

Circle from Barclay Circle (at their south intersection) to a point Nine Hundred Fifty (950) feet easterly thereof.

TCO No. PK-78.2 No Parking within the right-of-way of north side of Hampton Circle from Barclay Circle (at their south intersection) to a point Two Hundred Sixty (260) feet easterly thereof.

TCO No. PK-78.3 No Parking within the right-of-way of north side of Hampton Circle (at their south intersection) from a point Three Hundred Eighty (380) feet to a point Twelve Hundred Fifty (1,250) feet easterly thereof.

Whereas, said Traffic Control Order shall not be effective after the expiration of ninety (90) days from the date of issuance, except upon approval by this Council; and

Whereas, the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board has considered the issues pertaining to the Traffic Control Order and recommends that the Order be approved;

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council approves the issuance of Traffic Control Order No. PK-78 to be in effect until rescinded or superseded by subsequent order; and

Be It Further Resolved, that a certified copy of this Resolution be filed together with the Traffic Control Order, with the City Clerk of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan and signs and/or markings in conformity with the Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices giving notice of the same have been placed and maintained.

This Order rescinds and supercedes the following Traffic Control Order(s) adopted by the City of Rochester Hills: PK-76.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: Brown, Buiteweg, Colling, Jr., Hunter, Moore and Zendel

Absent: Oza

2004-0227

Traffic Control Order SS-131: Streets within Chichester Subdivision No. 4, Section 5

Attachments: Agenda Summary.pdf; Traffic Control Order SS131.pdf; Sec5TrafficSigns.pdf

Marc Matich told everyone that the video being viewed was of the intersection of Grandview and Ridgefield Court. Mr. Matich went over the facts sheet that was included with the agenda packet on this issue. The facts sheet was prepared by the Traffic Improvement Association (TIA) of Oakland County, a non-profit organization. He stated that the decisions should be carefully made on whether to install a stop sign or not because of the long range impacts. Answers to the following questions should be considered: Does it meet established warrants? What is the likelihood of noncompliance? What is the potential for increase in traffic crashes and liability? What will be the impact on traffic flow? Who would be opposed to this type of change? The two most important questions according to the TIA are; Will this help maximize both the safety and efficiency of pedestrians and vehicular traffic? And will it help and ensure that all citizens will maintain a healthy respect for the community's total traffic control system?

Paul Shumejko, Transportation Engineer for the City, reviewed the background on this

issue. On September 12, 2003, several residents along Grandview submitted a request for multi-way stop signs to be installed as speed control measures along Grandview Drive at its intersections with Sandy Ridge Drive, Ridgefield Court and at Sandy Ridge Drive at its intersection with Fairmont Drive. At the Traffic Board's September 22, 2003 meeting, City staff did not recommend the installation of these multi-way stop signs at these locations as a means to control speed. On September 23, 2003, a traffic control order (TCO) was issued for the installation of these multi-way stop signs. A revised TCO was later issued to extend the expiration date to April 9, 2004. Prior to approving or rejecting the TCO, City Council had requested that City staff perform a formal traffic study at these locations and present the findings to the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board. The traffic data was collected during the period of February 2, 2004 to February 5, 2004. The results were reviewed based upon the requirements set forth by the Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices. In addition to investigating whether warrants were met for corner sight distance clearance, crash history and traffic volume counts, the analysis also included driver stopping compliance rates at these intersections. Based on the traffic data collected, the stop signs at these locations, do not meet the necessary warrants for installation and it is recommended that they be removed. Based on field surveys, there was only one intersection (Grandview and Ridgefield Court) that had a sight obstruction of shrubbery. The property owner has been notified to remove this obstruction and if the homeowner does not properly trim the shrubbery, the City's Forestry Department will take action. This also does not warrant the installation of the multi-way stop signs. The next step was to review whether or not the crash history warrants were met for multi-way stop signs that were installed at these locations. The manual requires that there has been a minimum of five (5) crashes that have occurred at an intersection within a twelve (12) month period. The traffic crash data was obtained during the period of January 1, 2000 through December 31, 2002. The first intersection (Grandview and Ridgefield Court) there was found to be only one (1) fixed object collision and at the second intersection (Grandview and Sandyridge) there was one collision identified as other (vehicle hit a snow bank). The third intersection (Sandyridge and Fairmont Court) there was one parked vehicle collision. Based on this information, the crash history warrants do not justify the warrants for the stop signs that were installed. The final step in performing the traffic study was to review the traffic volume counts to see if they met the warrants for multi-way stop sign installations. It is required that there is a minimum of five hundred vehicles per hour, for an eight hour period of the day, from all approaches. The second requirement is that there is a combined vehicular and pedestrian traffic from the minor street must average at least two hundred units per hour for the same eight hour period. The third requirement is that when the 85th percentile approach speed of the major street of traffic exceeds 40 miles per hour, the minimum vehicular volume warrant can be reduced to 70% of the above requirement. Based on the volume data that was obtained from 12:00 p.m., wednesday, February 4, 2004 through 8:00 a.m. on friday, February 6, 2004, the first intersection of Grandview and Ridgefield Court, the greatest one hour bi-directional volume along Grandview Drive was 216 vehicles per hour. The traffic volume along Ridgefield Court was not collected due to it being a cul-de-sac and that it does not generate a significant amount of traffic to impact the volume. The 85th percentile approach speed just north of this intersection was measured at 31 miles per hour, which is below the 40 mile per hour justification for reducing the warrants to 70% . The second intersection (Grandview and Sandyridge Drive), had 139 vehicles per hour as the greatest one hour bi-directional traffic volume from all approaches. The greatest one hour bi-directional traffic volume for Sandyridge Drive was 17 vehicles per hour. The 85th percentile approach speed just north of this intersection was measured at 33 miles per hour, therefore, it did not meet the 70% reduction. The third intersection of Sandyridge and Fairmont had the largest one hour bi-directional traffic volume along Sandyridge was 17 vehicles per hour as previously stated. Fairmont Drive is considered the less traveled road at this intersection and would not meet the 200 vehicle per hour warrant for 8 hours of the day and therefore, no data was collected on that portion. The city does not collect speed data along Sandyridge. Based upon the requirements and the data that was collected, the traffic volume count warrants are not met and do not justify the multi-way stop signs along Grandview Drive and Sandyridge Drive remaining

