I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
   Patty Bordman, Mayor

II. ROLL CALL
    Cheryl Arft, Acting City Clerk

III. PROCLAMATIONS, CONGRATULATORY RESOLUTIONS, AWARDS, APPOINTMENTS, RESIGNATIONS AND CONFIRMATIONS, ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS, INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.

   Announcements:
   • Commissioner Sherman’s birthday
   • Senator McMorrow

   Appointments:
   A. Museum Board-City Manager’s appointment
      1. Patrick J. Hughes

   B. Confirmation of City Manager’s appointment to Museum Board of the Business Owner member for a three-year term to expire July 5, 2022.

   C. To confirm the City Manager’s appointment of Patrick J. Hughes to the Museum Board of the Business Owner member for a three-year term to expire July 5, 2022.

   D. Interviews for Advisory Parking Committee
      1. Gayle Champagne (resident shopper)
      2. Judith Paskiewicz (resident)

   E. To appoint _______ to the Advisory Parking Committee as a regular member who is a resident shopper within the parking assessment district to serve a three-year term to expire September 4, 2022.
      To appoint _____ to the Advisory Parking Committee as a regular member who is a resident who does not qualify under the following categories: downtown commercial representative of large retail, small retail, a professional firm, a building owner, a restaurant owner, or a downtown employee to serve a three-year term to expire September 4, 2022.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA
   All items listed on the consent agenda are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion and approved by a roll call vote. There will be no separate discussion of the items unless a commissioner or citizen so requests, in which event the item will be removed from the general order of business and considered under the last item of new business.

   A. Resolution approving the Regular City Commission meeting minutes of September 16, 2019.
B. Resolution approving the warrant list, including Automated Clearing House payments, dated September 18, 2019 in the amount of $1,634,175.38.

C. Resolution authorizing the City Manager to cast a vote, on the City’s behalf, for the incumbent member of the Michigan Municipal League Liability and Property Pool Board of Directors for three-year term, beginning January 1, 2020.

D. Resolution approving funding in the amount of $3,587.00 for the removal of the bus shelter near the northeast corner of Woodward and 14 Mile Road, and the relocation and installation of this bus shelter to the northwest corner of the intersection of Woodward and 14 Mile Road, on the north side of 14 Mile Road;

AND

Resolution approving funding in the amount of $17,500.00 for site preparation and sidewalk installation at the transit stop on 14 Mile west of Woodward, and for site preparation, sidewalk installation and construction of a retaining wall at the transit stop on E. Maple west of Coolidge;

AND

Resolution approving funding in the amount of $23,290.00 for the purchase and installation of a new bus shelter at the existing SMART bus stop on the north side of E. Maple just west of Coolidge Highway;

AND

Resolution approving the appropriations and amendment to the 2019-2020 General Fund and Capital Projects Fund budgets.

E. Resolution approving the contract change amount with WCI Contractors, Inc. in the amount not to exceed $9,426.00, to be funded from account 401-751.001-981.0100 and further; approving the appropriation and amendment to the fiscal year 2019-2020 General Fund and Capital Projects Fund budgets.

F. Resolution confirming the City Manager’s authorization for an emergency expenditure pursuant to Sec. 2-286 of the City Code in the amount of $8,469.84 at the Chester Street parking garage to meet fire safety inspection requirement to be paid by account #585-538.008-977.0000

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Resolution endorsing the Maple Rd. streetscape design refinements implemented by the design team as presented.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Public Hearing of Confirmation for the Lakeview Ave. Paving Special Assessment District

1. Resolution ratifying and confirming Special Assessment Roll No. 893 to defray the cost of construction for Lakeview Avenue Paving, and directing the City Clerk to endorse said roll, showing the date of confirmation and to certify said assessment roll to the City Treasurer for collection at or near the time of construction of the improvement; and further, special assessments shall be payable in ten (10) payments as provided in Section 94-10 of the City Code with an annual interest rate of six and one quarter percent (6.25%) on all unpaid installments.

B. Resolution approving the following recommendations of the Multi-Modal Transportation Board:

1. The installation of improved pedestrian crossings at the intersections of Cranbrook Rd. at both Midvale Rd. and Middlebury Lane, to be included in the upcoming resurfacing project to be completed by the Road Commission for Oakland County.

2. To direct staff to apply for a Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) grant to obtain federal funds to cover up to 80% of the construction cost of multi-modal improvements to consist of:
a. The installation of a 10 ft. wide concrete mixed-use path for pedestrian and bicycle usage on the east side of Cranbrook Rd. from Midvale Rd. to Lincoln Ave., and on the west side of Cranbrook Rd. from Lincoln Ave. to 14 Mile Rd.

b. Extension of Neighborhood Connector Route signs and sharrow signs on Midvale Rd. from Cranbrook Rd. to Larchlea Rd.

c. The installation of 5 ft. wide concrete sidewalks on the east side of Cranbrook Rd. from Lincoln Ave. to Northlawn Dr., and on the south side of Lincoln Ave., from Cranbrook Rd. to Golfview Blvd.

d. The installation of a 5 ft. wide concrete sidewalk on the north side of 14 Mile Rd. from Crosswick Rd. to Cranbrook Rd. (Lincoln Hills Golf Course frontage).

C. Resolution accepting the recommendation of the Multi-Modal Transportation Board for traffic signal changes at the N. Old Woodward Ave. & Willits St./Oakland Blvd. intersection, to remove the permissive left turn phase for eastbound and westbound traffic and extending the protected left turn phase timing accordingly.

VII. REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS

IX. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

X. REPORTS

A. Commissioner Reports
   1. Notice of Intention to Appoint to the Design Review Board and Historical District Commission, the Board of Zoning Appeals, and the Multi-Modal Transportation Board on October 7, 2019

B. Commissioner Comments

C. Advisory Boards, Committees, Commissions’ Reports and Agendas

D. Legislation

E. City Staff
   1. Master Plan report, submitted by City Planner Ecker
   2. Street Lighting Update –Triangle District & Downtown, submitted by City Engineer O’Meara
   3. Parking Utilization report, submitted by Assistant City Manager Gunter

XI. ADJOURN

PLEASE NOTE: Due to building security, public entrance during non-business hours is through the Police Department – Pierce St. entrance only.

NOTICE: Individuals requiring accommodations, such as mobility, visual, hearing, interpreter or other assistance, for effective participation in this meeting should contact the City Clerk’s Office at (248) 530-1880 (voice), or (248) 644-5115 (TDD) at least one day in advance to request mobility, visual, hearing or other assistance.

Las personas que requieren alojamiento, tales como servicios de interpretación, la participación efectiva en esta reunión deben ponerse en contacto con la Oficina del Secretario Municipal al (248) 530-1880 por lo menos el día antes de la reunión pública. (Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964).
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO APPOINT TO THE MUSEUM BOARD

At the regular meeting of Monday, July 8, 2019, the Birmingham City Commission intends to appoint two regular members to the Museum Board to serve three-year terms to expire July 5, 2022.

Interested parties may submit an application available at the City Clerk's office on or before noon on Wednesday, July 3, 2019. These applications will appear in the public agenda for the regular meeting at which time the commission will discuss recommendations, and may make nominations and vote on appointments.

Board Duties
The Museum Board is charged with collecting, arranging, cataloguing and preserving historical material. The Board may locate and erect plaques or markers at historic sites, buildings or properties in the City of Birmingham with the consent of the owner or owners of any such property and subject to the approval of the City Commission with respect to properties that, in the opinion of the Board, have historic significance. Further, the Board shall have the power to develop, operate and maintain the Allen House as a museum and to exercise authority, control and management over the Hunter House and John West Hunter Memorial Park.

NOTE: All members of boards and commissions are subject to the provisions of City of Birmingham City Code Chapter 2, Article IX, Ethics and the filing of the Affidavit and Disclosure Statement.

Applicant(s) Presented For City Commission Consideration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th>Criteria/Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick J. Hughes</td>
<td>• Shall be qualified electors of the City and members of the Birmingham Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>915 Kennesaw</td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUGGESTED ACTION:
To confirm the City Manager's appointment of ________ to the Museum Board as a regular member who is a business owner to serve a three-year term to expire July 5, 2022.
MUSEUM BOARD

Chapter 62 - Section 62-26
Terms - Three years - expiring first Monday in July
Seven Members:  Six are electors and appointed by city commission
               One is owner of a business and appointed by the city manager

The Museum Board is charged with collecting, arranging, cataloguing and preserving historical material. The board may locate and erect plaques or markers at historic sites, buildings or properties in the City of Birmingham with the consent of the owner or owners of any such property and subject to the approval of the city commission with respect to properties that, in the opinion of the board, have historic significance. Further, the board shall have the power to develop, operate and maintain the Allen House as a museum and to exercise authority, control and management over the Hunter House and John West Hunter Memorial Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Home Address</th>
<th>Home Business</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Appointed</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>1460 Bennaville</td>
<td>(248) 642-2314</td>
<td><a href="mailto:russwdixon@aol.com">russwdixon@aol.com</a></td>
<td>11/24/2003</td>
<td>7/5/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historical Society Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haugen</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>1694 E. Melton Rd.</td>
<td>(248) 459-0589</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Daniel.L.Haugen@gmail.com">Daniel.L.Haugen@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>6/3/2019</td>
<td>7/5/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keefer</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>505 E. Lincoln, #4</td>
<td>(248) 249-0996</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jlwk2014@gmail.com">jlwk2014@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>7/11/2016</td>
<td>7/5/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krizanic</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>2450 Northlawn Blvd</td>
<td>(248) 644-2124</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tkrizanic8@gmail.com">tkrizanic8@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>1/26/2015</td>
<td>7/5/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historical Society Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Home Address</td>
<td>Business Phone</td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>Term Expires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logue</td>
<td>Marty</td>
<td>2010 Buckingham</td>
<td>(248) 649-4921</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gtfiers@comcast.net">gtfiers@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>9/26/2011</td>
<td>7/5/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosso</td>
<td>Caitlin</td>
<td>355 Columbia</td>
<td>(248) 229-4227</td>
<td><a href="mailto:caitlinrosso@maxbroock.com">caitlinrosso@maxbroock.com</a></td>
<td>9/21/2015</td>
<td>7/5/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/5/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddell</td>
<td>Meredith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/25/2019</td>
<td>12/31/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPLICATION FOR CITY BOARD OR COMMITTEE

Thank you for your interest in serving on a Board or Committee. The purpose of this form is to provide the City Commission with basic information about applicants considered for appointment. NOTE: Completed applications are included in the City Commission agenda packets. The information included on this form is open to the public. All Board and Committee members are subject to the provisions of the Ethics Ordinance (Chapter 2, Article IX of the City Code).

Information on various Boards and Committees and a list of current openings can be found on the City website at www.bhamgov.org/boardopportunities.

(Please print clearly)

Board/Committee of Interest: Museum Board
Specific Category/Vacancy on Board: Business Owner Position

Name: Patrick J. Hughes
Phone: 248.419.0470

Residential Address: 915 Kennesaw
Email: phughes@BrickStory.com
Residential City, Zip: Birmingham, 48009
Length of Residence: 9 yrs.

Business Address: 915 Kennesaw
Occupation: eCommerce Exec / Entrepreneur
Business City, Zip: Birmingham, 48009

Reason for Interest: Explain how your background and skills will enhance the board to which you have applied.

Passionate about local history. Experienced in historical homes, related dataset and community-based storytelling.

List your related employment experience: BrickStory - 4 years; historical/community data/information sharing, 80 yrs entrepreneur (hands on).

List your related community activities: Developing/Producing Docuseries that tells the story of the American home - various neighborhoods - Conkstown e.g.

List your related educational experience: University of Michigan - Mathematics + Economics / Stats

To the best of your knowledge, do you or a member of your immediate family have any direct financial or business relationships with any supplier, service provider or contractor of the City of Birmingham from which you or they derive direct compensation or financial benefit? If yes, please explain:

No

Do you currently have a relative serving on the board/committee to which you have applied? No

Are you an elector (registered voter) in the City of Birmingham? Yes

Signature of Applicant: [Signature]
Date: 7/27/19

Return the completed and signed application form to: City of Birmingham, City Clerk's Office, 151 Martin, Birmingham, MI 48009 or by email to crmysberge@bhamgov.org or by fax to 248.530.1080.

Updated 8/16/17
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO APPOINT TO THE ADVISORY PARKING COMMITTEE

At the regular meeting of Monday, August 5, 2019, the Birmingham City Commission intends to appoint three regular members to the Advisory Parking Committee to serve three-year terms expiring September 4, 2022. (a resident shopper, a resident, and a representative of a professional firm in the parking assessment district) one regular member who is a restaurant owner in the parking assessment district to serve the remainder of a three-year term to expire 9/4/2020, one regular member who is a building owner in the parking assessment district to serve the remainder of a three-year term to expire 9/4/2021, and one alternate member to serve the remainder of a three-year term to expire 9/4/2020.

Interested citizens may submit an application available at the City Clerk’s Office or online at www.bhamgov.org/boardopportunities. Applications must be submitted to the City Clerk’s Office on or before noon on Wednesday, July 31, 2019. These documents will appear in the public agenda for the regular meeting at which time the City Commission will discuss recommendations, and may make nominations and vote on appointments.

Committee Duties
The Advisory Parking Committee shall provide guidance to the City Commission in the management of Birmingham's Auto Parking System. The Committee shall recognize parking requirements of the CBD and fairly assess the costs to users. It will provide for attractive, maintained and safe facilities.

Applicant(s) Presented For City Commission Consideration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th>Criteria/Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Champagne</td>
<td>Downtown commercial large retail business. Resident Shopper in parking assessment district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Paskiewicz</td>
<td>Resident who does not qualify under the following categories: downtown commercial representative of large retail, small retail, a professional firm, a building owner, a restaurant owner, or a downtown employee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: All members of boards and commissions are subject to the provisions of City of Birmingham City Code Chapter 2, Article IX, Ethics and the filing of the Affidavit and Disclosure Statement.
SUGGESTED ACTION:

To appoint _____ to the Advisory Parking Committee as a regular member who is a resident shopper within the parking assessment district to serve a three-year term to expire September 4, 2022.

To appoint _____ to the Advisory Parking Committee as a regular member who is a resident who does not qualify under the following categories: downtown commercial representative of large retail, small retail, a professional firm, a building owner, a restaurant owner, or a downtown employee to serve a three-year term to expire September 4, 2022.
ADVISORY PARKING COMMITTEE


Terms: Three years
Appointment requirements for regular members: The majority of the members shall be residents and membership shall be as follows:
- Downtown commercial representatives - large retail - 1 member; small retail - 1 member;
- professional firm - 1 member; building owner - 1 member; restaurant owner - 1 member;
- downtown employee representative - 1 member; residential - two members who do not qualify
under any of the previous categories, and one resident shopper.

2 alternate members may be appointed who own property, own a business or work in the parking assessment district.

The Advisory Parking Committee shall provide guidance to the City Commission in the management of Birmingham's Auto Parking System. The committee shall recognize parking requirements of the CBD and fairly assess the costs to users. It will provide for attractive, maintained and safe facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Home Address</th>
<th>Business Address</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>E-Mail Address</th>
<th>Appointed</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Champagne</td>
<td>Gayle</td>
<td>833 Hazel</td>
<td>Birmingham 48009</td>
<td>(248) 978-5581</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gcchampagne1@aol.com">gcchampagne1@aol.com</a></td>
<td>6/6/2016</td>
<td>9/4/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honhart</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>197 E. Frank</td>
<td>Birmingham 48009</td>
<td>(248) 644-3678</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ahonhart@atlaswelding.com">ahonhart@atlaswelding.com</a></td>
<td>9/4/1984</td>
<td>9/4/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalcynski</td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>100 Townsend</td>
<td>Birmingham 48009</td>
<td>(248) 642-7900</td>
<td><a href="mailto:skalczynski@yahoo.com">skalczynski@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>11/26/2012</td>
<td>9/4/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krueger</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>348 Ferndale Ave</td>
<td>Birmingham 48009</td>
<td>(248) 921-0099</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lisakrug21@gmail.com">lisakrug21@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/30/2015</td>
<td>9/4/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Home Address</td>
<td>Business Address</td>
<td>Home Phone</td>
<td>Home E-Mail</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>Term Expires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paskiewicz</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>560 Woodland</td>
<td>Birmingham 48009</td>
<td>248-642-3337</td>
<td><a href="mailto:judithpaskiewicz@hotmail.com">judithpaskiewicz@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>1/28/2013</td>
<td>9/4/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/4/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/4/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/4/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/4/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaitas</td>
<td>Algirdas</td>
<td>2633 Endsleigh Drive</td>
<td>Bloomfield Village 48301</td>
<td>(248) 593-3177</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alvortho@aol.com">alvortho@aol.com</a></td>
<td>11/13/2006</td>
<td>9/4/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yert</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>490 Park St.</td>
<td>Birmingham 48009</td>
<td>617-308-0080</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sulesq@yahoo.com">sulesq@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>8/13/2018</td>
<td>9/4/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CITY BOARD/COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE RECORD

**Name of Board:**  
Advisory Parking Committee  
Members Required for Quorum: 4  
**Year:** 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER NAME</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEPT</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>MTG</th>
<th>MTG</th>
<th>Mtgs.</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGULAR MEMBERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champagne, Gayle</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honhart, Anne</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalczynski, Steven</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krueger, Lisa</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paskiewicz, Judith</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaitas, Al</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yert, Jennifer (8/2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Present or Available:**  

|     | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**KEY:**  
- A = Member absent  
- P = Member present or available  
- CP = Member available, but meeting canceled for lack of quorum  
- CA = Member not available and meeting was canceled for lack of quorum  
- NA = Member not appointed at that time  
- NM = No meeting scheduled that month  
- CM = Meeting canceled for lack of business items

[Signature]

Department Head's Signature
APPLICATION FOR CITY BOARD OR COMMITTEE

Thank you for your interest in serving on a Board or Committee. The purpose of this form is to provide the City Commission with basic information about applicants considered for appointment. NOTE: Completed applications are included in the City Commission agenda packets. The information included on this form is open to the public. All Board and Committee members are subject to the provisions of the Ethics Ordinance (Chapter 2, Article IX of the City Code).

Information on various Boards and Committees and a list of current openings can be found on the City website at www.bhamgov.org/boardopportunities.

(Please print clearly)

Board/Committee of Interest

Specific Category/Vacancy on Board

Resident Shopper

Name

Gayle Champagne

Residential Address

833 Hazel

Residential City, Zip

Birmingham 48009

Business Address


Business City, Zip


Reason for Interest: Explain how your background and skills will enhance the board to which you have applied

been on this committee for 5 yrs

List your related employment experience

Sales

List your related community activities

Volunteer: Dog Rescue

List your related educational experience

BS Education

BS Dental Hygiene

To the best of your knowledge, do you or a member of your immediate family have any direct financial or business relationships with any supplier, service provider or contractor of the City of Birmingham from which you or they derive direct compensation or financial benefit? If yes, please explain:

Yes

Do you currently have a relative serving on the board/committee to which you have applied? No

Are you an elector (registered voter) in the City of Birmingham? Yes

Signature of Applicant

Date

Return the completed and signed application form to: City of Birmingham, City Clerk's Office, 151 Martin, Birmingham, MI 48009 or by email to cmy*((b)h*amgov.org or by fax to 248.530.1080.
APPLICATION FOR CITY BOARD OR COMMITTEE

Thank you for your interest in serving on a Board or Committee. The purpose of this form is to provide basic information about applicants considered for appointment. NOTE: Completed information is included in the City Commission agenda packets. The information included on this form is open to the public and Committee members are subject to the provisions of the Ethics Ordinance (Chapter 2, Article IX of the City Code). Information on various Boards and Committees can be found on the www.bhamgov.org/boardopportunities website.

(Please print clearly)

Board/Committee of Interest: Parking Advisory Board
Specific Category/Vacancy on Board: Resident

Name: Judith Poskiewicz
Residential Address: 560 Woodland
Residential City, Zip: Birmingham MI 48009
Business Address: 600 N. Old Woodward
Business City, Zip: Birmingham MI 48009

Phone: 248-535-8898
Email: judithposkiewicz@outlook.com
Length of Residence: 20 years
Occupation: Psychologist

Reason for Interest: Explain how your background and skills will enhance the board to which you have applied. Have you lived and worked in the "near downtown" area for many years and do you have an understanding of the needs of residents, businesses, customers and visitors? List your related employment experience. In my work, I practice being a careful and responsive listener, and I value the concerns and viewpoints of others. I have developed strong problem-solving skills. I also... bring these skills to my work on the Board.

Professional Representative: Judith Poskiewicz

List your related community activities: Board members of various boards...

List your related educational experience: M.S.W. (Social Work), Ph.D (Clinical Psychology)

To the best of your knowledge, do you or a member of your immediate family have any direct financial relationships with any supplier, service provider or contractor of the City of Birmingham from which you receive compensation or financial benefit? If yes, please explain: No

Do you currently have a relative serving on the board/committee to which you have applied? No

Are you an elector (registered voter) in the City of Birmingham? Yes

Judith Poskiewicz 9/4/2019
BIRMINGHAM CITY COMMISSION MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 16, 2019
MUNICIPAL BUILDING, 151 MARTIN
7:30 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Pattie Bordman, Mayor, 7:30 pm

II. ROLL CALL

PRESENT:
Mayor Bordman
Mayor Pro Tem Boutros
Commissioner DeWeese
Commissioner Harris
Commissioner Hoff
Commissioner Nickita
Commissioner Sherman

ABSENT: None

ADMINISTRATION: City Manager Valentine, City Attorney Currier, Deputy Clerk Arft, Human Resource Manager Myers, City Engineer O'Meara, Assistant Engineer Fletcher, DPS Director Wood, DPS Manager Filipski, Police Chief Clemence, Finance Director Gerber, Assistant Planner Dupuis, Building Official Johnson, IT Director Brunk, Library Director Koschik, Assistant Library Director Craft

III. PROCLAMATIONS, CONGRATULATORY RESOLUTIONS, AWARDS, APPOINTMENTS, RESIGNATIONS AND CONFIRMATIONS, ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS, INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.

09-209-19 ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- Mayor Bordman announced that the City of Birmingham received a fabulous award on September 16, 2019. The award will be placed in Lot #6/The Farmers’ Market Lot for the beautiful landscaping that was redone due to the changes in the lot to correct water runoff. It has a landing spot that has two benches and is a great spot to sit on the river year round. In addition, Plant Michigan Green Community Landscape Beautification Award was presented to the City; the plaque will be placed in City Hall. The competition was the entire State of Michigan and the other winners in Southeast Michigan were District Detroit, Bedrock Detroit, and The RiverWalk in Detroit. Included with the award and plaque was a proclamation from the State of Michigan signed by Mari Manoogian, State Representative, Mallory McMorrow, State Senator, Garlin Gilchrist, II, Lieutenant Governor, and Gretchen Whitmer, Governor congratulating the City of Birmingham on this award. She attributed this success to the City Staff who executed the project. The mayor further commented “Yeah for Birmingham”.

