



# Rochester Hills

## Minutes

### Advisory Traffic and Safety Board

1000 Rochester Hills Dr.  
Rochester Hills, MI  
48309  
(248) 656-4600  
Home Page:  
[www.rochesterhills.org](http://www.rochesterhills.org)

*Chairperson Ernest Colling, Vice Chairperson Carl Moore*  
*Members: Thomas Blackstone, Frank Cardimen, Paul Franklin, Scott Hunter,*  
*Allan Schneck, Michael Webber,*  
*Staff Members: Paul Davis, Marc Matich, Paul Shumejko*

---

Tuesday, April 8, 2008

7:30 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

---

#### CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairperson Moore called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

#### ROLL CALL

**Present** 5 - Frank Cardiman, Paul Franklin, Carl Moore, Michael Webber and Allan Schneck

**Absent** 2 - Scott Hunter and Ernest Colling

Non-voting members present:

Sheryl McIsaac, Recording Secretary  
Marc Matich, Traffic Technician  
Paul Shumejko, Transportation Engineer  
Michael Webber, City Council Representative

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**2008-0154** Draft Minutes of the Regular Meeting of February 12, 2008

Minutes from the regular Advisory Traffic and Safety Board Meeting of February 12, 2008 were considered for approval. Vice Chairperson Moore asked if there were any additions or deletions to be made. A motion to approve them as presented was made by Blackstone and seconded by Franklin.

Ayes: All  
Nays: None  
Absent: Colling

**MOTION CARRIED**

#### COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Shumejko stated that the Board was going to go a little bit out of order to get things out of the way prior to the Master Thoroughfare Plan Update Presentation,

first discussing Communications on the agenda.

**2008-0155 - Communication Items**

The first communication included in the packet is a letter submitted by the City to the Road Commission for Oakland County regarding any requests to consider the paving of Dutton Road.

The second is regarding the Tienken Road Bridge Replacement at Stony Creek. Recently that project was approved on the Michigan's Critical Bridge List and the funding to replace it. So staff made a request to the Road Commission to include a pedestrian crossing in the design for this project.

The third correspondence pertains to a new requirement for the Michigan Manual and Uniform Traffic Control Devices. This requires private developments, such as shopping centers, private condos and apartment complexes, to meet all the same standards for their traffic control devices on site. This would include stop signs, no left turn signs, etc. The reason is to get uniformity throughout private developments as well as in the public rights-of-way.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Carl Wellenkotter  
184 Shagbark Drive  
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-1815

Mr. Wellenkotter thanked Mr. Shumejko for all his correspondence on the No Left Turn sign at Valley Stream onto Livernois. Mr. Wellenkotter sent the board, through Mr. Shumejko, some e-mails discussing this situation and the details. He feels there never was a reason for the sign in the first place and the sign should be abolished. The residents from Valley Stream are not observing the sign. Most residents do not even know the sign is there. Mr. Wellenkotter would appreciate anything the Board can do to get rid of this sign.

Mr. Shumejko stated that the City will do traffic studies over the course of the summer. As had been indicated to the subdivision, the City will keep the sign in place until the University Drive construction in Rochester is complete. It was a concern because of the cut-through traffic that will occur while this construction project is on-going. The City will come back to the Advisory Board in either October or November with staff's final recommendation on this sign.

Allen Schneck had some questions regarding the March 26th letter to the Road Commission of Oakland County, and the City's intent to request the installation of a

pedestrian crossing on the bridge. He asked if the bridge was under the City's jurisdiction. Mr. Shumejko stated that it was not, it was under the County's jurisdiction. Mr. Schneck stated that the County would perform the bi-annual inspections and the County would prepare the application to the critical bridge list, which Mr. Shumejko said was correct. Mr. Shumejko explained that this bridge has been on the list for a number of years, and about 10 years ago, it was number 80 something in the state. It has been rising, as far as priority and now it has made the grade to allow funding. They are trying to coordinate it with the Tienken Road Improvements that are planned between Livernois and Sheldon Road.

