



Rochester Hills

Minutes

Advisory Traffic and Safety Board

1000 Rochester Hills
Drive
Rochester Hills, MI
48309
(248) 656-4660
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

*Thomas Blackstone, Frank Cardimen, Ernest Colling, Paul Davis, Jim Duistermars, Paul
Franklin, Scott Hunter, Marc Matich, Carl Moore, Allan Schneck, Paul Shumejko*

Tuesday, August 14, 2007

7:30 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Colling called the meeting to order at 7:36 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present 5 - Blackstone, Colling, Hunter, Moore and Cardiman

Absent 3 - Duistermars, Schneck and Franklin

Non-Voting Members Present: Paul Shumejko

Non-Voting Members Absent: Marc Matich

Others Present: Janice Dearing

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Advisory Traffic and Safety Board Regular Meeting - May 8, 2007

Chairperson Colling asked if anyone would like to make a motion of correction or approval for the minutes from the last regular meeting of May 8, 2007. Mr. Moore made a motion to approve them as presented, which was seconded by Mr. Blackstone.

Ayes: All

Nays: None

**Absent: Paul Franklin
Allan Schneck**

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS

Chairperson Colling said that the Board had two new members, and one of them, Mr. Frank Cardimen, was in attendance tonight. He asked Mr. Cardimen to give a brief introduction for the Board members who didn't know him.

Mr. Cardimen said he has been a resident of Rochester Hills for almost 31 years, and he was president of the Traffic Improvement Association (TIA). He has been a full and part-time faculty member at Oakland University for 29 years. He said he has been very active in the community, and was pleased to be a member of the Board.

Chairperson Colling commented that now we will have the inside track to all that TIA data we've always wanted.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION

Chairperson Colling advised the Board that he would be passing down a blue folder that contained certificates of appreciation for former Board members Terry T. Brown and Johannes Buiteweg for their service to Traffic and Safety. He asked all the members to sign it, although unfortunately all the members were not in attendance. After all the signatures were obtained the certificates would be given to them.

COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Colling asked if any of the Communications that were handed out at the meeting were pertinent to items on the agenda tonight. Mr. Shumejko responded they were recent correspondence.

Member Paul Franklin arrived at 7:45 PM. Second roll call taken.

Present 6 - Blackstone, Colling, Hunter, Moore, Franklin and Cardiman

Absent 2 - Duistermars and Schneck

TCO's

2007-0463

Request for Approval of Traffic Control Order TM-25.1 "NO LEFT TURN" from eastbound Valley Stream Drive onto Livernois Road at their intersection between the hours of 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m.

Whereas, Traffic Control Order No. TM-25 has been issued by the Acting City Traffic Engineer under provisions of the Rochester Hills Code of Ordinances, Chapter 7-09; and

Whereas, said Traffic Control Order covers:

TM-25.1 "NO LEFT TURN: from eastbound Valley Stream Drive onto Livernois Road at their intersection between the hours of 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Whereas, said Traffic Control Order shall not be effective after the expiration of 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. TM-25 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

TM-25.1 "NO LEFT TURN: from eastbound Valley Stream Drive onto Livernois Road at their intersection between the hours of 4:00 pm to 7:00 pm.

Chairperson Colling asked Mr. Shumejko to give the Staff Report for this matter. He first read the background. "On June 1, 2007, representatives from the Valley Stream Homeowners' Association (HOA) met with City staff to discuss concerns related to "cut-through" traffic resulting from the eastbound Walton Boulevard traffic turning left onto Rochdale Drive N. to Greenleaf Drive to Valley Stream Drive to head north on Livernois Road. The HOA stated that vehicles use Rochdale Drive N. to get to northbound Livernois to avoid having to use the median island turnaround at Walton and Livernois.

This has been an on-going issue of concern for the Valley Stream HOA, with previous meetings and discussions having been held between City staff and the HOA. Based upon those earlier meetings, staff suggested that "No Left Turn" restriction signage may be warranted during certain hours of the day, however prior to their installation the City would require a petition indicating support from a majority of homeowners along Valley Stream Drive. City staff never received the petition, and therefore no further action was taken.

More recently, however, the June 1st meeting brought to light a potential increase in "cut-through" due to the recent commencement of the construction work along University Drive within the City of Rochester. Since heavy traffic congestion is expected to occur along Walton Boulevard/University Drive as a result of said construction, staff concluded that additional vehicles might utilize Rochdale Drive N. off Walton Boulevard to get to northbound Livernois. Due to the timing of the request and the construction schedule of

University Drive, staff agreed to issue a TCO to restrict left turns off Valley Stream Drive between the hours of 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. without the petitions, for the duration of the construction period. The project is expected to last until November of 2008.

On July 11, 2007 a TCO was issued for the installation of the above-referenced "No Left Turn" sign restricting turning movements for eastbound Valley Stream Drive vehicles to head northbound on Livernois Road between the hours of 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m.

Upon the completion of the University Drive Reconstruction Project and based upon the feedback from the Valley Stream homeowners after the turning restriction has been place for a while, staff will review its effectiveness and recommend to the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board whether the signs should remain in place, times be revised, or removed altogether. Staff did send out meeting agenda notices to all of the residences within Valley Stream Subdivision about tonight's scheduled meeting. Additionally, the HOA handed out flyers to all the residents, a copy of which is attached.

It should be noted that staff did indicate to the HOA that the installation of traffic signage usually has minimal effect in changing driver behavior and often times is ignored. The effectiveness of signage invariably comes down to the level of enforcement, which the Oakland County Sheriff's Department (OCSA) can realistically only be expected to enforce periodically due to staffing commitments and prioritizations. Staff has and continues to encourage the HOA to pursue the installation of speed humps, as these provide a permanent feature in the roadway to help reduce speeds and potentially decrease cut-through traffic.

In conclusion, staff requests the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board to support having the TCO TM-25 issued, and that the Board recommends the City Council approve the TCO until rescinded or superceded."

Mr. Shumejko said there were maps attached in the packet, and Chairperson Colling asked for clarification on which way most of the cut-through traffic was going. Mr. Shumejko said the concern was that when drivers were heading eastbound on Walton, rather than going to Livernois, making a right and doing the crossover at the median to head back north on Livernois, many will try to avoid that altogether by making a left on Rochdale and cutting through the subdivision.

Chairperson Colling asked if this were a normal occurrence, or it would become more prevalent because of the construction. Mr. Shumejko said that there was some evidence from previous traffic studies, but as you will notice from the latest traffic study included in the packet that traffic volumes went down a bit from 2002. Their concern was that with University Drive being restricted with closures, and he believed next spring there would be a full closure along University from April to July with the detour being Tienken Road, traffic will probably increase along Rochdale with vehicles trying to avoid the intersection. Staff evaluated the situation and agreed to support the sign without receiving a petition

from the residents.

Chairperson Colling confirmed there were people in the audience from the Valley Stream Homeowners' Association. He explained he wanted to make it understood that if the TCO went into effect it would apply equally to the subdivision residents, so if they made a left-hand turn they will get a ticket as well. It would be for a period of at least 15 months, and he didn't wish to get into a situation where after a TCO is put into effect residents have "buyers remorse" and want the sign taken out again. He wanted to make it clear that if the sign is put in it will stay for the duration of the time listed in the TCO. He said he would open up the meeting for public comment, and people in the audience who had turned in a speaker's card will be called up to give their comments. He advised there were quite a few people in attendance tonight, so to keep their comments as brief as possible. After the Public Comment is closed, the matter will be turned over to the Board members. He explained that audience remarks should be made during the Public Comment period, and not after it was closed and the Board members took the matter up.

Ms. Jean Techendorf
1240 Greenleaf Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-1723

Ms. Techendorf thanked staff for putting up the no-turn sign. She said they had noticed a decrease in traffic between the hours of 4:00 and 7:00; however there are still some people who insist on making a left turn there. She requested that for at least two weeks police are stationed there and issue tickets to those who persist in turning left. Since there was a reduction in traffic coming through, perhaps the hours could be extended when school starts back up. Children are let off the bus at 2:00, so the hours of the turn restrictions could be moved back to 2:00 so students would have safe streets to walk on, rather than contending with the cut-through traffic.

She once again thanked staff for putting the sign up; saying it has been a relief.