4A
• Mayor Bordman reported on this year’s Sister city Good Will Mission to Japan illustrated by a slide show:
  o 53rd Year that Birmingham had a sister city in Shiga Prefecture.
  o A delegation of 3 Mayors, 15 Cities, and 30 participants. Mayor Bordman and Her husband represented Birmingham.
  o An impactful and interesting experience.
  o Home stay with a gracious family.
  o Shiga Prefecture was chosen for Michigan because they have Lake Bewa, the largest freshwater lake in Japan and Michigan has Lake Michigan. Lake Bewa is 1/86 the size of Lake Michigan.
  o Miho Museum, designed by IM Pei.
  o Ischia Madeira Temple
  o Everyone had to wear slippers wherever they went. Street shoes did not go inside.
  o Host family was Shatoshi and Yoshiko Fujisake; the man of the house is a monk and attached to the house is a temple. He even rang a gigantic gong daily at 7:00a.m.
  o The Japanese ate octopus on a Stick.
  o Greeted at City Hall by the entire staff and the Office of Mayor was applauded. It was a heartfelt experience for Mayor Bordman.
  o There was a gift exchange which the City of Birmingham received a plate with a picture of Mount Fuji and a box of good luck charms from the City of Ritto. Mayor Bordman was honored with a wooden lamp made by the Mayor of Ritto’s father.
  o She visited the Ramen Noodle factory where 4 million units a day are made for Japanese consumption only. They also have plants in California and Pennsylvania.
  o A party was given in honor of Mayor Bordman.
  o Farewell Luncheon for all of the participants.
  o Fantastic Cultural Exchange Program with Ritto, Japan.
  o The City does not expense this program.

• On Thursday, September 19th, at 7:00 PM, the Museum’s Fall Lecture Series featuring Birmingham’s First Families will begin at the Baldwin Public Library’s Jean Lloyd Room. The first presentation by Museum Director Leslie Pielack is entitled, “The Allens and the New City”, which explores how Harry and Marion Allen ushered in the change from rural village to modern city in the early 20th century. The lecture is free, but please register online at the library’s website.

• On Saturday, September 21st, at 1:00 PM, the Friends of the Birmingham Museum will host the popular annual Fall Greenwood Cemetery Tour, which focuses on Birmingham’s pioneers. $10 per person, $5 per student, and families $20. Meet at the east gate; no parking is available in the cemetery.

• Head to Beverly Park on September 28th for the third annual Read in the Park. Meet authors, walk the Storybook Trail, and enjoy beautiful Beverly Park. At 1:30 PM hear New York Times bestselling author Michael Zadoorian speak about his life and writing career. At 3:00 PM visit with beloved children’s author Kelly DiPucchio for a special story time.

• The City of Birmingham has recently been recognized as one of the Safest Cities to Live in Michigan for 2019 by BackgroundChecks.org. This organization establishes a safety index, which measures the safety of a given community based on crime rates and the size of its police force. Birmingham ranked 8th overall for the state and is a testament to the
fine services our police department provides. Mayor Bordman recognized the Police Chief for this achievement.

09-210-19 APPOINTMENTS TO THE ADVISORY PARKING COMMITTEE
The City Commission planned to interview current members:
1. Gayle Champagne - Resident Shopper – Not present
2. Judith Paskiewicz – Resident (unable to attend)
Commissioner Hoff expressed that she does not know Gayle Champagne and expected to interview her prior to appointment. However, she did know Judith Paskiewicz. Ms. Paskiewicz served with Commissioner Nickita and Commissioner Hoff on the Parking Development Committee. In her role, she was very involved and interested. Commissioner Hoff felt that the commission should be consistent and either have both come back for an interview or make both appointments tonight.

Mayor Bordman suggested putting off these appointments until the candidates for the Advisory Parking Committee are available to attend an interview. There were no objections by the Commission.

09-211-19 APPOINTMENT TO THE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
The City Commission interviewed current member Natalia Dukas.

MOTION: Motion by Nickita:
To appoint Natalia Dukas as a regular member to the Historic District Commission to serve a three-year term to expire September 25, 2022.

VOTE: Yeas, 7
Nays, 0

Deputy City Clerk Arft administered the Oath of Office to Ms. Dukas. Ms. Dukas was advised that she would not need to return for the DRB component.

09-212-19 APPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS, ALTERNATE
The City Commission interviewed the following applicants.
1. Adam Rubin
2. George (Jerry) Attia

MOTION: Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Boutros:
To appoint George (Jerry) Attia as an alternate member to the Board of Zoning Appeals to serve a three-year term to expire February 17, 2020.

VOTE: Yeas, 7
Nays, 0

Deputy City Clerk Arft administered the Oath of Office to Mr. Attia.

09-213-19 APPOINTMENT OF HEARING OFFICER, ALTERNATE
The City Commission interviewed applicant G. Michael Wooley
MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Hoff:
To appoint G. Michael Wooley as an alternate to the Hearing Officer, to serve a three-year term to expire June 30, 2021.

VOTE: Yeas, 7
Nays, 0

Deputy City Clerk Arft administered the Oath of Office to Mr. Wooley.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA
All items listed on the consent agenda are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion and approved by a roll call vote. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a commissioner or citizen so requests, in which event the item will be removed from the general order of business and considered either immediately following the vote on the Consent Agenda or under the last item of new business.

09-214-19 APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

The following items were removed from the Consent Agenda:


Commissioner Hoff: Item I - Resolution approving Kenning Park Ballfield #4 Modification Contract Award

Mayor Bordman: Recusal from Item A - Resolution approving the Regular City Commission meeting minutes of August 19, 2019 due to absence.

Commissioner Harris: Recusal from Item A - Resolution approving the Regular City Commission meeting minutes of August 19, 2019 due to absence.
Recusal from Item U - Resolution approving Kenning Park Ballfield #4 Modification Contract Award due to his Little League Affiliation.

Commissioner Nickita: Recusal from Item A - Resolution approving the Regular City Commission meeting minutes of August 19, 2019 due to absence.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Sherman, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Boutros:
To approve the Consent Agenda, excluding Items I and U, and noting recusals.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Commissioner Sherman
Mayor Pro Tem Boutros
Commissioner Hoff
Mayor Bordman
Commissioner Nickita
Commissioner Harris
Commissioner DeWeese

Nays: None
Absent: None
A. Resolution approving the Regular City Commission meeting minutes of August 19, 2019
B. Resolution approving the warrant list, including Automated Clearing House payments, dated August 21, 2019 in the amount of $733,242.11.
C. Resolution approving the warrant list, including Automated Clearing House payments, dated August 28, 2019 in the amount of $10,862,758.68.
D. Resolution approving the warrant list, including Automated Clearing House payments, dated September 4, 2019 in the amount of $3,374,117.29.
E. Resolution approving the warrant list, including Automated Clearing House payments, dated September 11, 2019 in the amount of $26,967,337.90.
F. Resolution approving the purchase of one (1) LCT600 model ODB Extreme-Vac and two (2) 9’ debris boxes from Bell Equipment Company through the Sourcewell/NJPA cooperative purchasing contract #041217-ODB in the amount of $76,220.47 from account #641-441.006.971.0100.
G. Resolution approving the purchase of one 2020 Chevrolet Tahoe police patrol unit through the Oakland County extendable purchasing contract #05218 in the amount of $36,896.00 from account #641-441.006.971.0100.
H. Resolution approving the purchase of one 2020 Ford Explorer Police Interceptor from Gorno Ford through the Oakland County extendable purchasing contract #OAK-4944 in the amount of $35,080.00 from account #641-441.006.971.0100.
J. Resolution approving the purchase of a new John Deere 1575 commercial mower from Deere & Company, using MI-Deal Contract #071B7700085 extendable purchasing pricing for a total expenditure of $32,455.72. Funds for this purchase are available in the Auto Equipment Fund, account #641.441.006-971.0100.
K. Resolution approving the purchase of (1) Polaris Ranger 1000 EPS Northstar Edition from Ball Equipment; further charging this expenditure in the amount of $23,144.00 to the Automobile Parking System capital outlay account # 585-305.000-971.0100.
L. Resolution approving the contract for 2019-20 handwork pavement markings with Hart Pavement Striping Corporation in the amount of $107,200.00 for combined fall 2019 and spring 2020 applications; further approving the contract for 2019-20 pavement marking longlines with PK Contracting, Inc. in the amount of $10,027.00 for spring 2020; further authorizing and directing the mayor and city clerk to sign the agreements on behalf of the city; further authorizing these budgeted expenditures from account number 202-303-001-937.0200.
M. Resolution approving the service agreement with Duke’s Root Control, Inc. of Syracuse, NY for the treatment of sanitary sewer root growth in an amount not to exceed $100,000.00 from account #509-536.002-811.0000.
N. Resolution approving the cost sharing agreement with the Road Commission for Oakland County, agreeing to pay the City of Birmingham’s share of the cost to replace the traffic
signal at the intersection of 14 Mile Rd. and Greenfield Rd., at an estimated cost of $27,500 to be charged to account number 202-303.001-971.0100.

O. Resolution approving the 2019 Emergency Management Performance Grant and federal funds for $22,686.00. Further, directing the Mayor to sign the agreement on behalf of the City and any required quarterly reports or surveys associated with the grant.

P. Resolution approving a purchase of a LIFEPAK 15 v4 defibrillator plus accessories from Stryker in the amount of $33,033.30 from account #101-336.000-971.0100 and further approving the appropriation and amendment to the 2019-2020 General Fund budget.

Q. Resolution approving the revised contract with SMART year 2020; and further directing the Mayor to sign the Municipal Credit and Community Credit contract for fiscal year 2020 on behalf of the City.

R. Resolution authorizing the IT department to purchase 95 block hours of GIS support from Geographic Information Services, Inc. 2100 Riverchase Center, Suite 105, Birmingham, AL 35244, the total purchase not to exceed $15,000.00. Funds are available in the IT GIS fund account # 636-228.000-973.0500.

S. Resolution approving an adjustment in Election Inspector compensation to $16.50/hour for a Super Chair, $13.00/hour for a Chairperson, $12.00/hour for a Vice Chair, $11.00/hour for an Inspector, and $20.00 for a 2-hour training session.

T. Resolution approving a special event permit as requested by the Lutheran Church of the Redeemer to display the Christmas Nativity in Shain Park beginning November 27, 2019 through December 31, 2019 contingent upon compliance with all permit and insurance requirements and payment of all fees and, further, pursuant to any minor modifications that may be deemed necessary by administrative staff at the time of the event.

V. Resolution adopting the Michigan Local Agency Pavement Warranty Program resolution in accordance with MCL 247.663. **AND**

Resolution agreeing to implement the Local Agency Pavement Warranty Program and annually report in accordance with the law.

W. Resolution authorizing the City’s compliance with the provisions of State of Michigan Public Act 152 of 2011, by exercising the City’s option to exempt itself from the requirements of the Act; and further, directing the City Engineer and Finance Director to sign and submit the required form to MDOT.


Y. Resolution setting Monday, October 7, 2019 at 7:30 PM for a public hearing to consider approval of a Special Land Use Permit and Final Site Plan and Design Review for 117 Willits to allow the operation of three new food and drink establishments Shift / Sidecar /Slice,
serving alcoholic liquors, in accordance with Article 7, Section 7.34 of the Zoning Ordinance.

09-215-19 (ITEM I) KENNING PARK BALLFIELD #4 MODIFICATION CONTRACT AWARD
Commissioner Hoff thought the public should be aware of this project and felt it was appropriate to bring this item forward. She asked Lauren Woods to explain why it is on the Consent Agenda Tonight.

- A Modification to field #4 that was necessary due to the easterly fields being reconstructed.
- Minimize the cost by using staff for some demolition required to modify the field and keeping majority of outfield fencing.
- Received competitive pricing from existing contractor.
- Commissioner Hoff asked if the same contractor that did the other two ball fields is doing the work on this project. Ms. Woods affirmed.
- Commissioner Harris asked if the part of the initial project that included scoreboards was in jeopardy. Ms. Wood affirmed that it is true with the input of Little League who asked the City to hold off on the boards because they were unhappy with the ones that were specified in the plans. The boards that they wanted were pricier and decided to phase into the project in spring or fall when funds may be available to contribute towards the scoreboards.
- Mayor Bordman expressed that the Birmingham Little League Association is very involved in this project, contributing $315,000.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Hoff, seconded by Commissioner DeWeese:
To approve the resolution awarding the Kenning Park Ballfield #4 modification to WCI Contractors, Inc. in an amount not to exceed $55,100.00, to be funded from account 401-751.001-981.0100 and further; approving the appropriation and amendment to the fiscal year 2019-2020 General Fund and Capital Projects Fund budgets.

VOTE: Ayes, 7
Nays, 0

09-216-19 (ITEM U) SPECIAL EVENT – ART BIRMINGHAM 2020
Mayor Pro Tem Boutros asked if the applicant was aware that the closure of the Maple Road due to an existing project; if so, what measures are being taken.

- Annie VanGelderan, Birmingham Bloomfield Art Center, expressed that the biggest concern is parking.
- Five complimentary valet stations have been added to accommodate art fair patrons. The cost would be covered by the BBAC.
- Mayor Pro Tem Boutros felt that the patrons would not be able to access the stores on Maple and asked if it would be difficult to postpone the event or skip a year.
- Annie affirmed that it would be difficult due to the established art fair circuit and postponing would cause a loss of prominent artists and the quality of the fair would be compromised.
- Commissioner Hoff asked if the current map of road closures reflect reality due to the construction projects scheduled for the assigned weekend. She also asked for a project status report for spring 2020 to have an idea of how to schedule events.
• Commissioner Harris was concerned about the ability to get into the City with the assigned construction and the proposed street closures by Art Birmingham; and suggested that the fair location be moved to another part of town.
• Mayor Bordman suggested that Annie meet with City Manager Valentine and other staff to work out the best solution to accommodate the Art Fair of 2020 and bring the resolution back later.
• Commissioner Sherman expressed that he will have the same concerns with the Chamber Carnival as well.
• Commissioner Nickita commented that Birmingham has two art fairs per year, and suggested that an Ad Hoc Committee, as an opportunity to strengthen the circumstance and utilize other parts of the City, evaluate them.
• Commissioner DeWeese expressed that location is the issue and suggested the area south of the 555 Building down to Lincoln would be a solution. He further commented that Old Woodward only has merchants on one side of the street and there would be less impact.
• Karen Daskas, Tender, appreciates arts fairs but asked if two art fairs are needed and reflected that the one on Mother’s Day weekend has a negative impact on the retail businesses who serve the community six days a week annually. She volunteered to meet with the BSD to provide input and express the retail community’s concerns about this event.

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

VI. NEW BUSINESS

09-217-19   PUBLIC HEARING – LAKEVIEW AVE. PAVING

Mayor Bordman opened the public hearing at 8:36 p.m.

Assistant City Engineer Fletcher presented the item explaining the process/policy to the residents in the affected area. There were over 30 people who attended the meeting on July 16, 2019 and as of today there are enough residents in favor of the potential project.

Commissioner Hoff wanted to confirm that all commissioners have the same materials relative to the project; Mr. Fletcher affirmed that everyone had the revision reflecting 53.8% by parcel and 52.4% by frontage.

Mayor Bordman commented that all materials sent to the Commission had been read and that she actually drove down Lakeview as well. She further expressed that several commissioners, including herself, live on unimproved streets. The following members of the public spoke:

**In Favor**

Mary Ellen and Carl Lyngaas, Lakeview and Vinewood
Louise and Todd Emerson, 611 and 619 Lakeview
Julie Hollinshead, 590 Lakeview
Chris Walton, 608 Lakeview
Margie Duncan, 540 Lakeview
Peter Hollinshead, 590 Lakeview
Sara Juarez, 591 Lakeview
Rob Lavoie, 555 Lakeview
Christina McKenna Walton, 608 Lakeview

**Not In Favor**

Dave Lurie, 755 Lakeview
Dave Potts, 530 Lakeview
David Louwers, 859 Lakeview
Don Schiemann, 784 Lakeview
Franklin Hamilton, 587 Lakeview
Mayor Bordman closed the public hearing at 9:08 p.m.

- Commissioner Hoff asked the status of the Street Improvements Ad Hoc Committee. City Manager Valentine replied that it would be another 5 - 6 months before a recommendation would come before this commission. She further asked what the difference between asphalt vs. concrete is. Mr. Fletcher explained the lifecycle and cost of each material. The City would be responsible for maintenance. She also asked how the materials are decided. City Manager Valentine replied that the current policy is concrete; if a different recommendation comes before the commission then they would have an opportunity to amend the policy.
- DeWeese asked if there were ways to pour concrete and not have it to look white. City Manager Valentine expressed that the concrete would have to be dyed and it would likely yield unfavorable results.
- Commissioner Harris asked if improved streets create safety issues. Police Chief Clemence knows of no data that suggest improvements would create safety hazards. Commissioner Harris also asked how soon the liens would be applied in response to the assessment related to the street improvement. City Attorney Currier expressed that the liens are placed as soon as the tax roll is confirmed. The liens are discharged as the assessments are paid.
- Commissioner Hoff asked if property owners could pay the assessment off earlier than the 10 years allotted. City Attorney Currier affirmed that it could be done.
- Mayor Pro Tem Boutros is a member of the Ad Hoc Committee. He expressed that the neighbors disagreeing with each other bothered him. He also felt that cape sealing is not a solution. He is in favor of moving forward to approve this resolution.
- Commissioner Nickita asked how many improved roads have been concrete. Assistant City Engineer Fletcher confirmed that all have been concrete since he has been with the City of Birmingham. Asphalt has been explored but not implemented into policy. He also asked if the infrastructure is addressed when a street is cape sealed. Mr. Fletcher said no, it is not.
- Commissioner Hoff commented on the practice of improving the streets when the appropriate number of residents come before the commission. In this instance, she is concerned about the swings in the number of residents that support the improvements.
- Mayor Bordman explained that people have moved in or out, illness and death, or simply changed their minds.

**MOTION:** Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Boutros, seconded by Commissioner Harris:
To approve the resolution authorizing necessity for the paving of Lakeview Avenue from Harmon Street to Oak Avenue and adopt the resolution for this project.

James Gorman, 739 Lakeview, has his house on the market and is subject to lose $30,000 in the sale due to the improvements. He expressed that the process is broken and have pitted neighbor against neighbor, urging the City to fix this process.
Dave Potts responded to the Mayor's question of how this happened. It was simply old-fashioned arm twisting, neighbor against neighbor, people in sideboards, people knocking on doors, and pitting idea against idea creating hostility.

Vote: Ayes, 7
Nays, 0

Mayor Bordman called for a 2-minute break dismissing the public if they chose to leave at 9:29p.m. Mayor Bordman reconvened the meeting at 9:31p.m.

09-218-19 BALDWIN PUBLIC LIBRARY YOUTH SERVICES EXPANSION & RENOVATION

Doug Koschik, Library Director, presented this item.

John Gardner, LZG Architects, presented the technical data.

- Commissioner Nickita addressed the architect about the preferred glass vs the recommendation, asking if the Guardian Clear is clearer. In terms of visibility, what is the difference? Guardian Clear has low e coding and reduces visibility without protection from ultraviolet rays increasing the heat gain in the summer and easy release of the heat in the winter.
- Commissioner Hoff asked what happened to change the specifications. Bruce Johnson explained that the ordinance changed for the glazing since the Adult Services renovation project.
- Mayor Pro Tem Boutros asked for clarification of the ordinance that he felt did not apply to the library. Clear windows apply to the retail section of the city and not the Library because it is a public building. Commissioner Hoff agreed.
- Commissioner DeWeese expressed that it makes sense, in terms of integrity to keep the same glass. When discussing UV, it has an impact on materials. While desiring clear windows in the retail environment, the counter-effects are not wanted. He would support the motion tonight.
- Commissioner Nickita believes that all ordinances should be adhered to whether or not the buildings are public or private; unless there is a distinctive reason not to do so. He further said that historically, clear glass is the standard in urban retail conditions; as illustrated across the world.
- Mayor Bordman inquired about the bird-friendly option for glass. She was told that it would be an additional $26,000 added to the project. The project is currently over-budget and there is no funding available to support the cost of bird friendly glass and no clear answer to the number of bird attacks that may be averted.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Nickita, seconded by Commissioner Hoff:
To approve the use of the originally specified glazing in the construction documents approved for the Baldwin Public Library Youth Services Expansion & Renovation.

VOTE: Aye, 7
Nay, 0
09-219-19  2019-20 COMPENSATION RECOMMENDATIONS
Ben Myers, Human Resource Manager, presented the item.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Sherman, seconded by Commissioner DeWeese:
To approve the recommendation by the Human Resources Department to implement a 2% salary table adjustment and in-range adjustments based upon performance for full-time and part-time employees in the Department Head and Administrative/Management classifications effective July 1, 2019.

**AND**
To approve the recommendation by the Human Resources Department to implement the 2% performance increment through June 30, 2020 with individual eligibility to be in accordance with the merit increase guidelines.

**AND**
To approve the transfer of the necessary funds by the Finance Department to the respective departmental personnel accounts.

**VOTE:**
Ayes, 7  
Nays, 0

09-220-19  APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CITY CLERK

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Sherman, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Boutros:  
To approve the resolution appointing Cheryl Arft as Acting City Clerk during the selection of a City Clerk of Birmingham.

**VOTE:**
Ayes, 7  
Nays, 0

VII. REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS

IX. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Mary Ryan Taras, 424 Baldwin, commented that the last time she addressed the Commission was right after someone shot a gun into the air on Old Woodward. Residents came to speak item and were told to wait. After waiting until the end of the agenda, she spoke on returning the City to some civility. She made a comment that the Commissioners goals were to make Birmingham a destination rather than a community. She then went on to talk about democratic processes and how should a popularly elected government function in terms of its citizens. She reminded the commission that people must be able to speak and have a right to petition the government for a redress of grievances. She believes the wait for public comment is unreasonable. Ms. Taras urged the Commission to open public comment at the beginning of the meeting. She further expressed that all speech at the Commission Meeting is political and comment by the public is in turn political; therefore, she asked the body to honor democratic principles and allow people to speak.

Clinton Baller, 822 Shirley, reported on the federal case that involve him and David Bloom. Mr. Baller and Mr. Bloom are seeking an injunction to halt certain behaviors by the City. They sued
the City to protect the rights of everyone. Mr. Baller closed by saying that Birmingham residents deserve to know the cost of defending this lawsuit and what is the end game.

David Bloom, Birmingham resident, reported on legal arguments held in federal court last week. He believes that the lawsuit is so important because it concerns a violation of the first amendment. It is his hope that Birmingham will have a new City Commission in November and begin restoring public trust.

Matt Wilde, 975 Madison, commented that Birmingham is one of the best cities in the state and he loves it here. He thanked the Commission for the great work that they do for the City. He would like to see the community re-united.

X. REPORTS

A. Commissioner Reports
   1. Intention to Appoint to the Board of Zoning Appeals and the Multi-Modal Transportation Board (Alternate member) on October 7, 2019.

B. Commissioner Comments

C. Advisory Boards, Committees, Commissions’ Reports and Agendas

D. Legislation

E. City Staff
   1. City Manager Valentine acknowledged that Commissioner Nickita received the 2019 Charles Blessing Award and Commissioner DeWeese is one of four people being inducted into the 2019 United State Track and Field National Officials Hall of Fame.

