

in accordance with the terms set forth in the Resolutions, bearing thereon.

DETERMINED: Yeas: Baron, Beaton, Carvey, Glass, Karas, Tull, Snell
Nays: None
MOTION CARRIED.

Exercise Option to Purchase Property from Mercy Services for Aging for use as a city park. [Copies of letter dated May 15, 1989 from Attorney Staran with attached Option to Purchase map and memo dated May 18, 1989 to City Council from Mayor Ireland forwarded to each Council Member.]

Mayor Ireland explained that the subject property is a triangular section located at the southeast corner of Avon and Livernois, and it is proposed to use it for a small park.

President Snell referred to Mayor Ireland's memo in which she indicated that, initially, the money for the purchase will come from General Fund reserves for park and recreation, and that amount will be reimbursed when the bonds are sold under the recreation ballot issue.

In answer to inquiry by Member Tull to whether this will have any effect on the bike path, President Snell said in his understanding that Mercy Services would no longer be obligated to construct the bike path as part of the Bellbrook project; however, it was planned to go along the Livernois right-of-way, and the city would have the right to extend the bike path along that property at some future time.

MOTION by Carvey, seconded by Glass, Resolved, that the City Council approves the Option to Purchase 5.140 acres of property located at the southeast intersection of Livernois and Avon Roads from Mercy Services for Aging in the amount of \$50,000, as presented; and that the Mayor and City Clerk be and are hereby authorized to execute and deliver said Option on behalf of the City.

Ayes: Beaton, Carvey, Glass, Karas, Tull, Snell, Baron
Nays: None
MOTION CARRIED.

Approval of Agreement for pathways to be located on Adams Road. [Copies of memo dated May 2, 1989 from David Bluhm, Engineering Department with attached agreement and location map forwarded to each Council Member.]

President Snell explained that the proposed location is along Adams Road in the Clinton River Valley and Quail Ridge Subdivisions and extending across the Clinton River into Pheasant Ring Subdivision.

MOTION by Carvey, seconded by Karas, Resolved, that the City Council approves the Pathway Liability Agreement, as presented, between the City of Rochester Hills and the Oakland County Road Commission for the construction of a non-motorized pedestrian pathway on Adams Road in Sections 19 and 20; and that the Mayor and City Clerk be and are hereby authorized to execute and deliver said Agreement on behalf of the City.

Ayes: Snell, Baron, Beaton, Carvey, Glass, Karas, Tull
Nays: None
MOTION CARRIED.

resumed at 9:12 p.m.

ended the meeting

Discussion re Traffic Study and Comprehensive Transportation Plan referred from the Planning Commission. [Copies of memo dated May 17, 1989 from Jeffrey Cohee,

CONTINUED

letter dated April 24, 1989 to Patricia Goodwin from Attorney Ternan, letter dated February 22, 1989 to Mr. & Mrs. J. Koch from Nicholas Gallopoulos, letter to Mr. Gallopoulos from Mr. & Mrs. J. Koch, letter dated May 5, 1989 to Mayor Ireland from Mr. H. Wayne Wells, letter dated May 8, 1989 to City Council and Planning Commission from Mr. & Mrs. Philip Heidelberger, letter to Jeffrey Cohee from Joseph Gallagher, letter dated May 8, 1989 to Jeffrey Cohee from David Massoglia, letter dated May 2, 1989 from Audrey Viglione, and minutes of the April 25, 1989 Planning Commission Meeting forwarded to each Council Member.]

President Snell advised that Council Members have received copies of the Comprehensive Transportation Plan that was put together through the efforts of BRW and the Citizens Advisory Committee. A Public Hearing on the plan was held on April 25, 1989 by the Planning Commission, who adopted a resolution referring it to the City Council for consideration and remarks, with concerns expressed by the Planning Commission, as follows:

- 1) The impact of the widening of Livernois.
- 2) The possible use of Van Hoosen Jones cemetery property in the City of Rochester's portion of the plan.
- 3) The interchange at Livernois and M-59.
- 4) The lack of widening Adams Road.
- 5) That a traffic control island on Tienken at Sheldon be arranged to preclude northbound traffic from the Sheldon Road extension going through a residential neighborhood.
- 6) That the paving of Hamlin Road from Rochester to Dequindre Road become a priority and considered within the next 2 to 5 years.

Further, President Snell said it is the intent of the Planning Commission to hold a joint session with the Citizens Committee after receiving input from the City Council, to resolve any remaining issues and then adopt a plan for the future road issues of the City of Rochester Hills.

President Snell said the transportation plan examines a number of issues: the transportation system policies; transportation improvement project priorities; improvement projects that were considered and rejected by the Citizens Committee as priority projects; recommended functional classification system; recommended roadway jurisdiction; typical geometric cross sections for major arterial four-lane residential boulevard and for minor arterial roads; implementation staging, involving planning design and construction; and adoption of the plan.

President Snell said he believes the discussion this evening would be most fruitful if the Council is able to focus on that list of issues of the plan, as well as the six issues stated in the Planning Commission's resolution.

Mr. Jeffrey Cohee, City Operations Coordinator, and Mr. Dick Wolsfeld, P.E., BRW, Inc., were present to provide additional information. Mr. Robert Justin and Mrs. Lauren Shepherd, Members of the Citizens Advisory Committee, were also present.

Member Glass said that, as a result of petitions opposing five-lane roads sent to the City Council, state and federal officials, and meetings with a State Representative and State Senator, as well as attendance at Oakland County Road Commission Meetings, there have been some changes in attitude.

Ms. Glass said one of the things she is most happy about with the plan is the possibility of building residential boulevards with a narrow median within 120 feet instead of five-lane roads.

In response to request by Member Tull for input on the six issues raised by the Planning Commission, Mr. Wolsfeld commented, as follows:

1) The impact of widening Livernois: Mr. Wolsfeld said they evaluated a number of alternatives during the development of the plan including widening a number of the north-south arterial roadways. The three roadways that provided the most opportunity for that were Rochester, Livernois and Adams, and the committee felt that Livernois was the preferred alternative of those three because of its north-south continuity and its proximity to Rochester Road. Mr. Wolsfeld said there is a graphic in the Plan that shows the Year 2010 travel demand compared to

CONTINUED

today's capability of the street system, and when the ratio exceeds one, there is congestion delay. Rochester, Livernois and Adams all exceed one right now, and the Committee felt that, of all the roadways, Livernois is appropriate for widening because of its north-south continuity, because of its proximity to Rochester road, and because of its potential to have an interchange with M-59.

There is traffic justification to widen any of the three roadways, but Mr. Wolsfeld said the Citizens Advisory Committee felt that Adams Road should not be widened because of its rolling character and because of its proximity to Oakland University.

Initially, Mr. Wolsfeld said the proposal was to extend Livernois, north of Walton and north of Tienken to connect to Orion Road, but that plan was amended so that Livernois would only be developed as a four-lane residential boulevard to just north of Walton at the last entrance to the shopping center, and then taper back to one lane in each direction, plus a center left-turn lane, with the improvement ending at Tienken Road.

Member Beaton said he would hope that this Council would prioritize Rochester Road for widening to a six-lane boulevard before Livernois is ever touched, and we might find that Rochester Road would carry the load without widening Livernois.