Ms. Gert Glazier
500 Oak Hill Court
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-1735

Ms. Glazier said her house was on the northwest corner of Livernois and Valley Stream. Her back yard faces Livernois, and the south side of her house Valley Stream, which gives her a great vantage point. Last Wednesday she took a brief sampling of traffic between the hours of 4:00 and 7:00, and did a stroke record count by the hour. What she found was there were a total of 132 cars that approached the intersection. Of these, 71 made left turns, and 61 made right turns. More than half of the vehicles completely ignored the sign although it's been there long enough for everyone to know that it's there, particularly those who use this route on a regular basis. She found the highest number of cars

approached the intersection between 4:00 and 5:00, and the volume decreased from there on. This led her to think that this is all local traffic rather than people coming home from work, just people going about their daily business and ignoring the sign.

Ms Glazier said she had no specific recommendation, but would like to see traffic cut down. She advised that unless you are going to "put some teeth" into it by virtue of police observation and ticketing, the situation will go unchecked. She thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Robert Kosnik
1189 Greenleaf Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-1722

Mr. Kosnik said he had been a resident of the subdivision for 23 years. The problem began when the new intersection of Walton and Livernois was put into place. It immediately turned their quiet subdivision into a thoroughfare. He thanked Mr. Shumejko and City staff for putting the No Left Turn sign in, and said they had seen a decrease in traffic coming through. He thought the stroke count Ms. Glazier had done was important to note because it showed there are still people turning left at that intersection. He had noticed the police out today enforcing the no left turn restrictions, which he thought was terrific. The more enforcement they could do, the better.

He thought it was unfortunate that the sign had to be put up as a result of the anticipated construction, because they had been trying to "fight City hall" for around 15 years, or as long as that intersection has been modified. He had personally met with Mayor Snell and Mayor Somerville to try to get this problem fixed, and he thanked Mr. Shumejko for listening to them at the last meeting. He thought they almost had it right, and in a perfect world he would like to see "No Left Turn" 24 hours a day. He agreed with Ms. Techendorf, that they should look at doing something when school is back in session, because the teenagers from Rochester High School race through there. There is a family with one-year old twins living directly across from him, and there is also a young family just around the corner. There are plenty of young kids in the neighborhood who have literally dodged cars going through there. He didn't know why they didn't double the fines for cutting through neighborhoods like this, and he stressed that there was a grade school in the neighborhood with a lot of walkers. He felt that made them different than a lot of other neighborhoods. He thanked them for doing that they have so far, saying it has been a relief, and as he had said before we're "almost there."

Mr. Kosnik asked about the time limit in terms of the TCO, as he had heard Mr. Shumejko say there would be discussion about taking the turn restriction off when the construction was done. Chairperson Colling said that right now the TCO was only intended on being in effect until the end of the construction period, which was roughly November or December of 2008. Mr. Shumejko said he didn't know if the TCO would

technically state that, but his intention was once construction is completed that they go out and reevaluate the situation, and then come back to the Board with any modifications or further analysis.

Mr. Kosnik said he would like to build on whatever momentum they had, and at a minimum keep the sign for the hours stated, then extend the hours. Chairperson Colling said it had been the Board's policy when a sign is put in to monitor it and ask Mr. Shumejko give us data around the time the kids go back to school to see how the traffic patterns change. He said they would probably monitor it in the spring of next year, and maybe once more in the summer. He explained people generally tend to use a cut-through like this when there is a problem with the main thoroughfare. If we can increase the traffic flow through the Walton and Livernois area so it is not cumbersome, very few will use this as a cut-through.

Mr. Kosnik said he couldn't agree more, and that is why they met with Oakland County and Staff when there was discussion for remodeling that intersection prior to it being built. He asked if you can build in the opportunity for there to be a direct left, not a Michigan left with traffic having to go right through the intersection to go left on Livernois. He felt they were just placated and told, "Of course we will be able to go back to that kind of intersection if there is a significant traffic problem." He stated there is no question that that intersection has hurt their home values, and been a problem for the little kids that live in the neighborhood.

He said he would love to make sure we do everything we can to keep the traffic on Walton and Livernois. By the way, if you come out onto Livernois and turn south from our subdivision, you can do another Michigan left. We could have a "Right Turn Only" sign all the time, and still keep the road safe. He said there was also a gradient problem looking left, or north on Livernois. There is a hill and if a car is coming over it in excess of 45 mph, which they do regularly, it is very dangerous. It is a low spot, and water collects down there in the wintertime. Kids used to get picked up at that intersection, and it is dangerous. He asked them to keep in mind that there have been serious accidents there over the years.

Chairperson Colling said their goal was to try to give them relief in the neighborhood, although we may take a different approach. He thought rather than the "No Left Turn" sign, we'd rather keep the traffic out of the sub. He said they would certainly review the situation and make a decision.

Mr. Kosnik said that the timing of the light going north on Rochdale used to be different years ago when the intersection at Walton and Livernois was first modified. That helped, so anyone heading east on Walton, if we could divert them to go north on Brewster prior to even getting to our neck of the woods or putting them through the intersection of Walton and Livernois would be ideal.

Ms Yvonne Carson
460 Streamview Court
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-1806

Ms. Carson thanked them for the opportunity to bring up their concerns, and said she had one thing to add. Much of the traffic is coming from the adjacent subdivision. They take a left or right onto Rochdale to get to the shopping center or out onto Walton Boulevard. She said that will be an ongoing problem.

Mr. Shumejko explained that when they do traffic studies to consider cut-through traffic, traffic from adjacent streets, and also in this case from the shopping center, is not considered cut-through traffic. If a vehicle goes from the shopping center and then goes to Rochdale to get to Livernois, that is not necessarily considered cut-through. Cut-through would be when it is one continuous motion, that they are heading east on Walton, and they go through your sub to head north on Livernois. It is not intermediate points of destination, and in the case of your adjacent subdivision, that is considered one contiguous area. For example if someone from Tienken Manor or Shagbark decides to use your street, that's not what we would classify as cut-through.

Ms. Carson asked if it would be classified as cut-through if they are going north on Rochdale onto Greenleaf, and then Greenleaf down to Valley Stream, and going out on Livernois. Mr. Shumejko said if they are coming from Walton. She asked what if they are coming from the subdivision, and he replied in that case, no. He explained if they live in the subdivision and are using the street to get to Livernois it is not cut-through. Cut-through is when you go from one main road to another main road directly, and there is no local destination within the area.

Chairperson Colling said they realized that a lot of the roads were built with a subdivision, and later expansions or new subs tie in. He said he had lived in the City since 1978, and a lot of subs weren't built at that time. As the City grows, you will have to share your roads with your neighbors in the newer developments that tie into your subdivision. Frankly, your "traffic neighborhood" is almost a square mile around you. He explained we don't want to penalize those folks for using local roadways, what we want to do is keep the through traffic on the thoroughfares.

Mr. Kosnik had one more comment. He said if you looked at the first road west of Rochdale, which is Shagbark, people will turn through there and then cut up Oakrock, then cut-through their neighborhood, so they are avoiding the Rochdale intersection also. Mr. Shumejko confirmed that would be considered cut-through traffic. Chairperson Colling interjected that they had done studies on Shagbark.

Mr. Shumejko said the true way to identify cut-through traffic was pretty labor intensive,

and is to post staff at each area, and have them write down license plates. The person at the exit points also writes down the plate numbers, and then you can determine who is actually cutting through. Chairperson Colling said there had been at least one of those studies done over the years. Mr. Shumejko said in the recent years they have not had the resources to do that type of study. Normally it is done in the morning, from 7:00 to 9:00 a.m., and then from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. in the evening. You would get a percentage cut through cars, and five to ten percent is considered standard. You are looking for something along the range of 20 percent.

Mr. Bob Oglesby
424 Streamview Court
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-1806

Mr. Oglesby said there was a survey made in regard to the No Left Turn sign for the subdivision. Something like 85% of the respondents were in favor of the sign. He explained it was not done formally, and was entered as a petition and is in the Association records. He questioned whether it would suffice as the petition from residents, along with a letter from the Association president. He felt it would indicate the sentiment of the subdivision.

Mr. Oglesby also wanted to ask a question about the "turn around" or roundabout planned for the intersection of Livernois and Hamlin Roads. He said he didn't understand the need for it, and he thought the City would spend a lot of money for very little benefit.