XI. ADJOURN

10:18 pm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check Number</th>
<th>Early Release</th>
<th>Vendor #</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>268717</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000855</td>
<td>48TH DISTRICT COURT</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268718</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000855</td>
<td>48TH DISTRICT COURT</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268719</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000855</td>
<td>48TH DISTRICT COURT</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268720</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>A &amp; B MODERN HOMES LLC</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268722</td>
<td></td>
<td>008106</td>
<td>ACUSHNET COMPANY</td>
<td>644.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268723</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007266</td>
<td>AETNA BEHAVIORAL HEALTH LLC</td>
<td>454.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268724</td>
<td></td>
<td>003708</td>
<td>AIRGAS USA, LLC</td>
<td>225.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268725</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALBAUGH MASONRY STONE AND TILE</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268726</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>002670</td>
<td>MIKE ALBRECHT</td>
<td>136.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268727</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALCO GLASS &amp; MIRROR INC</td>
<td>656.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268728</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>009117</td>
<td>ALL CITY DOGS INC</td>
<td>1,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268730</td>
<td></td>
<td>006686</td>
<td>ALLTRONICS SYSTEMS LTD</td>
<td>520.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268731</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000161</td>
<td>ALPHA PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES PC</td>
<td>695.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268732</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>APCOR CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268733</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008977</td>
<td>JOBMATCH LLC DBA APPLICANTPRO</td>
<td>239.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268734</td>
<td></td>
<td>007479</td>
<td>ASB DISTRIBUTORS</td>
<td>52.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268735</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>270.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268736</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>228.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268737</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>281.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268738</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006759</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>79.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268739</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>004027</td>
<td>AUTOMATED BENEFIT SVCS INC</td>
<td>7,161.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268740</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>AVER SIGN COMPANY</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268743</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008009</td>
<td>TREVOR BAKER</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268744</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>BALBES CUSTOM BUILDERS INC</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268746</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>003839</td>
<td>MATTHEW J. BARTALINO</td>
<td>27.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268747</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>009042</td>
<td>RANDY BEARDEN</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268748</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>002231</td>
<td>BILLINGS LAWN EQUIPMENT INC.</td>
<td>170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268750</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>BLOOMFIELD CONSTRUCTION CO</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268751</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>BLUMKE INSTALLATIONS</td>
<td>163.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268752</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006953</td>
<td>JACQUELYN BRITO</td>
<td>47.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268753</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>BUTCHER &amp; BUTCHER CONSTRUCTION COMP</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268754</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008658</td>
<td>BWMS-BLUE WATER MGMT INC</td>
<td>330.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268755</td>
<td></td>
<td>003907</td>
<td>CADILLAC ASPHALT, LLC</td>
<td>7,937.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268756</td>
<td></td>
<td>007933</td>
<td>CARDNO, INC.</td>
<td>3,178.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268757</td>
<td></td>
<td>005238</td>
<td>CBTs</td>
<td>5,316.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268760</td>
<td></td>
<td>007134</td>
<td>CERTIFIED POWER, INC</td>
<td>(1,006.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268761</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007744</td>
<td>MOHAMED F. CHAMMAA</td>
<td>39.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268762</td>
<td></td>
<td>000912</td>
<td>MARK CLEMENCE</td>
<td>193.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268763</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>004026</td>
<td>COFINITY</td>
<td>1,422.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268765</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008955</td>
<td>COMCAST</td>
<td>256.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Number</td>
<td>Early Release</td>
<td>Vendor #</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268766</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000627</td>
<td>CONSUMERS ENERGY</td>
<td>254.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268767</td>
<td></td>
<td>002668</td>
<td>CONTRACTORS CLOTHING CO</td>
<td>297.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268768</td>
<td></td>
<td>008582</td>
<td>CORE &amp; MAIN LP</td>
<td>314.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CRANBROOK CONTRACTUAL SERVICES</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268770</td>
<td></td>
<td>009119</td>
<td>CRITTER CONTROL OPERATIONS, INC</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268771</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>009061</td>
<td>MICHAEL A. CRUCIANO</td>
<td>59.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DCM INC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268774</td>
<td></td>
<td>008005</td>
<td>DE LAGE LANDEN FINANCIAL SVCS INC</td>
<td>173.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268776</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006907</td>
<td>DENTEMAX, LLC</td>
<td>142.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISPLAYMIX ADVERTISING</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DMR CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268779</td>
<td></td>
<td>009073</td>
<td>DORSEY EMERGENCY MEDICAL ACADEMY</td>
<td>5,275.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268779</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>009073</td>
<td>DORSEY EMERGENCY MEDICAL ACADEMY</td>
<td>5,275.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268780</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000180</td>
<td>DTE ENERGY</td>
<td>10,819.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268781</td>
<td></td>
<td>002375</td>
<td>DUANY PLATER-ZYBERK &amp; CO.</td>
<td>5,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268782</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007538</td>
<td>EGANIX, INC.</td>
<td>720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268783</td>
<td></td>
<td>004671</td>
<td>ELDER FORD</td>
<td>106.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ELIZABETH ARSOV</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268786</td>
<td></td>
<td>001495</td>
<td>ETNA SUPPLY</td>
<td>2,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268787</td>
<td></td>
<td>000936</td>
<td>FEDEX</td>
<td>140.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268788</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>004514</td>
<td>FEDEX OFFICE</td>
<td>21.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FELIX COLON</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268791</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008131</td>
<td>FINISHMASTER</td>
<td>1,790.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FLATROCK CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268793</td>
<td></td>
<td>007172</td>
<td>GARY KNUREK INC</td>
<td>163.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268794</td>
<td></td>
<td>000223</td>
<td>GASOW VETERINARY</td>
<td>135.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GLASIER, PETER</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268797</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>004604</td>
<td>GORDON FOOD</td>
<td>1,625.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GRIFFIN CEMENT LLC DBA</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268799</td>
<td></td>
<td>000249</td>
<td>GUARDIAN ALARM</td>
<td>235.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GUILMET JR, CHESTER F</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268801</td>
<td></td>
<td>005820</td>
<td>HENKE MFG</td>
<td>1,209.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HEWSON HOMES LLC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I SIGNS</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268804</td>
<td></td>
<td>000342</td>
<td>IBS OF SE MICHIGAN</td>
<td>616.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERCITY NEON</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268806</td>
<td></td>
<td>000344</td>
<td>J.T. EXPRESS, LTD.</td>
<td>4,361.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN MCCARTER CONSTRUCTION LLC</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KEARNS BROTHERS INC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268809</td>
<td></td>
<td>004088</td>
<td>KGM DISTRIBUTORS INC</td>
<td>127.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KILCOYNE, ERIN</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268811</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>005968</td>
<td>KOALA-T CONSTRUCTION CO</td>
<td>270,857.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268812</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000352</td>
<td>JILL KOLAITIS</td>
<td>1,870.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Number</td>
<td>Early Release</td>
<td>Vendor #</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268813</td>
<td></td>
<td>004085</td>
<td>KONE INC</td>
<td>1,953.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268814</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000362</td>
<td>KROGER COMPANY</td>
<td>129.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268815</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>LEVINSON-LEVIN PROPERTIES LLC</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268816</td>
<td>006817</td>
<td></td>
<td>LEXISNEXIS RISK DATA MANAGEMENT INC</td>
<td>136.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268817</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>LIBERMAN, KIRILL</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268819</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>LINDA LULGJURAJ</td>
<td>233.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268820</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>LIVE WELL CUSTOM HOMES LLC</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268821</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>LMB PROPERTIES LLC</td>
<td>1,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268822</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008158</td>
<td>LOGICALIS INC</td>
<td>9,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268823</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MARYGROVE AWNING CO</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268824</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MCCLURE, BRUCE</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268825</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008201</td>
<td>MECHANICAL DESIGN &amp; INSTALLTN LLC</td>
<td>113,159.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268826</td>
<td></td>
<td>004738</td>
<td>MGFOA</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268827</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>009085</td>
<td>MGSE SECURITY LLC</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268828</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MHB CUSTOM CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268829</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>009104</td>
<td>MICHIGAN INSTITUTE FOR NEUROLOGICAL</td>
<td>375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268830</td>
<td></td>
<td>006459</td>
<td>MICHIGAN SHOOTING CENTERS INC</td>
<td>1,120.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268835</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000230</td>
<td>MIKE SAVOIE CHEVROLET INC</td>
<td>354.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268836</td>
<td></td>
<td>008319</td>
<td>MKSK INC</td>
<td>3,611.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268837</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>007163</td>
<td>MOBILE HEALTH RESOURCES</td>
<td>2,010.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268838</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MORGAN HELLER ASSOCIATES INC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268840</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUSCAT BROTHERS CONSTRUCTION CO</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268842</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>007755</td>
<td>NETWORK SERVICES COMPANY</td>
<td>590.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268843</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>NORTHERN SIGN CO INC</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268844</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000477</td>
<td>OAKLAND COUNTY</td>
<td>433,631.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268845</td>
<td></td>
<td>006602</td>
<td>OAKLAND COUNTY TREASURER'S ASSN.</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268846</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>003461</td>
<td>OBSERVER &amp; ECCENTRIC</td>
<td>390.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268847</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>004370</td>
<td>OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH CENTERS</td>
<td>1,004.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268849</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000481</td>
<td>OFFICE DEPOT INC</td>
<td>973.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268850</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>ORCHARD DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTIO</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268851</td>
<td></td>
<td>003881</td>
<td>ORKIN PEST CONTROL</td>
<td>2,710.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268853</td>
<td></td>
<td>001325</td>
<td>P.K. CONTRACTING INC</td>
<td>96.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268854</td>
<td></td>
<td>006625</td>
<td>PACIFIC TELEMANAGEMENT SERVICES</td>
<td>78.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268856</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>PARRINELLO, VICTORIA L</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268858</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>001753</td>
<td>PEPSI COLA</td>
<td>206.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268859</td>
<td></td>
<td>001341</td>
<td>PIFER GOLF CARS INC</td>
<td>5,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268861</td>
<td></td>
<td>005501</td>
<td>POISON IVY CONTROL OF MI</td>
<td>5,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268863</td>
<td></td>
<td>004137</td>
<td>R &amp; R FIRE TRUCK REPAIR INC</td>
<td>186.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268865</td>
<td></td>
<td>000286</td>
<td>RESIDEX LLC</td>
<td>2,271.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268866</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROCK BUILDING CO INC</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268867</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROCK BUILDING COMPANY INC</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268869</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>002911</td>
<td>RUTH ROWLAND</td>
<td>96.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268870</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROYAL OAK &amp; BIRMINGHAM</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Number</td>
<td>Early Release</td>
<td>Vendor #</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268871</td>
<td></td>
<td>007697</td>
<td>SAVE THE MOMENT</td>
<td>81.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268872</td>
<td></td>
<td>006590</td>
<td>SECURE DOOR, LLC</td>
<td>143.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268873</td>
<td></td>
<td>007142</td>
<td>SHERWIN-WILLIAMS COMPANY</td>
<td>25.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268874</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIGN A RAMA</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268875</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIGNAL RESTORATION SERVICES</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268878</td>
<td></td>
<td>000260</td>
<td>SPARTAN DISTRIBUTORS INC</td>
<td>73.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268879</td>
<td></td>
<td>002809</td>
<td>STATE OF MICHIGAN</td>
<td>747.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268880</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>STEELE ANGEL</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268881</td>
<td></td>
<td>004544</td>
<td>STRYKER SALES CORPORATION</td>
<td>174.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268882</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>004355</td>
<td>SYMETRA LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>36,117.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268883</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>TEMPLETON BUILDING COMPANY</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268884</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>THE ANAM CARA GROUP</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268886</td>
<td></td>
<td>004379</td>
<td>TURNER SANITATION, INC</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268887</td>
<td></td>
<td>007226</td>
<td>VALLEY CITY LINEN</td>
<td>121.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268888</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000293</td>
<td>VAN DYKE GAS CO.</td>
<td>163.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268889</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008411</td>
<td>VARIPRO</td>
<td>817.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268890</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000158</td>
<td>VERIZON WIRELESS</td>
<td>90.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268891</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000158</td>
<td>VERIZON WIRELESS</td>
<td>1,515.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268892</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000158</td>
<td>VERIZON WIRELESS</td>
<td>431.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268893</td>
<td></td>
<td>004497</td>
<td>WATERFORD REGIONAL FIRE DEPT.</td>
<td>640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268894</td>
<td></td>
<td>009010</td>
<td>WCI CONTRACTORS INC</td>
<td>5,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268895</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>009010</td>
<td>WCI CONTRACTORS INC</td>
<td>64,390.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268896</td>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>WETHERHOLD, RICHARD L</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268897</td>
<td></td>
<td>009112</td>
<td>WISE COMPANY INC</td>
<td>2,990.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268898</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>009118</td>
<td>WOODWARD BATES PARTNERS LLC</td>
<td>258,364.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268899</td>
<td></td>
<td>008391</td>
<td>XEROX CORPORATION</td>
<td>667.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269900</td>
<td></td>
<td>000309</td>
<td>ZEP SALES AND SERVICE</td>
<td>503.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL PAPER CHECK** $1,335,877.25

**EFT TRANSFER**

| " " | 008732 | AMAZON.COM, INC | 229.78 |
| " " | 002429 | BIRMINGHAM BLOOMFIELD CHAMBER | 10.00 |
| " " | MISC   | BRYCER LLC      | 30.00  |
| " " | 006389 | GREAT WOLF LODGE | 143.18 |
| " " | 005710 | JET'S PIZZA     | 216.67 |
| " " | 008518 | LERMA, INC      | 85.00  |
| " " | 008279 | MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL EXECUTIVES | 1,347.00 |
| " " | 006056 | PANERA          | 141.00 |
| " " | MISC   | PENSKE TRUCK    | 362.00 |
| " " | 002589 | SHANTY CREEK RESORTS | 428.00 |

**SUBTOTAL EFT TRANSFER** $3,356.23

**ACH TRANSACTION**
## City of Birmingham

### Warrant List Dated 09/18/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check Number</th>
<th>Early Release</th>
<th>Vendor #</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1452</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>008847</td>
<td>ABS- AUTOMATED BENEFIT SVCS, INC</td>
<td>53,334.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1453</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>002284</td>
<td>ABEL ELECTRONICS INC</td>
<td>394.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1454</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000517</td>
<td>BEIER HOWLETT P.C.</td>
<td>50,438.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1455</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007345</td>
<td>BEVERLY HILLS ACE</td>
<td>50.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1456</td>
<td></td>
<td>006683</td>
<td>BIRMINGHAM LAWN MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>21,335.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1457</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007624</td>
<td>BIRMINGHAM OIL CHANGE CENTER, LLC</td>
<td>30.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1458</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000542</td>
<td>BLUE WATER INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS INC</td>
<td>78.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000157</td>
<td>BOB ADAMS TOWING INC</td>
<td>410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1460</td>
<td></td>
<td>008044</td>
<td>CLUB PROPHET</td>
<td>540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000956</td>
<td>DELTA TEMP INC</td>
<td>14,537.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1465</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>001077</td>
<td>DUNCAN PARKING TECH INC</td>
<td>3,542.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td></td>
<td>007684</td>
<td>ELITE TRAUMA CLEAN-UP INC.</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000207</td>
<td>EZELL SUPPLY CORPORATION</td>
<td>638.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1468</td>
<td></td>
<td>006181</td>
<td>FIRST CHOICE COFFEE SERV</td>
<td>101.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1469</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000243</td>
<td>GRAINGER</td>
<td>230.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470</td>
<td></td>
<td>003870</td>
<td>GREAT LAKES TURF, LLC</td>
<td>2,797.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1472</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>007870</td>
<td>J.C. EHRLICH CO. INC.</td>
<td>112.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473</td>
<td></td>
<td>000261</td>
<td>J.H. HART URBAN FORESTRY</td>
<td>31,625.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1474</td>
<td></td>
<td>000186</td>
<td>JACK DOHENY COMPANIES INC</td>
<td>2,180.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>003458</td>
<td>JOE’S AUTO PARTS, INC.</td>
<td>591.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>000891</td>
<td>KELLER THOMA</td>
<td>851.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>006359</td>
<td>NYE UNIFORM COMPANY</td>
<td>1,433.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1481</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>003554</td>
<td>RKA PETROLEUM</td>
<td>8,242.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1482</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>001181</td>
<td>ROSE PEST SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>487.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483</td>
<td></td>
<td>006832</td>
<td>SAFeware INC.</td>
<td>2,187.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1484</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>003785</td>
<td>SIGNS-N-DESIGNS INC</td>
<td>320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
<td>000254</td>
<td>SOCRRRA</td>
<td>75,379.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486</td>
<td></td>
<td>005787</td>
<td>SOUTHEASTERN EQUIPMENT CO. INC</td>
<td>880.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1487</td>
<td></td>
<td>004887</td>
<td>TRUCK &amp; TRAILER SPECIALTIES INC</td>
<td>18,506.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td></td>
<td>002088</td>
<td>WM. CROOK FIRE PROTECTION CO.</td>
<td>3,632.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL ACH TRANSACTION**  $294,941.90

**GRAND TOTAL**  $1,634,175.38

All bills, invoices and other evidences of claim have been audited and approved for payment.

Mark Gerber  
Finance Director/ Treasurer

*--Indicates checks released in advance and prior to commission approval in order to avoid penalty or to meet contractual agreement/obligation.*
DATE: September 12, 2019
TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager
FROM: James Gallagher, Assistant to the City Manager
SUBJECT: Michigan Municipal League Liability and Property Pool Board of Directors Election

The City of Birmingham is a member of the Michigan Municipal League Liability and Property Pool. The Michigan Municipal League is the state’s leading provider of municipal workers’ compensation and risk management services.

The Michigan Municipal League Liability and Property Pool is holding an election for this year’s Board of Directors. One of the Board’s incumbent Directors has agreed to seek re-election. A brief biographical sketch of the candidate is attached for your review. The incumbent Board member is:

Jean Stegeman, Mayor, City of Menominee

A resolution is required to authorize the City of Birmingham’s vote to be cast for the above person to serve as the Director of the Michigan Municipal League Liability and Property Pool Board. The incumbent is the only candidate seeking re-election to this Board.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:

To authorize the City Manager to cast a vote, on the City’s behalf, for the incumbent member of the Michigan Municipal League Liability and Property Pool Board of Directors for three-year term, beginning January 1, 2020.
To: Members of the MML Liability and Property Pool
From: Michael J. Forster, Pool Administrator
Date: September 9, 2019
Subject: Pool Director Election

Dear Pool Member:

Enclosed is your ballot for this year’s Board of Directors election. One (1) incumbent Director has agreed to seek re-election. You also may write in one or more candidates if you wish.

A brief biographical sketch of the candidate is provided for your review.

I hope you will affirm the work of the Nominating Committee by returning your completed ballot in the enclosed return envelope, no later than November 8. You may also submit your ballot online by going to www.mml.org. Click on Insurance, then Liability and Property Pool; the official ballot is located in the left navigation bar under Online Forms.

The MML Liability & Property Pool is owned and controlled by its members. Your comments and suggestions on how we can serve you better are very much appreciated. Thank you again for your membership in the Pool, and for participating in the election of your governing board.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Forster
Pool Administrator
mforster@mml.org
THE CANDIDATES
Three-year terms beginning January 1, 2020

Jean Stegeman, Mayor, City of Menominee

Jean has more than eight years of experience as a municipal official, currently serving as Mayor in the City of Menominee. She was a member of and served as chair of the Menominee planning commission for several years prior to becoming mayor. She is also active in several local civic organizations. Jean is seeking re-election to her third term as director.
DATE: September 12, 2019

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: Jana Ecker, Planning Director

SUBJECT: Bus Shelter Funding Request

INTRODUCTION:
The City of Birmingham approved a list of location priorities for new bus shelters within the City that support the Multimodal Transportation Plan and makes room for SMART’s new FAST bus service shelters in the City of Birmingham. The priority list included the relocation of one shelter located at 14 Mile and Woodward, and placement of a new bus shelter at an existing bus stop at E. Maple Road and Coolidge.

BACKGROUND:
On May 3rd, 2018, the Multimodal Transportation Board recommended approval of the list of priority bus stop locations for bus shelters to the City Commission.

On September 17th, 2018, the City Commission approved the list of priority bus stop locations for bus shelters as a guide when new bus shelters are considered for installation, as well as the relocation of one bus shelter at 14 Mile and Woodward, and a new bus shelter at E. Maple and Coolidge. At that time, the City Commission also approved the addition of SMART FAST branded bus stops and shelters along the FAST route.

SMART is now ready to install the new FAST shelter at Woodward and 14 Mile Road, and thus approval is now sought to relocate the existing shelter in that location to the north side of 14 Mile Road just west of Woodward. Approval is also sought to order a new bus shelter for the next location on the adopted priority list on the north side of Maple just west of Coolidge Highway. Given the small amount of right-of-way dedicated to sidewalk at this location, the City approached the private property owners adjacent to the north to seek permission to locate a bus shelter on their property. This property is owned by a condominium association. Approval has been given by the condo association to allow the City an easement to install a concrete pad, retaining wall, sidewalk and bus shelter on their property where there is an existing berm immediately adjacent to the northern right-of-way line for E. Maple Road.

LEGAL REVIEW:
The City Attorney prepared the Easement Agreement and has reviewed the plans and has no legal concerns.

FISCAL IMPACT:
This bus shelter purchase was budgeted in the 2018-2019 budget year but not spent, so a budget amendment is necessary. Also, the cost of removing a bus shelter and re-installing it at another location was not budgeted in 2019-2020 and an amendment is necessary for this as well. The
purchase of the new bus shelter will be funded from SMART Community Credits. The funding for relocating the bus shelter, installing sidewalks and the retaining wall would come from the General Fund.

SUMMARY:
The Planning Division is seeking funding approval for the relocation of one bus shelter at 14 Mile and Woodward, and the purchase and installation of a new bus shelter at E. Maple and Coolidge, along with the anchors and templates needed for installation.

ATTACHMENTS:
- Location Priority List for Bus Shelters
- Location Maps
- Signed Easement Agreement for use of private property at E. Maple and Coolidge
- Enseicom Quote

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:
To approve funding in the amount of $3587.00 for the removal of the bus shelter near the northeast corner of Woodward and 14 Mile Road, and the relocation and installation of this bus shelter to the northwest corner of the intersection of Woodward and 14 Mile Road, on the north side of 14 Mile Road;

AND

To approve funding in the amount of $17,500.00 for site preparation and sidewalk installation at the transit stop on 14 Mile west of Woodward, and for site preparation, sidewalk installation and construction of a retaining wall at the transit stop on E. Maple west of Coolidge;

AND

To approve funding in the amount of $23,290.00 for the purchase and installation of a new bus shelter at the existing SMART bus stop on the north side of E. Maple just west of Coolidge Highway;

AND

To approve the appropriations and amendment to the 2019-2020 General Fund and Capital Projects Fund budgets as follows:

**General Fund:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>101-000.000-400.000</th>
<th>$21,090</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draw from Fund Balance</td>
<td>101-000.000-400.000</td>
<td>$21,090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>101-999.000-999.4010</th>
<th>$21,090</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Capital Projects Fund</td>
<td>101-999.000-999.4010</td>
<td>$21,090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Revenues $21,090

Total Expenditures $21,090
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In – General Fund</td>
<td>401-901.020-699.0101</td>
<td>$21,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART Community Credits</td>
<td>401-901.020-587.0001</td>
<td>$23,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$44,380</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>401-901.020-971.0100</td>
<td><strong>$44,380</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$44,380</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Priority Locations for Enhanced Transit Stops – 08-05-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Stop ID</th>
<th>Routes</th>
<th>Bus Stop</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>2017 Ridership</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22059</td>
<td>460,780</td>
<td>E. Maple &amp; Coolidge Westbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11300</td>
<td>450,460,780</td>
<td>W. Maple &amp; Old Woodward Eastbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>W. Maple &amp; Old Woodward Westbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>450,460</td>
<td>S Old Woodward &amp; Daines Northbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12082</td>
<td>445,450,460</td>
<td>Woodward &amp; Bennaville Southbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10676</td>
<td>450,460</td>
<td>Bowers &amp; S. Old Woodward Northbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12099</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>W. Maple Rd &amp; Pleasant Eastbound</td>
<td>ARC 7/15/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10691</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>W Maple Rd &amp; Woodward Westbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23830</td>
<td>461,462</td>
<td>Woodward &amp; Maple Southbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Too soon for ridership figures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23829</td>
<td>461,462</td>
<td>Woodward &amp; Maple Northbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Too soon for ridership figures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22375</td>
<td>415,420</td>
<td>14 Mile Rd &amp; Woodward Westbound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: April 23, 2018

TO: Multi-Modal Transportation Board

FROM: Lauren Chapman, Assistant City Planner

APPROVED BY: Jana L. Ecker, Planning Director

SUBJECT: Priority Bus Stops for Bus Shelters

Over the past several years, the City has implemented a bus shelter installation program. Please find attached a list of SMART bus stops that are the top priorities for the installation of bus shelters. Ridership numbers are extracted from data from September 4, 2017 through December 31, 2017. On numbers are what generally constitute the need for a shelter or other amenities at any given stop.