Member Baron said that Squirrel Road is going to be widened and, since the strategy is to divert the traffic out of Rochester Hills and to tie into east-west arteries like Tienken and Dutton, he feels that is very significant when discussing the widening of Adams Road.

Regarding Livernois, Mr. Baron said it does not have the continuity of Rochester Road, which is a main north-south artery that goes through Rochester Hills, Rochester and Oakland Township. Mr. Baron said he feels the widening of Rochester Road should be the top priority because it is a state road, and it would be less of a tax burden on the citizens of Rochester Hills if we can get our fair share of road funds from the state to pay for it.

President Snell said he would not like to see the impression created that state funds are only used for state roads, because the City of Rochester Hills has been awarded a grant to do engineering studies on Livernois under federal funding, and the City of Troy has received federal and state funds to improve roads, such as Big Beaver. Also, the City of Rochester Hills applied for and appears to have been granted at least a portion of 22 million dollars to improve city and county roads (Hamlin, Adams and a portion around M-59).

Member Tull asked for Mr. Wolsfeld's opinion regarding Mr. Beaton's earlier statement that widening Rochester Road would carry the load.

Mr. Wolsfeld said that in the Year 2010, one additional lane on Rochester Road will not even come close to serving the north-south travel demand. Mr. Wolsfeld said there are three kinds of traffic on Rochester Road: 1) through-traffic that is truly cutting through the community from north to south and vice versa; 2) traffic going to the interchanges (M-59 and I-75); 3) traffic that is destined to commercial activities that exist along Rochester Road. The problem is that it is just too much traffic, in terms of being able to accommodate what that travel demand is.

By widening Livernois and putting an interchange at M-59, Mr. Wolsfeld said it will serve two kinds of traffic: Traffic that wants to get to M-59 without going to Rochester road to do that; and Livernois would serve as a north-south travel path for people who have destinations on Rochester Road. Mr. Wolsfeld said Livernois will not serve the traffic cutting through the community, because of its lack of continuity to the north.

Member Tull asked Mr. Wolsfeld what the impact would be on the plan if the Council were to recommend that it does not like one item in the plan, namely, the widening of Livernois.

Mr. Wolsfeld said his opinion is that the impact would be severe, because the Livernois improvement is critical to the entire plan. Mr. Wolsfeld further explained that the Citizens Advisory Committee felt it was impossible to solve the whole problem without changing the residential character of the community, but there are certain critical things that need to happen to solve just 50 percent of the problem: Improvement of Livernois; an interchange at M-59 and Livernois; improvement of Rochester Road to a six-lane boulevard; Crooks Road improvement; and implementation of the Squirrel Road improvement. Mr. Wolsfeld said he feels to pull any one of them would cause the Committee to rethink the entire plan.

Member Beaton said he thinks the widening of Livernois is a commercial decision, and feels that a Livernois interchange is just a method to make it convenient for employees of the industrial area to get in and out and for 18-wheelers to get in and out of the industrial park; he asked Mr. Wolsfeld if that was taken into consideration when making the decision.

Mr. Wolsfeld said the land use assumed in terms of the plan is really the basis for forecasted employment and forecasted population; if the employment were frozen today, and the residential development continues in the north and northwest, there is still justification for the widening of Livernois. Mr. Wolsfeld said he was on Avon at Livernois at 5:45 this evening and, looking to the north and to the south as far as he could see, there were cars backed up in both directions, and there is no interchange at M-59 today.

Mr. Wolsfeld said he feels the widening of Livernois is the top priority; adding an interchange to Livernois will make it easier for people to get to and from the industrial area, and it will also make it easier for people who live within 1/2 mile of Livernois to get to M-59. If he had to pick between the two, Mr. Wolsfeld said the widening of Livernois is the most important.

In answer to inquiry as to whether the Rochester Road improvement should be prioritized before the widening of Livernois, Mr. Wolsfeld said he understands that the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) has already communicated to the city that they will pay for the widening of Rochester Road when the City of Rochester Hills delivers the right-of-way. Just looking at a couple of major obstacles to getting 15 feet on either side of Rochester Road, Mr. Wolsfeld said that is probably going to take a while to acquire that right-of-way. Both of the improvements are very, very well justified in terms of serving present and future traffic, but Mr. Wolsfeld added that attempts to widen Rochester Road will always be faced with some kind of restriction in the center of the roadway in downtown Rochester.

2) Possible use of Van Hoosen Jones cemetery property in the City of Rochester's portion of the plan: Mr. Wolsfeld said the approach taken by the City of Rochester in terms of Main Street, where they are not happy with the 18-wheelers rolling through their commercial area, is to intercept at least some of those vehicles that come in from the east on Sheldon and take them around the downtown area and bring them in at the intersection of Second and Main Street. The City of Rochester view is that Sheldon could serve as an intercept roadway to give people an alternative to get to the south on Main Street without going through the heart of downtown Rochester. In order to do that, Mr. Wolsfeld said it would require locating that road through the western edge of the cemetery; that is their proposal.

Member Baron expressed his objection to moving a cemetery for a roadway; in his opinion, the Van Hoosen Jones Cemetery property is an untouchable piece, but he said there is some merit for a ring road, and he would like to think there are other alternatives.

Member Baron expressed his approval of one of the alternative ideas to use the Grand Trunk Railroad right-of-way for a roadway to service traffic, and he asked Mr. Wolsfeld if he believes the opportunity to acquire that right-of-way might open up in the future.

Mr. Wolsfeld said the railroads are undergoing tremendous changes in terms of what they are doing in order to survive, and their situation can change monthly.

CONTINUED

A member of the Grand Trunk Railroad, Mark Higgenbotham, served for a short period on the Technical Advisory Committee, and Mr. Wolsfeld said he calls him every couple of months to ask him if there is any change, because perhaps their reaction may depend on whether they feel they have an interested buyer. Mr. Wolsfeld said he would guess that something may change there in the next five years.

President Snell said the Trailways Commission has an interest in acquiring that property as an additional trailway to tie into the current Paint Creek Trailway, so there may be a decision between recreation and roads if it becomes available.

Regarding the cemetery property, Member Beaton said he feels this City Council should work diligently to save the cemetery property.

Member Tull asked what alternative there is to taking a sliver of the cemetery property for the positioning of the proposed road.

Mr. Wolsfeld said there are very nice single-family homes that back right up to the cemetery property, and it is his understanding that the portion of cemetery property proposed does not have graves on it. Mr. Wolsfeld said there are not a lot of options; to establish continuity with Sheldon to the north, these homes would have to be destroyed if the road couldn't go through the cemetery.

Member Tull asked if there are alternatives within the City of Rochester to permit the ringing of their downtown business district.

Mr. Wolsfeld said he does not believe there is a location further to the east because of the park, the river and other problems; the next alternative might be to create one-way streets in the downtown area to increase the capacity. Mr. Wolsfeld said there is generally very strong resistance from the merchants who front on the two-way roadway for fear of losing customers.

Member Tull asked what impact it would have on their forecast if the plan were approved without the inclusion of the Sheldon Road extension, and Mr. Wolsfeld said it would just make the Rochester Road traffic worse through downtown and to the north.

Member Baron said he would like to clarify this former statement regarding his objection to widening Livernois. Mr. Baron said he is opposed to widening Livernois to a four-lane boulevard and he is opposed to the interchange, but that doesn't mean he would object to three lanes on Livernois for local traffic.

