

AGENDA
TRAFFIC COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 21, 2004 - 7:30 P.M.
LOWER LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
TROY CITY HALL
500 W. BIG BEAVER ROAD

1. Roll Call
 2. Minutes – November 19, 2003
 3. Install Traffic Signal on South Boulevard at High Oaks
Requested by the Road Commission for Oakland County
 4. Remove Traffic Signal at Big Beaver and Wrenwood (for information/discussion)
Requested by the Road Commission for Oakland County
 5. Sidewalk Program
 6. Visitors' Time
 7. Other Business
 8. Adjourn
- cc: Traffic Committee Members, Including Ex-Officio Members
Gary A. Shripka, Assistant City Manager/Services
Steven Vandette, City Engineer
Captain Dane Slater, Police Department
Lt. Scott McWilliams, Police Department
Lt. Robert Matlick, Fire Department
Lori Grigg Bluhm, City Attorney
John K. Abraham, Traffic Engineer
- cc: Appropriate Sections to Interested Citizens:
3. Residents within 300 feet of South Boulevard and High Oaks
 4. Residents within 300 feet of Big Beaver and Wrenwood

TRAFFIC COMMITTEE

MESSAGE TO VISITORS, DELEGATIONS AND CITIZENS

The Traffic Committee is composed of seven Troy citizens who have volunteered their time to the City to be involved in traffic and safety concerns. The stated role of this Committee is:

- a. To give first hearing to citizens' requests and obtain their input.
- b. To make recommendations to the City Council based on technical considerations, traffic surveys, established standards, and evaluation of citizen input.
- c. To identify hazardous locations and recommend improvements to reduce the potential for traffic accidents.

Final decisions on sidewalk waivers will be made by the Committee at this meeting.

The recommendations and conclusions arrived at on regular items this evening will be forwarded to the City Council for their final action. Any citizen can discuss these recommendations before City Council. The items discussed at the Traffic Committee meeting will be placed on the City Council Agenda by the City Manager. The earliest date these items might be considered by City Council would normally be 10 days to 2 weeks from the Traffic Committee meeting. If you are interested, you may wish to contact the City Manager's Office in order to determine when a particular item is on the Agenda.

Persons wishing to speak before this Committee should attempt to hold their remarks to no more than 5 minutes. Please try to keep your remarks relevant to the subject at hand. Please speak only when recognized by the Chair. These comments are made to keep this meeting moving along. Anyone wishing to be heard will be heard; we are here to listen and help in solving or resolving your particular concerns.

**AGENDA EXPLANATION
TRAFFIC COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 21, 2004**

1. **Roll Call**
2. **Minutes – November 19, 2003**

REGULAR BUSINESS

3. **Install Traffic Signal on South Boulevard at High Oaks**

The Traffic Engineering office received a letter from Winston Myrie, Traffic Engineer at the Road Commission for Oakland County, suggesting installation of a signal on South Boulevard at High Oaks.

A gap study was conducted on South Boulevard at High Oaks, which indicates that there are insufficient acceptable gaps in the South Boulevard traffic to accommodate side street traffic and pedestrian crossings. High Oaks is approximately the mid-mile point on South Boulevard, and provides the best location for platooning traffic and optimizing traffic progression. However, before a signal can be installed the tapers on South Boulevard would need to be extended.

Mr. Myrie reports that the signal is warranted as per warrants 5 and 7. This signal is expected to improve gaps for traffic exiting residential streets and driveways onto South Boulevard and improve progression with better platooning.

If approved, some physical improvements may be necessary at the intersection that includes turn lanes on South Blvd. Mr. Myrie has indicated that since South Blvd. is a County road, the improvements will be included in their budget.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:

1. Recommend installing traffic signal on South Boulevard at High Oaks.
 2. Recommend no changes.
4. **Remove Traffic Signal at Big Beaver and Wrenwood (for information/discussion)**

There is currently a signalized school crossing on Big Beaver at Wrenwood to allow Pembroke Elementary School students in the northeast quadrant of Adams-Big Beaver to cross safely. The Birmingham School District has notified the Road Commission that students in that area are being bussed and the school crosswalk is no longer required.

Further, RCOC took traffic counts at this intersection and determined the warrants for traffic signals are not met; therefore, they suggest that this signal be removed. Big

Beaver is a County road and if the County Board approves, this signal may be removed. City staff has contacted the RCOC and placed this on hold.

This signal was installed in 1971. In 1983 there was a request to remove the signal, but the Traffic Committee and City Council resolved to RETAIN the signal and keep it operational. In 1994 there was a request to move the signal from its location at Wrenwood to Caswell. This request did not go through due to concerns that the signal would increase cut-through traffic in the residential neighborhoods north of Big Beaver Road. This intersection is around 1500 feet east of Adams and around 1700 feet west of the existing signal at Golfview. Residents in the subdivisions north and south of Big Beaver have reported that this signal helps in creating gaps in Big Beaver traffic between Golfview and Adams facilitating turns into and out of residential streets such as Cedar Ridge, Caswell, Brooklawn, Oakhill, Kingsley and Henhawk.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTIONS:

1. Recommend requesting the RCOC to retain the traffic signal on Big Beaver at Wrenwood.
2. Recommend removal of the signal as requested by RCOC.

5. Sidewalk Program

This is an informational/discussion item to discuss the City's sidewalk program. We have been trying to fill in all gaps in our sidewalk system and the budget for sidewalks has been increased substantially. Please review the following information and the attached map and provide input on the same. Specifically, do you have any recommendations for sidewalk gaps that need to be completed, any other priorities?