FAST is a new service powered by SMART, which offers limited stops to connect people throughout the region quickly and easily. The new high-frequency service travels along three of metro Detroit’s busiest corridors, Gratiot, Woodward, and Michigan, and only stops at designated FAST stops. In addition to the City’s ongoing shelter installation program, SMART plans to install 20 enhanced shelters this summer on each corridor (Woodward, Gratiot, and Michigan) at FAST stops. SMART staff is considering installing shelters in Birmingham on Woodward northbound at 14 Mile and northbound and southbound at Maple. There is a standard Birmingham shelter on northbound Woodward at 14 Mile. If SMART installed a FAST style shelter at that stop, the City could relocate the shelter to another bus stop. The City can install standard Birmingham shelters, but SMART would only be willing to do the concrete work. If we accept SMART’s FAST style shelters, they will provide all the funding and work. Attached are drawings of the shelters that SMART is willing to provide. The shelters will include:

- Red accents (Woodward is the red route);
- Overhead lighting;
- A bench with three seats;
- A solar powered beacon bus stop sign pole;
- A solar powered backlit identification sign box;
- 2 solar powered USB ports;
- An emergency phone; and
- 32” solar powered real time information screen.

Some aspects of the shelters are still under design and may change. City staff believes that the SMART FAST style shelters are a good choice because they look similar to the standard Birmingham shelters, have valuable enhancements, and contribute to a regional identity. The MMTB is asked to review the priority list and recommend approval and select the next location for a standard Birmingham shelter. In addition, the MMTB is asked to make a recommendation to the City Commission regarding the use of the FAST shelters and their installation.

**Suggested Recommendation**

To recommend to the City Commission that the attached list of priority locations for bus shelters be used as a guide when new bus shelters are considered for installation.

**AND**

To recommend to the City Commission that City staff work with SMART to install three SMART enhanced FAST style shelters at SMART FAST bus stops on Woodward northbound at 14 Mile and northbound and southbound at Maple.

**AND**

To relocate the existing standard Birmingham shelter on northbound Woodward at 14 Mile to westbound 14 Mile at Woodward in order to facilitate the installation of a SMART enhanced FAST style shelter at the existing bus stop.

**AND**

To recommend to the City Commission approval of the location of the next bus shelter at westbound E. Maple and Coolidge.
There were no comments on the motion from members of the public at 6:35 p.m.

**Motion carried, 5-0.**

**VOICE VOTE**  
**Yeas:** Edwards, Folberg, Rontal, Isaksen, Schafer  
**Nays:** None  
**Absent:** Slanga

### 6. RAIL DISTRICT STANDARD BIKE RACK AND LOCATIONS

Chairman Rontal noted there is not a standard bike rack standard for the Rail District. Tonight the board has been given choices for bike racks along with their prices.

Ms. Chapman recalled the design suggestions for the Rail District streetscape were that it be hip and edgy, have clean lines, potentially use black wrought iron and/or brushed steel elements and a graphic that represents ties to the railroad.

U-racks (the City standard) have been installed in the Rail District by developers. City staff has identified 18 locations for bike racks within the District. City Staff recommends that bike racks be embedded into the surface rather than mounted onto the surface. Embedded racks tend to be more secure and more stable than surface mounted racks.

Board members were enthused by the logo for the Rail District and thought it might be installed on black U racks in highly visible places in the District, if it is not cost prohibitive. Ms. Ecker thought that staff could get some quotes for that and bring them back to the board. Also staff will come back at the next meeting with a map for the board's consideration that includes some suggested locations for placement of the racks.

It was thought that racks on Eton should be priorities and maybe one in front of Kenning Park.

### 7. BUS SHELTER LOCATION PRIORITIES

Ms. Chapman advised that over the past several years, the City has implemented a bus shelter installation program.

FAST is a new service powered by SMART, which offers limited stops to connect people throughout the region quickly and easily. The new high-frequency service travels along three of metro Detroit’s busiest corridors, Gratiot, Woodward Ave., and Michigan, and only stops at designated FAST stops. In addition to the City’s ongoing shelter installation program, SMART plans to install 20 enhanced shelters this summer along each corridor at FAST stops. SMART staff is considering installing shelters in Birmingham on
Woodward Ave. northbound at 14 Mile Rd., and northbound and southbound at Maple Rd.

There is a standard Birmingham shelter on northbound Woodward Ave. at 14 Mile Rd. If SMART installed a FAST style shelter at that stop, the City could relocate the shelter to another bus stop. The City can install standard Birmingham shelters, but SMART would only be willing to do the concrete work. If the City accepts SMART’s FAST style shelters, they will provide all the funding and work.

Some aspects of the shelters are still under design and may change. City staff believes that the SMART FAST style shelters are a good choice because they look similar to the standard Birmingham shelters, have valuable enhancements, and contribute to a regional identity.

Ms. Ecker said the question is whether to allow SMART to do their branded bus shelters throughout the Birmingham section of their route. SMART would pay for them and they would have many more amenities, however they would have red accents. Mr. Isaksen said he would like Birmingham’s shelters to look like every single other bus shelter on the entire length of Woodward Ave. This is a metro wide effort and Birmingham should be part of that effort.

Ms. Ecker advised that SMART would be responsible for maintaining the SMART standard shelters if they install them. It is staff’s understanding that DPS would maintain the grounds.

**Motion by Mr. Isaksen**
Seconded by Ms. Edwards to recommend to the City Commission that the attached list of priority locations for bus shelters be used as a guide when new bus shelters are considered for installation.

**AND**
To recommend to the City Commission that City staff work with SMART to install three SMART enhanced FAST style shelters at SMART FAST bus stops on Woodward Ave. northbound at 14 Mile Rd. and northbound and southbound at Maple Rd.

**AND**
To relocate the existing standard Birmingham shelter on northbound Woodward Ave. at 14 Mile Rd. to westbound 14 Mile Rd. at Woodward Ave. in order to facilitate the installation of a SMART enhanced FAST style shelter at the existing bus stop.

**AND**
To recommend to the City Commission approval of the location of the next bus shelter at westbound E. Maple Rd. and Coolidge.

The Chairman called for public comment at 6:55 p.m.
Mr. Strader confirmed that Mr. Robert Kramer at SMART told him if the MMTB approves the red shelter, SMART will take care of all the cost of installation and repairs, including cracked windows, and look to the City or business sponsor for trash pickup and any landscaping maintenance.

Motion carried, 5-0.

VOICE VOTE
Yeas: Isaksen, Edwards, Folberg, Rontal, Shafer
Nays: None
Absent: Slanga

8. COMPLETE STREETS TRAINING SESSION

Mr. Strader explained that his presentation focuses mostly on pedestrians and bikes and not so much on autos. The training objective is to provide a basic understanding of what complete streets are and what they mean to your community. The Michigan Complete Streets Coalition came up with a definition for Michigan that was enacted in Michigan Public Act 135 of 2010. A system of streets... "planned, designed, and constructed to provide appropriate access to all legal users in a manner that promotes safe and efficient movement of people and goods whether by car, truck, transit, assistive device, foot or bicycle." That is when Complete Streets got its big push in Michigan that has changed the way streets are designed.

Also in 2010 one of the laws that was changed in Michigan was to acknowledge Complete Streets in Act 33 of 2010 (Planning Act). The Birmingham Planning Board follows the Planning Act in terms of a Master Plan that directs land uses and infrastructure and is a guide for capital improvements.

In Michigan, State funding for roads is called Act 51 of 2010 (Michigan Transportation Fund). It classifies roads into major and minor streets and provides the formula for how the City gets its funds funneled through the State. MDOT may work with communities or municipalities to look at Complete Streets design changes on a trunk line such as Woodward Ave. MDOT has an undefined amount that is supposed to go for maintaining pedestrian and bicycle ways and in the Upper Peninsula maintaining snow mobile trails.

Nationally and in Michigan there are ten Complete Street principles:
1. Set the vision.
2. Accommodate all legal roadway users.
4. Address all roadways and inter-jurisdictional issues to have consistency where possible.
5. Define process for exceptions based on criteria.
7. Context sensitive design to fit the characteristics of that part of the city.
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Sample of Retaining Wall Design Proposed
### QUOTATION

**Project:** SHELTER  
**Sales Rep:** CONSTANTINE MOUSSIS

**Billing Address:** CITY OF BIRMINGHAM  
151 MARTIN ST  
PO BOX 3001  
BIRMINGHAM MI USA

**Contact:** NICHOLAS DUPUIS  
(248) 530-1856  
ndupuis@bhamgov.org

**Site Address:**  

**Notes:** Transport is based on standard delivery terms. After hours and weekend deliveries are extra

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Drawing No.</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Extended Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SHELTER</td>
<td>D7569-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$11,200.00</td>
<td>$11,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>BENCH (3 SEATS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,460.00</td>
<td>$1,460.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>ANCHORS BOLTS &amp; TEMPLATE INCLUDING TRANSPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$490.00</td>
<td>$490.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>INSTALLATION OF NEW SHELTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,235.00</td>
<td>$2,235.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RELOCATION OF EXISTING SHELTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,375.00</td>
<td>$3,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>ANCHORS FOR BENCH</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$212.00</td>
<td>$212.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE**  
ALL WORK TO BE DONE ON (1) TRIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>EXTENDED PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SITE SURVEY</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td>INCLUDED</td>
<td>INCLUDED</td>
<td>INCLUDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNICAL</td>
<td>INCLUDED</td>
<td>INCLUDED</td>
<td>INCLUDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>INCLUDED</td>
<td>INCLUDED</td>
<td>INCLUDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING STAMP (IF REQUIRED)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRATING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$675.00</td>
<td>$675.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOADING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,515.00</td>
<td>$2,515.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTALLATION MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,265.00</td>
<td>$4,265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUNDATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**  
This quotation is valid for (30) days after date of submission.

**Order placed this __________ day of ________________________ 2019, and accepted by:**

ENSEICOM INC.  
CONSTANTINE MOUSSIS

CITY OF BIRMINGHAM  
NICHOLAS DUPUIS

Required installation date ________________________ 2019
Possible bus shelter at Birmingham Corners

John Reinhart <john_reinhart_home@yahoo.com>  
To: Lauren Chapman <lchapman@bhamgov.org>  
Mon, Aug 6, 2018 at 8:43 AM

You have our (Birmingham Corners Association) support and approval to install a SMART bus shelter on our property (NW corner of Maple and Coolidge) between the sidewalk and carport, pending a review meeting and legal agreement.

Contact me with any questions / next steps.

Sent from the iPad of John Reinhart
313-909-7481
john_reinhart_home@yahoo.com

[Quoted text hidden]
GRANT OF EASEMENT
FOR BUS SHELTER

This Grant of Easement for Bus Shelter ("Grant") located at the northeast corner of Maple and Coolidge is made effective as of September 11, 2019 (the “Effective Date”) by the City of Birmingham, Michigan, a Michigan municipal corporation, having an address of 151 Martin Street, Birmingham, Michigan 48012 ("Grantee"), to the Birmingham Corners Association a Michigan condominium having an address of 161 Coolidge ("Grantor").

RECITALS

A. Grantor is the fee simple owner of land commonly known as Birmingham Corners located in City of Birmingham, Oakland County, Michigan legally described on the attached Exhibit A, having real estate parcel number 2030478064 (the “Grantor’s Property”).

B. Grantor wishes to grant to Grantee an easement to site a bus shelter on the northeast corner of Maple and Coolidge.

AGREEMENT

NOW, THEREFORE, for and in consideration of $1.00 and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, Grantor and the Grantee agree as follows:

1. Grant of Easement. Grantor hereby grants and conveys to the Grantee an easement to site a bus shelter on the northeast corner of Maple and Coolidge large enough to hold a pad of 7 feet by 13 feet. Grantor hereby grants Grantee access rights to a sufficient portion of the Grantor’s Property as is reasonably necessary for exercising its rights and privileges granted herein including, but not limited to, the construction and maintenance of the bus shelter. (See Exhibit B)

2. Grantor’s Covenants. Grantor agrees not to build or to convey to others permission to build any permanent structures on the Easement Parcel. Grantor shall not cause or permit to be caused any obstruction to, disruption or alteration of the bus shelter without prior notification to, and written approval by the Grantee, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld by Grantee.

3. Grantee Covenants. Grantee agrees to restore any portion of the Easement Parcel that is disturbed by reason of its exercise of its rights and privileges granted herein. Grantee shall be responsible for the costs associated with maintenance, repair and replacement of that portion of the Drainage System that passes through the Easement Parcel.

4. Binding Effect; Appurtenant Easement. This Grant shall run with Grantor’s Property as an appurtenance and shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the Grantee, Grantor, and their respective transferees, successors, executors, and assigns. Any conveyance of all or any part of the Grantee’s Property shall include, and by this Grant is deemed to include, the Drainage Easement as an appurtenance for the use and benefit of the transferee. Any conveyance of all or any part of the
Grantor’s shall be subject to this Grant and the Drainage Easement and shall burden the Grantor’s Property and be binding upon the transferee.

5. **Authority.** Grantor represents that Grantor is the fee simple owner of Grantor’s Property with full authority to execute this Grant and grant the Bus Shelter Easement described herein.

6. **Effective Date.** This Grant shall be effective on the date of the signature of the last party, who shall enter that date at the top of this Grant.

7. **Governing Law.** This Grant shall be governed and construed under the laws of the State of Michigan.

8. **Integration: Modifications.** This Grant constitutes the entire final and binding integrated agreement between the parties hereto with respect to the subject matter hereof, and supersedes the entirety of all prior oral and written negotiations, understandings or agreements between the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof. No oral modification hereof shall be binding upon the parties, and, to be valid, any modification to this Grant must be in writing, signed by the parties and recorded with the Oakland County Register of Deeds. Failure by a party to insist upon or enforce any of its rights shall not constitute a waiver thereof. Either party hereto may waive the benefit of any provision or condition for its benefit contained in this Grant.

9. **Counterparts.** It is understood and agreed that this Grant may be executed in several counterparts, each of which, for all purposes, shall be deemed to constitute an original and all of which counterparts, when taken together, shall be deemed to constitute one and the same agreement, even though all of the parties hereto may not have executed the same counterpart.

10. **Severability.** The parties intend that a court shall endeavor to give effect to the provisions of this Grant to the fullest extent permitted by law. Each part of this Grant is intended to be severable. If any term, covenant, condition or provision hereof is in whole or in part unlawful, invalid, or unenforceable for any reason whatsoever, then that term, covenant, or condition shall, if possible, be deemed to have been modified in a manner that will make lawful, valid and enforceable. If that is not possible, then that term, covenant, or condition shall be deemed stricken and all remaining parts hereof shall be valid and enforceable and have full force and effect as if the invalid or unenforceable part had not been included.

11. **Notices.** Any notice or consent required to be given pursuant to this Grant or otherwise desired to be delivered by one party to the other, shall be effective if sent to the address set forth in the preamble (or such other address as directed by either party in writing to the other) in writing which is either (a) personally delivered to such party at its address set forth below (or to such other place as the party to receive such notice shall have specified by notice in advance thereof); (b) sent by certified mail with postage prepaid, return receipt requested to such party at such address; or (c) sent by Federal Express or other similar overnight air courier.

12. **Recitals.** The Recitals to this Grant are incorporated herein by this reference.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Grantor and Grantee have caused this Grant to be executed as of Effective Date.

GRANTOR:
BIRMINGHAM CORNERS ASSOCIATION

By: [Signature]
Its: [Title]

By: [Signature]
Its: [Title]

STATE OF MICHIGAN )
) ss.
COUNTY OF OAKLAND )

Acknowledged before me on ___________, 2019 by ___________, acting in his/her capacity as the ___________ and acting in his/her capacity on behalf of Birmingham Corners Association, a Michigan municipal corporation, on behalf of said Municipal Corporation.

________________________________________
Notary Public
County, Michigan
Acting in ___________, County, Michigan
My Commission expires: ____________________

GRANTEE:
CITY OF BIRMINGHAM, A Michigan Municipal Corporation

By: [Signature]
Its: [Title]
STATE OF MICHIGAN )
COUNTY OF OAKLAND ) ss.

Acknowledged before me on ______________________, 2019 by__________, acting in his/her capacity as the ____________ of the City of Birmingham, A Michigan Municipal Corporation.

_________________________________________ Notary Public

_________________________________________ County, Michigan
Acting in _____________, County, Michigan
My Commission expires: ______________________

Prepared by and when recorded return to:

Timothy J. Currier (P28939)
Beier Howlett, P.C.
3001 W. Big Beaver Road, Suite #200
Troy, MI 48084
(248) 645-9400
Exhibit A
Legal Description of Grantor’s Property

Lots 32 & 33 of East Maple Gardens, a part of the SE ¼ of Section 30, T2N, R11E, City of Birmingham, Oakland County Michigan.

Exhibit B
Diagram and Legal Description of the Easement Parcel
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: PARCEL I.D. 20-30-478-064

LOTS 32 & 33, "EAST MAPLE GARDENS" THE SOUTH 666 FEET OF SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 30, T. 2 N., R. 11E., TROY TOWNSHIP, CITY OF BIRMINGHAM, OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN. PLAT RECORDED IN LIBER 31, PAGE 15 OAKLAND COUNTY RECORDS.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: EASEMENT

COMMENCING AT THE S.E. CORNER OF LOT 33 OF "EAST MAPLE GARDENS" (L-31, P.15, O.C.R.); THEREON NORTH 88 DEGREES 50 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST 33.22 FEET ALONG SOUTH LINE OF SAID LOT 33 TO THE EASEMENT P.O.B.; THEREON NORTH 88 DEGREES 50 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST 36.86 FEET ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LOT 33; THEREON NORTH 62 DEGREES 34 MINUTES 35 SECONDS EAST 7.94 FEET; THEREON NORTH 01 DEGREES 10 MINUTES 00 SECONDS EAST 9.00 FEET; THEREON SOUTH 88 DEGREES 50 MINUTES 00 SECONDS EAST 26.75 FEET; THEREON SOUTH 01 DEGREES 10 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST 9.00 FEET; THEREON SOUTH 38 DEGREES 21 MINUTES 36 SECONDS EAST 4.93 FEET TO THE EASEMENT P.O.B.

SAID EASEMENT CONTAINS 362.44 SQUARE FEET OR 0.0083 ACRES

PREPARED FOR: CITY OF BIRMINGHAM

SCALE: 1" = 30'
DATE: 07-10-19
DRAWN: GV
JOB NO.: L025
SHEET: 1 of 1
DATE: September 16, 2019
TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager
FROM: Lauren A. Wood, Director of Public Services
SUBJECT: Kenning Park Ballfield Project – Change Order Approval

INTRODUCTION:
On February 25, 2019, the City Commission awarded the Kenning Park Ballfield Construction project to WCI Contractors, Inc. for $737,000. This ballfield construction project targets the two easterly fields and includes the reconfiguration of fields #2 and #3. Work includes removal of existing fencing, other site furnishings and related demolition, importing soil and grading for the construction of the fields. In addition, the installation of concrete walks and pads, ballfield fencing, storm drainage, furnishing and installing player benches. Work also includes installing safety netting, infield surfacing, tree planting, turf establishment along with site preparation, irrigation installation and all related work.

BACKGROUND:
The work has progressed nicely since starting the project in late June 2019, with some delays due to the significant rain events in June and July. During the course of the project, a few change orders or bulletins were deemed necessary and in turn authorized by the Administration during the construction in order to not cause interruptions or project delays. In addition, Johnson Hill Land Ethics Studio (JHLE) who is serving as the project manager for the Kenning Park Ballfield Construction project concur with these modifications.

Sometimes either the Owner (City of Birmingham) or Contractor initiates such change orders other times field conditions warrant adjustments while the project is underway. With all of the changes authorized to date, we find ourselves under the contract award amount by $6,704.00. Therefore, the contract amount sits at $730,296.

The primary factor for this is the Birmingham Little League decided not to proceed with the specified scoreboards in mid-August. During June, Birmingham Little League (BLL) informed us they wanted to search for a different scoreboard for the project than was originally specified. The preferred scoreboards would have cost significantly more money than they could provide us at this time. Holding off on the two scoreboards provides for a contract credit amount of $11,276. BLL fully intends to have the two scoreboards installed later this year or in the spring, so as part of this project it does include running the electrical to the future scoreboard locations.

A summary of the project credits and additions are displayed on the attached chart, which coincides with the enclosed write-ups from WCI Contractors, Inc. detailing all change requests. This now affords us with an opportunity to have sod placed in the outfields, which was originally bid as hydroseed. Sod is preferred rather than seed, but we were trying to contain costs when
the project was bid. Both the infields and outfields were specified to be seed, but sod will be a better product and turf will establish better and faster than using seed this year.

On numerous occasions, the City informed BLL with the project starting at the end of their season in June and play starting the next season as soon as March/April when the weather breaks, the window would be very short for the seed to establish the turf as much as we would like. DPS crews would more than likely need to spend time and money to re-seed and make repairs to the turf in the spring. Not knowing how the turf will look in the spring, the repair costs by the City could far exceed the amount requested in this report. There would not be a long enough resting period for the seed to take root and fill in accordingly. This change is considered a value added adjustment to the contract amount. The City of Birmingham will be getting a lot of benefit by switching from seed to sod.

LEGAL REVIEW:
This purchase does not require legal review.

FISCAL IMPACT:
This work is proposed to be funded by a General Fund contribution of $9,426.00. Funds for this project will come from account #401-751.001-981.0100.

SUMMARY:
The City of Birmingham has made adjustments during the Kenning Park Ballfield Construction project and the time has come to provide the City Commission with a status update on the contract changes to date. In addition, this request includes getting approvals for the modification to the contract amount by an increase of $9,426.00 or a .013% change. Based on the list of items, but for the deduction of the scoreboards, we would not be requesting adding sod to the outfields. By itself, the sod for the outfields adds $16,130 to the project amount. With the credits to date, this addition, which increases the contract amount only by $9,426, is much more desirable.

At this point, we do not anticipate any significant change orders. The target completion date is October 31, 2019.