Mr. Wolsfeld said when you go from a comprehensive transportation plan that sets out strategies, the next level gets into engineering and, at that stage, you can look at a much finer level of detail in terms of the location of curb cuts, what the topography is, what the impacts are, and you can look at alternatives, such as: Do nothing; two lanes in each direction, plus the center left turn; or the four-lane residential boulevard. Mr. Wolsfeld said you can direct your Engineering Department to do conceptual engineering on all three alternatives and look at the cost, the service, and the impact, and then make a judgement in terms of the preferred direction.

Continuing, Mr. Wolsfeld said they may find places by the High School where the four-lane residential boulevard works fine without much impact but, in another area, it might not be necessary because of the topography or other concerns.

3) The interchange at Livernois and M-59: Mr. Wolsfeld said the interchange would be a major benefit for the people on Livernois, south of Hamlin, in terms of access to M-59. Another major benefit would be to move traffic over from Crooks and from Rochester Road to access M-59. Probably, for people north of Hamlin, Mr. Wolsfeld it would just be more of a convenience.

Member Glass said she has to question designing another interchange at M-59, because it has been necessary to put traffic lights, turn lanes, etc. at the current interchanges, and there have been many problems. Ms. Glass said she is concerned about creating another hazardous situation; there are so many accidents and back-up now at Crooks Road because of the configuration.

CONTINUED

Mr. Wolsfeld said it would be nice if Livernois and M-59 intersected each other at right angles and if there were no development there, so he would have to admit that it is not a terrific situation in terms of geometric design; if the ramp terminals are signalized, most of the problems would be resolved. Mr. Wolsfeld said a lot has been learned about geometric design since M-59 was first built in terms of turn lanes, bridge widths and signalization.

Mr. Wolsfeld added that an engineering study would determine whether the Livernois interchange can be designed to meet standard engineering practice; if it can't, MDOT won't fund it. Mr. Wolsfeld said enough engineering has been done on the intersection to encourage them to go to the next step in terms of conducting a feasibility study.

4) The lack of widening Adams Road: Mr. Wolsfeld said the primary reason for not widening Adams is because an alternative to the west, Squirrel Road, was available, but he added that an interchange will be constructed at Squirrel and M-59, which will send east-bound traffic over to Adams. Mr. Wolsfeld said he believes the strategy was that Squirrel Road is the appropriate road to serve the Technology Park, and everyone believes Squirrel Road will be improved up to Walton Blvd. The committee felt very strongly that Squirrel needs to be improved further to the north, to Silver Bell, so that connections can be made to Silver Bell and to Tienken to provide a diversion capability; if Adams were improved, the committee felt it would reduce the incentive for Auburn Hills to extend the Squirrel Road improvement up to Silver Bell.

President Snell pointed out that Adams is proposed to be widened between Hamlin and Auburn; the portion of Adams that is proposed not to be widened in this plan is located south of Auburn and north of Hamlin.

Mr. Wolsfeld said he believes the committee was a little hesitant to be making recommendations for improvements outside of the city, but conversations with the staff at Auburn Hills have informed us that the Squirrel Road improvement is committed and the funding is approved, so the committee felt it was appropriate.

In answer to inquiry by Member Karas regarding improvement rather than widening of Adams Road from M-59 north, Mr. Wolsfeld said he would suggest the installation of left-turn lanes at the major intersections and removal of some of the vertical curves from the roadway, which would require some retaining walls.

Member Tull said he is wondering how jurisdictional questions over roads will affect the plan and asked to what extent our input will be considered, and how does the Oakland County Road Commission view our transportation plan when it is interposed upon their plan.

Mr. Wolsfeld said that Jim Barbarossa, a member of the Road Commission, served on the technical advisory committee, and it seems their position is that they (Oakland County Road Commission) have so little money to spread around that if a municipality is in opposition to a project, they have plenty of other places to spend money and don't need to get beat up trying to propose roadway improvements that are not wanted.

On the other hand, with all the problems that exist within the county, Mr. Wolsfeld said the OCRC likes to spend its money on what traffic engineers deem the most hazardous sections or the ones with the greatest capacity problems. When they see a community with a comprehensive plan with some strategies for dealing with the roadway problems and for funding, Mr. Wolsfeld said they tend to be more inclined to participate in those proposals.

President Snell said he recalls that in meetings with the OCRC last year, they indicated that if the City of Rochester Hills and its residents wish to have four-lane boulevards, they won't say we can't have them; however, they did state that they would not expect to pay a share of the additional cost difference for a four-lane boulevard as opposed to a five-lane road. Dr. Snell asked Mr. Wolsfeld if that is still their position.

Mr. Wolsfeld said he's not sure, but that's probably correct; however, he said he does not think the cost difference between the two is significant. He added

CONTINUED

that the Road Commission sometimes changes its initial position after seeing a road improvement implemented that turns out to be a better solution, and they may eventually adopt it as their standard.

Member Baron referred to Mr. Wolsfeld's statement regarding improvements to Adams, and he suggested that the traffic light signalization is a problem and the stacking lane is inadequate for traffic turning east onto Avon. Mr. Baron said these are things that can be addressed to improve the traffic flow on Adams, on Livernois and on other arteries if that is our priority.

Member Glass said she would like to start off slowly and first make intersection improvements and properly signalize the traffic lights and see if those things will help; before starting on four-lane boulevards, Ms. Glass said she first wants to try all other steps to speed the traffic along. If nothing else works, then Ms. Glass said she will look at this plan; if the plan is adopted, it is not a goal, but just an idea that may help.

President Snell said if the Council approves the plan, he feels we should make a valiant effort to implement it. The Council adopts a number of plans, such as the Master Land Use Plan and the Master Recreation Plan, and we commit to the residents that we have the full intent of implementing them. Understandably, not everything in the Transportation Plan may happen because of costs, unplanned events, or other considerations, but Dr. Snell said if the Council is willing to accept a plan for the roads, he feels we owe it to the residents of the city to try to implement that plan or make an effort to go in that direction.

Dr. Snell said he does not see this plan as a last resort if nothing else works; he feels the plan was put together with the intent that this is what appears will be useful and workable, so that's what we should strive for - and not put it on the shelf and wait 10 years while we try something else.

Member Tull said he believes this plan addresses the question of operational improvements, which constitute just one phase of the plan; those improvements are not going to provide the traffic flow that is necessary to improve capacity and volume ratios. Mr. Tull said we all agree that we need to improve stacking lanes and to make other operational improvements, but the plan, itself, says that's not enough to reach our major transportation plan goals.

Mr. Wolsfeld said if you just drive the road system here in Rochester Hills today, you know you can't go wrong with making any kind of improvements; there are enough problems right now that, if everything stopped, including Oakland Technology Park, it would still take 10 years to catch up. Even if it were fully implemented, part of the plan is that Rochester Hills will have to live with a certain level of roadway congestion. Mr. Wolsfeld said the committee felt the impact on the residential character of the community would be too great to provide a reasonable level of service on all roadways in the Year 2005.

Member Glass said she does not see where there is money to do all of the road improvements that need to be done, and she said she would like to be hopeful that, somehow, technology will help us out of this situation, in terms of overhead tram or something to alleviate the street traffic.

Member Tull said that you have to plan and work toward a goal; it's not hopeless.