Mr. Schneck stated as far as funding, as it pertains to the City and our participatory share, if it is a pedestrian structure we may end up funding 100% of that cost. Would it be eligible for a transportation enhancement grant for non-motorized pathway, and/or would it be eligible for an MDNR grant for the continuation of a pathway?

Mr. Shumejko responded that he was unsure of the answer. Right now there is no pathway on either side of it. The major stumbling block is the crossing at the creek. This is something we can look in to. Only one side, the south side, will have the pedestrian crossing. The County said that they would fund the design, but the additional construction costs would be the City's responsibility. Mr. Shumejko stated that he would look into obtaining grants for the City to offset the costs.

Mr. Franklin stated that he had asked for crash data regarding the intersection of Valley Stream and Livernois. He has just received it and wanted everyone to know that between 2005 and 2007 there were two accidents (both on Livernois) and both of these accidents had something to do with an animal and not the left turn. So apparently there are no crashes due to the left turn onto Livernois from Valley Stream. Mr. Blackstone asked the resident, Mr. Wellenkotter, where the comments came from. Were they just his comments or were they the concern of all the residents in the area? Mr. Wellenkotter stated that it was suggested to him to get together a petition, but he felt a petition didn't make any sense. Mr. Wellenkotter asked if the e-mails he sent to Mr. Shumejko were distributed to all the members of the board. Mr. Shumejko stated that they weren't because he was going to include them as part of the final report back to the Traffic Board in October. The provision he has allowed with the subdivision is that the City would keep the sign in place throughout the duration of the construction in downtown Rochester. Once this is complete, we would gather all of the traffic volume data and cut-through traffic data to bring back to the Board for a final recommendation. Mr. Wellenkotter asked that his e-mails be given to the Board in advance so they can get an understanding on where this issue is coming from. Mr. Blackstone asked if he had discussed any of this with his neighbors, and Mr. Wellenkotter responded no, he did not try to get a petition, but everyone he talked to in passing stated that the sign made no sense

whatsoever. Many of his neighbors do not even realize there is a sign there and do not observe it.

Mr. Cardimen stated that coming from the Traffic Improvement Association, they are always looking to see how many signs they can remove rather than add. He stated the sign is in, it requires a study, the community is going to study it, there is no problem out there with crashes whether it is in or not in, and by the end of this year there will be a resolution on this issue.

## **MASTER THOROUGHFARE PLAN UPDATE**

At this time, Vice Chairperson Moore turned the meeting over to the presentation of the Master Thoroughfare Plan Update Summary.

Mr. Shumejko made introductions and welcomed all those at the meeting. Background was given on the Master Thoroughfare Plan. Currently the committee is at the tail end of the process that began in November of 2006. Public meetings were held at various locations and monthly technical advisory board committee meetings were also held. Mr. Shumejko acknowledged those members that were part of the technical board committee, along with The Corradino Group, and Mr. Steve Dearing with Orchard, Hiltz and McCliment. Mr. Shumejko noted that Mr. Rosen couldn't make the meeting, but he did include a letter as part of the packet for everyone to read in his absence.

Mr. Shumejko stated that the presentation would include explaining what the process was, what was involved, and their final recommendations.

Mr. Jim Hartman of The Corradino Group gave the presentation.

### **Key Points of Presentation:**

*Changes in land use, transportation and funding*

*Time to update the plan*

*Major Roadways were the focus*

*Non-motorized system, a focus to improve the quality of life & the transportation system*

*82 miles of pathway, 36 miles to go*

*Looked at the current system to find deficiencies, especially during peak hours*

*What would the system look like in the year 2035?*

*Evaluation of alternatives and how to address the deficiencies*

*Looked at base future projects to be completed*

*30 alternatives were tested using a macro model*

*Roadway Network, started in the north/south direction, learned from each model run*