Mr. Shumejko responded that in regard to the Hamlin Road project, the section from Crooks to Livernois has been in the planning stages since 1992. That was when it was first placed into the queue for federal funding by the Oakland County Federal Aid Task Committee. It has been hanging around for some time because of some of the issues with the potential historic home located off Livernois. At the time it was moving forward as a boulevard - boulevard intersection, but more recently with the construction of more roundabouts and their realized safety benefits in reducing crashes, the City along with their consultant reviewed and analyzed how a roundabout would function at this intersection. Based on all the models and other data, it indicated that the intersection would flow better and there would be reduced crashes, and also benefits because there would be no need for traffic signals. Overall the roundabout intersection, because it didn't require the run-outs for the boulevard, reduced the right-of-way acquisitions along Livernois by twenty parcels. He thought the net cost was reduced from a traditional - boulevard intersection, and all studies and data indicate that it will be a safer intersection.

Mr. Shumejko said there were articles in the newspapers today about pedestrian movements at roundabouts. The Federal Highway Access Board, who reviews the American with Disabilities (ADA) compliance requirements, has discussed that topic. One of the issues they've been tossing around is whether or not roundabouts of two lanes

or more should be required to install push-activated signals for pedestrian crossings. He thought that would be considered over the next couple of years, and has been under discussion for the last four or five years at this point. Today's newspaper story dealing with the Road Commission and the potential lawsuit might bring the issue more to the forefront.

The safety benefits of roundabouts have been not only been noted in this country, but also in Europe for a number of years (at least 40). They have proven to reduce crashes, and the crashes that do occur are more often sideswipes verses angle crashes or head-ons.

Chairperson Colling stated he would be closing the Public discussion on this issue, and asked if there was anyone who wanted to make a comment that had not had an opportunity to do so. Hearing none, he closed Public Comment and opened up the matter for discussion by the Board. He gave a brief summary of the matter, saying of those who had spoken on the issue, all of them were in favor of the TCO. He said he had made some notes on the speakers, which the Board members were welcome to review. He asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Cardimen said that the last resident to speak, Mr. Olglesby, had indicated that the Subdivision Association was in favor of this temporary no left turn restriction, and asked if that were correct. Mr. Olglesby responded that they would prefer that the sign was not temporary, and was for unrestricted hours.

Mr. Moore asked Mr. Shumejko if the 2007 traffic counts they were given were taken before or after the blockage on University. Mr. Shumejko responded they were done prior to the construction, and they had not done another count since. Mr. Moore thought the numbers did not show a cut-through problem when compared to the years of 2002 and 2004. On Valley Stream Drive in 2002 there were 596 outgoing vehicles, in 2004 there were 500, and in 2007 574. He said he was having a problem seeing where cut-through traffic was shown in the data. He allowed that the numbers might be higher now, and asked whether another traffic study needed to be done now that the road has been blocked.

Mr. Shumejko agreed that the traffic counts did not show an actual cut-through traffic study, but were merely of total volumes. He said they had not gotten into that much detail at this point. The intention was to allow the TCO, and then do several follow-up studies. He said he would like to do one while the construction work is still going on, and another after University Drive is completed. He thought that could be done in the early part of 2009, after traffic had found its way back.

Chairperson Colling said he would like to make a suggestion. He said he was with Mr. Moore on this, but that with Mr. Matich out they didn't have the personnel for a full-fledged license plate cut-through study. He proposed that they do a compliance

study, which he felt would answer Mr. Moore's question. He suggested they put one staff member in an unobtrusive vehicle where they can observe the intersection. We have some information from Ms. Glazier's informal study, which he had taken notes on. He summarized that the highest turn ratios were between 4:00 and 5:00 p.m., with 71 vehicles turning left and 61 right. Ms. Glazier said those numbers were the vehicle totals for the three hours of the study. Chairperson Colling suggested we get someone out there to do a compliance study within the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Moore said from the numbers it looked as though it were the residents who are using the intersection to make left hand turns. Chairperson Colling thought the numbers might be deceptive, and they showed that Rochdale was the subdivision's prime entrance. Mr. Shumejko said we don't have all the numbers showing the amount of cut-through traffic.

Mr. Cardimen said his concern, though he was not sure we have any control over this, is whether or not we can get the enforcement to really affect this necessary change. If there is a way to get the enforcement to start with, he thought it would make it work better.

Chairperson Colling said Sergeant Walker from the Oakland County Sheriff's Department was not at the meeting tonight, but they could certainly put it on the list to request enforcement. Realistically the Sheriff doesn't have the staff to monitor it all of the time, but they would hit it when they've got some time, and hit it hard.

Mr. Shumejko said he as well as a resident from the subdivision had talked to Lieutenant Jacobs. The sign was put in around July 11th, and they did inform the OCSD of the TCO. They were out there and issued several tickets. He got a complaint from a resident whose daughter got ticketed, so he knew they were doing enforcement. Realistically, he was not sure how many resources could be committed to this. It becomes an issue if we are only getting 30% compliance, and he thought that should weigh into whether or not the signs stay. He wanted them to realize that it was around a \$150 ticket, with several points on your driver's license, and there were other repercussions like your insurance rate going up. It may be considered unfair if you are only going to hit it once in a while and most people are not complying.

Chairperson Colling added it becomes a problem if something is perceived of as a "speed trap." As an example he explained he drives to Warren everyday, and Mound Road between 12 and 13 Mile Road was probably the City of Warren's best producer. They were taken to court, and now the speed limit just changed from 25 mph to 50 mph. If this were perceived of as this type of situation, we couldn't make the sign stick if we wanted to. However, with the situation of the on-going construction, and the fact that studies done in the past, and which we will do in the future, can show that people are doing a reroute to avoid an intersection, we can certainly put the sign up as a temporary measure for between 15 to 18 months. However, we will have to review this, and review the intersection of Walton and Livernois for traffic patterns. If this continues to be a

cut-through, we definitely have to do something with the intersection of Walton and Livernois.

Chairperson Colling thought they were at a point to start thinking of a motion. He summarized for the Board that it seemed that the residents of the homeowners' association and the people who had come before the Board tonight are in favor of this TCO. It is a limited time frame TCO, and he suggested that if someone wanted to make a motion that they consider some of the things they had just talked about, such as reviewing the intersection of Walton and Livernois.

Motion by Hunter to approve TCO TM-25, with a compliance study done within the next two weeks, with enforcement by the Oakland County Sheriff's Department, and that the hours of the turning restriction be changed to between 2:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m.

Chairperson Colling suggested that rather than changing the hours of the sign now that he make it a condition that if the traffic study warrants it, the time be changed to from 2:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. He also asked if Mr. Hunter would consider another condition, that at the end of this construction, around November 2008, that we review the intersection and surrounding area to see if the traffic flow is working as expected. If not, that we do the appropriate study to determine what will resolve the situation. Mr. Hunter said he agreed, but asked if all that could be included in the motion. Mr. Colling explained it would be a motion with conditions

Mr. Shumejko wanted to make a clarification. He said the way the TCO is worded right now, if the Board recommends supporting it, it will go to City Council for approval and will be in effect until it is taken back to Council with a request to rescind or modify it. He was not aware of the Board ever putting a sunset clause within the TCO itself, and said he would have to check on the validity of doing so.

Chairperson Colling said as a point of protocol, when he chairs the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) we have findings and conditions, and he assumes this Board can do the same. He suggested calling it a finding or condition for approval; and said we can make the sunset clause a condition of our approval. We can also ask for these studies as a condition of our approval, and he would like those listed so in that way the message will get to City Council as to our particular intent.

Mr. Shumejko clarified if the verbiage would be included in the TCO, and Chairperson Colling explained they would not be within the verbiage of the TCO, but would be conditions. He stated that we had a motion on the floor, and asked if there were a second.

Mr. Moore said he would like to put the matter on hold until after the studies are done.

The sign is there, but instead of locking it in he wanted to see what the true numbers are and what is really happening at that corner. If the numbers are there they could come back and make the motion.

Mr. Shumejko said the compliance study would not tell us the amount of cut-through traffic. Chairperson Colling said if they approved the motion that was on the floor, there is a condition to go back within a short period of time and revisit the intersection. We can ask staff to bring that information back to the Board and take action at that point in time if we need to. Mr. Moore agreed as long as it was clear that it was not set in stone. Mr. Shumejko commented that he thought it was clear that there would be further evaluation, and that the matter would be coming back to the Board. It would have to go to City Council or else the TCO would expire after 90 days.