Member Carvey agreed and pointed out that Rochester Hills has an opportunity for 25 million dollars from the state, which is a big chunk of the money needed. Mr. Carvey said he feels the Council has to have a plan ready when those kinds of opportunities come along so we can take advantage and not turn them down.

Mr. Wolsfeld said he would add that, in 1991, the existing Federal Surface Transportation Act expires, and the construction of the interstate road system is essentially over. There's a rehabilitation repair function, but that's not nearly as costly as building it was, so Mr. Wolsfeld said there is the expectation that there will be a shift from the interstate system to the next level of arterial roadways in terms of some help from the federal gas tax. If a governmental unit has an adopted plan that's committed to with plans on the shelf ready to go, that community tends to get a higher priority for that.

CONTINUED

5) A traffic control island on Tienken at Sheldon to preclude northbound traffic from the Sheldon Road extension going through a residential neighborhood:

Member Baron asked if the traffic control island would keep the traffic from going into the residential areas.

Mr. Wolsfeld said someone would get sued at the first fatality, and he would not sign his name to the plan. Continuing, Mr. Wolsfeld said that issue would be dealt with during the design and, if you don't want Sheldon Road to be continuous, you don't build Sheldon Road - you don't build a road and then put a barrier in the middle so people can't use it; that's a waste of money.

6) That the paving of Hamlin Road from Rochester to Dequindre become a priority and be considered within the next 2 to 5 years: Mr. Wolsfeld referred to Figure 38 on Page 73 of the Transportation Plan, where the projects are broken into priorities of 1-5 years, 6-10 years, and 10+ years, and the Hamlin improvement is listed in the 6-10 year time-frame. It was suggested that it be slid into the 1-5 year time-frame. Initially, Mr. Wolsfeld said that every project was in the 1-5 year time-frame and, because the money is not available to build them all, Hamlin was shifted to the 6-10 year time-frame.

Member Beaton said he would like some of these gravel roads finished before we start widening Livernois, and he feels it would take a lot of congestion off Avon and Auburn Roads if that portion of Hamlin were paved, so he suggested that the Hamlin improvement be moved up in priority.

Member Baron referred to state and federal plans to improve Auburn and M-59, so he would not want to spend city money on a four-lane boulevard for Hamlin, which is a third east-west route.

Mr. Richard Stouffer asked if any type of mass transportation was considered in this study.

Mr. Wolsfeld answered in the affirmative; five major strategies were suggested in the plan, and the fifth strategy was to provide and encourage travel other than single-occupant automobiles, such as transit services, car pools, van pools, staggering work hours and metering freeways. A problem with these types of management tasks is that they generally work at the destination (work places), and there are not major concentrations of employment in Rochester Hills. Mr. Wolsfeld said transit services is a funding issue; SEMTA does not have a lot of money, and they have had to cut back services.

Mr. Stouffer asked if any thought was given to asking the State for a piece of land to extend John R through the state park, which would funnel traffic out around the downtown area.

Mr. Wolsfeld said he believes the feeling of the committee was that once you get through the park to the north, there isn't a good north-south route to tie into for continuity.

Beverly Ross, 1150 Hickory Hill Drive, questioned whether the proposals discussed this evening are for the purpose of moving traffic quickly or for safety purposes, and she suggested that new traffic lights, lengthened passing lanes and left turn lanes would solve some of the problems. In addition, Ms. Ross said she would like to know how much Rochester Hills citizens will have to pay for these improvements in dollars and/or in the quality of life in their city.

Hope Sadowski, 837 John R, referred to the extra expense the city will have to assume to maintain the boulevards. Ms. Sadowski said that a middle school will be built at Sheldon and Tienken Roads, and she said Sheldon will need some improvements in order to provide entrance for buses and parents. Ms. Sadowski said she believes that the City of Rochester should consider making some one-way streets to move traffic in the downtown area.

Sharon Bond, 1020 Hidden Lane, expressed her opposition to the widening of Livernois and said she would rather see Adams widened than Livernois.

CONTINUED

Member Beaton asked if Ms. Bond would support widening Rochester to a six-lane boulevard before Livernois is touched, and she answered in the affirmative.

Vicki Gossert, 2285 S. Livernois, expressed her opposition to the widening of Livernois or Adams and to an interchange at M-59 and Livernois; she suggested an alternative might be an interchange at Auburn & M-59.

Brenda Polasek-Savage, 1715 Northumberland Dr., asked Mr. Wolsfeld the purpose of the study.

Mr. Wolsfeld said there were three goals, which are listed in Figure 3 on Page 9 of the Report: 1) To efficiently and effectively serve the travel needs of the community; 2) To be compatible with adjacent land uses and the predominantly residential and environmental character of the suburban community; and 3) To implement improvements in a cost-effective manner.

Ms. Polasek-Savage said she fears the outcome will be a major city thoroughfare, and she feels it unwise to commit to spending monies to do something the people really don't want, and she suggested that operational improvements would be sufficient.

President Snell said he feels this Council also has to represent the residents of this community who are asking for road improvements, so there has to be a compromise between the two positions.

Member Tull pointed out that operational improvements are an important part of the Plan, but they are not presented as a solution for the future. Mr. Tull said if this Council does not plan for future traffic, he feels it will be extremely difficult to have any quality of life in this city.

Tom Burch, 2456 Wortham, said when he was first named to the Citizens Advisory Committee to work with BRW in the preparation of the Comprehensive Transportation Plan, he favored the widening of Adams Road. In the course of his discussions on that committee, Mr. Burch said he has changed his mind, and he gave his reasons for now supporting the widening of Livernois instead. Mr. Burch said he feels that improving both Livernois and Rochester Roads will do the most for our residents because these roads are in the heart of Rochester Hills, and not along the edge like Dequindre and Adams, and he believes Auburn Hills will see the need to complete Squirrel Road when they receive complaints from people who work there and are sitting in long lines of traffic.

Mr. Burch suggested that, before deciding to make changes to the Transportation Plan, the Council should consider that no one on the advisory committee or no one in the audience this evening is a traffic engineer, and that is why the Council contracted with BRW. Mr. Wolsfeld has 15 years of experience doing hundreds of traffic studies and, after sitting with many groups doing projections, he has developed a sophisticated computer model of our roads, so the impact of the proposed road improvement can be tested without actually building the roads. Even with its blemishes, Mr. Burch said the transportation plan under consideration is a document that he believes is visionary; it attempts to deal with today's problems with an eye to the future and, with a projected cost of 60 million dollars, Mr. Burch said the plan is aggressive, as well as attainable.

Mr. Burch suggested that when the final plan is agreed upon, he would hope that a copy of the plan can be made available at the Library so the general public can review the material and come to appreciate the magnitude of the problem. Mr. Burch urged the Council to accept the study as is, without major changes, so political leaders in the Year 2000 will not look back to today and criticize us for our lack of vision.