in place. City staff's recommendation again is to look into the possibility of installing traffic calming devices, such as speed humps, to control speed.

Marc Matich reviewed the results of the study of vehicles stopping at the stop signs that are currently there. There were four groups that were categorized with the study, full stop, almost stop, forced (stopped by traffic) and no stop. Grandview at Ridgeview Court, observed 346 vehicles, of that 4% voluntary full stop, 12% stopped by traffic, 65% almost stopped and 19% non-stopping. At Grandview and Sandyridge, observed 207 vehicles, 16% voluntary full stop, 7% stopped by traffic, 62% almost stopped and 15 % non-stopping. At Sandyridge and Fairmont, observed 34 vehicles in a 3 hour period, which is not a good sample size, 15% voluntary full stop, 3% stopped by traffic, 59% almost stopped and 23% non-stopping.

Chairman Colling noted for the record the receiving of two additional letters on this subject and they are entered into the record. One from David Hunter, dated March 9th and the other dated March 8th from a Thomas Lydick. Both these letters were against the devices and they wanted them removed.

Public Comments:

Dick Olson, president of the Homeowner's Association. Speed humps versus stop signs were discussed at previous meetings. The conclusion was that they would request additional implementation of the speed limit. Hoping for speeding tickets to take care of the problem that way. Grandview is a through street and shortcut for most. Several people are going way above the speed limit and that is what concerns them. The warrants are useful tools and guidelines, which means there can be exceptions and they think there are exceptions for Grandview. Went over data given in the studies. At least the stop signs make people slow down. Is for keeping the stop signs installed. Does not like the suggestion of speed humps and listed reasons why. The stop signs are in fact, for this particular, unique situation, a direct answer to it and therefore, apply for an exemption to the guidelines.

Tom Davenport, 1194 Grandview Drive: Asked for previous data and Chairman Colling stated that the data hasn't changed in quite a few years. The signs have significantly reduced the speeding. Noted that Grandview is a major school bus route. Stated that normally people will get one ticket, but rarely two for the same thing and in the same area. Thought that since the video was taped in February, with snow and ice, of course people would be traveling slower.

Mr. Lydick, 1115 Grandview Drive: There are existing guidelines and they were written by professionals in the State of Michigan and the fact of the matter is Grandview Drive does not meet any of these requirements. He does not see where it is appropriate to challenge the validity of the guidelines. The City's own professional engineers do not support these stop signs either. He thinks that the guidelines should be followed and that the only exception to the guidelines in place is for an increase in safety. The data simply doesn't support this in this instance. People may feel safer because of these signs and the data proves it is not safer, people may be taking some chances and have a false sense of security and that could lead to other negative things. If police wrote tickets on Grandview all the time, it would be a misuse of the police force and would look bad for the neighborhood. We can't police it 24 hours a day and therefore we aren't going to change it, so he hopes there are alternative means to reducing speed other than stop signs.