Mr. Franklin said as this was his first meeting as a new Board member, he was trying to get up to speed. He said most of the rationale that he read said the sign was to prevent cut-through traffic. He asked if it were safe to make a left turn at the intersection. How many accidents have occurred there because of someone making a left turn? He said he was president of a homeowner's association and he would generally support the TCO if the subdivision supported it, but if it is safe to make a left turn there...

Chairperson Colling said in a cut-through situation it is normally very obvious which way people turn to avoid traffic. This is not the first time this particular street has been before this Board for this issue. The established traffic pattern has been people taking Rochdale north to Greenleaf to Valley Stream, then making a left turn on Livernois. It is relatively safe to make a left turn there. There are issues with the topography and geography that make it difficult at times depending on speed, but it is a safe proposition. However, with the construction that is going on from the intersection of Walton and Livernois (Mr. Shumejko added from Crittenton east) it is going to back up traffic, and the intersection at Rochdale is going to be used more and more as a cut-through.

Chairperson Colling said when the Livernois construction was going on, he was a first member on this Board. He sat at some nice person's house in their driveway on his motorcycle because that was the only way he could get back in there around the traffic, and did his own traffic count. All we are trying to do by removing the left hand turn is remove the incentive to use it as a cut-through.

Mr. Franklin remarked that in his subdivision that if people all of a sudden couldn't make a left turn on Cumberland to Hamlin, they would be pretty upset. Mr. Shumejko said they could make it an additional condition to gather the traffic crash data, and Mr. Franklin confirmed that he would like to do that. Mr. Shumejko said he believed the sight distance at the intersection was adequate, but they could also verify that as well for the crest in Livernois. Mr. Franklin said another thing was that if they are serious about having a no left turn, one of the things that should be considered long term is putting in some kind of

island so that you have to make a right turn. Chairperson Colling responded that in this case it was a temporary TCO. He reminded them that there was a motion on the floor, and asked if there had been a second made for Mr. Hunter's motion.

A Second was made by Mr. Cardimen.

Motion by Hunter, with a second by Cardimen, to approve TCO TM-25, with the following conditions:

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

Chairperson Colling asked if there were any further discussion or questions, and hearing none he call

A motion was made by Hunter, seconded by Cardiman, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Blackstone, Colling, Hunter, Moore, Cardiman and Franklin

Absent 2 - Duistermars and Schneck

2005-0659

Review of PK-86.1 "NO PARKING" within the right-of-way of both sides of Rochdale Drive N., from Walton Boulevard to Oakstone Drive.

2005-0659**Review of PK-86.1 "NO PARKING" within the right-of-way of both sides of Rochdale Drive N., from Walton Boulevard to Oakstone Drive.**

Mr. Shumejko said this was based on a request from a resident to reevaluate and look into the necessity for the No Parking signs that are in place. Staff did not prepare any additional study, but included in the packet what was previously taken to the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board. To refresh their memories, the original reasoning was that back in 2005 City Staff received a Traffic Survey Inquiry from a resident along Oakstone indicating that along Rochdale just south of Oakstone Drive a vehicle was parking within the roadway and forcing vehicles heading northbound on Rochdale to cross over the center double yellow pavement markings, creating a situation where vehicles were driving on the wrong side of the lane. There are photographs in the packet showing the parked vehicles. As background, Rochdale Drive is classified as a City Major Road, and does receive Act 51 dollars through MDOT. Part of MDOT's requirements for major road status is that the roads be posted for no parking, and striped. Also, some of the curvatures within Rochdale necessitated the striping originally. So the No Parking signs were an oversight, and probably should have been installed back when the road was striped. However for whatever reason they weren't, and based upon this concern from the resident, staff went out and evaluated it and confirmed it was a potential safety issue, with vehicles crossing over the center of the road. Based on that, it was brought to the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board, with a recommendation to issue a TCO indicating No Parking on both sides of the right of way of Rochdale from Walton Boulevard up to Oakstone Drive.

After this letter was received from the Homeowners' Association, Staff went out to reevaluate the spacing of the signage. We were able to minimize the number of signs by four or five, by double posting them. Since the No Parking signs were put in, Staff has installed two watershed signs to indicate the County drain crossing at the bridge, so we shifted the no parking signs onto the same sign post so some posts were eliminated. Tonight Staff is just providing information as to why the signs were installed, and is making a recommendation that they stay in place.

Chairperson Colling asked what brought the issue to the agenda. Was it a request for their removal? Mr. Shumejko confirmed they had received a letter from Ms. Jean Teschendorf dated June 1, 2007 requesting that the signs be reevaluated. Chairperson Colling said now that they had staff's recommendation; he would open the matter up to public comment.

Mr. Eric Batke
402 Rochdale Drive N.

Rochester Hills, MI 48309-1741

Mr. Batke said it was probably his son's car that they saw in the photographs in the packet that was creating the problem, as they parked in front of their house. He understood that they were saying that Rochdale is a major road, but Rochdale extends all the way down to Greenleaf, and there is not a yellow line going all the way down to Greenleaf.

Mr. Batke said his home was residential, and where the yellow line is it is residential. The parked car, if it did anything, was a hindrance to traffic and may have slowed it down. He said he had heard a lot of comments here tonight about the traffic flow, and Rochdale is a high traffic street. So what we've done effectively is put the yellow lines in, put in no-parking signs, and now we have a thoroughfare designed for speed. He said the traffic speeds in that area are generally about 45 mph, or at least 40 mph, which is not safe. The yellow lines are also a hindrance, and he would like them removed because he walks that street all the time, and as he walks there are people in vehicles who will not cross over a yellow line. The street is not very wide and there are no sidewalks; where is he going to walk? He walks in the street and he has people drive by him in their sport utility vehicles with the large mirrors and just about knock him off the road. Vehicles beep their horns at kids riding their bikes, who have nowhere to go but on the street. There is a high school down there and an elementary school, with plenty of kids going up and down Rochdale. There is no sidewalk in place, yet you put this yellow line in to force people to stay in their lane.

Mr. Batke said there are also plenty of people who ignore the yellow lines, and that he has been passed when he was driving down Rochdale to his house. He said the lines don't mean anything, and when he turns into his driveway nobody stops and waits, they just drive around him. Their effectiveness is minimal at best. In his view they are a safety hazard because they force drivers who want to obey the law to stay to the right of the yellow lines, and they don't slow down or stop for people walking in the street. When the condominiums along there have their sprinklers going you have no choice. You are either going to get wet or get run over.

He said he also had an issue with the no parking. If you post it no parking, fine, do it at the driveway to the condominium entrances. He said his home was part of a subdivision, it is a neighborhood, and he has every right to have the same opportunities as his neighbors. He should be able park in front of his house. Now his son parks his car 50 feet down. Nothing has changed, it's still in the street, vehicles still have to drive around the car, only there is no double yellow line ten feet on the other side of his property. He felt his home had been singled out and targeted in this case by the City, and he resented it. He pays the same taxes as his neighbors, but didn't enjoy the same privileges and protections. Now there are two additional new homes a little further south, which will also have to have the yellow lines that make it look like a

highway in front of their homes. He asked if they would reconsider for two reasons:

1. The aesthetics of the neighborhood.
2. The safety of the residents in the neighborhood, the children and adults who walk up and down that street.

He asked them to take a look at the width of the street. He suggested they walk it during rush hour when people are cutting through both subdivisions. He said Rochdale Drive was used as a thoroughfare, and that he would appreciate it if they would consider that.

Ms. Jean Teschendorf
1240 Greenleaf Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-1723

Ms. Teschendorf commented that what Mr. Batke said was absolutely true, and that she supported his viewpoint. She also wanted to thank staff for removing some of the signs. She said that going down Rochdale it looked like a vertical jail with all those signs posted. They used to enjoy the west side of Rochdale as being a nature preserve. Although it is privately owned it is all open and was nice to view. All of a sudden all those signs went up out of nowhere for no reason. Because of those signs it was the laughingstock of the neighborhood, the vertical prison. They couldn't figure out why they would put so many signs down the street when basically no one parks there except that one particular house. She agreed that he had every right to enjoy the same amenities that everyone else in the neighborhood enjoys.