James Colbert, 240 Mead Road, said he is one of those people who hasn't spoken at a Council Meeting before, and he asked the Council to adopt the plan to improve the roads. Mr. Colbert said he has read the plan from Page 1 to Page 40, and he believes it is a good plan. As political leaders, Mr. Colbert said this Council has to make hard decisions, and he said there are an overwhelming number of people like himself who want the roads improved. Mr. Colbert said he

CONTINUED

feels the changes suggested in the plan are so fundamental, that none of them can be discarded without wrecking the whole plan and going back to square one. Mr. Colbert said his co-workers, neighbors and friends in the community all feel the same as he does about the roads, and the only objections he has ever heard are those that he has heard here this evening; he suggested that only people with self interests are going to object to particular parts of the plan, but there is a large, silent majority in our city, thousands and thousands of people, who are not telling this Council how they feel, and he is telling the Council to do something for them.

Cheryl McClain, 940 Dickson Lane, said she is opposed to widening Livernois Road because her house backs up to it, and she fears widening the road will draw more traffic there. Ms. McClain said she does not want our city to look like another Troy or Southfield, and she believes new traffic lights and extended turn lanes will help solve the problem. Ms. McClain said she would support widening Rochester Road to six lanes before Livernois, and she said she is also opposed to the M-59 interchange, because she feels an interchange every mile is a waste of money, and it can be better spent.

Bill Lomaka, 1177 Christian Hills Drive, said he does not consider his quality of life changed by all the traffic, and he feels money could be better spent on new traffic signals.

Mr. Beaton referred to Appendix G of the study and pointed out that, in the Year 2005, more cars (50,000) are projected to travel on Livernois per day than on Rochester Road (46,000), between Hamlin and Avon Road.

Mr. Don Wharff, 603 Wilwood, said that Livernois had been scheduled to be a four or five-lane highway for many years, and he expressed his approval of the widening of Livernois and the interchange and M-59.

President Snell declared a recess at 11:30 p.m., and it is recorded the meeting resumed at 11:47 p.m.

President Snell said the Planning Commission is seeking input from the Council on the six issues discussed this evening and, additionally, it has been suggested that the Council take some positions of either concurrence or non-concurrence on a number of major points in the plan. President Snell suggested these issues can be addressed independently, considering a motion on each one, or perhaps the Council could generate a list which could be adopted or denied at the end.

President Snell asked Council how they wish to handle the six issues referred by the Planning Commission: 1) Widening of Livernois; 2) Cemetery property; 3) Interchange at Livernois & M-59; 4) Widening of Adams; 5) Traffic control island on Tienken & Sheldon; and 6) Hamlin Road paving as a project priority.

MOTION by Beaton, seconded by Glass, Resolved, that the Council determines to consider each of the six issues referred by the Planning Commission independently.

Discussion: Member Tull said that while he can appreciate why some Council Members would prefer to do that, he feels it would be better to take a look at the Plan as a whole and, if there are concerns, amendments could be made to a motion to adopt the plan, and address the issues in that manner. Mr. Tull said the plan placed before the Council is the product of two years of study and work by a group of citizens who volunteered to serve, and he fears that Council may propose tinkering with it in a way that may have a dramatic impact.

Member Carvey said he agrees totally with Mr. Tull. Mr. Carvey said he greatly fears tinkering with the plan after paying a greatly experienced consultant, who has put together figures that seem to have validity, and after the Citizens Advisory Committee, which represents a good cross-section of our community, has

CONTINUED

spent hundreds of hours on the plan. Mr. Carvey suggested, also, that individual concerns could be addressed as amendments.

Member Glass said she would not like to address these six items in an "all or nothing" fashion, and she would rather consider them separately.

Member Beaton said he agrees with Ms. Glass that the Planning Commission wants the Council's reaction to each individual issue.

Member Baron said he would not agree with an "all or nothing" approach.

Member Karas said he could accept a motion on the entire plan as long as statements can be made with regard to individual issues.

Vote on Motion:

Ayes: Snell, Baron, Beaton, Glass, Karas
Nays: Carvey, Tull MOTION CARRIED.

1) The impact of the widening of Livernois.

MOTION by Beaton, seconded by Baron, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission that Rochester Road be widened to a six-lane boulevard from its southern city limits to Avon Road prior to constructing any widening of Livernois and prior to the construction of an interchange at Livernois & M-59, except that safety improvements, such as left and right-turn lanes and signal improvement are not included in this resolution.

Discussion:

Member Carvey expressed a concern that we have recently learned that we might apply for Faus funding for Livernois and, if federal funding became available for a section of road, then this motion could put the city in the position of having to turn down that funding. Mr. Carvey said he would not want the taxpayers to get stuck paying for something that could have been federally or state funded.

Member Beaton said he understands the state is willing to widen Rochester Road if Rochester Hills acquires the easements, and he feels it is more important for Rochester Hills to spend our tax dollars on acquiring easements for Rochester Road than for asphalt on Livernois in the next five to six years.

Member Tull said that is surely a good way to stick the residents, because the cost of that right-of-way (for Rochester Road) will be significant and, even if federal funding is available to handle a portion of the improvements recommended for Livernois, it could not be done the way this motion reads. Mr. Tull said he can not support a motion that would tie the hands of the city in that way; we can state that our priority is Rochester Road widening, and that is what it should be, but it's not responsible to the citizens to delay implementation of a critical part of the plan for 6 to 8 years.

Member Beaton suggested to re-word his motion to state that the City Council wishes to prioritize the widening of Rochester Road over any road improvements to Livernois.

Member Carvey said that is alright as long as the understanding is that if state or federal funding is received tomorrow for Livernois, the city can take that money and use it for that purpose.

Member Beaton requested to withdraw his original motion from the floor. It is recorded the supporter of the motion refused to withdraw his support. Member Beaton then said he did not wish to withdraw his motion.

Vote on Motion:

Ayes: Glass, Baron, Beaton
Nays: Carvey, Karas, Tull, Snell MOTION DEFEATED.

CONTINUED

MOTION by Karas, seconded by Carvey, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission that it agrees with the widening of Livernois, with the understanding that, where possible, Rochester Road improvements be pursued as a higher priority; however, the Council does not desire the setting of said priority to deter the improvement of Livernois.

Ayes: Karas, Tull, Snell, Carvey
Nays: Baron, Beaton, Glass

MOTION CARRIED.

Discussion: Member Tull said he feels the Council will have to look closely to these improvements if the funding ever does become available, and the next and most important step will be the design; Council will have to be sensitive to the concerns expressed at that point. Right now, Mr. Tull said the Council is indicating its agreement that the plan, as it relates to Livernois Road, is acceptable in general fashion.

2) The possible use of Van Hoosen Jones Cemetery property in the City of Rochester's portion of the plan.

MOTION by Tull, seconded by Beaton, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission that they oppose the use of Van Hoosen Jones Cemetery property in the City of Rochester's portion of the plan concerning the extension of a road from Sheldon to Second Street.

Ayes: Snell, Baron, Beaton, Carvey, Glass, Karas, Tull
Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

3) The interchange at Livernois and M-59.

President Snell said Mr. Wolsfeld has indicated the interchange is a lower priority than the widening of Livernois.

Member Carvey asked Mr. Wolsfeld, if the interchange were not built, how would traffic move off Livernois over to M-59.

Mr. Wolsfeld said the same as today - that traffic will have to use Hamlin to get over to the Crooks or Rochester interchanges.

In answer to inquiry by Mr. Carvey as to whether widening of Hamlin should be included in the plan in that instance, Mr. Wolsfeld said if the interchange is not included in the plan, they will have to go back and take a look at the traffic volumes to see what impact that would have on Hamlin.