Pat Blucher, 1258 Grandview: Clarified that if speeds were in excess of 40 miles per hour you could then reduce the vehicular volumes to 70%. Paul Shumejko stated that even at that point, the maximum we had for one hour was 249 vehicles. She lives in Grandview and she has a hard time backing out of her driveway. With the stop signs it has been safer and she doesn't have to wait as long, so it has been a plus. She doesn't want the speed humps because of the cost of them, plus the roads are getting beat up

with the construction in the area and she has noticed a number of police officers over the last two or three weeks. Enforcement would help, but you are not going to get it every day. Shouldn't take the signs down no matter what the guidelines say. It is a safety issue. She thinks the signs have helped tremendously.

Ken Wilson, 1210 Grandview: Stated that Grandview should never have been designed as such a straight cut-through street so that people could build up speed. He doesn't know what needs to be done to stop this kind of traffic.

Cheryl Davenport, 1194 Grandview Drive: If someone had been ticketing the people that are speeding through her subdivision and who now ignore the stop signs, you would have sufficient funds to pay for the speed humps. People have sure picked up speed when they get to her address and beyond and she just wanted to bring up this point.

Janis Ferry, 1943 Brookfield Court: Grandview is definitely a collector street. She has no choice but to drive on Grandview and nobody asked her if she would like to have stop signs on Grandview. This is an entire square mile issue, not just a Grandview issue. It was a bad design, but throwing up stop signs arbitrarily and not asking anyone else that has to drive on that road, is just plain wrong.

Pat Somerville, Mayor of Rochester Hills: The police have spent more time out on Grandview than any other road in the city. The police report in to her about every other day and it is definitely a cut through from other subdivisions. They have clocked and given tickets to people going as high as 60 miles per hour because it is a straight through shot. A lot of teenage drivers have been given tickets and have been clocked at over 60 miles per hour, as adults have too. The speed there is definitely not what you would want where you live. She hears the arguments about stop signs, and the subdivision she lives in, every other street has a stop sign. They all manage to survive and stop at these stop signs.

Paul Davis, City Engineer for the City of Rochester Hills: He feels it is his duty to make some comments on this issue. To try and give a perspective, but he doesn't perceive changing many opinions, but he does want to repeat some things that have previously been said. When the Engineering staff gets a request to do an engineering study, we look for the motoring public as a whole and it is a very difficult job. He would not like to be in the mayor's position at all, dealing with people making these types of requests. They are emotional and he knows the mayor wants to help solve people's problems. Especially when they are difficult things that have gone year after year and there still seems to be a problem there. Basically, the city uses engineering standards that have been developed through previous studies, MMUTCD has been quoted tonight. That is one of the standards. Another one is the Traffic Improvement Association. There have been a lot of studies on these types of issues. And what the city looks for is to try and have some organization in consistency, not only on Grandview, but really in any location in the City and any other community in the State, where these types of issues are set, so when we talk about stop sign warrants, we are trying to be consistent so that people know what to expect when they are traveling down a road. Someone said tonight that someone was driving 65 miles per hour down Grandview. He doesn't doubt that. That is why there is an 85th percentile that is used to assign speed on roadways. There is always going to be a maniac driver. And unfortunately, you have to try and catch that maniac driver by enforcement and hopefully, they don't hurt themselves in the process of speeding down a road like that. Stop signs are not going to stop this. You can see on the video that there are several people that are driving less than 65 miles per hour that ignore the stop sign. He doesn't expect that the person driving 65 miles per hour is all of sudden going to stop because there is a stop sign there. TIA and the City share a common goal, and that basically is to improve traffic safety. He has bought into some of the studies that they have done and some of the recommendations that they have made for us to consider and this board to consider when they make decisions on whether stop signs should be put in place and that is why we go through these engineering studies for the warrants. If they are not met, then our recommendations are not going to be to put