Mr. Robert Kosnik
1189 Greenleaf Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-1722

Mr. Kosnik wanted to remind the Council that every mayor, except for the current one, encouraged them to park their cars on the street to slow the traffic cutting through their neighborhood. He said his good neighbor essentially did that, and they have been penalized with this steel forest of parking signs up and down Rochdale. If you want to do a traffic study, stand and count how many people park on that street. There may be one car at the encouragement of previous administrations to do so. And it really does help slow down the traffic. It is a residential neighborhood, except for that stretch of Rochdale that is a City major road. He remembered from a previous meeting that the difference between funding for it being a city major rather than a residential road is something like \$3.00 per foot. Mr. Shumejko replied it was more like \$20.00 per foot. Mr. Kosnik said he would pay the difference out of his own pocket to get those signs gone. He estimated it was only about 300 feet.

Mr. Shumejko said it was around 1,000 feet, and just to clarify we do have some local streets in the City that are striped as well. He felt there were two issues:

1. It is a major road.
2. Some of the curves as you are going across the bridge and around the bend meet warrants for striping due to the curvature of the roadway.

Mr. Kosnik said the striping was one thing and the signs are another, but sometimes common sense has to outweigh a state law or legislation or road guidelines. It really is a residential neighborhood, and they would like to keep it that way.

Mr. Shumejko said it came down to liability as well. Staff didn't go out proactively looking to find areas to post no parking. There was a concern raised by a resident, they reviewed it, and it was a legitimate concern. It is our duty and responsibility to act on a safety issue in the community.

Mr. Kosnik said they were looking for traffic studies to either support or refute their cause. He asked if there had ever been an accident caused by a car parked in front of his neighbor's house. He ventured to say that that had never happened, so why put up a No Parking sign if there has never been a problem? Mr. Shumejko said they could look at the crash data.

Chairperson Colling asked if anyone else would like to speak on this item.

Donald Brockman
448 Springview Court
Rochester, MI

He said he lived in the subdivision, and wanted to reiterate something that had been said. He walks up and down that street a lot, and the same situation had happened to him. Nine times out of ten people won't pull over, and he's stuck too because the sprinklers are going, and he's almost been nailed a couple of times. There are also a lot of kids that come through there, usually around 12:00 or 2:00 when school lets out. The traffic is barreling up there. One of these days you will hear about someone getting run over. He said he didn't know what the problem was, there should be parking there to slow down the traffic.

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

They had talked about the lines on the road earlier, and that they need to be there through the bridge. He didn't think they would disagree with the bridge part of it,

because it does give you a little guidance, but the fact that it extends 600 or 700 feet beyond the bridge after the road straightens out has always been a concern. None of them have figured it out, and he agreed totally with Mr. Batke that basically those two yellow lines create a thoroughfare accelerated speed lane. If you are on there you see no parking, you see a clear lane, it's straight, it's what all of us used to use as a drag strip when we were kids.

He didn't think it was fair that one of their neighbors was punished because you need an extra 80 feet of his lot, for whatever that's worth, \$20 per foot, so for 80 feet so we're getting \$1,600 per year to tick off one of our neighbors.

Chairperson Colling closed Public Comment and opened the matter up to the Board. He said there was no recommendation from staff in the packet, which in effect was asking them to leave the TCO in place. This matter was before the Board on several occasions, the last being October 11 of 2005. The pictures included in the packet were dated August 25, 2005. He opened the matter up for discussion by the Board and said they could make a recommendation or take no action at this time.

Mr. Franklin said he had a question. Across from Valley Circle there are two what he assumed are residential lots. He asked if one of them was 402 Rochdale, or if it were further up toward Greenleaf. Mr. Shumejko said 420 is just south of Oakstone Drive on the east side. Mr. Franklin said he would like to park his car in front of his house as well, and wondered if there was any way to change the striping from Oakstone to 200 feet south of Valley Circle. He thought that would solve a significant part of the problem. .

Chairperson Colling recalled that the reason that this matter was here in the first place is that part of that roadway is used for access by the shopping center, and there were some issues. The road is actually wider than most roads in the City, and is more akin to Cumberland, a very wide road through a subdivision. If there were no striping on it at all, he thought the speeds would be faster. Striping did not create the illusion of speed, but wide-open concrete did. There is data from studies over the years to back that up. He said he had no personal preference about the parking restrictions, because although it does affect a couple of homeowners down the road, from what he could recall from the history of this roadway, it was configured the way it was because it had originally been designated as a local collector road. He asked Mr. Shumejko for confirmation of that, who responded that when the streets were transferred from the Road Commission to the City he thought that was when it officially became a City major road. Chairperson Colling said there were certain criteria for those roadways, and if they had been observed at the time some of these things would have been done years ago.

Mr. Cardimen said he had a legal question. Let's assume the No Parking signs are not

out on the road. Let's assume there is a car parked in front of the house in question, and someone crashes into that car and gets killed. Do we have a legal obligation as a City when in fact the rules state we should have that street posted no parking? Chairperson Colling responded that the answer to that it yes. Mr. Cardimen continued that then there would be an obligation by the City for not fulfilling its legal responsibilities. Chairperson Colling said it would be the same liability the City would have if for example they put in an unwarranted Stop sign, it is not observed, and a death occurred there. The City would have some culpability.

Mr. Batke said that if his son parks his car 50 feet further down Rochdale Drive, it is the same street with the same width, but there is no yellow line. With the same scenario, is the City's liability the same?

Chairperson Colling said it had to with the warrants that fit that situation. He explained that a traffic engineer doesn't just go out arbitrarily and post it at 300 feet or 600 feet or whatever. There is a Federal set of warrants, which is incorporated into the State warrants, that are the Uniform Traffic Manual for the State of Michigan that we have to follow on this Board, and that our engineers duly follow. When they make a decision to go out into a roadway and change signage or striping or anything like that, there are set distances and regulations they follow based upon the data they find at the site. The design they put in was based upon the warrants for the State of Michigan having to do with this situation.

Mr. Shumejko added that part of this issue was that the position of the vehicle being parked is as you are approaching the curvature of the road, so not only does the parked vehicle force the northbound vehicle to cross the center of the road, it is also obstructing the view of oncoming traffic as you are going around the radius. He said he would revisit the site, but he believed that once you get past Oakstone that issue resolves itself so you can see oncoming traffic.

Ms. Teschendorf said the bottom line was that we have to be careful when driving, and when northbound on Rochdale and you see a vehicle is approaching from the south, even if there is a car parked you know full well you can't cross over to the next lane. You should stop and allow that other car to pass, and then you go through. Those are the rules of driving. She said that what you are doing is accommodating those who are not adhering to the rules of driving.

Chairperson Colling responded that that could also be said the other way. He related that in his own subdivision he couldn't tell you the number times he has almost been hit head on because someone would rather speed up and go around a car parked in their lane and have him stop because their life is more important than his. He said that is exactly what you are describing, and he could not legislate nor control bad behavior on the part of drivers. He added frankly that probably 90 % of the drivers that do

that live within your subdivision because 90 % of the traffic in your subdivision is generated by people who live there, people that are part of your own homeowners' association. You can't have that much cut-through traffic that all the problems that are occurring in the sub are only the people that are cutting through, because this obviously occurs at other times of the day where you are not likely to have cut-through traffic.

Mr. Shumejko said part of the problem he had was they were notified of a potential issue, they went out and reviewed and analyzed it, recommended that the no parking signs be placed, and nothing has changed out there since the last review that would indicate that they should be removed. He was concerned with the liability if after the City did the analysis, did the study, investigated in the field, and recommended that the signs be put in, if all of a sudden we remove them without any engineering basis or study to support it. He felt it exposed the City to liability issues.

Chairperson Colling said he would like to make a recommendation at this point. He recommended that the Board do nothing tonight, but that as part of the ongoing study that was asked for on the last item that we also review this parking, striping, and signage issue. This review would determine if it still meets all the warrants based on the original situation, and the distance it would apply. He advised this was not to say that it would be removed. It is possible the distance can it be lessened, but it may not even be touched. The engineering will be redone as part of this study, but he wanted to be very clear about it up front that nothing might change.

t

Chairperson Colling looked for someone from the Board to make a motion to that effect.

Mr. Blackstone recommended that we be able to explain just how we derived where this line should stop. Chairperson Colling said the study would show the logic behind it.

A motion was made by Mr. Franklin, with a second by Mr. Cardimen that in the matter of PK-86.1 "NO PARKING" within the right-of-way of both sides of Rochdale Drive N. from Walton Boulevard to Oakstone Drive that the Board do nothing tonight, but that as part of the ongoing study that was asked for on the last item that we also review this parking, striping, and signage issue.