*Found we have to alleviate the congestion*  
*Volume to capacity ratios in congestion within the model*  
*Showed the best performing alternatives or improvements*  
*Used the system to ask the community to rank what was important to them*  
*Air quality and noise were not as important. Safety came high on the list*  
*The consulting team ranked the issues the community thought important*  
*Came up with alternative 27 as the best performing alternative*  
*Lots of improvements to lots of roads, and then cost was brought into the equation*  
*Modified Alternative 23 became the best one in the plan*  
*It's a critical piece, straightening out Dequindre with 23 Mile Road*  
*It also removes one of the intersections with Avon Road.*  
*Also looked at safety and identified the deficiencies - intersections specifically*  
*Long-term improvements*  
*Planned Road Sections were discussed, i.e. John R*  
*Priority Recommendations were shown along with estimated costs*  
*Laundry list was shown with all the projects that should be monitored over time*  
*Non-motorized priorities, getting paths along freeway with the widening of M-59*  
*Looked at schools and parks during the recommendation*  
*Estimated costs were shown*  
*6 ½ million for pathways, 20 million for roadways, 87 million in total*  
*What are the next steps?*  
*Getting any additional input at this meeting - still a draft*  
*Ask for Planning Commission approval and adoption of the plan*  
*Finalize the report and provide final deliverables*

**Questions & Comments regarding the presentation:**

Mr. Franklin stated that the sources of funds had not been identified at this time. Some sources of money for some of the projects have been identified, but in general, sources of funds hadn't been identified and only estimated costs were given. Mr. Hartman stated that this was a plan and working document. This is the first step.

Mr. Dearing reiterated that you start with this plan. Without the plan you don't have a good basis to try to chase after funding sources beyond just dipping into your own pockets. Using Dequindre Road as an example, 19 million dollars is a big price tag, but it is a border road between Oakland/Macomb Counties, and it's a County Road. So both of those Road Commissions are going to have to be committed to share in the costs. It will be eligible for Federal Aid under the Service Transportation Program. Both Road Commissions generally have policies that require the locals to share in the cost of what is not Federal Aid. In this case it's a border road between

Rochester Hills and Shelby Township. When you look at 100% of the costs, Federal Aid will cover 80% of it, Oakland, Macomb and Shelby Township will take 5% each. This leaves Rochester Hills' share as 5%, and although it is still a lot, it is easier to digest than the whole amount. This same kind of strategy will be played out with all of the different road segments. Decisions need to be made on priorities and how important these systems of transportation are to the community.

Mr. Schneck asked about the alternatives, and whether they were broken down into short and long term goals and objectives. He also asked if there were phased approaches to the alternatives in case funding became available.

Mr. Hartman stated that this is a starting point and the priorities will shift and change. There is a lot of work yet to be done. There is a lot of data behind this plan to come up with this scoring.

Mr. Franklin asked if there were any other locations in the City that roundabouts were considered. Mr. Hartman stated they are considered when they do a traditional intersection safety or operational analysis. They were looked at on Rochester Road, especially at Rochester and Auburn Roads. This intersection is high in the County and the State for number of accidents. A roundabout wasn't recommended in this area, but he believes it should be considered when moving forward within the next 10 years.

Mr. Dearing mentioned again that within the plan there is a laundry list of different types of remedial treatments that would be considered, either short term or long term. The reality is that when one of the intersections finally gets to the top of the priority list for potential funding sources, City staff working along with the designers is going to pick the best treatment for that intersection at that point in time. It could be a roundabout, or it could be keeping the signal control and just adding additional turn lanes. This is a system plan; it wasn't prudent to give a jobs list for the next 35 years. They wanted to keep it at a high policy level so the community understood, in general terms, the scope of the improvements without being specific about what the actual work consisted of.