MOTION by Tull, seconded by Carvey, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission that the Interchange at Livernois and M-59 be included in the plan, but that it be placed at a lower priority than other improvements recommended for immediate implementation as soon as funding is available, and that it be studied in terms of its necessity once other improvements that have a higher priority are completed.

Discussion: President Snell said it is the intent of the plan's recommendation that this plan be reviewed at least every five years, so that could be incorporated in such a follow-up study.

Member Karas said he would like to take another look at this interchange after the Adams interchange is completed, and after the impact of the improvement of Rochester and Livernois, so would like to defer it, but not delete it.

Member Beaton questioned why Mr. Tull is suggesting to low-prioritize the interchange after saying it would not be wise to do so with the widening of Livernois in case funding becomes available.

CONTINUED

Member Tull said he wants to see the impact of the other improvements first; it has been the attitude of the state not to put an interchange there, so by putting it at a lower priority, we are assuring that the state will not commit funds there.

Member Beaton said he would be very upset to ever see this interchange go in, and he feels the dollars it would cost could be better spent building environmental barriers along M-59 to protect the residential character.

President Snell said the fact that the plan is to be reviewed at least every five years brings in the study aspect, and he feels a discussion would certainly be held at the time funding becomes available, so he would rather remain consistent and refrain from assigning priorities in one area over another, other than in just a general sense.

Lauren Shepherd said if the city were to say consistently that its priority is Rochester Road and dollars from the state will be welcomed for the right-of-way, she feels, eventually, the state will comply. Ms. Shepherd encouraged the Council to support putting a Livernois interchange at a very low priority.

Ayes: Tull, Carvey, Karas

Nays: Snell, Baron, Beaton, Glass

MOTION DEFEATED.

President Snell said the plan put together by the Advisory Citizens Committee may not be perfect and does not solve all the problems, but he believes it is a conceptual plan that looked at many options before stating that this combination of things makes the best sense for the residents of this city. Dr. Snell said the reason he voted "no" on the last motion is not because he disagrees with the priority setting, but because he desires to be consistent.

Member Glass said she voted against the motion because she feels there are people on this Council who are willing to build any road if the money is forthcoming without regard to the need or a well thought-out plan for that road. Ms. Glass said she has a philosophical problem with the widening of Livernois and with constructing another interchange at Livernois. Ms. Glass said she feels it would be creating another unsafe situation and a traffic hazard.

MOTION by Beaton, seconded by Baron, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission that the interchange at M-59 and Livernois be eliminated from the plan, and that the Planning Commission request from BRW alternatives that could be considered if the interchange is deleted.

Ayes: Baron, Beaton, Glass

Nays: Snell, Carvey, Karas, Tull

MOTION DEFEATED.

Discussion: Member Baron said he believes the vote will send a message to the Planning Commission; there is one group that wants to widen Livernois and include an interchange, and there is another group that does not, so he does not feel it necessary to adopt another motion to indicate Council preference.

There being no objection, President Snell moved on to the next item.

4) The lack of widening Adams Road.

MOTION by Beaton, seconded by Tull, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission that they concur with the presentation in the plan for the treatment of Adams Road in terms of not widening those sections of Adams located south of Auburn and north of Hamlin; and that the Council also concurs with recommendations in the plan that operational efficiency improvements are needed on Adams Road.

Ayes: Snell, Baron, Beaton, Carvey, Glass, Karas, Tull

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

CONTINUED

CORRECTED AT THE 6/28/89 CITY COUNCIL MEETING
ADD TO READ: "In response to a question from Mr. Karas,"

5) A traffic control island on Tienken at Sheldon.

MOTION by Tull, seconded by Glass, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission to not consider in the plan a traffic control island on Tienken at Sheldon to preclude northbound traffic from the Sheldon Road extension going through a residential neighborhood.

Ayes: Snell, Baron, Beaton, Carvey, Glass, Karas, Tull
Nays: None
MOTION CARRIED.

6) That the paving of Hamlin Road, from Rochester to Dequindre, become a priority to be considered within the next 2 to 5 years.

MOTION by Beaton, seconded by Baron, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission that the paving of Hamlin, as a two-lane road from Rochester to Dequindre, become a priority to be considered within the next one to five years.

Discussion: Member Tull said he would agree that Hamlin needs to be paved, but he is concerned that it might be misunderstood with the priorities for major road fund funding from our city budget next year.

Member Beaton referred to the cut-through traffic on Hampton Circle, and he feels the paving of Hamlin will help that problem.

Lauren Shepherd asked the Council to consider moving Hamlin on the 1-5 year priority list, and Livernois on the 6-10 year priority list.

Vote on motion:

Ayes: Snell, Baron, Beaton, Carvey, Glass, Karas, Tull
Nays: None
MOTION CARRIED.

President Snell advised he has been asked to provide Council input of concurrence or non-concurrence to the Planning Commission on eight major areas of the report.

1. Five transportation system policies described on Pages 49 through 57 of the Report.

Member Tull said he would concur with the five policies with the exception that he would add language to the first sentence of Policy #4, as follows: "...recognizing the funding constraints which the city presently faces."

MOTION by Tull, seconded by Karas, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission its concurrence with the five (5) transportation system policies described on Pages 49 through 57 of the Report, as follows:

- 1) Six-lane major arterial roadways should generally not be built because of sensitive land use and environmental adjacencies and the high capital cost of such improvements.
- 2) The community must accept a degree of traffic congestion along particular roadways.
- 3) A strategy to intercept through-traffic originating outside Rochester Hills and Rochester and divert it to selected identified routes should be developed.
- 4) Five transportation projects should be scheduled for immediate implementation RECOGNIZING THE FUNDING CONSTRAINTS WHICH THE CITY PRESENTLY FACES. All roadway upgrades should be done in a manner which is sensitive to adjacent land uses and environmental characteristics.

- 5) Alternative modes of transportation and management of travel should be pursued as an alternative to roadway construction.

Ayes: Snell, Baron, Beaton, Carvey, Glass, Karas, Tull
Nays: None
MOTION CARRIED.

2. Five priority transportation improvement projects listed on Page 52 of the Report.

MOTION by Tull, seconded by Carvey, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission its concurrence with the five priority transportation improvement projects listed on Page 52 of the Report, as follows:

- 1) Widen Livernois Road to a four-lane residential boulevard (four lanes and a landscaped median, Figure 36; this roadway is hereafter referred to as a four-lane residential boulevard) between South Boulevard and the north end of great Oaks Shopping Center north of Walton. Construct an interchange at Livernois/M-59.
- 2) Widen Crooks Road to a four-lane residential boulevard from approximately Hamlin Road to South Boulevard and improve the Crooks Road/M-59 interchange.
- 3) Align Hamlin Road east and west of Crooks Road, and widen Hamlin Road to a four-lane residential boulevard west of Livernois and to a two-lane roadway with turn lanes from Livernois to Dequindre. Eliminate the existing interchange of Adams and M-59, realign Adams directly to the south, construct a new interchange with M-59, and extend Adams along the north side of the Grand Trunk Railroad to existing Adams.
- 4) Widen Rochester Road south of Avon to M-59 to a six-lane boulevard and improve the interchange with M-59 to minimize left turns.
- 5) Improve Dequindre from Runyon to South Boulevard as a four-lane residential boulevard and improve Dequindre to a two-lane paved roadway north of Runyon with route continuity to a paved 26-Mile Road. This will help to divert traffic from the Stoney Creek Historic District. Dequindre, in the area of Avon, is proposed to be relocated to the east in order to establish route continuity and to avoid the cider mill.