Chairperson Colling said a roll call vote would be taken.

Mr. Cardimen asked if he could make a comment before the vote. He said he supported this motion, and was very sympathetic to our resident, but from his background and understanding of traffic engineering and traffic studies the City could

be in serious legal jeopardy if in fact we violate sound traffic engineering principles. He said he supported this delay to reexamine whether or not the same engineering principles in the distances that have been used in the past can be changed. If they can't, with all his sympathies he would have to vote to keep the no parking signs up there because of the legal issue.

Chairperson Colling said he would also echo the same from his position.

Blackstone: Aye
Cardimen: Aye
Colling: Aye
Franklin: Aye
Hunter: Aye
Moore: Aye

Absent: Allan Schneck

Chairperson Colling told the audience members that the Board had agreed to study the matter, and would make the results of that study public to them.

A motion was made by Franklin, seconded by Cardiman, that this matter be Reviewed. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Blackstone, Colling, Hunter, Moore, Cardiman and Franklin

Absent 2 - Duistermars and Schneck

MASTER THOROUGHFARE PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Shumejko said materials that were provided at the last Public Thoroughfare meetings had been handed out tonight to the Board members. Up to this point they had been plugging along and gathering residential input and feedback through public meetings, getting an overall consensus of how the residents and stakeholders of Rochester Hills rate the current system, and what they anticipate or expect to see improved. It was not until the last couple of weeks that they are getting to what he calls the "fun" part of the study. This is where we're looking at taking different traffic volumes, different crash data, and doing different scenarios, such as if we widen this road how does it impact this road? If we widen these two what does it do to this part of the City? He thought they would probably come up with twelve to fifteen different scenarios, and from them eventually there will be a recommended proposal, a secondary proposal, and a third. It is really not until now that they are actually getting into the meat and bones of the study itself.

At the last public meeting a synopsis was handed out, containing where the residents would like to see the existing thoroughfare plan go. It has their comments, including what they like, what they don't like, and what they would like to see. It also includes pedestrian improvements and better conductivity from parks and schools.

Mr. Shumejko said that Chairperson Colling had been attending the Master Thoroughfare plan meetings, and Mr. Moore had come to a meeting. Mr. Franklin is on the technical committee for the project. Mr. Colling told the Board they were welcome to come to any of the public meetings and kibitz or add a comment or two. The surprising thing about it to him was after they did a poll of the residents they did a poll of the Tech Committee, and then a poll of the consultants. It was interesting to find that they were not all that far apart. If you had gone through the process of querying the residents you would have sworn that we were apples and oranges, but in the end after we looked at their suggestions and explained to them what we truly wanted to do, and took their priorities and melded with it, it was a lot closer than he thought.

He said we have come to the same conclusion that this Board has probably twenty years ago, that we do not have a good east west route through the City, and we don't have a north south route through the City. A couple of the things we put before them, and you are welcome to comment on this, are we would like to see Dequindre be improved to route traffic around the City, and perhaps Hamlin, or another east-west road such as South Boulevard. We would also like to see M-59 improved because we think that a lot of the traffic we see on Auburn Road (and others) is due to that. This is the way we're leaning now, but all the scenarios aren't finished

Mr. Shumejko said at this point everything is in play. He speculated that in the end it will be a compromise. He thought the consensus was that something has to be done for a north-south as well as an east-west connector.

At our last meeting the Oakland County Sheriff's Office as well as the Traffic Advisory Board were asked to identify different problem areas in the City based on their travels and/or past experiences. These are areas they wanted the Thoroughfare study to address. In the packet there is a summary of all those issues, which are identified both on a listing and a map. This information was provided to the consultant, but he thought that at the last meeting there was discussion about making it an actual resolution supported by the Board, to then become an official part of the files for the Master Thoroughfare Study. Chairperson Colling said it had been brought up, and that he supported Mr. Shumejko on this. He asked for input from Board. He said this is the strongest message we can send to the Master Thoroughfare Committee. He said if you

agree with the documentation, let yourselves be heard.

Mr. Blackstone said he was a little confused on what he was asking the Board to do. Chairperson Colling said they all had a copy of the list of concerns. At one of the Master Thoroughfare Plan meetings he had told them they had the perfect resource, as the Traffic and Safety Board has been dealing with this stuff since 1985. Mr. Shumejko and his staff went through the records of the past meetings and did a compilation of issues and problem areas. They had also polled the Board members and the Sheriff's Deputies at the last meeting for their traffic concerns, which were incorporated into the list. He thought they should be proud of what they had done and put a resolution forth stating we would like the Master Thoroughfare Plan study to consider this information in their deliberations.

A motion to do was made by Mr. Cardimen, and was seconded by Mr. Hunter.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Colling asked if there were any other business to come before the Board. Mr. Shumejko said some communications and correspondence had been included in the packet. Recently the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) received a declaration that Oakland County roads are now the safest in the world for a road network of a similar size. This is based on the fatality rate per million vehicle miles traveled. The RCOC had a press conference several months ago, and it is something they take great pride in. They have gone a long way in doing this over the years through funding of roads, and also with the efforts of the Traffic Improvement Association (TIA). He thought a lot of what had helped the Road Commission and all of Oakland County achieve this is that the data has been there to support or recommend different intersection improvements to make them safer. He asked if Mr. Cardimen had something to add.

Mr. Cardimen said he had just passed out some additional information. Because TIA provided the data to the Road Commission they were part of the article, and had been recognized highly by Federal Highway, NTSA (National Traffic Safety Administration), Oakland County, the State, and a whole host of people. He called it a forty-year overnight success story, and said if you look back to 1967 when TIA began at Oakland University, the County had a little less than 600,000 people. Now we are at a million two, and you can see the growth in vehicle miles traveled. But take a look at the fatalities, and how they've come down even though we've grown this community three or four times. It is an incredible story that is unmatched in America.

The 0.47 is 0.47 fatalities per hundred million vehicle miles traveled. If you compare that with the State of Michigan, Michigan's rate is 1.1, and the USA is 1.5. We are the lowest in Michigan; we are the lowest in the United States. He compared the rate with some of his international friends in Europe; and the three safest countries in the world are Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands. They rank their rates by population because they think traffic safety is a medical or health issue in their country. Their fatality rate is 6.0 or less; the UK is about 5.7 people per hundred thousand population. When you compare what we have in Oakland County, our number is 5.8. Some of the members of the Road Commission Board like to say that we are the safest in the world. It is pretty hard to compare Oakland County to the Netherlands or the UK or Sweden. Those three countries are very socialistic; those three countries have been allowed to impose rules and regulations unlike what we could do in this country because of the government and individual rights. So the story is even more impressive when you think we've been able to do this within our own system.

Mr. Cardimen said we are very proud of that, and explained that the other sheets showed continued decreases in crashes, and the last one had the traffic safety comparisons he had just talked about. He explained he brought this information to give more background when he saw the topic included on the agenda. Because they had the data, just for informational purposes, he also pulled together the traffic crash records for Rochester Hills. The first page is the summary, showing where we've had fatals and personal injuries, property damage, and total crashes. One column shows crashes, and one column shows people injured. In 2006 we had five crashes that were fatals, and we had five individual people in the vehicles that were killed. You can see that the number of injuries and total crashes are on the way down. Property damage is down. Personal injuries are down. Fatals are a unique, random event. We have the data and we've worked very closely with Mr. Shumejko, Mr. Matich, and the City of Rochester Hills. The City has done a phenomenal job of taking the data and using it in correcting areas in our City.