in stop signs there. TIA has basically made numerous studies and shown that stop signs are not an effective means of controlling speed. You may argue that someone stops right at that intersection or they are slowing down. I heard, "Now I am finally seeing people slow down there.", well they didn't have a reason to slow down there before when the stop sign wasn't there. I don't doubt that they are starting to slow down there now. The fact is, that studies have shown, throughout the rest of Grandview, that the speeds are still up there. The stop signs are not the effective way to control it, the enforcement is. Speed humps or traffic calming measures, are another way to do it. We talked about disrespect of traffic control devices, and we try not to set precedent by encouraging a breed of discontent for traffic control devices to be out there. When we put a stop sign there, we want them to stop. We don't want them to say, "Well I'll stop at this one but I'm not going to stop at this other one." Disrespect is something the city is very concerned about. Putting in stop signs in unwarranted cases doesn't help this issue. You may, in other areas of the state, get a ticket by going through a speed trap. That is not fair. It is probably not any more fair than having stop signs that are unwarranted. There are speed limits on some roads that are unwarranted. They are political speed limits and sometimes communities feel that they need to try and slow down traffic this way. What it does is, it just becomes a place to write tickets. It doesn't matter if you drive through a stop sign at 20 miles per hour or go through it at 1 mile per hour, a slow roll. You are still going to get a 3 point write up on a traffic ticket for rolling that stop sign. This will just breed that traffic discontent for traffic control devices. That is enforcement. You do not need a stop sign to write a traffic ticket. If someone is speeding, you can write a traffic ticket when you catch them speeding. There may be times when emotional decisions are necessary and maybe even better than an engineering study that is kind of black and white the way we look at it on this issue. He doesn't believe Grandview is one of those cases in point.

Chris Hummel, 2006 Edgemont Court: He agrees that we do not need to be a protagonist with these stop signs. He doesn't believe that going 32 miles per hour, we should not raise the speed limit to then to whatever people choose. He thinks the speed has been reduced. He doesn't know if there was a speed study done before the stop signs were installed. Maybe it is not an effective stopping device, but it is a speed control. If we decide not to keep the stop signs, and put the speed humps there, are we going to do the same type of study? If that doesn't work, take yet another measure?

Chairman Colling stated that the only community that has experience with speed humps is Farmington Hills. This board has gone there and looked at the results from the Farmington Hills installation and they have been very effective. There has been no instance recorded of anyone "speed jumping" them and they are put in so that fire and safety equipment can get through at a reasonable speed and not damage the equipment. They are long enough and gradual enough so that you can plow over them, but if you go over them a greater speed, it is a very unpleasant sensation. Basically, the compliance rate in Farmington Hills has been quite good with them. The funding is not here for the City to implement them on a City-wide basis. The decision was made by council, when this first was approached, to make it a special assessment. The board has no control over this. There has also been other areas of the city; Raintree and Firewood for one, where traffic circles were put in. They are a very effective way of slowing down traffic. You have optical discontinuities, where you do things to the roadway to make it appear narrower at points, even though it is not. The common thread that the board has heard, time and time again, is speed. The best weapon is education and cooperation between the communities. You have to treat signage and roadways as a community, and not as an isolated subdivision. The best advice he can give here, is to communicate with the neighboring subdivisions and understand that it is your neighbor that probably isn't paying attention and comes through a little bit fast and you may be doing it to them. It is a matter of awareness and the best results we have had is when the subdivision associations, within a square mile block radius that share the roadways, communicate and have an education program amongst themselves to help one another. Ninety percent (90% of the violators live within the immediate area.

Chris Hummel, 2006 Edgemont Court: He doesn't want to go through the time and trouble to put in a speed hump if it will have less effect than the stop signs. If it is not going to have a physical impediment upon them, he doesn't think it is going to be any more effective than a stop sign that has a penalty of three (3) points. There is no deterrent with a speed hump.

Marc Matich, Traffic Technician for Rochester Hills, stated that a speed hump will lower the speed by at least 5 to 6 miles per hour. It will lower the 85th by that much. A three to four inch hump, in the roadway, does lower the speed. You just have to place them within a proximity of each other so that you can maintain the speeds at a reasonable condition. That is something that doesn't have to be enforced, it is an automatic police officer in the field. We do recognize that there is a speed problem on Grandview. The association needs to decide on whether the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. Signage and pavement markings have to go with them. You do have to have more than just one speed hump, otherwise, they will just pick their speed after the speed hump. Speed hump locations for this instance are included in the meeting packet.

Paul Shumejko, Transportation Engineer for Rochester Hills, noted that the locations for the speed humps were determined to catch the driver at the midpoint between the intersecting streets. You do not want to put them too close to the intersections. We wanted to have multiple speed humps along the stretch to control the speeds. There were two proposals submitted. The cost associated with this is about \$4,000.00 or so, per hump. The speed humps are typically over a transition of 12 to 14 feet with a 4 inch rise.