Ayes: Carvey, Karas, Tull, Snell
Nays: Baron, Beaton, Glass

MOTION CARRIED.

3. Three improvement projects that were considered and rejected by the Citizens' Advisory Committee as priority projects listed on Page 55 of the Report.

MOTION by Glass, seconded by Tull, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission its concurrence with the rejection of the three (3) projects that were considered and rejected by the Citizens Advisory Committee as priority projects listed on Page 55 of the Report, as follows:

- 1) To realign Butler Road to connect to Avon through Oakland University to Squirrel Road. This was rejected because of the impact on Oakland University and the impact on the residential uses along Avon, west of Livernois.
- 2) To widen Adams to a four-lane roadway with appropriate turn lanes. This was rejected in favor of using Squirrel Road to serve the demand for a north-south arterial roadway and because of the rolling terrain of Adams Road.
- 3) To improve Livernois, north of Walton to Orion Road. Rejected because of the conflict between the improved roadway and environmental characteristics of the area.

Ayes: Snell, Baron, Beaton, Carvey, Glass, Karas, Tull
Nays: None
MOTION CARRIED.

4. Recommended Functional Classification System on Figure 33, Page 59 of the Report.

President Snell explained this figure delineates what are principal arterials, major arterials and minor arterials, as proposed in the plan. It covers the roadways within the City of Rochester Hills, and it also shows I-75 and a portion of M-59 that goes beyond the city limits into Pontiac, Auburn Hills and Shelby Township. It also shows, as a concept, a major east-west corridor road on the north side of the city, at this point, between Dutton and Gunn Roads.

MOTION by Tull, seconded by Karas, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission its concurrence with the Recommended Functional Classification System, on Figure 33, Page 59 of the Report WITH THE UNDERSTANDING that the Sheldon Road portion would not be shown as a minor arterial road, which includes the intent of the Sheldon Road portion of the ring road tie-in.

Ayes: Carvey, Karas, Tull, Snell
Nays: Beaton, Glass, Baron

MOTION CARRIED.

Discussion: Member Beaton advised that he voted "no" on the principle that Livernois is depicted as a major arterial road. Further, Mr. Beaton said he feels one way to send a message to the state and county of the priority of Rochester Road over Livernois Road is to downgrade Livernois to a minor arterial road, which does not prevent more lanes from being added.

5. Recommended Roadway Jurisdiction on Figure 34, Page 60 of the Report.

President Snell said this Figure recommends a few changes in terms of jurisdictions that presently exist; it considers that Hamlin would become a county road instead of a city road; that Avon would become a city road instead of a county road; that Tienken, west of Adams, would become a county road instead of a city road; that Auburn would become a county road instead of a state road; and that Rochester Road, north of Tienken, would become a state road instead of a county road.

President Snell advised the reasons for the changes are within the report, which have to do with the type of use and type of traffic the roads are likely to have.

Regarding Auburn Road, Mr. Wolsfeld said it is generally not appropriate for the state to have jurisdiction over a roadway that is functionally classified as a minor arterial. Mr. Wolsfeld further explained that, generally, the state has jurisdiction over the principal arterials, the county has jurisdiction over the major arterials and some minor arterials, and the city has jurisdiction over some minor arterials and all the collectors and local streets.

President Snell said the bottom line is that the city would end up with about the same number of miles of the major roads, except that we would lose the Tienken mile, west of Adams; Avon Road would make up for the Hamlin piece.

Member Karas pointed out that Hamlin, as reconstructed, will be a brand new road with little maintenance, while Avon has seen its better days.

MOTION by Karas, seconded by Baron, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission that the Recommended Roadway Jurisdiction on Figure 34, Page 60 of the Report not be incorporated into the plan, as presented.

Discussion: Member Carvey questioned what impact that action would have on the plan or on any funding.

Mr. Cohee, City Operations Coordinator, said the long-range prospect is that the city would want to have a road system that would be under this jurisdiction, as proposed, when it is finally completed. In terms of whether we turn roads back to the county or accept roads from the county, Mr. Cohee said that will be a negotiation process; it is not necessarily going to happen just because it is put in the plan.

As an example, Mr. Cohee explained if the city pays to improve Hamlin Road and then turns it over to the county and, assuming Avon then becomes a city road, part of the negotiation process would be an agreement with the county to improve the condition of Avon so the city would not have to spend money to improve it.

Mr. Cohee said he feels the Council could accept the jurisdiction plan, because the way the changes in the jurisdiction will occur would be through a negotiation process with the county.

President Snell said if the resolution is adopted as stated, he feels it leaves a void as to what the city would like to see instead, and he asked if the maker and second of the motion wish to consider recommending that the current jurisdiction be retained.

Based on Mr. Cohee's explanation that the jurisdiction is a negotiated item, Mr. Karas said he would amend his motion to add that the jurisdiction remain as it is at the present time.

Member Baron asked for a restating of the motion, and President Snell said his understanding of the motion by Mr. Karas is: That the Council recommends to the Planning Commission that Figure 34 on Page 60 of the Report not be incorporated into the plan and, instead, recommends that the current road jurisdictions in the City of Rochester Hills be substituted in its place.

Member Baron said he would concur with the resolution, as stated.

Member Tull said, since we know the state does not want jurisdiction of Auburn Road, it can't hurt to address that issue; the committee is recommending that the county should have jurisdiction instead of the city, and he suggested that perhaps it should not be left under the jurisdiction of the state for purposes of this plan.

President Snell said he would agree with Mr. Tull that the city has been discussing with the state and county that Auburn should become a county road because the state is not available to deal with the road. In the long range, Dr. Snell said he believes Auburn makes more sense under county control than under the state.

MOTION by Tull, seconded by Carvey, Resolved, that the motion on the floor be amended to add: "Except, as it relates to Auburn Road, that the plan show the jurisdiction of Auburn as a county road instead of a state road."

Ayes: Snell, Beaton, Carvey, Glass, Karas, Tull

Nays: Baron

MOTION CARRIED.

It is recorded the resolution on the floor, as amended, is as follows:

MOTION by Karas, seconded by Baron, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission that the Recommended Roadway Jurisdiction on Figure 34, Page 60 of the Report not be incorporated into the plan as presented; and, instead, recommends that the current road jurisdictions in the City of Rochester Hills be substituted in its place except, as it relates to Auburn Road, that the plan show the jurisdiction of Auburn as a county road instead of a state road.

Ayes: Snell, Baron, Beaton, Carvey, Glass, Karas, Tull

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

6. Typical geometric cross-section for Major Arterial Four-lane Residential Boulevard on Figure 36, Page 64 and for Minor Arterial on Figure 37, Page 65 of the report.

Member Tull raised a concern presented at the Bike Path Committee Meetings that the design for our roadways should include at least a two-foot portion on the side of the road to accommodate bicyclists so they are not forced to travel on the pathways with pedestrians, which creates an unsafe condition. Mr. Tull asked if the recommended cross-section addresses that problem.