Mr. Blackstone asked Mr. Cardimen to what he attributed this great decrease, who replied it was totally due to the Traffic Improvement Association! He went on to explain that it was due to three or four reasons. TIA definitely played a role, because they are the focal point and bring the data together. The Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) manages over 50 percent of the roads in Oakland County. In 1987 they made it a mandate in their Mission Statement that traffic safety was number one. So when they get TIA's data, they use our crash data and they weight the crashes to the point where our data becomes the guideline for which roads get fixed first. So they are going after those roads that are seriously in jeopardy. As an example, in 1991-1992 we identified the 12 Mile and Beck Road intersection, and it ranked for two or three years as the number seven intersection in terms of frequency of crashes, about 100 in terms of serious injuries, and number one in terms of volume going through the intersection. So we notified the Road Commission and told them this ought to be one that you put on your list. We weighted it and gave them all the data. They said they would absolutely correct that intersection by 2000. The next two years we had the same data, and we kept saying, "Isn't there anything we can do? Can we go after some money? Can the communities get involved?" The bottom line is that in November of 1995 the cities of Wixom and Novi, MDOT, and the Road Commission came together with a million two, and corrected that intersection. If you take a look at the data prior to November 1995, there were on an average of 38 people injured at that intersection for ten years prior to that time. It was almost like clockwork. Subsequent to that the average has been five. With the data and with the implementation of making corrections, over forty years those incremental changes have had a major effect. You have a Road Commission whose priority now is traffic safety, we keep very accurate and timely crash data for people to analyze, we have a traffic engineer on staff that works with all the community, you have a law enforcement community that recognizes the importance of traffic safety, and the traffic law enforcement in this community has been very, very supportive of all the traffic safety messages. And in his opinion, the last piece is that Oakland County is blessed for two reasons:

1. Demographically you have a highly educated population, and with that higher education people were very quick to adopt the safety belt issue, they were quick to understand drinking and driving, they were quick to teach their kids. Most of the State lagged, and we were up front in that.
2. The economics in the County, allowing for newer and safer vehicles. As the years have gone by the automakers continue to make the vehicles safer and safer.

And so it has been a combination of all those pieces to make an overnight success story in forty years.

Chairperson Colling thought that one of the things that was really key to this decrease is that Mr. Cardimen and TIA worked with the police department to make sure when they issued tickets or wrote up accident reports they put more data into them. This made the data more viable and gave them the kind information they needed to document these accidents. And over the course of years it has gotten to the point that they could accurately state, "This intersection is bad and here is why." We are still seeing the results of it here today, and Mr. Cardimen is a welcome addition to our Board.

Mr. Cardimen said that at some meeting in the future, we now have a web-based program that Mr. Shumejko and each community can use where you can log on and pull out your own crash data. You can manipulate it, analyze it, show maps of where the crashes are, do an engineering collision diagram, and within the next two months we should have the

UD 10s on the web page. Mr. Shumejko said he had used TIA's site in the past week to gather traffic crash data, and added that it was pretty user friendly now.

Mr. Franklin asked that since we have this data, and since it was stated at the meeting that the traffic circle that will be built at Livernois and Hamlin is being built because it is safer, could we get the crash data for that intersection for the last five years? That way we will have a benchmark to compare to after the new intersection is built.

Mr. Shumejko said when they had the public hearing for the roundabout a resident requested that information, and it is in the Environmental Assessment. It is part of the official document that was sent to MDOT and FHWWY, so we do have the data that indicates the number of crashes to date. Once the roundabout is constructed we will be able to analyze it.

Chairperson Colling said it is City policy to go through and review all the roads in the City over a five or six year cycle. At one point in time almost every section in the City has had the TIA data requested for accident counts and traffic counts, and when we do the engineering studies and revisit these streets I can guarantee you TIA data is in it. So we have exactly what you mentioned, and it is interesting that in the next go around we're going to be approaching the cycle limit on Firewood and Raintree. Also in short order we're going to get there for the two new traffic circles that are in, so we will some good data on traffic circles shortly.

Mr. Cardimen said we did a pre and post on the Indianwood roundabout, and found that to be a very positive traffic safety improvement. Chairperson Colling said he remembered growing up in a rural community, and almost every rural community had a traffic circle. It was where the main monument to the civil war or somewhere was, and it's where the crossroads of the city met because they couldn't afford traffic lights in those days. If you go through many of the small towns, or even some of the larger ones in Michigan and Ohio, these things were built when the automobile came of age in the 1920s and 30s, and you are going to find these traffic circles still working today. They are not new phenomena; we have just rediscovered them.

Mr. Cardimen added that we rediscovered them with the influence of Europe, which has really forced us to look at them because while in the USA our fatality rate is 1.5, in the safest countries they are down to 0.5. Mr. Shumejko said he thought one of the issues is that this country is so litigious; while in Europe they are quicker to test different improvements or try trial runs. Here we are worried about litigation unless something has been studied and analyzed over so many years.

Mr. Cardimen said they had a long discussion about the lawsuit this morning. He said they do not know of any other place in the country where there has been a lawsuit filed on a roundabout. The other thing he kept questioning is, "What's going to be the default? How can you claim discrimination when the whole world has been doing this?" It's a safe environment and there's been no litigation anywhere else in the country. So it is going to be interesting to see what, if anything, comes out of this.

Mr. Shumejko said before tonight's meeting he was watching Channel 4 News, and they reported on this with Bernstein and Paula Tubman doing the story. They were talking about walking across the traffic at a roundabout, and the way they did it they weren't crossing at the refuge islands. They were about 500 feet south of the roundabout crossing just a couple of lanes of traffic, and so they didn't actually show how you would cross when it is open to traffic. When done correctly you cross half-width, stage there, and then cross the other half.

2007-0496 COMMUNICATIONS

This matter was Reviewed

NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairperson Colling said before they adjourned he wanted to talk about the next meeting date. The September 11, 2007 meeting has been cancelled due to the primary elections. He was not sure if there were anything on the agenda for October as of yet, and said he imagined they would probably have a meeting in October or November.

Mr. Cardimen asked what the time frame was for the Master Thoroughfare Study, and Mr. Shumejko responded that it should wrap up probably by the end of January. Initially it was hoped to have it done by the end of the year, but they got a bit of a late start. Mr. Cardimen asked if between now and then they would start generating some options that this group could take a look at. Mr. Shumejko thought they might get some options in September.

Chairperson Colling asked if anyone had any more business to come before the Board. Mr. Hunter said he had brought this matter up before, and requested that someone check the light at eastbound Hamlin at Dequindre between the hours of 4:00 and 7:00 p.m. He has seen it stacked up seven cars, and he personally avoids it by going straight and cutting through the Seven Eleven to go northbound on Dequindre when he sees that happening. There is so much more traffic coming westbound since they paved the other side of Hamlin that there is not enough time for the cars to get through. He said he sometimes sees only one car make a left turn through a cycle.

Chairperson Colling asked if it were the left turn north to go eastbound on Hamlin that was stacking up, and Mr. Hunter confirmed that it was. Mr. Shumejko thought the signal was under the jurisdiction of the Macomb County Road Commission. There was some discussion about when the light was installed at that intersection, and whether or not it was a SCATS signal. Mr. Cardimen suggested that they email Brent or Daniel over at the operations center for the Road Commission for Oakland County.

Mr. Franklin said that speaking long term he would like to take a look at streetlights at major intersections. Mr. Shumejko said they had discussed doing that and it had been a bit of a slow go, but they are proceeding with it. Mr. Franklin said he would like to get caught up on what has gone on for this issue, because there are some intersections that really need to have a look taken at them, and he thought it should be policy. Chairperson Colling said at this point the matter would have to come back to the City Council, and they would have to give them some direction on that. In the Board's charter on streetlights it says that if a resident requests a street light the Board is to review it, and there is actually a streetlight policy. He asked Ms. Dearing to find the policy and give a copy to Mr. Franklin. Until we get a request from a citizen for a streetlight, or the City decides they want to move one, there is no point in discussing the issue because the policy is set.

Mr. Shumejko said he was not sure if major roads would be reviewed individually at some point. He thought it was something the City needed to analyze and review. There were boulevards at Livernois, Hamlin, Crooks, Adams, which were all pretty much unlit. The issue has gone before City Council a couple of times and been tabled.

Chairperson Colling recognized Vice Chairperson Moore, who said first of all he would like to welcome the new members to the Board. He also wanted to bring up the issue of the "safe havens" for the trail crossings on Livernois and Avon. He thought there was a misconception as to what should happen that he has observed at both these locations. Someone will be in the middle, traffic will be doing 40 mph down the road, and all of a

sudden a car will slam on their brakes. We have no signage saying who has the right-of-way. Is traffic supposed to stop or is the pedestrian supposed to stay there until traffic clears? He thought an accident could happen due to a pedestrian thinking the traffic would stop because it had the last time, and this time the car will not stop. He said he had seen people on bicycles pointing their fingers at cars that went through without stopping. He thought there was a problem because there was not a set pattern on what to do at these trail crossings.