ATTACHMENTS:
- Kenning Park Ballfield Contract Changes Chart
- WCI Contractors, Inc. letters (various dates)

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:
To approve the contract change amount with WCI Contractors, Inc. in the amount not to exceed $9,426.00, to be funded from account 401-751.001-981.0100 and further; to approve the appropriation and amendment to the fiscal year 2019-2020 General Fund and Capital Projects Fund budgets as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Revenues:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101-000.000-400.0000 Draw from Fund Balance $9,426.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$9,426.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Transfers Out – Capital Projects Fund</th>
<th>$9,426.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101-999.000-999.4010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Projects Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,426.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Projects Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-751.001-699.0101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Public Improvements</th>
<th>$9,426.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401-751.001-981.0100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,426.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>New Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost at Award:</td>
<td>$737,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin 1: Reduce amt of fence to be demoed. CREDIT</td>
<td>(-1,900.00)</td>
<td>$735,100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin 2: Manhole material change needed per Eng. ADD</td>
<td>+2,300.00</td>
<td>$737,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment needed for the addition of 1 net. ADD</td>
<td>+2,500.00</td>
<td>$739,900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLL declines scoreboards. CREDIT</td>
<td>(-11,276.00)</td>
<td>$728,624.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conduit added for FUTURE power needs (new location in dugouts). ADD</td>
<td>+1,672.00</td>
<td>$730,296.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sod at Infields. NO CHANGE</td>
<td>+16,130.00</td>
<td>$746,426.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 23, 2019

Tyler Sprague, ASLA
The Johnson Hill Land Ethics Studio
412 Longshore Drive
Ann Arbor, MI 48105

RE: City of Birmingham Kenning Park Ballfield Construction – Bulletin 1

Mr. Sprague,

Per your request, the following is our price for Bulletin 1, dated May 13, 2019, which reduces the outfield fence removal on the field south of the Ice Rink. Our price is the following:

1. Eliminate the removal of approximately 380 L.F. of 5’ tall outfield fence from original project scope.

    CREDIT:  $1,900.00

Please let me know if you have any questions and how you would like to proceed.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas A. Maliszewski III
WCI Contractors, Inc.
August 2, 2019

Tyler Sprague, ASLA
The Johnson Hill Land Ethics Studio
412 Longshore Drive
Ann Arbor, MI 48105

RE: City of Birmingham Kenning Park Ballfield Construction – Bulletin 2

Mr. Sprague,

Per your request, the following is our price for Bulletin 2, dated July 26, 2019, which relocates Manhole A and connections to Yard Inlet A and Yard Inlet B. Our price for replacement structures for Manhole A and Yard Inlet A is the following:

Total: $2,300.00

The manufacturer estimates about 3 days for fabrication after approval.

Please let me know if you have any questions and how you would like to proceed.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Maliszewski III
WCI Contractors, Inc.
September 4, 2019

Tyler Sprague, ASLA
The Johnson Hill Land Ethics Studio
412 Longshore Drive
Ann Arbor, MI 48105

RE: City of Birmingham Kenning Park Ballfield Construction

Mr. Sprague,

After receiving the contract price breakdown after our pre-construction meeting on May 1, we noticed a discrepancy with the amount included for the modification of Alternate 2. The amount included in the contract was $9,500.00, but it should have been $12,000.00. We provided a deduct of $9,500.00 to eliminate one of the barrier nets, but this amount was included as if it was the total amount for one net. Please see the attached email correspondence when this was noticed.

Since there was potential the net system would change, this was not formally added to our project scope adjustments at the time, but now that we are progressing with the original system, we are requesting the amount of $2,500.00 be added to our contract scope changes.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Maliszewski III
WCI Contractors, Inc.
September 4, 2019

Tyler Sprague, ASLA
The Johnson Hill Land Ethics Studio
412 Longshore Drive
Ann Arbor, MI 48105

RE: City of Birmingham Kenning Park – Bulletin 3

Mr. Sprague,

Per your request, the following is our price for the Kenning Park Additional Ballfield Renovations Bulletin 3, dated August 25, 2019, which includes the elimination of the scoreboards and the addition of conduits for future use in the storage areas. Our price and scope is the following:

1. Eliminate two (2) scoreboards:
   a. Eliminate 2 Varsity Model 3314 Scoreboards ($ 5,420.00)
   b. Eliminate 4 Posts ($ 1,144.00)
   c. Eliminate Installation ($ 2,992.00)
   d. Eliminate Electrical Connection to Disconnect ($ 250.00)

   Sub-Total Cost: ($ 9,806.00)
   Credit OH&P: ($ 1,470.00)
   Sub-Total Credit: ($ 11,276.00)

2. Add Electrical Conduits & Sleeve:
   a. Add six (6) ¾” conduits stubbed 3’ beyond concrete edge at locations indicated on plans. Conduits above grade to be rigid galvanized steel and below grade as PVC. $ 1,520.00
   b. Install one (1) 6” PVC sleeve under walks.

   Sub-Total: $ 1,520.00
   OH&P: $ 152.00
   Sub-Total ADD: $ 1,672.00

   TOTAL CREDIT: ($ 9,604.00)

Please let me know if you have any questions and how you would like to proceed.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas A. Maliszewski III
WCI Contractors, Inc.
WCI Contractors, Inc.
20210 Conner
Detroit, MI 48234
Phone: (313) 368-2100
Fax: (313) 368-8986

August 19, 2019

Tyler Sprague, ASLA
The Johnson Hill Land Ethics Studio
412 Longshore Drive
Ann Arbor, MI 48105

RE: City of Birmingham Kenning Park Ballfield Construction

Mr. Sprague,

In reviewing the project scope, schedule and costs, WCI Contractors, would like to propose to establish the turf of both infields with sod in lieu of the specified hydroseed and mulch. WCI will place the sod in the Fall of 2019, according to the time period specified within the project schedule. The sod will be a standard Kentucky Bluegrass sod.

There is no cost to the City of Birmingham for this change.

Please let me know if you have any questions and how you would like to proceed.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Maliszewski III
WCI Contractors, Inc.
August 19, 2019

Tyler Sprague, ASLA
The Johnson Hill Land Ethics Studio
412 Longshore Drive
Ann Arbor, MI 48105

RE: City of Birmingham Kenning Park Ballfield Construction

Mr. Sprague,

In reviewing the project scope, WCI Contractors, would like to propose to establish the turf of both outfields with sod in lieu of the specified hydroseed and mulch. WCI will place the sod in the Fall of 2019, according to the time period specified within the project schedule. The sod will be a standard Kentucky Bluegrass sod. The additional cost is the following:

1. Credit: approximately, 6,100 s.y. of seed & mulch at $1.00 per s.y.: ($ 6,100.00)

2. Add: approximately 6,100 s.y. of sod at $3.30 per s.y.: $ 20,130.00

   Sub-Total Cost: $ 14,030.00
   
   General Conditions, OH&P: $ 2,100.00
   TOTAL: $ 16,130.00

All other surrounding turf areas outside of the ballfields will be restored with seed and mulch, per original project specifications.

Please let me know if you have any questions and how you would like to proceed.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas A. Maliszewski III
WCI Contractors, Inc.
**MEMORANDUM**

**Office of the City Manager**

**DATE:** September 13, 2019

**TO:** Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

**FROM:** Tiffany J. Gunter, Assistant City Manager

**SUBJECT:** Emergency Expenditure – Chester Parking Garage: Fire Protection Repairs

Annual fire inspections took place during the months of July and August. During the inspections, the Fire Marshall, working in conjunction with William Crook Fire Protection deemed fire protection repairs necessary during hydrostatic testing at the Chester Street garage. The work was performed on during July and August consisting of four separate visits to complete the repairs. The total cost for the repairs was $8,469.84.

By code, the requirement for hydrostatic testing is to reach 200 pounds per square inch (psi) for two hours without leaks. The testing and subsequent repairs consisted of fixing leaking pipes and sprinklers, where the leaks presented at 125 pounds per square inch (psi). Given the results of the test, the repair work was deemed an emergency and began immediately following discovery.

**SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:**

To confirm the City Manager’s authorization for an emergency expenditure pursuant to Sec. 2-286 of the City Code in the amount of $8,469.84 at the Chester Street parking garage to meet fire safety inspection requirement to be paid by account # 585-538.008-977.0000
**INVOICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PURCHASE ORDER NO.</th>
<th>INVOICE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/14/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>1907307T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIRE PROTECTION REPAIRS DEEMED NECESSARY DURING HYDRO-TESTING IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ATTACHED TIMESHEETS AND MATERIAL LIST.

WORK PERFORMED: 07/31, 08/01, 08/05 & 08/06/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHOP FABRICATION/DELIVERY</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$967.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD LABOR - REG JOURNEYMAN</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$1,980.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD LABOR - REG FOREMAN</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td>$2,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE TRUCK - PER FO PER DAY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEE LISTING ATTACHED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,432.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL AMOUNT DUE: $8,469.84

ENCLOSURE: SUPPORTING TIMESHEETS & MATERIAL LIST

Ok to pay. J. Hunter. 8/21/2019
#585-538.00 8-977.0000
# Wm Creek
## FIRE PROTECTION CO.
211E. LINCOLN, ROYAL OAK, MI 48067  
(248)-543-6888  
(248)-543-2204 FAX

---

### INVOICE

**B130**  
**CITY OF BIRMINGHAM**  
151 MARTIN STREET  
BIRMINGHAM, MI 48012-3001  
**ATTENTION: ACCOUNTS PAYABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PURCHASE ORDER NO.</th>
<th>INVOICE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/14/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>19073077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHESTER STREET PARKING GARAGE**  
180 CHESTER STREET  
BIRMINGHAM, MI

FIRE PROTECTION REPAIRS DEEMED NECESSARY DURING HYDRO-TESTING IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ATTACHED TIMESHEETS AND MATERIL LIST.

WORK PERFORMED: 07/31, 08/01, 08/05 & 08/06/2019

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHOP FABRICATION/DELIVERY</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$967.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD LABOR - REG JOURNEYMAN</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$1,980.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD LABOR - REG FOREMAN</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td>$2,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE TRUCK - PER FO PER DAY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MATERIALS**  
SEE LISTING ATTACHED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TOTAL AMOUNT DUE**  
$8,469.84

---

**ENCLOSURE:** SUPPORTING TIMESHEETS & MATERIAL LIST
**LABOR & MATERIAL**

**BILL TO:** Cliford Parking Garage  
186 Clifford  
Birmingham, Mi  

**DATE:** 7/31/19  
**CUSTOMER JOB NO.:**  
**OUR JOB NO.:** 19073077  

**ATTN:**  
**PROJECT:**  

**DESCRIPTION OF WORK DONE:** Performed Repairs. Resumed Hydro Test, More.  
Leaks present at 120 psi. Ordered material for necessary Repairs. System improved.

**LABOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STRAIGHT TIME</th>
<th>1-1/2 TIME</th>
<th>2 TIME</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ryan K  
John S  
(FO)  
(FO) | 8             |            |        |       |

**SUPervision**  
**TRAVEL EXPENSE**  
**ENGINEERING**  
**SHOP FABRICATION/DELIVERY**  

**TOTAL HOURS**

| TOTAL | 5.5 |

**MATERIAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4&quot; BL COUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1/2&quot; 150° SSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25 9-93/4 n 1/4&quot; n 1/4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/4&quot; 10-10 1/4&quot; 1/2&quot; TEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/4&quot; 2-6 1/4&quot; 1/2&quot; 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1&quot; 10-10 1&quot; 1/4&quot; 1/2&quot; TEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21/2&quot; 1-0 6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21/2&quot; BL COUP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUB-TOTAL MATERIAL**  
**SALES TAX**  
**RENTALS**  
**SUB-LABOR**  

**GRAND TOTAL**

**AUTHORIZED AND APPROVED**  
**FIRM:**  
**DATE:** 7/31/19  

**By:**  

**IMPORTANT: THIS ORDER MUST BE SIGNED OR OTHER AUTHORIZATION ATTACHED**  
**Form #103**  
**SHEET NO.** __OF___
**LABOR & MATERIAL**

**BILL TO:** Chester Parking Structure  
180 Chester St.  
Birmingham, MI

**DATE:** 8/1/19

**CUSTOMER JOB NO.:**  
**OUR JOB NO.:** 19073077

**ATTN:**  
**PROJECT:** Dry System Hydrotest/Repair

**DESCRIPTION OF WORK DONE:** Repaired/Replaced leaking piping/sprinklers. Resumed Hydrotest. Leaks pressured @ 125 psi. Measured/charged.

**MATERIAL FOR REPAIR/FABRICATION/SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STRAIGHT TIME</th>
<th>1-1/2 TIME</th>
<th>2 TIME</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Walsh (F)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Speck</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUPERVISION**

**TRAVEL EXPENSE**

**ENGINEERING**

**SHOP FABRICATION/DELIVERY**

**TOTAL HOURS**

6.5

**MATERIAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4&quot; 17.0' 1/2 G6 w/ (2) 1/4&quot; x 1/4&quot; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4&quot; GR. Coup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/4 x 0.6 Ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11/4 GR Coup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1/2&quot; BR 150° SSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4&quot; x 1-11/4 G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUB-TOTAL MATERIAL**

**SALES TAX**

**RENTALS**

**SUB-LABOR**

**GRAND TOTAL**

**AUTHORIZED AND APPROVED**

**FIRM:**  
**DATE:** 8/1/19

**IMPORTANT: THIS ORDER MUST BE SIGNED OR OTHER AUTHORIZATION ATTACHED**

Form # 103

**SHEET NO. OF **
**LABOR & MATERIAL**

**BILL TO:** Chester Parking Structure
180 Chester
Birmingham, Mi

**DATE:** 8/5/19

**CUSTOMER JOB NO.:**

**OUR JOB NO.:** 1907307T

**ATTN:**

**PROJECT:**

**DESCRIPTION OF WORK DONE:** Removed/Replaced leaking pipe, Fittings. Performed Hydro-static test. Observed leaks @ 200 PSI. Measured and removed leaking pipe for installation on 8-6-19. *System improved*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STRAIGHT TIME</th>
<th>1-1/2 TIME</th>
<th>2 TIME</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Walsh</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUPERVISION**

**TRAVEL EXPENSE**

**ENGINEERING**

**SHOP FABRICATION/DELIVERY** 9.5

**TOTAL HOURS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 1/4 x 2-6 w/ 1 1/4 x 1 1/4 x 1/2 TEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 1/4 x 10-10 w/ 1 1/4 x 1 1/4 x 1/2 TEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 1/4 x 1/2 90 w/ 10-10 TXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1/2 155° BR SSR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUB-TOTAL MATERIAL**

**SALES TAX**

**RENTALS**

**SUB-LABOR**

**GRAND TOTAL**

**AUTHORIZED AND APPROVED**

**FIRM:**

**DATE:** 8/5/19

**BY:**

**IMPORTANT: THIS ORDER MUST BE SIGNED OR OTHER AUTHORIZATION ATTACHED**

Form #103
**LABOR & MATERIAL**

**BILL TO:** Chester St. Parking Structure  
180 Chester Birmingham, MI  

**DATE:** 8/6/19

**CUSTOMER JOB NO.:**  
**OUR JOB NO.:** 1907301T

**ATTN:**  
**PROJECT:**

**DESCRIPTION OF WORK DONE:** Repaired leaking pipes and fittings. Concluded 2" valve; Hydrostatic Test. System restored back into service.

### LABOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STRAIGHT TIME</th>
<th>1-1/2 TIME</th>
<th>2 TIME</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Wursh (Fb)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy St. Andre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Meade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUPERVISION**  
**TRAVEL EXPENSE**  
**ENGINEERING**  
**SHOP FABRICATION/DELIVERY** -

**TOTAL HOURS**

### MATERIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 1/4 x 2-6 1 1/4 x 1/2 Tee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 1/4 x 10-10 1 1/4 x 1/2 Tee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 1/4 x 10-10 1 1/2 x 1/2 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 1/2 x 21-0 GY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 1/2 x 10-9 1/2 W 1 1/4 W.O.L 1&quot; W.O.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot; 155° BR. SSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3&quot; GR. Coup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4&quot; GR. Coup</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUB-TOTAL MATERIAL**  
**SALES TAX**  
**RENTALS**  
**SUB-LABOR**  

**GRAND TOTAL**

**AUTHORIZED AND APPROVED**

**FIRM:**

**DATE:** 8/6/19

**By:**

**IMPORTANT: THIS ORDER MUST BE SIGNED OR OTHER AUTHORIZATION ATTACHED**

**Form # 103**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quan.</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>Black Sch #40 Pipe</td>
<td>$2.79</td>
<td>$30.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1-1/4&quot;</td>
<td>Black Sch #40 Pipe</td>
<td>$5.13</td>
<td>$759.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2-1/2&quot;</td>
<td>Black Sch #10 Pipe</td>
<td>$5.18</td>
<td>$5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>Black Sch #10 Pipe</td>
<td>$7.43</td>
<td>$81.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>Black Sch #10 Pipe</td>
<td>$7.58</td>
<td>$363.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-1/4&quot;</td>
<td>0'-6&quot;</td>
<td>$5.03</td>
<td>$15.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>Black Iron Screwed RED TEE</td>
<td>$6.42</td>
<td>$6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-1/4&quot;</td>
<td>Black Iron Screwed RED 90</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1-1/4&quot;</td>
<td>Black Iron Screwed RED TEE</td>
<td>$10.44</td>
<td>$125.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>Threaded Pipe Welded Outlet</td>
<td>$4.43</td>
<td>$17.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-1/4&quot;</td>
<td>Threaded Pipe Welded Outlet</td>
<td>$4.63</td>
<td>$18.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-1/4&quot;</td>
<td>Grooved Coupling</td>
<td>$12.15</td>
<td>$36.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-1/2&quot;</td>
<td>Grooved Coupling</td>
<td>$11.60</td>
<td>$23.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>Grooved Coupling</td>
<td>$21.63</td>
<td>$64.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>Grooved Coupling</td>
<td>$26.73</td>
<td>$213.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>Grooved Coupling</td>
<td>$31.59</td>
<td>$31.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1/2&quot;</td>
<td>BR. UPR.</td>
<td>$7.13</td>
<td>$584.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total...** $1,255.77

**Total...** $185.70

**Total...** $0.00

**Total...** $406.21

**Total...** $0.00

**Total...** $0.00

**Total...** $584.66

**Total...** $0.00

**Total...** $0.00

**Total...** $0.00

**Total...** $0.00

**Total...** $0.00

**Total...** $2,432.34
MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 16, 2019

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: Jana Ecker, Planning Director
Scott Grewe, Police Commander
Paul O'Meara, City Engineer

SUBJECT: Maple Rd. Reconstruction
Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave.

INTRODUCTION:
The City of Birmingham plans to reconstruct the downtown section of Maple Rd. from Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave. in 2020. Design concepts have been reviewed previously by the City Commission, with final approval being achieved at the meeting of May 20, 2019. Since then, detailed design work has been undertaken in order to submit the plans to the Michigan Dept. of Transportation (MDOT) for their review and approval. During that process, certain areas of the design were refined that resulted in changes from what was presented at the concept stage.

BACKGROUND:
During the design process, the design team of City staff, planning consultant MKSK, and design engineer Nowak & Fraus have worked together to prepare a detailed set of plans and bidding documents. The plans are now about 80% complete, and have been submitted to MDOT for review (since federal funds are being spent on this project, MDOT must conduct a full review before the project is bid).

The following items have been improved or modified since the conceptual plans were last presented to the City Commission, in order of their appearance, starting at the west end of the job, and heading east.

1. Southfield Rd. Intersection

The reconstructed Southfield Rd. intersection will now incorporate the City’s standards for crosswalk design in the Central Business District, including 12 ft. wide marked walking surfaces. On the original layout, the significant change in width for the new sidewalk did not transition well to the standard five foot existing sidewalks heading west and south from this intersection (adjacent to Martha Baldwin Park). Upon further review, staff saw an opportunity for a landscape feature and seating area. MKSK was asked to prepare a concept plan, which was then engineered by Nowak & Fraus. The plans have been reviewed by the Martha Baldwin Park Board. The Board took no exception to the plan, as long as the new sidewalk feature did not encroach from the right-of-way onto the park property. The right-of-way at this location is large, so encroachment is not an issue.
The final design features a circular sidewalk area surrounded by new landscape, similar to the Maple Rd. and Chesterfield Ave. intersection seating area that is currently under construction about 0.6 mile to the west of this location.

2. **Layout of Street Lights & Parking Meters**

The concept plan presented to the Commission showed a pattern where landscaped tree wells would be placed adjacent to each maneuvering area between parallel parking places, and a street light and parking meter post would be placed on the parking space between them (two parking meters on one post). Upon further study, staff realized that it would be unwise to install parking meter posts in perpendicular alignment just a few feet in front of a street light. Patrons wishing to use the parking meters would have to walk between the street light and parking meters, which could be awkward, especially for handicapped individuals.

On the revised plan, the street light remains in the same location so that they are equidistant between the adjacent City trees. The parking meters and post has been moved to the east or west of the street light, so that patrons can find it easier to access.

3. **Handicap Ramps for Accessible Parking Spaces**

As was discussed in previous meetings, there are both requirements and recommended guidelines that have been issued by the federal government pertaining on how to meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). City staff took the input received from the City Commission, as well as from Nowak & Fraus. Further, the City consulted with an expert in the ADA. The final conclusion was that it would be best to:

   a. Not remove any accessible spaces from the new project area if they are already present on the current street.
   b. Build standard sized parallel parking spaces marked as reserved for the handicapped that are adjacent to an open sidewalk area, so that if the space is being used by a side access van, the side door can open from the passenger side of the vehicle directly on to the sidewalk.
   c. Provide an accessible, 8 ft. long area to the rear of the vehicle so that if the space is being used by a rear access van, it can open down on to the street level, and then be served directly adjacent by a handicap ramp to allow direct access to the sidewalk.

Currently, the segment of Maple Rd. being reconstructed contains five accessible parking spaces. New spaces will be constructed in similar locations for four of the five spaces. One current space that was provided on the south side of Maple Rd. east of Chester St., adjacent to St. James Episcopal Church will be moved to the back of the church, on Martin St. This decision is based on a request from the church leadership, as they have indicated that the accessible entrance for the church is located on Martin St., and the space would be more useful in that location.

On the four new accessible parking spaces, specific handicapped ramps will be constructed at each space, similar to what was done for the accessible parking spaces built last year on the Old Woodward Ave. project.
4. **Transition to Phase 1 (West of Pierce St.)**

Last year, the City reconstructed Maple Rd. to a point about 50 ft. west of Pierce St. to address sidewalk grade issues, and to introduce a pedestrian crossing island at the Pierce St. crosswalk. At the island, Maple Rd. through traffic transitions from a three-lane street without parking, to a two-lane street with parking. In the Phase 2 design, the east edge of the parking spaces for this block (from Henrietta St. to Pierce St.) has been set at the point where the through lanes begin transitioning to a three-lane section. The remaining space from that point to where the Phase 1 improvements end (about five feet) becomes too narrow to be used as a vehicular parking space. It is recommended that this transition area be used as an opportunity for scooter parking.

5. **Mid-Block Crossing Refinements**

The original mid-block crossing was laid out with a relatively narrow sidewalk area between the two planter boxes (on both sides of the street). Doing so left inadequate space for the street light that is needed in this area to properly light the crosswalk at night. The street light also provides a mounting space for the Via wayfinding sign that is proposed on the south side of the street, encouraging pedestrians to use the private via that extends south as a shortcut to Old Woodward Ave.

The attached plans show adjustments to the sidewalk width, planter boxes, street light placement, and seating.

6. **South Side Streetscape Between Peabody St. and Woodward Ave.**

Currently, the City sidewalk on the above block is only nine feet wide. The concept plans initially considered that this area would require a modified planter box design, due to the lack of space. However, after laying out the new pavement design with ten foot lanes (as has been approved by MDOT for this short segment only), the new sidewalk will be thirteen feet wide, which allows for planter boxes that will be consistent with the design being used on the remainder of the project. A layout of the new streetscape design on this block is attached.

**LEGAL REVIEW:**
No legal review is required at this time.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
None of the items noted above are anticipated to make any impact on the overall budget for this project.