Mr. Cardimen stated that in alternative 23 most of the roads, if not all of them, are on either the Road Commission or the MDOT road system. The funding would be some sort of joint funding process. There were Road Commission and the MDOT people on the committee, and are they in agreement that this is the best-proposed plan for the City of Rochester Hills? Mr. Dearing said he thought so, yes. They know they have to do something, especially with Rochester Road. They know that their responsibility is to provide reasonably safe roadways. They are going to get behind what is needed to correct these roads. There is a vested interest by these agencies to make this work. We all face the same problem, which is there are a lot

more needs than there is cash. Mr. Cardimen stated that it seemed to him with working on the technical committee that all of the people involved were totally engaged in the process and were moving right along with the City in the whole process to this conclusion. He felt these other agencies were already committed to the concept and therefore the issue of funding becomes the most critical piece. He stated that there was great emphasis on both southbound on Crooks to the bridge and northbound improvements on Crooks to the bridge, but there is no plan from MDOT to do anything with that two-lane bridge. When we decide to improve and expand the road systems on Crooks we must have some agreement with MDOT to correct this problem. He also wanted to state that the process that the community went through was outstanding, and he complimented all those that were involved.

Councilman Webber asked whose land along Dequindre Road would be needed when aligning the road. Mr. Hartman stated that there are a lot of other stakeholders in the picture; it is not just two counties and two municipalities. There are utilities that want to get through there, there is a connection to a major trail line, and the owner of Yate's Cider Mill is looking to be there for the next 150 years. It is not going to be an easy process. Everyone working together is the way to go.

Mr. Dearing stated that he worked on this same project 16 years ago. There are a lot of property owners that have their own particular interests at stake here. Sixteen years ago it stalled, as it didn't fit into the spending priorities of the various communities at that moment in time. Now it is a more urgent matter for Macomb County because of the explosive growth over there. There are very few options to get over the Clinton River. There is a lot more interest today than there was then.

Councilman Hooper asked about the bridge costs. In the presentation, what does the cost actually represent? Mr. Dearing answered that he believed it was the City's share of the costs to rebuild the interchange bridge that carries Crooks over M-59. The .75 million is 3% of the grand total of that interchange job (City share). Mr. Hooper asked to make that distinction on the presentation, and Mr. Hartman stated that he would do so. Looking at future improvements that may come down the pipeline, several years from now there may be a project that comes up that would put pressure on an intersection and the City may decide to do an improvement on this intersection. The first place people are going to go is to this plan that is going to be adopted and realize that it was never talked about. He thinks this may become an issue. It would have been nice if there were some sort of detailed listing of priorities on intersections. Mr. Hartman stated that the ones in there were the focus, but he realizes there may be other fixes needed for either operations or safety. He stated that there are qualified staff at the City who look at these issues every day. This is a snapshot looking 30 years out, which will continue to be monitored. I

Mr. Hooper stated that a request had come before City Council just recently for

approval to spend money at the intersections of Brewster and Walton and Old Perch and Avon. The first thing he said when faced with spending \$40,000.00 at each intersection was instead of spending money on this light, why don't we look at putting in a roundabout? The plan really hasn't looked at these two intersections. Mr. Shumejko stated that a lot of the items in the plan were based on high crash intersections or high congestion issues at the intersections. When things flushed out, those weren't the high priorities. Mr. Hooper said it would be nice if we had a tool or an analysis was already done to help them decide on issues. Mr. Hooper said it was a great document and he looked forward to its adoption.

Mr. Ed Anzek, Planning Director, stated he was very pleased with the opportunity to hire the Corradino Group to do this work. They have done an exceptional job. They had a tremendous outreach program throughout the community. Regarding the cost estimates, for a variety of reasons the right-of-way costs can't be published in this report. We don't know what they will be, nor do we want to guess. Mr. Anzek has been in contact with the Planning Director in Shelby Township and they are starting that process by sitting down together to discuss the Dequindre project. One of the strengths they see is that since it sits on the County line, we double our representation at the state level and the federal level, and there are a lot more people to lobby. There are a lot of people with power that can start talking to people with money to help move this project up. The last point Mr. Anzek made was that several Planning Commission members were there and they were going to read this plan from cover to cover, and they only received it Friday. Mr. Anzek wanted to alert everyone that it was going to take a little bit of time prior to it going to the Planning Commission for a recommended approval. Mr. Anzek felt the document was an easy read and very well written, and he gave his compliments to the people that wrote it. Mr. Anzek wanted it known that the approval of the document did rest with the Planning Commission, not City Council.