Following is a brief summary of the program:

City sidewalks are installed in a number of ways. Through the subdivision ordinance, new developments are required to have sidewalks put in before a certificate of occupancy is issued. Businesses/property owners along the major roadways that do major renovations requiring a certificate of occupancy or site plan would also have to put in sidewalks. The City may grant temporary sidewalk waivers to the property owners at places where it is not practical at that time to put in sidewalks. The property owners requesting a sidewalk waiver also sign an irrevocable petition, such that they participate in the costs for installing a sidewalk when the City Engineer deems it necessary.

Sidewalks are also included on both sides of major roadways as a part of any road widening or reconstruction project. The policy used for the width of sidewalks has eight-foot sidewalks on both sides of the major roadways. Variances for this width and for installation are determined by the Traffic Committee and the City Engineer, based on physical constraints on field and other hardships demonstrated.

City staff continually inventory all sidewalks installed on major roads. Measurements are taken by walking existing sidewalks and by locating them with respect to existing

streets/permanent objects. This inventory contains data on location of sidewalk gaps, their estimated length and the side of roadway.

This data was then used to update the existing sidewalk map to show both the existing sidewalks and the sidewalk gaps. Attached map shows this data.

Cost Estimate:

The cost estimates were separated into construction costs and cost of acquiring right of way. The construction cost estimate is based on installing 8-foot sidewalk on both sides of all streets. Unit prices used were derived from what was quoted to the City by contractors for the year 2002 sidewalk construction projects. Table 1 presents a summary of the breakup of estimated costs for each roadway and the total cost estimate to fill all sidewalk gaps.

Roadway Name	Side of Street	Total Gaps-ft	Construction Cost Estimate	Yr 2000 Right-of-Way Estimate	Total Cost Estimate
Maple	South	6177.6	\$494,208	\$40,000	\$534,208
Maple	North	2217.6	\$177,408	\$40,000	\$217,408
Wattles	South	13358.4	\$1,068,672	\$1,730,000	\$2,798,672
Wattles	North	5375.04	\$430,003	\$690,000	\$1,120,003
Long Lake	South	2481.6	\$198,528	\$100,000	\$298,528
Square Lake	South	18321.6	\$1,465,728	\$2,870,000	\$4,335,728
Square Lake	North	5913.6	\$473,088	\$2,255,000	\$2,728,088
South Blvd.	South	20275.2	\$1,622,016	\$2,890,000	\$4,512,016
Adams	East	12883.2	\$1,030,656	\$1,675,000	\$2,705,656
Beach	East	10049.6	\$502,480	\$1,495,000	\$1,997,480
Beach	West	17846.4	\$892,320	\$2,205,000	\$3,097,320
Coolidge	East	3590.4	\$287,232	\$600,000	\$887,232
Coolidge	West	3115.2	\$249,216	\$310,000	\$559,216
Crooks	East	4012.8	\$321,024	\$300,000	\$621,024
Livernois	East	3854.4	\$308,352	\$615,000	\$923,352
Livernois	West	7708.8	\$616,704	\$1,365,000	\$1,981,704
Rochester	East	11510.4	\$920,832	\$2,240,000	\$3,160,832
Rochester	West	7075.2	\$566,016	\$1,465,000	\$2,031,016
Stephenson	West	1953.6	\$156,288	\$0	\$156,288
John R.	East	2956.8	\$236,544	\$325,000	\$561,544
John R.	West	4646.4	\$371,712	\$890,000	\$1,261,712
Dequindre	West	6124.8	\$489,984	\$760,000	\$1,249,984
TOTAL		171,448.6	\$12,879,011	\$24,860,000	\$37,739,011

Table 1 Summary of Costs for Filling Sidewalk Gaps Along Major Roadways

Note: This includes all sidewalk gaps that exist today and does not take into account any sidewalks that may be installed by a developer/property owner, or as a part of a major road project 2004+

Priorities for yearly sidewalk projects:

Connections to schools and school district priorities
 Connections to City parks
 Homeowners associations' priorities
 To finish sidewalks on few major roadways completely
 Consider City mile sections that can have a continuous loop of sidewalks internally
 Individual requests from residents
 One-mile segments with small gaps

Sidewalk projects in the near future:

Projects being looked at for next 2 years based on above priorities (contingent upon availability of right-of-way):

- Coolidge north of Wattles – east side one parcel (church)
- North side of Maple between John R and I-75
- Livernois west side - Woodland School to Lovell
- Livernois east side – Lovell to Wildwood
- South side of Maple east of John R
- South side of South Blvd. from John R to Dequindre (connecting the new golf course and Flynn Park)
- Eastside of Rochester from Square Lake to Congress
- John R east side - Saxony and Lakeside- could be a scenic sidewalk (boardwalk) project since there are some wetlands on the eastside
- West side of Dequindre from South Blvd. to the hospital (may involve some boardwalk)

Sidewalk gaps that may be completed in the next 5 years as a part of major road construction:

Following are some of the road widening projects that have partial federal funding. Contingent on receiving federal funds for construction, these sections will have sidewalks on both sides when the widening projects are completed:

- a. Crooks Road – Square Lake to South Boulevard
- b. John R Road from Long Lake to South boulevard
- c. Dequindre – From Long Lake to South Boulevard

Other parallel efforts to improve pedestrian facilities

City of Troy Safety Pathway Program proposal: The City hired James Scott and Associates to develop a safety pathway system in 1999. The consultant developed four pathway systems radiating from the Civic Center and going to the four quadrants of the City. City staff also prepared funding application for this project that was not submitted as the local match commitment ranged up to 6 million dollars.

6. Visitors' Time (Items not on the Agenda)

7. Other Business

Items not on the agenda which Traffic Committee members may wish to discuss.

8. Adjourn