**SUMMARY:**
The Maple Rd. bidding documents are nearing completion. Staff is requesting that the City Commission endorse the streetscape modifications that have been introduced into the project at this time.
ATTACHMENTS:

1. Presentation from MKSK detailing the modifications outlined above.
2. City Commission agenda package for meeting of October 8, 2018, including:
   - Cover memo to MMTB for meeting of July 11, 2018.
   - Presentation to MMTB for meeting of July 11, 2018.
   - Approved minutes from MMTB meeting of July 11, 2018.
   - Cover memo to MMTB for meeting of August 2, 2018.
   - Presentation to MMTB for meeting of August 2, 2018.
   - Approved minutes from MMTB meeting of August 2, 2018.
   - Cover memo to City Commission for meeting of October 8, 2018.
   - Concept plans comparing parking space layouts.
   - F&V memo for meeting of October 8, 2018.
   - Memo regarding timing of Maple Rd. project.
   - Presentation slide featuring project location map.
   - Preliminary detour route plan.
   - Preliminary Southfield Rd. intersection plan.
   - Plans comparing conceptual parking and pavement marking layouts to existing conditions.
   - F&V memo from September 28, 2018 regarding design options for the Park St./Peabody St. intersection.
3. City Commission agenda package for meeting of November 19, 2018, including:
   - Approved minutes from the City Commission meeting of October 8, 2018.
   - Approved minutes of the MMTB meeting of November 1, 2018.
   - Cover memo to MMTB for meeting of November 1, 2018.
   - F&V memo dated October 26, 2018.
   - Southfield Rd. intersection final concept plan.
   - Cover memo to the City Commission for the meeting of November 19, 2019.
   - Presentation prepared for City Commission.
4. Cover memo to the City Commission for the meeting of December 10, 2018.
5. Presentation from MKSK providing details on the three landscape design options, prepared for the City Commission meeting of December 10, 2018.
7. Cover memo to the City Commission for the meeting of May 20, 2019.
8. Presentation from MKSK prepared for the City Commission meeting of May 20, 2019.
9. Minutes from the City Commission meeting of May 20, 2019.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:
To endorse the streetscape design refinements implemented by the design team as presented.
UTILITY NOTE

THE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF SOME OF THE EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THE SURVEY DRAWING WERE OBTAINED FROM MUNICIPAL AND UTILITY COMPANY RECORDS AND MAPS. THEREFORE, NO GUARANTEE IS EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AS TO THE COMPLETENESS OR ACCURACY THEREOF. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.
1. SOUTHFIELD ROAD INTERSECTION

Key Map

**Existing**

**Proposed**

- SIDEWALK WIDENED TO 12 FT.
- LANDSCAPE FEATURE & SEATING AREA
- EXISTING LANDSCAPE MAINTAINED
Lights & parking meters (overall)

» Meters to be placed in line with light poles, NOT in front or behind

» Improved “barrier-free” compliance, easier access to meters

» Some meters may stand alone, based on ADA ramp conflicts and light pole spacing pattern
3. HANDICAP RAMPS FOR ACCESSIBLE PARKING SPACES

ADA Ramps

» 8 ft accessible access area to the rear of parking space with adjacent handicap ramp

» May minimally affect adjacent planters to accommodate ramp

Before

Proposed

Key Map
4. TRANSITION TO PHASE 1

Transition to Phase 1

» Extra ~5 ft space at end of parking spaces, as potential scooter parking areas

» Gap necessary to accommodate taper, lane widths of Phase 1
Midblock

- Width of “waiting area” increased to 21 ft
- No change to parking
- Light posts located NE and SW, pedestrian crossing signage NW and SE
South side streetscape

- Sidewalk width on south side increased from 9 feet to 13 feet
- 10 foot lanes
- Planter boxes to match typical layout
As you know, the City of Birmingham has committed to a three-phased program to reconstruct its major corridors in the Central Business District. Phase I construction, focusing on the central part of Old Woodward Ave., is currently nearing completion, with an expected completion in early August. The remaining two phases will consist of:

Phase 2 – Maple Rd. – Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave. (Construction planned in 2020)
Phase 3 – S. Old Woodward Ave. – Brown St. to Landon Ave. (Construction planned in 2022)

While the Multi-Modal Transportation Board (MMTB) assisted with the initial street designs used in Phase 1, the City Commission assisted at a high level in the final design package. Per their direction, a planning consultant (MKSK) was hired and assisted the City in the conceptual design package now being constructed. Since there is a desire to be consistent and follow the design theme started in Phase 1 into the remaining projects, MKSK has been retained to assist again to develop the conceptual plans for Phase 2. This is a particularly smooth transition, given that MKSK has now been retained and is teamed with the City’s traffic engineering firm F&V. Together, they have prepared the attached conceptual plans as a first review for the MMTB to assist the MMTB with all of its planning needs. It is expected that the initial MMTB comments will be taken at this meeting, and then initial comments will be taken from the City Commission. A final review by the MMTB is expected later this summer.

As plans are prepared for Phase 2, it is important to note that the City was fortunate to be awarded two federal grants to assist in covering the cost of this project. Grants include:

- A grant for $352,000, awarded by the Oakland Co. Federal Aid Committee, to assist the City in the cost of reconstructing this major road. As a street with high traffic counts, combined with the need for general safety improvements, this segment of Maple Rd. qualified for a grant estimated at covering 80% of the cost of resurfacing this street.
- A grant for $249,700, awarded under the Highway Safety Improvement Program, covering 80% of the cost of reconstructing the Southfield Rd. at Maple Rd. intersection.

Together, these two grants will cover about $600,000 of the City’s costs in reconstructing Maple Rd. As a result, the project will be bid and paid for through the Michigan Dept. of Transportation (MDOT). The final construction plans will have to be reviewed and approved through MDOT, meaning that MDOT standards will have to be followed as a part of the design process. The following is a summary of the project highlights, from west to east:
1. **Southfield Rd. Intersection** – The skewed angle in which Southfield Rd. meets Maple Rd. has created a high crash environment. It is also considered unfavorable for pedestrians attempting to cross Maple Rd. at this signal, as right turns from Southfield Rd. to eastbound Maple Rd. can be executed at higher than normal speeds. F&V studied crash histories for the City. They determined that moving the intersection to the west (as shown on the attached plans), therein making all turning movements to be executed at a 90° angle, would have a measurable impact on reducing crashes.

Maple Rd. pavement is in marginal condition in this area, and the widths as constructed do not need to be changed. A concrete approach is planned for Southfield Rd., otherwise, Maple Rd. will be asphalt resurfaced. The traffic signal will have to be relocated as a part of this improvement. Being that the City is installing mast arm traffic signals at all of its intersections within the Central Business District, and since this intersection is at the outside edge of the district, the City Commission will be asked to consider whether a mast arm traffic signal design is appropriate here or not. MKSK and F&V have been asked to provide two pieces of information to assist in this decision:

   a. Estimated cost difference between the standard span wire signals (matching the current design) and installing mast arm signals. (The cost differential will not be covered by the federal grant.)
   b. Photo renderings of the appearance of the two signal designs, as viewed for northbound traffic, and the visual impact they will have on the Birmingham Museum located at this intersection.

2. **Southfield Rd. to Chester St.** – This block serves as a transition into the business district. The traffic lane design was modified in 2016 in conjunction with the three lane road conversion to the west, now providing sufficient storage for the large numbers of left turns being made in both directions. Since the pavement is in marginal condition, and no changes are proposed, milling and resurfacing of the asphalt surface is proposed here. Traffic volumes are inherently higher here as vehicles turn on and off of Chester St. to bypass the congestion in the center of downtown.

3. **Chester St. to West of Pierce St.** – Complete reconstruction, including water and sewer improvements, fiber optic, street lights, and landscaping (where possible) is proposed. A safety improvement encompassing aligned left turn lanes at Bates St. will likely be required as a part of the design, as will be explained by the consultant. While bumpouts and reduced crosswalk lengths are desired, the smaller road width on Maple Rd. will require that truck turning movements be considered in the design. Historically, left turns have been banned to Henrietta St. from 7 AM to 7 PM. That restriction is proposed to continue with this new design, in order to allow for a reduced road width in this area. MKSK will provide lane and sidewalk width options, as well as conceptual sidewalk design concepts for the Board to review.

4. **East of Old Woodward Ave. to Park St./Peabody St.** – Similar to paragraph 3 above, complete reconstruction is planned. During discussions on Phase 1, the City Commission clarified the desire for a mid-block pedestrian crossing on this block, to be located at the pedestrian via currently located just west of Café Via (300 E. Maple Rd.). The mid-block crossing has been included in this design. Also, in accordance with the
Downtown 2016 Master Plan, Park St. will be modified to operate as a two-way street, allowing for better circulation of vehicles in the northeast section of the CBD. Due to the short distance from Woodward Ave., the existing traffic signal function must remain as is. Southbound Park St. traffic will be required to turn right, after following a STOP sign. Some form of traffic island is recommended to reinforce this right turn movement. Large and small island options are presented for the Board’s review.

5. **Park St. / Peabody St. to Woodward Ave.** - Similar to the section west of Chester St. above, this block acts as a transition out of the Central Business District. Traffic volumes are higher as vehicles turn on and off of Park St. and Peabody St. Given traffic levels, coupled with the short distance available for queues, no changes are suggested. Due to the age of the pavement, complete reconstruction is proposed. MKSK will provide suggested sidewalk conceptual design given the limitation of space.

**Parking Options**

A design concept that the MMTB will be asked to discuss is how to design the pavement markings. Options include:

A. **Parking Space Size**
   1. 20 ft. long parking spaces adjacent to 8 ft. maneuvering boxes (similar to the current parallel parking concept provided on all downtown Birmingham streets)
   2. 22 ft. long parking spaces, with no maneuvering boxes.

Note that the total count of parking that can be provided does not change based on which one is selected.

B. **Lane Width**
   1. 11 ft. wide travel lanes with 8 ft. wide parking spaces.
   2. 11 ft. wide travel lanes, a 1 ft. wide parking buffer, and 7 ft. wide parking spaces.

The positives and negatives of both options will be reviewed.

A suggested recommendation to the City Commission is provided below:

**SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION:**

To recommend to the City Commission conceptual design plans for the reconstruction of Maple Rd. from Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave., with the following design features:

1. Parking spaces sized at __________, and lane widths designed at ____________.
2. Option ____ for the design of Maple Rd. between Chester St. and Henrietta St.
3. Option ____ for the design of the Park St. intersection.
Maple Road Project (and extension of current project)

- Full reconstruction Chester to Pierce and E of Old Woodward to Woodward
- Resurfacing from Southfield to Chester St.
- Realignment and signal upgrade at the Southfield intersection

Timeline: Bid Package by December
Project Goals: to the Degree Practical

- Consistency with the Phase 1 project
- Improve the pedestrian environment
- Ease pedestrian crossings
- Provide reasonable traffic operations
- Maximize the number of on-street parking spaces
- Consider maintenance costs
- Meet MDOT design standards (MDOT funded)
Recommended Street Tree Pattern: Parking Zones

In Parking Zones:
- Street trees line with center of every other parking space (top right)
- Street lights line the middle of other parking spaces (top right)
- Use of narrow, columnar trees instead of large canopy trees (bottom right)

Trees with columnar branching habit (left) preferred over large canopy trees (right).
Recommended Street Tree Pattern: Widened Sidewalk Option

In Options where Parking Removed (Maple & Bates):

- Street trees reflect pattern of Woodward Ave
- Larger sidewalks allow for larger trees and planters
Phase 1 Study
Safety Funding for Intersection redesign
  • Includes eliminating the angled intersection approach
  • Signal modifications

Signal Options:
  • Modify existing signal-included in safety grant
  • Upgrade to mast arms- Additional $80k-$120k
Maple & Bates
Existing Conditions

• Options
  • WB left-turns prohibited
  • Provide left-turn lane

• Left-turn Volumes
  • WB (33 AM/32PM) – No existing Left-turn lane
  • EB (6 AM/14 PM) – Existing Left-turn lane
Maple & Bates Option A: Left-turn Lane with Narrower Sidewalk

- Left-turn Volumes
  - WB (33 AM/32PM) – No existing Left-turn lane
  - EB (6 AM/14 PM) – Existing Left-turn lane
- Improve sight distance
- Reduce rear-end crashes
- Reduce vehicle queues on Maple Road
Maple & Bates
Option B:
Left-turn Lane with Parking Removed

- Left-turn Volumes
  - WB (33 AM/32PM) – No existing Left-turn lane
  - EB (6 AM/14 PM) – Existing Left-turn lane
- Improve sight distance
- Reduce rear-end crashes
- Reduce vehicle queues on Maple Road
Maple & Bates: Which is Preferred?

Option A: Left-turn Lane with Narrower Sidewalk

OR

Option B: Left-turn Lane with Parking Removed
**Maple & Park**  
**Option A:**  
Channelized Right-turn Lane

- Two stage pedestrian crossing
- Free-flow right-turns onto NB Park Street
- No queueing from right-turns onto Woodward
Maple & Park
Option B: Reduced Traffic Island

- Typical pedestrian crossing
- Signal Control right-turns onto NB Park Street
- No queueing from right-turns onto Woodward
Maple & Park: Which is Preferred?

Option A: Channelized Right-turn Lane

OR

Option B: Reduced Traffic Island
Parking Options
Option A-1: 20 ft Parking with 8 ft Boxes

- No Extra space at end of Blocks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERSECTION TYPE</th>
<th>&quot;Z&quot; (FT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO TRAFFIC CONTROL NO CROSSWALK</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO TRAFFIC CONTROL WITH CROSSWALK</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC CONTROL PRESENT</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE SECTION 257.674 OF THE MICHIGAN VEHICLE CODE FOR MORE INFORMATION.
Parking Options
Option A-2: 22 ft Parking

- Extra space at end of block
  - Bike Parking
  - Larger Bump-outs
  - Pedestrian Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERSECTION TYPE</th>
<th>&quot;Z&quot; (FT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO TRAFFIC CONTROL NO CROSSWALK</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO TRAFFIC CONTROL WITH CROSSWALK</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC CONTROL PRESENT</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE SECTION 257.674 OF THE MICHIGAN VEHICLE CODE FOR MORE INFORMATION.
Parking Options
Option B-1: 11ft lanes with 8 ft wide Parking
Parking Options

Option B-2:
11ft lanes with 7 ft wide Parking with 1 ft buffer
Parking Options: Which is Preferred?

Option A-1: 20 ft Parking with 8 ft Boxes

Option A-2: 22 ft Parking

Option B-1: 11 ft lanes with 8 ft wide Parking

Option B-2: 11 ft lanes with 7 ft wide Parking with 1 ft buffer
Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Multi-Modal Transportation Board held Thursday, July 12, 2018.

Chairperson Slanga convened the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

Present: Chairperson Johanna Slanga; Board Members Vice-Chairperson Lara Edwards, Amy Folberg, Daniel Rontal, Katie Schafer, Doug White

Absent: Alternate Board Member Daniel Isaksen

Administration: Lauren Chapman, Asst. City Planner
Jana Ecker, Planning Director
Austin Fletcher, Asst. City Engineer
Scott Grewe, Police Dept. Commander
Paul O'Meara, City Engineer
Carole Salutes, Recording Secretary

Fleis & Vanderbrink ("F&V"): Julie Kroll
MKSK: Brad Strader

2. INTRODUCTIONS (none)

3. REVIEW AGENDA (no change)

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, MMTB MEETING OF JUNE 7, 2018

Page 2 - Add in that Lara Edwards was nominated as Vice-Chair.

Motion by Ms. Folberg
Seconded by Ms. Edwards to approve the MMTB Minutes of June 7, 2018 with the addition.

Motion carried,

VOICE VOTE
Yeas: Folberg, Edwards, Rontal, Slanga, Schafer, White
Abstain: None
5. RESIDENTIAL STREET WIDTH STANDARDS

Ms. Ecker recalled that on January 22, 2018, the City Commission considered future street widths for Bennaville, Chapin and Ruffner. Several residents appeared on behalf of Bennaville Ave., and additional residents appeared on behalf of the one block of Chapin Ave. After much discussion, the City Commission endorsed the recommendations of the Multi-Modal Transportation Board (“MMTB”) with regards to the future street width. However, during the discussion, the Commission expressed confusion as to what the City’s policy is for determining the width of a new street. As a result, the MMTB was asked to study the issue in further detail, and send information and policy direction back to the Commission.

Accordingly, the MMTB discussed revising street widths standards over several months and on May 18, 2018, the revised Residential Street Widths Standards were presented to the City Commission. The Commission concluded that the document should be returned to the MMTB for suggested edits to the document. An updated draft with the changes that the Commission requested shows the changes noted in red.

Ms. Folberg commented that on street design standards (1), it looks like for new and existing unimproved residential streets that are being improved that there is no variance from the 26 ft. except when the right-of-way is less than 50 ft. She did not think that was the Board’s intent. That is not in agreement with the flow chart, which extends to both newly improved streets and existing but reconstructed streets that if any of the items in 4 are present, a different width for the street may be considered.

Mr. O’Meara and Ms. Ecker agreed that the intent was that a slightly wider width may be considered for new and existing unimproved residential streets that are being improved.

Ms. Ecker concluded the language for (1) should read, “When streets are improved or newly constructed, the standards below shall generally be applied. Exceptions may be considered when factors such as those described in Section 4 are evident.” Also, in INTRODUCTION a T is missing.

Mr. Rontal thought the City Commission wants a standard and a means of identifying when the standard can be breached.

Ms. Ecker noted all of this will be together from start to finish in the City Commission Agenda packet when it goes back to the Commission. If approved, the new City Standard will be on the City’s website.

Motion by Ms. Edwards
Seconded by Mr. Rontal to recommend approval to the City Commission of the revised Residential Street Width Standards with the changes that were discussed.

Motion carried, 6-0.

VOICE VOTE
Yeas: Edwards, Rontal, Folberg, Slanga, Schafer, White
Nays: None
Absent: Isaksen

6. BIKE SHARE PROGRAM

Ms. Chapman described the different bike share types. Most common is the docked or station based. There is also dockless where people need not return the bike to a kiosk. Additionally, there is another dockless service where the bike is locked to a City rack or a station.

Grant opportunities are available. MoGo (Detroit's bike share) was awarded two grants. SEMCOG awarded a Transportation Alternatives Program grant for $495,380 to the cities of Berkley, Detroit, Ferndale, Huntington Woods, Oak Park, and Royal Oak for a multi-community bike share. In addition to that grant, MoGo also received a grant from Build a Better Bike Share for $400,000 to support adaptable bikes that are for users who struggle to use two-wheel bikes.

There are different ways to fund bike shares:
- The entity partnering with the bike share puts up money;
- Through a third party operation;
- Through various partnerships;
- Small business sponsors.

Anyone can use a bike share for any reason, at any time. The City has several miles of trails. Several people have expressed that they would like a bike rental in the City. Ms. Chapman noted 21 potential station locations in Birmingham.

There were several questions that Ms. Chapman asked the board to consider:

If bike share is favored:
What kind would the board prefer?
- Recommendation: The City pursues docked (station based) bike share or dockless (kiosk optional). For dockless: Users would be required to lock bikes to public racks or company provided racks.

Is there interest in multi-community connections?
Recommendation: The City link with other communities in order to increase the effectiveness for Birmingham and other communities.

What company?
- **Recommendation:** If linking with other communities the City would have to contract with the same systems MoGo (Shift Transit) or Southfield (Zagster) use. If not, City staff has no specific recommendation.

Should we provide accessible bikes now or withhold opinion until later? - **City staff recommends** that the MMTB consider accessible bikes after a bike share has been operational for at least a year.

Ms. Ecker noted there is no information that suggests you cannot have a successful bike share program without infrastructure. Or, that you cannot have successful infrastructure without a bike share program. One is not needed before the other.

Mr. Rontal had a hard time seeing people use a bike share program to get around the City of Birmingham. He could see it being useful to get to surrounding communities. In terms of intra-city bike share, he favored something more along the lines of the Lime Electric Scooter Share they have in San Francisco as being more convenient.

Ms. Ecker said with respect to locating the stations the board would lead and public input would be encouraged. Offsite parking locations would be good places to put a station so that commuters can get to Downtown. Mr. Rontal said he has a hard time visualizing people biking down Maple Rd. from some of the outlying churches, wearing their work clothes.

Discussion turned to usage and Ms. Chapman said with both Zagster and MoGo their usage data is proprietary to their participating cities.

With regard to safe bike routes to surrounding communities, Eton, and Pierce were noted.

Ms. Schafer wondered whether if other cities are using bike share and Birmingham is not, is Birmingham shutting itself out of that potential draw of people because they can't leave their bike in Birmingham.

Ms. Ecker stated there is a whole generation of folks that don't want to drive and might want to ride bike share. To Ms. Schafer's point, if surrounding cities have bike share and Birmingham doesn't, is Birmingham left out?

Ms. Chapman said in response to Mr. Rontal that the cost to go with either Zagster or MoGo depends on the number of stations and how many bikes at each station.
Ms. Slanga noted the Zagster pilot is paid for by Zagster. However, it is much more on the community with MoGo; but then there is the connectivity with surrounding cities. Ms. Chapman said the cities can bring in different sponsors. Advertising can be applied to the bikes or to the kiosks. Mr. Rontal suggested they should look at going to large businesses for sponsorship as well as small businesses. Maybe Ford, GM, and Chrysler would be interested in stepping in. Ms. Ecker advised that in the past the Surnow Group has been interested in sponsorship.

Ms. Ecker thought it would be a mistake to start something and not try to connect with surrounding communities.

Ms. Chapman asked the board members whether they feel bike share is a favorable possibility.

Ms. Folberg said to her the question is whether it is worth $100,000 to do a feasibility study. Ms. Chapman said that other communities have not done a feasibility study and are basically signing up for bike share a year at a time to see how it goes. MoGo is planning to hold community meetings for them to consider possible station locations.

Ms. Ecker said that opportunities for grants come up every year. She added surrounding municipalities are generally more than happy to share information back and forth with Birmingham. It was discussed that being a year behind may provide Birmingham a lot of information about what might or might not work.

Board members asked staff to come back with:
- A round number of locations with an accessibility map;
- If Birmingham were to go with MoGo in order to connect with surrounding communities it would be around $______. If it were $100,000 to implement, then the $100,000 feasibility study seems like a waste of money;
- What is the City's perspective on how it would be managed;
- With MoGo the City would have to do more of the heavy lifting than with Zagster. Is there enough resources and staff to do that;
- Provide information from surrounding cities that are starting this up;
- Some thoughts and opinions from the business community on bringing in bike share.

Ms. Ecker predicted that once a bike station is in place people will be surprised how much they might use it. Ms. Chapman said the key for locations are to place bike stations somewhere people can get to and somewhere that people want to be.
7. MAPLE RD. IMPROVEMENTS (Phase 2 of Old Woodward Ave. Project)

Mr. O'Meara noted that the City of Birmingham has committed to a three-phased program to reconstruct its major corridors in the Central Business District. Phase I construction, focusing on the central part of Old Woodward Ave., is currently nearing completion, with an expected completion in early August. The remaining two phases will consist of:

- Phase 2, Maple Rd. – Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave. (Construction planned in 2020)
- Phase 3, S. Old Woodward Ave. – Brown St. to Landon Ave. (Construction planned in 2022)

While the Multi-Modal Transportation Board (“MMTB”) assisted with the initial street designs used in Phase 1, the City Commission assisted at a high level in the final design package. Per their direction, a planning consultant (MKSK) was hired and assisted the City in the conceptual design package now being constructed. Since there is a desire to be consistent and follow the design theme started in Phase 1 into the remaining projects, MKSK has been retained to assist again in developing the conceptual plans for Phase 2. This is a particularly smooth transition, given that MKSK has now been retained and is teamed with the City’s traffic engineering firm F&V. Together, they have prepared conceptual plans to assist the MMTB with all of its planning needs. It is expected that the initial MMTB comments will be taken at this meeting, and then initial comments will be taken from the City Commission. A final review by the MMTB is expected later this summer.

As plans are prepared for Phase 2, it is important to note that the City was fortunate to be awarded two federal grants to assist in covering the cost of this project. Grants include:

- A grant for $352,000, awarded by the Oakland Co. Federal Aid Committee, to assist the City in the cost of reconstructing this major road. As a street with high traffic counts, combined with the need for general safety improvements, this segment of Maple Rd. qualified for a grant estimated at covering 80% of the cost of resurfacing this street.
- A grant for $249,700, awarded under the Highway Safety Improvement Program, covering 80% of the cost of reconstructing the Southfield Rd. at Maple Rd. intersection.