Chairperson Colling said there was a misconception in that the people on the pathways believe that if they are within that safety zone traffic has to stop for them, but it doesn't. He thought there needed to be some public education done, or a sign put up on each side that says, "Cross when safe, traffic does not stop." He thought that would end all the Chairperson Colling said before they adjourned he wanted to talk about the next meeting date. The September 11, 2007 meeting has been cancelled due to the primary elections. He was not sure if there were anything on the agenda for October as of yet, and said he imagined they would probably have a meeting in October or November.

Mr. Cardimen asked what the time frame was for the Master Thoroughfare Study, and Mr. Shumejko responded that it should wrap up probably by the end of January. Initially it was hoped to have it done by the end of the year, but they got a bit of a late start. Mr. Cardimen asked if between now and then they would start generating some options that this group could take a look at. Mr. Shumejko thought they might get some options in September.

Chairperson Colling asked if anyone had any more business to come before the Board. Mr. Hunter said he had brought this matter up before, and requested that someone check the light at eastbound Hamlin at Dequindre between the hours of 4:00 and 7:00 p.m. He has seen it stacked up seven cars, and he personally avoids it by going straight and cutting through the Seven Eleven to go northbound on Dequindre when he sees that happening. There is so much more traffic coming westbound since they paved the other side of Hamlin that there is not enough time for the cars to get through. He said he sometimes sees only one car make a left turn through a cycle.

Chairperson Colling asked if it were the left turn north to go eastbound on Hamlin that was stacking up, and Mr. Hunter confirmed that it was. Mr. Shumejko thought the signal was under the jurisdiction of the Macomb County Road Commission. There was some discussion about when the light was installed at that intersection, and whether or not it was a SCATS signal. Mr. Cardimen suggested that they email Brent or Daniel over at the operations center for the Road Commission for Oakland County.

Mr. Franklin said that speaking long term he would like to take a look at streetlights at major intersections. Mr. Shumejko said they had discussed doing that and it had been a bit of a slow go, but they are proceeding with it. Mr. Franklin said he would like to get caught up on what has gone on for this issue, because there are some intersections that really need to have a look taken at them, and he thought it should be policy. Chairperson Colling said at this point the matter would have to come back to the City Council, and they would have to give them some direction on that. In the Board's charter on streetlights it says that if a resident requests a street light the Board is to review it, and there is actually a streetlight policy. He asked Ms. Dearing to find the policy and give a copy to Mr. Franklin. Until we get a request from a citizen for a streetlight, or the City decides they want to move one, there is no point in discussing the issue because the policy is set.

Mr. Shumejko said he was not sure if major roads would be reviewed individually at some

point. He thought it was something the City needed to analyze and review. There were boulevards at Livernois, Hamlin, Crooks, Adams, which were all pretty much unlit. The issue has gone before City Council a couple of times and been tabled.

Chairperson Colling recognized Vice Chairperson Moore, who said first of all he would like to welcome the new members to the Board. He also wanted to bring up the issue of the "safe havens" for the trail crossings on Livernois and Avon. He thought there was a misconception as to what should happen that he has observed at both these locations. Someone will be in the middle, traffic will be doing 40 mph down the road, and all of a sudden a car will slam on their brakes. We have no signage saying who has the right-of-way. Is traffic supposed to stop or is the pedestrian supposed to stay there until traffic clears? He thought an accident could happen due to a pedestrian thinking the traffic would stop because it had the last time, and this time the car will not stop. He said he had seen people on bicycles pointing their fingers at cars that went through without stopping. He thought there was a problem because there was not a set pattern on what to do at these trail crossings.

Chairperson Colling said there was a misconception in that the people on the pathways believe that if they are within that safety zone traffic has to stop for them, but it doesn't. He thought there needed to be some public education done, or a sign put up on each side that says, "Cross when safe, traffic does not stop." He thought that would end all the discussion. He asked if Vice Chairperson Moore would like to make a motion on the matter.

Motion by Moore, to put signage at the two safe havens, not only for the pedestrians on the trail, but also the roadway traffic.

Chairperson Colling said he didn't think it was necessary to put anything up for the traffic on the roadway, but just the pedestrians that are in the island. Vice Chairperson Moore disagreed. Mr. Shumejko said both roads were under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission, and he believed they dictated the signage that was out there. At one point someone wanted a sign that said, "Cars Yield To Pedestrians," but the County would not adopt that. The City of Rochester uses it, but they have a local ordinance that allows it, and because it is a downtown it is a little different.

Mr. Shumejko said what they could look at doing is if you're on the trail and you approach the Stop sign at the road, there could be a warning placard placed below it saying, "Cross traffic does not stop," or something to that effect. Chairperson Colling said a driver education program was also needed. It could be put out in the local papers that you do not stop for one of these crosswalks if you are on the main thoroughfare. From what he had seen he thought the pedestrian behavior was atrocious. They are assuming they have the right-of-way when they don't.

Mr. Cardimen seconded the motion on the floor.

A Board member asked for clarification on the motion. He said Vice Chairperson Moore had two aspects to his motion; one that dealt with signs for pedestrians and another dealing with signs for vehicles. Chairperson Colling responded that they had just clarified that the Road Commission had the jurisdiction and the City cannot put those signs in. There was some procedural discussion, and Mr. Moore said he would change his motion to reflect that.

Vice Chairperson Moore said his third item was that the people on bicycles in this City are out of control. He saw a gentleman on a bicycle in the right hand lane of Walton

Boulevard heading westbound with a tractor-trailer behind him. There was no way the tractor-trailer could go by him without hitting him, and the truck was blowing his horn. The cyclist was about two-feet away from the curb, he turned around and made an obscene gesture at the truck driver.

Chairperson Colling said we had a motion on the floor, which was seconded. All those in favor:

*Ayes: All
Nays: None*

Chairperson Colling said the motion was approved.

Mr. Shumejko said he would like to comment briefly. He said the issue came down to education. In the Parks Department at the City there are bumper stickers with a picture of a bike and a car stating, "Same roads, same rights, same rules." He agreed that the true bicyclist doesn't use the pathways or really even the trails; they use the roads just as though they are a vehicle. He added that they have every right to do so, but they also had to follow the same traffic rules.

Chairperson Colling said he thought he knew where Vice Chairperson Moore was coming from, and there is a difference between a true bicyclist and the zealot bicyclist. The zealot bicyclist thinks because they have the right to use the roadway, everybody else has to go 15 mph under the speed limit. They are going to get themselves killed. You have to take the same mentality he uses when he is on his motorcycle; you can't argue with an 80,000-pound truck on 600 pounds of bike. He said he didn't know what the answer to it was. Unfortunately it comes down to Darwin and the survival of the fittest.

Vice Chairperson Moore said he had a question for Mr. Cardimen. Although he does not travel extensively all over the United States, he has traveled from state to state in the last three months. Nowhere in any city that he has been to in Illinois, Indiana, or Iowa has he seen bicyclists on the roads, but Rochester Hills seems to be the center for bicyclists using the streets.

Chairperson Colling thought the Velodrome brought a lot of bicyclists into the City. He said he works in Warren, and a lot of people in Warren ride their bikes to work, though they generally stay off the roads. Bikes and traffic, like kids playing in the streets and traffic, don't mix, but it wouldn't change until the State takes a stance like California and puts bicycle lanes in the road. One of the most interesting things he saw was on a recent trip to California where a bicyclist got ticketed for driving outside of his lane.

Mr. Franklin said that a lot of college towns have quite a bit of bicycle traffic and they interact very well; Ann Arbor being one, and East Lansing another, and certainly many of the college towns in California and in Washington. If we want to take a look to see how bicycles and traffic can coexist, those college towns are the place to start. Some of them didn't require wider roads, but created bicycle lanes. On the Huron River Trail in Ann Arbor there is a bicycle lane. They didn't widen the road to have it, but it encourages the bicyclist to stay in one part of the road.

Mr. Hunter said that most of those places don't have bike paths like we do. There has been a lot of time and money invested in those bike paths.

Chairperson Colling speculated that they could debate this issue for quite a while. He thought they should assess what we have in the City, and have the City take a look at

passing an ordinance saying that where a bike path exists bicyclists are to use it. The question is whether the State law that allows cyclists on the roadways will supersede that. He said it needed to be researched. Mr. Shumejko thought a recent Michigan Legislature actually modified and reinforced the user rights of bicyclists on Michigan highways. Mr. Franklin said to take a look at New York City, because they have a ton of bicycles using the roadways.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Hunter said he would like to make a motion to adjourn, which was seconded.

Chairperson Colling adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Note:

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