Board Discussion: Mr. Ken Zendel noted that there are some rumble strips already in place along this stretch of Grandview and the road slopes significantly downhill from around Brookfield Court south along Grandview. There are no homes really from North Fairview and Sandyridge on the west side, which makes it seem like it is not really a subdivision anymore. When the stop signs were put in, there were stop sign warning signs installed as you approach the stop signs from both sides. Sandyridge and Grandview is the correct location for the all-way stop.

Chairman Colling stated that they were aware of the rumble strips and that this issue has been before the board since numerous times since 1985, when he joined the board.

Terry T. Brown stated that the safety concerns that have been expressed are emotionally stated and very real. On the other hand, he concludes, from having driven this route over recent years, that based on the volume counts, this is not a unique situation in terms of volume and the guidelines are pretty well considered. There are a lot of professional people that have helped establish the guidelines and he can't think of any reason to make an exception to these guidelines. His opinion is to follow the guidelines from our professional staff and remove those stop signs.

Johannes Buiteweg wanted to know what the practical stop means. He also wanted to have the specs of the speed humps. Does it affect a car that speeds fast over it? Chairman Colling stated that they are fourteen (14) feet long, over the entire width of the roadway with a four (4) inch rise. Mr. Buiteweg has seen speed humps in other areas and has found them to be very, very effective. He also wanted to mention that he thought the speed on Grandview was a little fast. He has a problem with the way speed is determined in this City. Wants everyone to pay attention to what is being said and not to just go only by the safety.

Carl Moore thanked everyone for coming before the board and voicing their concerns and problems. He wanted to remind everyone that they took an oath to support the Michigan Manual. He was ready to make the motion to remove the stop signs and recede the TCO. This was restated as letting the temporary control order number SS-131 expire. Chairman Colling stated that without support or a recommendation of the board it would go to City Council and they would have to vote on it to make it a

permanent control order.

Chairman Colling just wanted to restate that the 85th percentile speed was between 31 and 34 miles per hour. This has been the case since he has been on the board. No amount of traffic control or enforcement is going to stop the odd maniac driver. You can't legislate common sense. They are just going to break the law. He requested that a cut-through study be taken. Based on the data and warrants, he can not support this traffic control order. He then asked for a roll call vote.

A motion was made by Citizen Representative Moore, seconded by Citizen Representative Brown, that this matter be Referred to the City Council Liaison. For temporary traffic control order number SS-131, that is due to expire on April 9, 2004, be sent to City Council for their decision and vote on this issue.

Whereas, Traffic Control Order No. SS-131 has been issued by the Mayor under the provisions of Chapter VI of Act No. 300, Public Acts of Michigan of 1949, as amended (Michigan Vehicle Code), and under the provisions of the City of Rochester Hills Code of Ordinances, Chapter 98 (Rochester Hills Traffic Code), as amended; and

Whereas, said Traffic Control Order covers:

- SS-131.1 All approaching traffic to STOP from both Grandview Dr. and Ridgefield Ct. at their intersection**
- SS-131.2 All approaching traffic to STOP from both Grandview Dr. and Sandy Ridge at their north intersection**
- SS-131.3 All approaching traffic to STOP from both Sandy Ridge and Fairmont Drive at their intersection**

Whereas, said Traffic Control Order shall not be effective after the expiration of ninety (90) days from the date of issuance, except upon approval by this Council; and

Whereas, the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board has considered the issues pertaining to the Traffic Control Order; and

Whereas, this order rescinds and supersedes the following Traffic Control Order adopted by the City of Rochester Hills: YS-06.4;

Resolved that the Rochester Hills City Council approves the issuance of Traffic Control Order No. SS-131 to be in effect until rescinded or superseded by subsequent order; and that a certified copy of this Resolution be filed together with the Traffic Control Order, with the City Clerk of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan.

The motion failed by the following vote:

Aye: Brown, Colling, Jr. and Moore

Nay: Buiteweg, Hunter and Zendel

Absent: Oza

Present: Brown, Buiteweg, Colling, Jr., Hunter, Moore, Oza and Zendel

2004-0228

Grandview Drive at Stonington "Stop Signs".

Attachments: 4506StoningGrandv.pdf; 0228.1.pdf

Marc Matich stated that Council Representative Ms. Linda Raschke brought this up as a