Mr. Hunter stated that he didn't see any mention of the intersection of Dequindre and Auburn in the document. Mr. Shumejko stated that there is a design moving forward with the Road Commission for the improvement already, and it is a committed project.

Mr. Joe Corradino stated his appreciation of the opportunity of working with Mr. Shumejko, the technical committee, the Planning Commission and City Council.

Mr. Moore thanked everyone for coming.

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

Mr. Cardimen had some information to share with everyone. In 1967 there were 206 fatalities in Oakland County on our transportation system. The Transportation Improvement Association (TIA) was formed at that time. Over the next 40 years,



improvements had come down to where the number of fatalities last year was 49. The fatality rate in Oakland County is 0.36, which is the lowest in Michigan and the United States. When compared to the three safest countries in the world (United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Sweden) it equals or betters those. It is an incredible story of a community coming together, which includes the City of Rochester Hills, in terms of its police, its engineering and its administration in their commitment to a traffic safety culture.

The second handout is that next week there will be a news release in the form of an announcement coming from the Ash Institute which identifies TIA (which is made up of 69 communities, 50 police agencies, 15 corporations, citizens and businesses) as one of the top 50 agencies in the country that has had an impact to transform government in a positive way. They also have a chance at being one of the top ten invited to Harvard to make their pitch as to why they are the best. There is also a \$100,000.00 gift there.

## **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Shumejko mentioned some construction projects that will be coming up. The preconstruction meeting for the John R Widening Project (South Blvd. to Auburn), which includes drainage improvements, installing a center left turn lane the whole length along with pathways, is this week. Also, the annual concrete slab replacement program is underway. Mr. Shumejko felt it was very successful last year as far as getting a lot of work done throughout various subdivisions. There was definitely a visible impact. Mr. Shumejko also mentioned that there are two capital improvement projects up for approval during this year's capital improvement process. The first is to allow \$25,000.00 to be budgeted annually toward providing a funding source, at a 50/50 cost share for subdivisions, to install traffic calming devices or speed humps. Typically, the association or subdivision doesn't have the money (100% of the project) to fund this type of thing and the project dies. The other capital improvement project submitted is to put the same amount for major roads to fund for speed humps. Mr. Shumejko stated that we'd see how these things are ranked in the committee. We should have an answer by budget time, so probably around the August-September time frame.

Mr. Shumejko explained that regarding the resident that came before the Board tonight and his concerns, why we were holding off until the construction in downtown Rochester is completed. He stated that it was the Advisory Board's prerogative, but when we left it last November, it was because of the anticipation of the construction. It is going to be three phases and the second phase should be starting shortly. This phase will require a complete shutdown of University, East of Crittenton Hospital. At our August meeting it was decided to put the sign up temporarily, do the traffic studies, and then come back when the construction was completed in downtown Rochester.

Mr. Blackstone asked if the sign was put up because the residents wanted it. Mr. Shumejko stated that this has been an ongoing issue, and Valley Stream residents requested it. They were concerned that there would be a lot of cut-through traffic when the work on Livernois was being done, rather than going through the intersection of Livernois at Walton. Mr. Matich stated that the majority of people think we should leave the sign there and let the study go forward. Mr. Schneck agreed, and felt we need to have justification for taking it down first in case something happens after we take it down. We need the statistics to warrant whether it stays up or comes down.

Mr. Moore stated that it was a real honor to serve on the board with the current members. He felt we had a fantastic group serving.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Moore made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Mr. Hunter.

**Ayes: All**  
**Nays: None**  
**Absent: Colling**

## **MOTION CARRIED**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

Anyone planning to attend the meeting who has need of special assistance under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is asked to contact the Clerk's Office at 248-841-2460 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.