

Minutes Excerpt
Advisory Traffic and Safety Board Meeting
August 14, 2007

TCO's

2007-0463

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 (OCSD) 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 was 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 OCSO 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 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 left turn restriction, 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.

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 called for a Roll Call Vote.

Moore: Aye

Hunter: Aye

Franklin: Aye

Colling: Aye

Cardimen: Aye

Blackstone: Aye

Absent: Schneck

Chairperson Colling said they had their TCO approval. He addressed the audience, telling them they had heard what they intended to do, and that they would stick to it and help them out as best as they could. He thanked them for coming to the meeting tonight.

I:\Eng\TRAF\MTGS-AGENDAS-MINUTES-ETC\Draft Minutes to CC\TM-25.doc