Mr. Wolsfeld said his perception is that most of the use of bicycles on the pathways in Rochester Hills is for recreation, rather than actually commuting and, as long as the width is eight feet, it should not be unsafe for the bicyclists to travel on the pathways. Mr. Wolsfeld said this cross-section does not address provision for a two-foot portion on the side of the road for bicyclists.

In answer to inquiry by Member Beaton as to whether the width of the median can be changed, Mr. Wolsfeld said some alternatives were developed where the width of the traveled roadway remains the same, but the issue is how much of the 120 feet of roadway is wanted in the shoulder, versus how much is wanted in the median. Mr. Wolsfeld said the median width can vary from 14 feet (as is shown in Figure 36) up to 24 feet, which would then reduce the width of the shoulders of the road. Mr. Wolsfeld said the committee decided to leave the widths depicted as the base case, and perhaps add a table that would show some alternative treatments of the median and shoulders.

Member Beaton said if he approves Figure 36, would that mean he would be approving a median of 14 feet up to 24 feet, and Mr. Wolsfeld answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Wolsfeld suggested that a note could be added that would refer to a Table showing a Minimum Median, Medium Median and Maximum Median.

Figure 36:

MOTION by Beaton, seconded by Tull, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission its concurrence with the Typical Geometric Cross-Section Major Arterial on Figure 36, Page 64 of the report with the addition of a note referring to a Table depicting a Minimum Median, Medium Median and Maximum Median.

Ayes: Snell, Baron, Beaton, Carvey, Glass, Karas, Tull
Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Figure 37:

MOTION by Beaton, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission its concurrence with the Typical Geometric Cross-Section Minor Arterial on Figure 37, Page 65 of the report ONLY if it abuts residential property on either side.

It is recorded the Motion failed for lack of support.

Member Beaton explained that many roads in Rochester Hills are marked as minor arterials, and he said he has a problem with the word "typical." In cases where there are more driveways or more commercial development, Mr. Beaton said this typical minor arterial could end up being four lanes wide with a center turn lane, and he gave Auburn Road through the commercial district of Olde Towne as an example.

Member Tull said it is just a typical basic design, but any time a specific road were being considered, the City Council would review that and provide input as to whether the typical design would be appropriate in that situation.

CONTINUED

Mr. Beaton said he put "residential property" in his motion because he wants a strong message in the master road plan that we will build three-lane roads in areas that abut residential when they are designated as minor arterials.

MOTION by Beaton, seconded by Baron, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission that Figure 37 on Page 65 of the report not be incorporated into the plan as a Typical Geometric Cross-Section Minor Arterial.

Discussion: President Snell asked Mr. Beaton what recommendation he would make to put in its place.

Mr. Beaton said he would like to recommend to BRW that they show the different variations of what a minor arterial can be so that it will be very clear to the residents of this city the range of what a minor arterial is.

Mr. Tull said it may be true in certain circumstances that a minor arterial, such as Adams Road, can have areas where it may have a five-lane treatment with a center lane near a shopping center to make it safer for people to get in and out, but that involves only a short distance, and it then reverts back to the normal, minor arterial.

Mr. Beaton said he believes if a minor arterial can be five lanes, four lanes three lanes and two lanes, then it should be drawn that way or it is misleading to the public.

In answer to inquiry by Member Tull regarding the purpose of including this typical cross-section in the plan, Mr. Wolsfeld said the purpose is to indicate in a typical situation along a minor arterial what one might expect in terms of a design. Avon Road is a minor arterial, and Mr. Wolsfeld said this is the way he would expect Avon Road to look from Adams through the community at some time in the future. For great portions of Auburn Road, Mr. Wolsfeld said he would expect that, but when you get to the new center being built, there could be short sections of that minor arterial roadway that would not look like that because of higher traffic volumes. Mr. Wolsfeld said that well over 80% of a minor arterial roadway would probably look like this typical design.

Vote on motion:

Ayes: Glass, Baron, Beaton

Nays: Carvey, Karas, Tull, Snell

MOTION DEFEATED.

MOTION by Carvey, seconded by Karas, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission its concurrence with the Typical Geometric Cross-Section Minor Arterial on Figure 37, Page 65 of the report.

Ayes: Karas, Tull, Snell, Carvey

Nays: Glass, Baron, Beaton

MOTION CARRIED.

7. Implementation Staging (Planning, Design and Construction) on Figure 38, Page 73 of the report.

President Snell advised this was amended earlier this evening in terms of a recommendation to the Planning Commission that the priority for the Hamlin Road project be changed from 6-10 years to 1-5 years.

MOTION by Carvey, seconded by Karas, Resolved, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission its concurrence with the Implementation Staging (Planning, Design and Construction) on Figure 38, Page 73 of the report WITH THE UNDERSTANDING that the Council desires that the improvement of Hamlin to a two-lane roadway from Rochester Road to Dequindre be changed to a 1-5 year priority project.

Discussion: Member Baron said his interpretation is that this item is in the plan, basically, to widen Livernois.

CONTINUED

MOTION by Beaton, that the resolution on the floor be amended to move the priority of the project to widen Livernois Road to the 10 Year+ bracket.

It is recorded the Motion failed for lack of support.

MOTION by Beaton, that the resolution on the floor be amended to move the priority of the project to widen Livernois Road to the 6-10 Year bracket.

It is recorded the Motion failed for lack of support.

Member Tull referred to the Note on Figure 38 which states: "Staging Depends Upon Funding Availability," and he said that is, obviously, the most critical aspect of all the projects listed. Mr. Tull said the city probably won't be able to start any of these projects in the very near future. When money is available, decisions will have to be made as to how to spend it, but he would prefer to stay with the original motion as stated.

Vote on Motion:

Ayes: Snell, Carvey, Karas, Tull
Nays: Baron, Beaton, Glass

MOTION CARRIED.

8. Adoption of the plan.

President Snell said if the Council feels it wishes to recommend adoption of the plan, he would assume that approval would incorporate all the modifications recommended to the plan this evening.

MOTION by Karas, seconded by Carvey, that the City Council recommends to the Planning Commission adoption of the Traffic Study and Comprehensive Transportation Plan, and requests that the modifications, as recommended during these proceedings, be incorporated into the Plan.

Ayes: Karas, Tull, Snell, Beaton, Carvey
Nays: Baron, Glass

MOTION CARRIED.

Discussion: Member Glass said she appreciates all the work that went into this plan and all the time spent by the Citizens Advisory Committee and everyone involved. Ms. Glass said her vote this evening is not an indication that she believes it to be a totally bad plan; it is more reflective of the individual changes that she would like to see. Ms. Glass said she would hope the lengthy discussion held will make that clear when it goes before the Planning Commission, and that her vote will not be seen as an indictment of the entire plan.

[Exit Member Baron]

Other matters discussed.

Request by BRG Associates for a Public Hearing to consider an amendment to their project (copies of memo dated May 22, 1989 from Doug Walker and letter dated May 18, 1989 from Attorney Robert L. Schwartz distributed to each Council member.)

MOTION by Karas, seconded by Tull,

WHEREAS, there exists in the State of Michigan and the City of Rochester Hills the need for projects to alleviate present conditions of unemployment, to assist and retain local industries and commercial enterprises in order to strengthen and revitalize the economy of the State and the City and to encourage the location and expansion of commercial enterprises to provide needed services and facilities to the City and its residents; and