and all they become is roadside hazards because people start hitting signs. And then there is the associated cost of reinstalling the signs.

Chairperson Colling said what he had a real problem with is that we are seeing this regularly, and it is another example of actions by the school board who act independently and have no responsibility by Michigan state law to interact with the communities they service. Mr. Shumejko said in defense of the Rochester Community Schools he would like to say that we have a very good relationship with the district. Since a lot of the schools were expanded seven to nine years ago it has dramatically improved, and there is communication on both ends. When they have something going on they ask for input, and vice versa. Because they meet with them frequently the next time they meet with the transportation group he could bring this up and see if something could be done before they resort to putting signage up.

Chairperson Colling was not sure if the situation was endemic to this one bus stop or not. He requested that some time between 6:30 and 7:00 a.m. especially on inclement or cold days they ask the Oakland County Sheriff to monitor that particular intersection and observe the behavior. If they feel it is necessary because of blocking hazards, they could start issuing some tickets. It opined that it was the same cars all of the time. One is a Pontiac Aztec, and the other is a Chrysler Sebring.

Mr. Shumejko said he had a quick housekeeping matter. In light the amount of studies they do for the meetings and the volume of paper it generates, would the Board object if the background detail data such as the actual traffic counts could be accessed through the Legistar system. Staff would summarize the data and if a Board member wanted to investigate it further he could log in. Chairperson Collin thought an executive summary format would suffice.

Mr. Cardimen had to couple of things he wanted to mention. The first was there are new definitions in the revisions to the 2006 Motor Vehicle Code, including new definitions of the business district and commercial business. You might ask, "What is he talking about?" The bottom line is there is a new definition of speed limits and the 25 mph speed limit that is taking place right now, and TIA has gotten more phone calls from communities over this new definition and regulation than anything in his sixteen years with TIA. Maybe at the next meeting we will have someone come in. He was not sure how the new definitions

impacted us, and suggested that he just give the information on the new State standards to Mr. Shumejko.

Mr. Matich said they did address it in for Enterprise Drive, and they did identify and meet standards. Mr. Cardimen said it has been very confusing to the communities, and TIA had been working around the clock trying to understand the real details of it. Chairperson Colling thought it would be a good idea to have someone come to the next Board meeting and give them a brief presentation.

Mr. Cardimen said that his second and most important item was to wish everyone a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year!

Chairperson Colling wished everyone the same, and asked if anyone had anything else they wanted to discuss. Mr. Webber announced he had been reappointed as City Council representative for the Advisory Traffic Safety Board and so would be with them for another year.

Mr. Franklin said at the last meeting they discussed Cumberland Hills and changed the time for the no parking restriction. He requested that they ask for selective enforcement because people are ignoring the signs. He thought it would take some tickets to get people to comply. Chairperson Colling asked if this was another school drop-off situation, and Mr. Franklin confirmed that it was. Chairperson Colling said we have got to talk to the school district, as their policies are impacting the subdivisions. No matter how you want to slice it, that is the problem. The schools are real good at getting out there when they want a millage passed, or in doing something that will bring money into their pockets, but when it comes to cooperating with the City to fix a resident's quality of life issue because of parking concerns they won't even send a letter home to parents. He suggested that Staff put this on their list of things to bring up with the school board when they talk to them about other issues.

Mr. Franklin thought it would take a ticket or two get in order for it to get some attention. The other thing he wanted to bring up was that although he is an opponent of NO LEFT TURN signs, there is one situation he has come across several times that he thought the Board should take a look at. At Hollywood Market on Tienken and Rochester Road he has been in the situation that he needed to make a left-hand turn onto Tienken, and because of the traffic changes there with the widening it is very difficult to see westbound traffic. There is no turn lane to turn into, and he has almost been nailed at least three or four times.

Mr. Shumejko responded that there is quite a bit of history with that, and he could provide it for the next meeting. He asked if it would be safe to assume there would not be a meeting in January due to the upcoming holidays. He added that it was also difficult to do studies with snow on the ground.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing a motion and a second, Chairperson Colling wished everyone a very Happy Holiday, and adjourned the meeting at 10:45 p.m.