Mr. Strader spelled out the goals of the Phase 2 project:

- Be consistent with Phase 1;
- Improve the pedestrian and bike environment using recommended design options from the MMTB and the City Commission;
- Provide reasonable traffic operations;
- Consider on-street parking options that maximize the number of spaces;
- Consider maintenance costs;
- Meet the MDOT standards;
• Consider placement of street trees and ornamental street lights;
  - A tree every other parking space interspersed with a street light every other space;
  - Trees to be columnar in nature.

Mr. Strader and Ms. Kroll covered options for the various sections of the road.

1. **Southfield Rd. Intersection** – The City received a safety grant to improve the geometrics. The skewed angle in which Southfield Rd. meets Maple Rd. has created a high crash environment. It is also considered unfavorable for pedestrians attempting to cross Maple Rd. at this signal. F&V studied crash histories for the City. They determined that moving the intersection to the west, therein making all turning movements to be executed at a 90° angle, would have a measurable impact on reducing crashes. The traffic signal will have to be relocated as a part of this improvement. The MMTB and City Commission will be asked to consider whether a mast arm traffic signal design is appropriate here or not. To upgrade the signal from span wire to a mast arm would be an additional $80 to $120 thousand, depending upon the design. The standard for Downtown is a mast arm; outside of Downtown it is not. MKSK and F&V will provide photo renderings of the appearance of the two signal designs as viewed for northbound traffic, and the visual impact they will have on the Birmingham Museum located at this intersection.

Mr. Rontal suggested that if the mast arm is used and it is decided this is Downtown, they should locate signage or public artwork on the SE corner of the intersection so people are notified that they are coming into Downtown. He hoped the options for street trees would include those with fall color.

Mr. Strader assured they will draw the schematics to ensure the intersection is designed for trucks to be able to make the turn onto Southfield Rd.

2. **Maple Rd. Between Chester St. and Bates** – The consultants looked at a median option but it did not work out because after using the MDOT and Federal funding standards the island became too small.

3. **Maple Rd. and Bates** - The options are to leave the intersection as it is with left turns prohibited, or to provide a left-turn lane with:
   • **Option A** - Left turn lane with narrower sidewalk
     - Improves site distance;
     - Reduces rear-end crashes;
     - Reduces vehicle queues on Maple Rd.
   
   • **Option B** - Left turn lane with eight parking spaces removed
     - Improves site distance;
     - Reduces rear-end crashes;
     - Reduces vehicle queues on Maple Rd.
In this case Ms. Kroll opined that the low volume of left turns probably does not warrant a left turn lane.

Mr. Strader said they have a little room to move the street trees out into the road and restore the sidewalk width at the east and west side of Bates. The priority is to either keep the sidewalk as wide as possible even if they sacrifice on-street parking, or is keeping the on-street parking a critical priority and then doing the best they can with the sidewalk and street trees. Option A, allowing on-street parking, benefits the businesses and street life and it buffers the pedestrian from the travel lanes on the positive side. On the downside it adds to congestion because of parallel parking maneuvers. Option B makes it much better for pedestrians and it helps the traffic flow as well. The downside is the loss of parking.

Right now Maple Rd. lanes are 12 ft. wide and they are proposed to be narrowed to 11 ft. which are the least they can be with all of the constraints of high volume of traffic, busses, and heavy vehicles.

Discussion concluded there could be an Option C that would take out both sides of left turn lanes. That may cause backups. Option D would be no left turns at Bates.

Board members leaned towards Option B.

4. Maple Rd. and Park St. –
- Option A - Channelized right-turn lane
  - A center median with a two-stage pedestrian crossing;
  - Allows free-flow right turns onto NB Park St.;
  - No queuing from right turns onto Woodward Ave.

- Option B - Reduced traffic island;
  - Typical pedestrian crossing;
  - Signal Control right turns onto NB Park St. (free-flow);
  - No queuing from right turns onto Woodward Ave.

Ms. Ecker noticed that with Option A the whole pork chop space is wasted. Whereas in Option B usable sidewalk space is being added. Mr. Strader pointed out that a diverter will be needed so that people will not continue SB from Park St. onto Peabody, and they would have to turn right.

Ms. Ecker said to keep in mind that the NE corner of Park St. and Maple Rd. is likely to be redeveloped in the near future. Pretty much everyone who is interested talks about wanting Park St. to be two-way for ease of access to that property.

Chairperson Slanga expressed the opinion that nuggets and pork chops just don’t work.

It was agreed that the board needs to think a little more about this intersection.
5. **Maple Rd. East of Peabody and Park St.** - There is a narrow sidewalk with not a lot of room for street trees. They could do something to keep the small trees but the thought is maybe no street trees and replace them with a low ground cover or some other kind of plant material. Board members agreed.

6. **Parking**
- Option A-1 - 20 ft. parking with 8 ft. boxes
  - No extra space at end of blocks.
- Option A-2 - 22 ft. parking
  - Bike parking;
  - Larger bumpouts;
  - Pedestrian areas.
- Option B-1 - 11 ft. lanes with 8 ft. wide parking
- Option B-2 - 11 ft. lanes with 7 ft. wide parking with 1 ft. buffer

Board members were split on these options.

8. **MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**
(no public was present)

9. **MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS** (none)

10. **NEXT MEETING AUGUST 2, 2018 at 6 p.m.**

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

No further business being evident, the board members adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

________________________________________
Jana Ecker, Planning Director

________________________________________
Paul O'Meara, City Engineer
DATE: July 31, 2018

TO: Multi-Modal Transportation Board

FROM: Jana Ecker, Planning Director
      Scott Grewe, Police Commander
      Paul T. O'Meara, City Engineer

SUBJECT: Maple Rd. Reconstruction
         Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave.

At the last meeting of the Multi-Modal Transportation Board (MMTB), the Board discussed initial design concepts for the planned reconstruction of the downtown section of Maple Rd., scheduled for 2020. As you know, our consulting team presented initial design concepts and questions. The meeting helped to provide feedback to further develop the concepts. A revised presentation has been assembled, and will be reviewed by the Board. The summary of topics include:

1. Parking space layout and total count.
2. Tree selection.
3. Planter design options.
4. Park St. intersection design.
5. Bates St. intersection design.
6. Southfield Rd. intersection design.

The design team would like to get additional feedback on these topics before finalizing a presentation to the City Commission. The design elements will then be presented to the City Commission later in August. A suggested recommendation can be found below:

SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION:

To recommend to the City Commission the conceptual design plans for the reconstruction of Maple Rd. from Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave., with the following design features:

1. Parking spaces sized at 22 ft. wide per MDOT requirements, and lane widths at 11 ft. wide.
2. Option ____ for the design of Maple Rd. between Chester St. and Henrietta St.
3. Option ____ for the design of the Park St. intersection.
Maple Road Project (and extension of current project)

- Full reconstruction Chester to Pierce and E of Old Woodward to Woodward
- Repaving from Southfield to Chester St.
- Potential realignment and signal upgrade at the Southfield intersection

Timeline: Bid Package by December
Updates:

1. Parking layout options
2. More information on street tree selection
3. Landscape options for narrow segments
4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
5. Additional options at Maple & Bates
6. Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta
7. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
Current Maple Occupancy Rates

Parking Study Findings:
- 43 On-street parking spaces west of Old Woodward. Use of narrow, columnar trees instead of large canopy trees (bottom right) **95% full**
- 29 On-Street east of Old Woodward
- **Total=72 existing spaces**
- Image: Weekday from 12-2pm
Maple Rd. On-Street Parking Options

Existing:
72 Total spaces

MDOT Recommendation:
54 Total spaces

NO PARKING ZONE (YELLOW CURB OPTIONAL)

20 FT. LONG, 8 FT. WIDE MIN SPACES

NO PARKING ZONE (YELLOW CURB OPTIONAL)
On-Street Parking
Existing

• 43 On-street parking spaces west of Old Woodward
• 29 On-Street east of Old Woodward
• Total=72 existing spaces

Existing Google Earth Aerial
MDOT
Recommendation:
22 ft Parking Spaces

- City may seek a design exception from MDOT
- Spaces reduced at corner per MDOT specifications
- 36 On-street west of Old Woodward.
- 18 On-Street east of Old Woodward
- Total= 54 spaces
  Existing=72 spaces
  (-18 spaces)
Updates:

1. Parking layout options
2. More information on street tree selection
3. Landscape options for narrow segments
4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
5. Additional options at Maple & Bates
6. Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta
7. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
Recommended Street Trees

- Segments of Maple Rd sidewalk are more narrow
- Businesses do not prefer large canopy trees that block frontage
- Need for shade
- Columnar trees grow to 10-15’ wide and still provide street character with some shade
- However, some wider sidewalk zones can afford canopy trees (to match those on Old Woodward)
Recommended Columnar Street Tree: Option 1

Ginkgo (columnar)
*Ginkgo biloba*

- **Height**: 30-50’
- **Spread**: 10-15’
- **Shape**: Narrow, fastigate
- **Foliage**: Light green
- **Fall color**: Bright yellow
- **Easy to grow, columnar**
  variety of popular urban street tree. Extremely adaptable, can fit into narrow spaces, air pollutant tolerant.
Recommended Columnar Street Tree: Option 2

Armstrong Maple
*Acer Rubrum ‘Armstrong’*

- **Height:** 45’
- **Spread:** 15’
- **Shape:** Narrow, fastigate
- **Foliage:** Light green
- **Fall color:** Yellow, orange-red
- Fast growing, columnar tree used in streetscapes with narrow clearances
Recommended Street Tree for Wider Sidewalk Zones

Thornless Honey Locust
*Gleditsia triacanthos f. inermis*

- **Height:** 30-70’
- **Spread:** 25-40’
- **Shape:** Round, spreading
- **Foliage:** Dark green
- **Fall color:** Bright yellow
- Thornless and seedless variety recommended for tree lawns and streets.
- Already specified on Woodward Ave
Updates:

1. Parking layout options
2. More information on street tree selection
3. Landscape options for narrow segments
4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
5. Additional options at Maple & Bates
6. Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta
7. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
Landscape Options for Narrow Segments

Existing conditions

- Segments of Maple Rd sidewalk are more narrow
- Streetscape character must continue in these zones
- Most options are alternative to tree plantings

Option 1: Soil cells/structural soils
Option 2: Raised Planter Pots
Option 3: Flush tree grate
Option 4: Linear raised planters
Landscape for Narrow Segments
Option 1
Soil Cell Systems/Structural Soils

Weight-bearing modules or structural soils lie under street/sidewalks to maximize root growth and prevent stunted growth of trees

- Allow trees to grow in small spaces without sacrificing walkable area
- Recommended for first impression entry zone off Woodward Ave, if trees are desired
Raised pre-cast concrete; planters are **highly customizable**

Ideal for narrow spaces with not enough underground root space or width for trees

Separates pedestrians from road

Provide opportunity to **showcase seasonal/annual plantings**

Specialty irrigation/drainage systems and/or maintenance may be required
Landscape for Narrow Segments: Option 3
Flush Tree Grates

- Tree grate constructed **flush to curb** (does not require the addition 6” redundant tree grate curb)
- Ideal for narrow spaces
- **Maximizes walkable pedestrian hardscape area** around tree
- May be combined with soil cells/stabilized soil to promote sustainable tree health
Landscape for Narrow Segments: Option 4
Linear Raised Planters

- Low, linear raised planters are highly customizable
- Ideal for narrow spaces
- Maximizes walkable pedestrian hardscape area
- Does not require large width or depth for tree plantings
- Separates pedestrians from road
Updates:

1. Parking layout options
2. More information on street tree selection
3. Landscape options for narrow segments
4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
5. Additional options at Maple & Bates
6. Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta
7. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
Maple, Park & Peabody

F&V asked to evaluate other options...
Park & Peabody SYNCRO Simulations
Updates:

1. Parking layout options
2. More information on street tree selection
3. Landscape options for narrow segments
4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
5. Additional options at Maple & Bates
6. Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta
7. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
Maple & Bates Intersection

Option A - Left turn lanes

Option C1 - No left turn lanes, tapered

Option C2 - No left turn lanes, with parking

Previous:
- **Option B**: Left turn lane, reduce sidewalk width
Maple & Bates Intersection: Option A: Left Turn Lanes
Maple & Bates
Intersection:
Option C1
No Left Turn Lanes, Tapered
Maple & Bates
Intersection: Option C2
No Left Turn Lanes, with Parking
Updates:

1. Parking layout options
2. More information on street tree selection
3. Landscape options for narrow segments
4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
5. Additional options at Maple & Bates
6. Additional options at Maple & Chester to Henrietta
7. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
Maple & Chester to Henrietta Crash Analysis

Total Rear End Crashes (5 Years): 16
Average Rear End Crash Frequency: 3.2 Crashes per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Bates East of Chester</th>
<th>Chester East of Henrietta</th>
<th>Henrietta West of Bates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driver error</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to stop at intersection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distracted driving</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Rage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped EB traffic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped WB traffic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crashes caused by stopped traffic-mid block

Number of Crashes by Location and Cause
Updates:

1. Parking layout options
2. More information on street tree selection
3. Landscape options for narrow segments
4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
5. Additional options at Maple & Bates
6. Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta
7. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
Maple & Southfield Intersection
Proposed Signal Mast Placement

- Two posts required
- Daylight views to museum
- Opportunity for gateway feature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Min Distance</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Max Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>~70’</td>
<td>180’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>~110’</td>
<td>180’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>~90’</td>
<td>180’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southfield Rd. and Maple Rd. Intersection Signal Masts

Raised Planter Pots

• Raised pre-cast concrete planters are highly customizable
• Ideal for narrow spaces with not enough underground root space.
• Provide opportunity for showcasing seasonal/annual plantings
• Specialty irrigation/drainage systems and/or increased maintenance
Maple & Southfield Intersection
Proposed Gateway Opportunities

- New configuration allows opportunity for gateway features
- Signage, landscaping, lighting, seating
- Constructed in stages over time
Recommendation on Alternatives to City Commission

1. Parking layout options
2. More information on street tree selection
3. Landscape options for narrow segments
4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
5. Additional options at Maple & Bates
6. Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta
7. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Multi-Modal Transportation Board held Thursday, August 2, 2018.

Chairperson Slanga convened the meeting at 6:02 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL**

   **Present:** Chairperson Johanna Slanga; Board Members Vice-Chairperson Lara Edwards, Amy Folberg, Doug White, Student Representative Alex Lindstrom

   **Absent:** Board Members Daniel Rontal, Katie Schafer; Alternate Board Member Daniel Isaksen,

   **Administration:** Lauren Chapman, Asst. City Planner
   Jana Ecker, Planning Director
   Austin Fletcher, Asst. City Engineer
   Scott Grewe, Police Dept. Commander
   Paul O'Meara, City Engineer
   Carole Salutes, Recording Secretary

   **Fleis & Vanderbrink ("F&V"):**
   Julie Kroll

   **MKSK:**
   Brad Strader
   Haley Wolfe, Landscape Architect

2. **INTRODUCTIONS**

   The new student representative, Alex Lindstrom, introduced himself to the Board. He is a junior at International Academy. Everyone welcomed him.

3. **REVIEW AGENDA** (no change)

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES, MMTB MEETING OF JULY 12, 2018**

   Motion by Ms. Edwards
Seconded by Ms. Folberg to approve the MMTB Minutes of July 12, 2018 as presented.

Motion carried, 4-0.

VOICE VOTE
Yeas: Edwards, Folberg, Slanga, White
Abstain: None
Nays: None
Absent: Rontal, Schaefer, Isaksen

5. MAPLE RD. IMPROVEMENTS (PHASE II OF OLD WOODWARD PROJECT)

Recommendation on alternatives to City Commission:

Mr. Strader said they would like to get additional feedback on several topics before finalizing a presentation to the City Commission later in August. He reminded this project is funded by MDOT and so it must be consistent with MDOT standards.

Key topics for tonight's discussion are as follows:
1. Parking layout options
2. More information on street tree selection
3. Landscape options for narrow segments
4. Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
5. Additional options at Maple and Bates
6. Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta
7. Mast arm signal at Maple and Southfield

Parking Layout Options
MDOT recommends 22 ft. long parking spaces and a no parking zone at the corners. The City typically has parking much closer to the corner than MDOT. The City may be able to seek a design exception from MDOT to extend the parking closer to the corners. MKSK’s recommendation to the City Commission based on MMTB input from last month will be to go with this design without the Xs and give up four spaces. Areas at the corners can be used for more landscaping and bumpouts if they can't extend the parking.

In response to Ms. Slanga, Mr. O'Meara said the positive thing about the Xs is that they allow maneuvering space to get in and out quickly so as not to back up traffic. However, there are less parking spaces. Mr. Strader noted that wherever they can get a bumpout or an amenity for pedestrians they will add it in. He recalled the discussion last month was to recover some of the lost parking if possible. ADA spaces are put at the ends so there is not so much of an impasse throughout the day for turning trucks. Conclusion was to meet with MDOT to see what the flexibility is with the different options.
Street Tree Selections
Ms. Ecker noted the City will try to put in the bigger, broader canopy trees wherever there is room. Ms. Wolfe noted segments of Maple Rd. sidewalk are more narrow and columnar trees still provide street character with some shade. Board members liked the Armstrong Maple for narrow sidewalks because of its orange-red, yellow Fall color. For the wider sidewalk zones, they preferred Thornless Honey Locust.

Landscape Options for Narrow Segments
Board members considered:
- Option 1 - Silva cells and structural soils;
- Option 2 - Raised planter pots;
- Option 3 - Flush tree grates;
- Option 4 - Linear raised planters with seating.

Consensus was to choose Option 3 for the sidewalk treatment, as it is the most narrow option with a tree rather than a planter. It is the best opportunity to provide shade, plus it is ADA compliant by being flush with the sidewalk. Board members also liked Option 4 for wider sidewalks because of the seating.

Additional options at Maple/Park/Peabody
Ms. Kroll ran Syncro simulations for the board to evaluate. She showed a model of a typical crossing with a push-button activated control to stop right turns. It would be a free-flow movement unless someone pushes the button to stop. Ms. Ecker said with a push-button, pedestrians will be able to cross the first part and the second part will have a stop sign. The members preferred the typical intersection and crossing design that did not include a separate diverter lane for the right hand turn lane.

There was discussion about doing something else with Park other than making it a two-way street. However, there were benefits of keeping it one-way. Ms. Ecker said that generally speaking they try to follow the 2016 Plan which suggests two-way traffic. Further, it will bring value to the vacant site near the Hunter House.

Additional options at Maple and Bates Intersection
- Option A - Left turn lanes, either lose parking or narrow sidewalks;
- Option C-1 - Left turns would be banned at Bates from 7 AM to 7 PM, with the street, tapered towards Chester so there is more sidewalk space between Chester and Bates.
- Option C-2 - No left turn lanes - keep on-street parking all the way to Chester but less room on the sidewalk.

After reviewing the Syncro model, everyone was in favor of Option C-1. Bates will operate the same as Henrietta.

Additional options at Maple from Chester to Henrietta
Mr. Strader stated that the left turn volumes are low. EB turns are higher than the WB. When the center turn lane is taken away, the potential for rear-end collisions increases. Ms. Kroll indicated there have been 3.2 crashes/year. Four crashes were caused by stopped traffic, either in the queue or to park. So, no left turns are recommended from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.

Mast arm signal at Maple and Southfield
It was shown that the mast arms afford a better view into the Museum from Southfield. The new configuration for the entryway allows the opportunity for gateway features from the west such as signage, landscaping, lighting, seating.

Mr. Strader said they will take this input, repackage it for the City Commission and after the Commission’s direction they will come back with the whole design in an animated model.

6. 2019 LOCAL STREETS PROGRAM - PAVING STREET WIDTHS

Mr. Fletcher noted one of the projects planned for the 2019 construction season is the Quarton Lake Subdivision reconstruction. The project involves the complete reconstruction of the following streets:
   Raynale St. – N. Glenhurst Dr. to Chesterfield Ave.;
   Brookwood St. – N. Glenhurst Dr. to Raynale St.;
   N. Glenhurst Dr. – Oak Ave. to Raynale St.;
   Kenwood Court – Glenhurst Dr. to 220 ft. to East.

It should be noted that these are the only improved streets in the area that have not been worked on in more than 30 years. The following is a detail of what is proposed. He recalled that the Multi-Modal Transportation Board ("MMTB") recently recommended a written policy on determining the width of new and reconstructed streets in Birmingham. The policy was approved by the City Commission at their meeting of July 23. The finalized version of the policy has been used as a reference in making the following recommendations. A summary of existing conditions is provided below, followed by a recommendation based on the City’s new residential street width standards.

Raynale St.: The existing pavement on this block was installed at thirty-two (32) feet wide. The curbs were originally installed in 1929, with an asphalt surface installed at a later date. The road width is wider than the twenty-six (26) ft. width requirement (per the Residential Street Width Standards). The existing right-of-way is sixty (60) ft. wide. A total reconstruction (new concrete pavement and underground utilities) is proposed for this street. A 26 ft. pavement width is recommended that will narrow the pavement, and provide more green space and City trees. The center line will remain the same.

Brookwood St.: The existing pavement on this block was installed at twenty-four (24) ft. wide. The curbs were originally installed in 1929, with an asphalt surface installed at a
N. Glenhurst Dr.: The existing pavement on this block was installed at thirty-two (32) ft. wide. The curbs were originally installed in 1929, with an asphalt surface installed at a later date. The road width is wider than the twenty-six (26) ft. width requirement (per the Residential Street Width Standards). The existing right-of-way is fifty (50) ft. wide. There are no existing City trees in the greenbelt (area between the road and sidewalk), due to the right-of-way and pavement widths. It should be noted that the City recently received a petition to reconstruct N. Glenhurst between Pine St. and Oak Ave. The pavement width of this section of N. Glenhurst is proposed to be constructed at twenty-six (26) ft., in accordance with the Residential Street Width Standards. The center line would remain the same. If the petition is successful, it will likely become a part of this project for logistic purposes as well as to take advantage of economy of scale (better pricing).

Kenwood Court: Kenwood Court was originally constructed as a dead end with a length of approximately 220 ft. The existing pavement was installed at twenty-four (24) ft. wide. The curbs were originally installed in 1929, with an asphalt surface installed at a later date. In the early 1990’s Kenwood Court was extended an additional 250 ft. The existing pavement was also installed at twenty-four (24) ft. wide. This street has two (2) right-of-way widths, fifty (50) ft. on the original section (west) and forty (40) ft. on the newer section. Because this street was constructed in two (2) different eras, the rehabilitation needs are different. Because of not wanting to jeopardize the existing large mature trees in the greenbelt, the recommendation is to keep the pavement at 24 ft. wide. A total reconstruction is proposed for the west half of the block (oldest) and resurfacing is proposed for the east half, as it is newer and does not require utility work. The existing curbs will remain in place on the newer section as well.

Motion by Ms. Folberg
Seconded by Ms. Edwards to accept the suggested recommendations changing the typo in (C) to twenty-six (26) ft.:

A. Reconstructing Raynale St. at twenty-six (26) ft. wide between N. Glenhurst Dr. and Chesterfield Ave.;
B. Reconstructing Brookwood St. at twenty-four (24) ft. wide (matching existing) between N. Glenhurst Dr. and Raynale;
C. Reconstructing N. Glenhurst Dr. at twenty-six (26) ft. wide between Oak Ave. and Raynale St.;
D. Reconstructing the west half of Kenwood Ct. (approximately 250 ft.) at twenty-four (24) ft. matching the existing and resurface the remaining portion of Kenwood Ct.;
E. Schedule a public hearing at the regularly scheduled meeting of the Multi-Modal Transportation Board for September 6, 2018 at 6 p.m.
Motion carried, 4-0.

VOICE VOTE
Yeas: Folberg, Edwards, Slanga, White
Nays: None
Absent: Rontal, Schaefer, Isaksen

7. MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Ms. Folberg passed out two articles. One was from the Detroit Free Press that talks about Detroit starting scooter sharing. The second article was from MNPR which mentions bumps along the way for scooter sharing and walking. She noted that in Detroit the pricing for bike share is $8/day, $18/month, and $80/year. She doesn't see bike share as being a casual use at that price.

Dockless scooter share is priced at $1 up front and then $.15/minute. This may be a better option that bike sharing.

Ms. Ecker advised that details on bike share and scooter share will be brought back to the MMTB in September. The scooter share company runs everything. In Detroit the scooters are required to be used in the bike lanes and not on the sidewalk.

Ms. Edwards stated she would like to see a task force from the public working to encourage bike share in Birmingham. They would investigate if there are more bikes how to make biking safe and how to encourage a biking environment.

Discussion followed that the City should consider doing some public relations activities that promote cycling in the City, such as bike events, group rides, public service messages for drivers to stop for cyclists and pedestrians, or drafting an ordinance to require bikes to be on the streets and not sidewalks. Board members thought that a slow roll like group ride for cyclists in Detroit would be fun for the community.

9. MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS (none)

10. NEXT MEETING SEPTEMBER 6, 2018 at 6 p.m.
11. ADJOURNMENT

No further business being evident, the board members adjourned at 7:28 p.m.

________________________________________
Jana Ecker, Planning Director

________________________________________
Paul O'Meara, City Engineer
DATE: October 2, 2018

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: Jana Ecker, Planning Director
      Scott Grewe, Police Commander
      Paul T. O'Meara, City Engineer

SUBJECT: Maple Rd. Paving Project
          Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave.

Recently, questions have been raised relative to whether it is appropriate to proceed to the
reconstruction of Maple Rd. in 2020, in light of the pending reconstruction of the N. Old
Woodward Ave. Parking Structure reconstruction. A separate report relative to that topic
explains the benefits of proceeding with the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan as currently
laid out. Based on that assumption, construction of the Maple Rd. downtown segment is
currently planned to begin in March of 2020. Unlike Phase 1, Phase 2 will include federal
funding in the form of two federal grants totaling a value of approximately $600,000. As a
result, the bidding documents will be bid through the MI Dept. of Transportation (MDOT). The
additional lead time required to meet the State’s bidding timetable to achieve the City’s
preferred construction schedule requires that final engineering design begin in December of this
year. As a result, the MKSK/F&V consulting team that regularly works with the Multi-Modal
Transportation Board (MMTB) presented options to the Board at their regular meetings of July
12 & August 2, 2018. After taking input from the MMTB, the following represents their
recommendations of the design’s highlights through the entire corridor. Input from the City
Commission is desired at this time so that a finalized version can be returned at a future
meeting for final approval.

PROJECT SUMMARY

As outlined on the attached map, the 2020 Maple Rd. project will consist of three separate
sections:

1. At the west end of the job, the Southfield Rd. approach to Maple Rd. will be relocated to
   the west to allow for true 90° turns to and from Southfield Rd. The more conventional
   intersection design is expected to reduce crashes, which allows this work to qualify for a
   grant valued at 80% of the construction cost, or approximately $250,000.

2. Between Southfield Rd. and Chester St., no changes are proposed to the traffic pattern
   or street, which was modified in 2016 as a part of the Maple Rd. 3-lane conversion
   completed that year. The asphalt pavement is in marginal condition, therefore, an
   asphalt milling and resurfacing is proposed.
3. Starting at Chester St. and extending to Woodward Ave., the Maple Rd. corridor will be completely reconstructed, including new water and sewer improvements, new concrete street, new sidewalk streetscape, new traffic signals, and new fiber optic system conduit. The Maple Rd./Old Woodward Ave. intersection completed in 2018 will be left as is.

**DESIGN DETAILS**

The following summarizes the design details that have been reviewed and endorsed by the MMTB. These design features will be presented in detail at the meeting:

1. **Parking Space Design**

Birmingham has traditionally marked parallel parking spaces with alternating “x” areas that allow for easier maneuvering of vehicles into and out of parallel parking spaces. The consultant reviewed this question, and determined that MDOT allows both options. The consultant found that the design with the “x” areas is not very popular in most congested Michigan downtowns. After review, the MMTB recommended that the “x” parking space design be eliminated if this would add parking spaces in the project area. After further study, the consultant has determined that removal of the “x” areas would not create additional parking spaces, therefore, the final recommendation is to construct the street with them being a part of the design.

Once that was decided, staff and the consulting team met with local representatives of MDOT to determine a design that could be approved relative to the important questions of lane widths, parking space dimensions, and distance between crosswalks and parking spaces. Since this is not a state highway, MDOT offered the following design parameters:

- Through traffic lanes and left turn lanes must be a minimum of **11 ft. wide**.
- Parallel parking spaces must be a minimum of **8 ft. wide, and 22 ft. long**.
- The distance from a crosswalk to an adjacent parking space can be reduced from the traditional MDOT standard of 50 ft. down to a minimum of **20 ft**.

We were pleased with these concessions from MDOT. Implementing these standards, the new design will have the following features:

- Standard 38 ft. street width in areas where parking is provided (down from the current 44 ft. width).
- City sidewalks gaining three feet of width in areas where parking spaces are present (plus, in areas where double steps currently exist, all steps will be removed, improving the sidewalks even more so from current conditions).
- Landscape and seating feature areas at Henrietta St. and at the mid-block crossing east of Old Woodward Ave.
- Counting three new parking spaces being introduced on Park St., a final tally showing all but 7 parallel parking spaces remaining, even with the introduction of the mid-block crossing.

The Commission is also advised that as a part of the street reconstruction, the accessible parking spaces that are within the project area will require enhancements, in accordance with revisions made in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Widened parking spaces with
handicap ramp access are now required for parallel parking spaces on newly constructed streets, similar to the sketch included in this report. It is anticipated that a total of four accessible spaces will have to be constructed along the project length to meet the requirements of the ADA.

2. **Landscaping Design**

The design theme used from the Old Woodward Ave. project will be continued. Design features will include:

- Raised planter beds at each tree.
- Large areas of structural organic soil around each tree.
- Landscaped seating areas at Henrietta St. and at mid-block crossing.

Unlike the rest of the project, due to the required street width between Park St. and Woodward Ave., the proposed sidewalks will remain similar to what they are today. MKSK provided multiple options on how to provide landscaping features in this area. The MMTB recommended the installation of columnar trees that have innovative concrete removal panels placed between the tree and the right-of-way line, for maximum usable walking space. Photos are attached.

3. **Southfield Rd. Intersection**

As shown on the attached drawing, the south leg of the Southfield Rd. intersection will be moved about 50 ft. to the west. While still remaining in the right-of-way, the plan is anticipated to reduce traffic crashes at this location. The more conventional design will reduce speeds for northbound Southfield Rd. traffic, which will in turn improve safety for pedestrians crossing at the east leg of the intersection. The safety grant awarded to the City will cover 80% of the construction cost for this part of the project, including relocation of the existing “span wire” style traffic signal. Since this intersection is on the edge of the Central Business District, the City Commission may wish to consider approving the installation of a new “mast arm” style traffic signal at the intersection. It is anticipated that the additional cost of the mast arm style signal would be approximately $100,000.

When considering this design element, note that the Bates St. and Henrietta St. traffic signals are already planned and budgeted for complete replacement, and they will feature the mast arm design. Further, in 2019, MDOT will be replacing the traffic signal at Maple Rd. & Woodward Ave. The City has already agreed in concept to reimburse MDOT the additional funds required to upgrade that signal to the mast arm style, instead of the standard span wire style. The MMTB did not make a recommendation on this item, since the decision does not impact the function of the streets.

4. **Bates St. Intersection**

The current configuration of the intersection is unconventional in that the pavement markings provide for a left turn lane on the west side of the intersection, where the current street is 48 ft. wide, vs. the east side of the intersection, which has no left turn lane, and is 44 ft. wide. Based on current standards, if a left turn lane is provided, it must line up with equally sized lanes on both sides of the intersection. Traffic counts were taken, and it was determined that
left turn demand is currently low in both directions, even during the peak hour. Allowing any left turns can be a serious detriment to the flow of through traffic if there is no left turn lane. Further, given the narrow right-of-way, if left turn lanes are provided, either parking must be eliminated, or sidewalks must be constructed at a narrow, undesirable width.

For several decades, left turns have been banned daily at the Henrietta St. intersection from 7 AM to 7 PM. The turn restriction allows Maple Rd. to function well during the day without left turn lanes. The design team and the MMTB recommend that a similar turn restriction be introduced at the Bates St. intersection, thereby requiring motorists to turn at Chester St. instead. Implementing this restriction provides several design benefits:

- Parking spaces can be constructed for the full length of the block to the east, improving accessibility for the multiple retail destinations in the immediate area.
- Vehicle turning movements can be moved to Chester St., where retail activity is reduced.
- Enhanced, wider sidewalks can be constructed on both blocks.
- The transition from a three lane cross-section at Chester St. to a two-lane cross-section closer to Bates St. can be designed to mimic the design concept previously approved for the Maple Rd. segment east of Old Woodward Ave.

Bumpouts are proposed at the intersection to reduce pedestrian crosswalk lengths. Reviewing the plan with truck turning movements, the handicap ramps areas will be designed to accommodate encroachments from trucks turning at this intersection.

5. Henrietta St. Intersection

The traffic configuration at Henrietta St. will match the current street. A larger landscaped sidewalk area will be developed, similar to that done at the three-way intersections on the Old Woodward Ave. project. Crosswalk lengths will be reduced.

Reviewing the truck turning movements, given the narrow width of the existing Henrietta St. pavement, turning trucks at this intersection will have to encroach on to the handicap ramps as designed. Provisions will be incorporated into the final design to accommodate this.

6. E. Maple Rd. Mid-Block Crossing

As requested by the City Commission, a mid-block crossing is provided on the block east of Old Woodward Ave. The crossing is designed to line up with the existing via that extends south into the Central Park Properties complex. Enhanced landscaping and public seating areas similar to what was done on Old Woodward Ave. will be provided.

7. Park St./Peabody St. Intersection

In accordance with the 2016 Downtown Birmingham Master Plan, the plan proposes modifying the north leg of this intersection to accommodate two-way traffic on Park St. Several alternatives were studied. Please refer to the attached memo from Fleis & Vandendbrink (F&V) for more details.
This detailed traffic analysis was just finalized by F&V, and was not fully presented to the MMTB. It was not known at that time whether Alternate 4 would be a viable option. Now that we know that it is, and since it improves the pedestrian environment the best, the consultant and staff team recommend the implementation of Option 4. Option 4 provides the safest pedestrian crossing for the north leg, as described in the attached memo.

Focusing on Option 4, it should be clarified that the drawings show three different options for a traffic island on the north leg, including no island, a small island, or a large island. The drawback of having no island is that some north and southbound motorists may be tempted to violate the turn restriction signs and drive straight through the intersection. We see this as being a relatively minor problem, however.

Removing the island allows for a larger sidewalk streetscape and development opportunity on the northeast corner, adjacent to the currently vacant property. The enhanced pedestrian environment that could result at that corner causes the team to recommend that no island be installed at this intersection.

**SUMMARY**

Summarizing the above, the design team is requesting specific input on the direction of the design in the following areas:

1. Landscaping design concepts will follow that used on the Old Woodward Ave. project. On the narrow sidewalk section between Park St. and Woodward Ave., columnar trees with removable concrete panels will be implemented to provide maximum sidewalk space.
2. Approval of the funding required for the installation of a new mast arm traffic signal at the Southfield Rd. intersection.
3. Banning left turns from 7 AM to 7 PM at the Bates St. intersection.
4. Reconfiguration of the Park St./Peabody St. intersection, modifying Park St. to the north to allow for two-way traffic with on-street parking, and signalizing the north leg of the intersection for improved pedestrian safety.

A detailed resolution follows.

**SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:**

To direct the MKSK/F&V design team to proceed to final plans for the Maple Rd. project from Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave., as follows:

1. Designing Maple Rd. with 11 ft. wide travel lanes and 8 ft. wide parking spaces for a new standard road width of 38 ft. between curbs, and continuing to provide the “x” maneuvering areas between parallel parking spaces.
2. Landscaping design concepts will follow those used on the 2018 Old Woodward Ave. project. On the narrow sidewalk section between Park St. and Woodward Ave., columnar trees with removable concrete panels will be implemented to provide maximum sidewalk space.
3. Inclusion of a new mast arm traffic signal at the Southfield Rd. intersection, at an estimated additional cost of $100,000.
4. The Bates St. intersection shall be designed without left turn lanes, and left turns shall be banned from 7 AM to 7 PM.
5. The Henrietta St. intersection will be complemented with additional landscaping and seating areas, similar to that done on Old Woodward Ave.
6. A mid-block pedestrian crossing will be provided on E. Maple Rd., aligning with the existing pedestrian via to the south currently located between 288 & 300 E. Maple Rd.
7. Option 4 shall be implemented for the Park St./Peabody St. intersection, which will convert Park St. to the north to two-way traffic with parking for northbound traffic, and signalization of the north leg of the intersection for improved pedestrian safety.
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Mr. Paul O’Meara  
City Engineer  
City of Birmingham  
151 Martin Street  
Birmingham, MI 48012

RE: Maple Road & Park Street Intersection Alternatives Analysis

Dear Mr. O’Meara,

The purpose of this letter is to provide a summary of the alternatives analysis performed at the Maple Road and Park Street intersection. The following alternatives were considered for the intersection operations and design. Each of the alternatives features are summarized herein.

- Alternative 1: Channelized Right-Turn with Bump-out
- Alternative 2: Full Intersection Operations
- Alternative 3: Channelized Right-Turn with Center Island
- Alternative 4: NB and SB Right-turn Only-Signalized E/W Ped Crossings

**ALTERNATIVE 1: CHANNELIZED RIGHT-TURN WITH BUMP-OUT**

The intersection operations with this alternative are similar to the existing conditions, with the following notable changes.

- A single WB right-turn lane is provided (currently a dual right-turn).
- A small island is provided to prevent SB vehicles from making left-turn or through movements and prevents NB vehicles from making through movements.
- A bump-out is provided on the northeast corner of the intersection.

Items of note associated with this alternative:

- The NB, EB and WB approaches will operate with traffic signal control. No changes from the existing signal operations is proposed.
- The SB approach is STOP control and the WB right-turn operates as a free-flow movement. With the WB right-turn operating as a free-flow movement, there is no concern with these vehicles impacting the adjacent intersection operations at Woodward Ave.
• Pedestrians on the west and south legs of the intersection will have pedestrian signal heads. The north leg of the intersection will operate as an unsignalized crossing and vehicles will need to yield to pedestrians in the crosswalk. This the existing pedestrian operations at this intersection.

Overall, this alternative will operate in a manner similar to existing conditions, with the addition of southbound traffic on Park Street.

**ALTERNATIVE 2: FULL INTERSECTION OPERATIONS**

The intersection operations with this alternative provide a typical intersection. This alternative considers the following features:

- Full movements for all approaches.
- Signalized control for all approaches, including signalized pedestrian crossings.

Items of note associated with this alternative:

- All approaches will operate with traffic signal control.
- Pedestrians will have pedestrian signal heads on the north, south and west legs of the intersection.

Overall, this alternative will operate with significant delay for vehicles on all approaches. It is expected that vehicles will back-up on all legs of the intersection, and of particular concern are vehicles on the WB approach impacting the operations of the Woodward Ave. intersection. Therefore, full access at this intersection is not recommended due to the proximity to the Woodward Ave. intersection and the poor intersection operations.

**ALTERNATIVE 3: CHANNELIZED RIGHT-TURN WITH CENTER ISLAND**

The intersection operations with this alternative are similar to the existing conditions and alternative 1, with the following notable changes.

- A single WB right-turn lane is provided (currently a dual right-turn).
- A large island is provided to prevent SB vehicles from making left-turn or through movement and NB vehicles from making through movements.

Items of note associated with this alternative:

- The large island provides a 2-stage pedestrian crossing with a pedestrian refuge in the island.
- The NB, EB and WB approaches will operate with traffic signal control. No changes from the existing signal operations is proposed. The SB approach is STOP control and the WB right-turn is a free flow movement. With the WB right-turn operating as a free-flow movement, there is not concern with these vehicles impacting the adjacent intersection operations at Woodward Ave.
- Pedestrians on the west and south legs of the intersection will have pedestrian signal heads. The north leg of the intersection will operate as an unsignalized crossing and vehicles will need to yield to pedestrians in the crosswalk. This is the existing pedestrian operations at this intersection.

Overall, this alternative will operate in a manner similar to existing conditions, with the addition of southbound traffic on Park Street.

**ALTERNATIVE 4: NB AND SB RIGHT-TURN ONLY-SIGNALIZED E/W PED CROSSINGS**

The intersection operations with this alternative are similar to the existing conditions, with the following notable changes.

- A single WB right-turn lane is provided (currently a dual right-turn).
- Signalized control will be provided for all approaches, including signalized pedestrian crossings.

Items of note associated with this alternative:

- All approaches will operate with traffic signal control.
- Pedestrians will have pedestrian signal heads on the north, south, and west legs of the intersection.
- There is no room for an island on the north leg with the larger bumpout on the northeast corner.

Overall, this alternative will operate in a manner similar to existing conditions, with the addition of southbound traffic on Park Street. One notable improvement for this intersection is that there is signalized pedestrian control for pedestrians crossing the north leg of the intersection.

This leg of the intersection currently does not have any traffic control for pedestrians. There is no proposed median island with this alternative due to facilitating truck turning movements with the proposed bump-out. Without an island on the north and south legs of the intersection there is nothing preventing vehicles from driving through or making a left-turn.

**SUMMARY**

**Alternative 1: Channelized Right-Turn with Bump-out**

- This alternative will operate in a manner similar to existing conditions, with the addition of southbound traffic on Park Street. This alternative provides both a bump-out and a small island on the north leg of the intersection.

**Alternative 2: Full Intersection Operations**

- This alternative will operate with significant delay for vehicles on all approaches. It is expected that vehicles will back-up on all legs of the intersection, and of particular concern is vehicles on the westbound approach impacting the operations of the Woodward Ave. intersection. Therefore, this alternative is not recommended due to the proximity to the Woodward Ave. intersection and poor intersection operations.

**Alternative 3: Channelized Right-Turn with Center Island**

- This alternative will operate in a manner similar to existing conditions, with the addition of southbound traffic on Park Street. This alternative provides no bump-out, but does provide a large channelizing island on the north leg of the intersection.
Alternative 4: NB and SB Right-turn Only-Signalized E/W Ped Crossings

- This alternative will operate in a manner similar to existing conditions, with the addition of southbound traffic on Park Street.
- Overall, this alternative will operate in a manner similar to existing conditions, with the addition of southbound traffic on Park Street. One notable improvement for this intersection is that there is signalized pedestrian control for pedestrians crossing the north leg of the intersection. This leg of the intersection currently does not have any traffic control for pedestrians. There is no proposed median island with this alternative due to facilitating truck turning movements with the proposed bump-out. Without an island on the north and south legs of the intersection there is nothing preventing vehicles from driving through or making a left-turn.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on a holistic analysis of the intersection, considering all factors including vehicular and pedestrian safety, maneuverability and accessibility, F&V recommends that the City of Birmingham move forward with the design and construction of Alternative 4. The Multi-Modal Transportation Board has stressed pedestrian safety as their highest concern at this intersection, and Alternative 4 grants this. While this option is the most expensive, it provides the greatest benefit to all users.

Alternatives 2 and 3 were not found to be acceptable alternatives from both a safety, operational and fiscal standpoint.

If Alternative 4 is not fiscally viable, F&V recommends that the City of Birmingham move forward with the design and construction of Alternative 1. While not as optimal as Alternative 4, Alternative 1 provides benefits to motorists while not diminishing the level of service or level of safety that pedestrians currently have.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact our office.

Sincerely,

FLEIS & VANDENBRINK

Julie M. Kroll, PE, PTOE  
Sr. Project Manager

Justin Rose, PE  
Project Manager

JPR:jmk

Attachments: Alternatives 1-4
DATE: September 28, 2018

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: Paul T. O'Meara, City Engineer

SUBJECT: Phase 2 of Downtown Infrastructure Project

At the July 9th City Commission meeting, the Commission had directed staff to evaluate the trade-offs of changing the sequence of the future planned phases for the S. Old Woodward Ave. and Maple Rd. projects in light of prospective plans for the N. Old Woodward and Bates Street project. The following is a compilation of the key considerations that would be affected.

**Project Timing:**

The current schedule for the Phase 2 Maple Road project involves two related projects. First is the reconstruction and infrastructure replacement on Maple Rd. from Chester St. to Woodward Ave. The second is the reconfiguration of the intersection at Southfield Rd. and Maple Rd. The timing for this project includes:

- Detailed design work to begin in December, 2018
- Project Submitted for MDOT approval in August, 2019 (for work in 2020).
- Project start in March/April of 2020 (4 month project)

The alternate option for constructing S. Old Woodward in 2020 would follow this basic same schedule. However, design work has already progressed on the Maple Road phase given the current sequencing of the project phases. A change at this time to prepare designs for S. Old Woodward would pose a delay of about 4 months, but could still be accomplished to bid the project in August of 2019.

The coordination with the N. Old Woodward and Bates Street parking structure project is difficult to assess given the plans are still tentative. Based on current timelines provided in the development team's proposals and the desire to begin the parking structure replacement as soon as possible, the following tentative timeline is provided:

- Development Agreement finalized in December, 2018
- Preparation of site plan reviews begin the Spring, 2019
- Bond funding proposal submitted for May, 2019
- Project start in October, 2019 thru November, 2022

The following timeline outlines the overlap between the Maple Rd. Project and S. Old Woodward Ave. Project in relation to the proposed N. Old Woodward and Bates Street project based on the above assumptions. The red line represents the N. Old Woodward and Bates...
Street project, the green line represents the Maple Rd. Project and the yellow line represents the South Old Woodward Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Old WW &amp; Bates</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Old WW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact on Downtown Traffic**

To help envision how traffic will be managed, a conceptual detour plan for the Maple Rd. project is attached. The project is expected to be built in two phases, as described below:

1. **Phase 1 - Underground Phase**

   Complete pavement removal, followed by all new utilities, is planned between Chester St. and Woodward Ave. To help facilitate this work, we propose to direct all traffic on to the old Ring Road bypass, similar to what was done for the 2018 project. Parking lanes will be removed where feasible to allow for two lanes of through traffic on Willits St., Oakland Blvd., Chester St., and Brown St.

2. **Phase 2 - Paving Phase (including Southfield Rd.)**

   During the paving phase, the detour route will remain as described above. To facilitate the work around Southfield Rd., Maple Rd. will be narrowed to two lanes, and Chester St. and Brown St. will be used for a detour of all through traffic on Southfield Rd.

The use of Ring Road worked very well overall during the 2018 project. An important part of its success was the removal of on-street parking to allow more vehicles through at each intersection. While Maple Rd. is closed, it will be important to have two westbound lanes open on Willits St. Assuming the parking structure is the first priority of the N. Old Woodward Ave. & Bates St. project, and given the timing above, it is anticipated that the parking structure would be under construction from approximately October, 2019, to May, 2021. Once the parking structure is done, and work begins on the smaller private building projects, activity on the Willits St. portion of the site will intensify. Construction of a five-story building on the Willits St. frontage of the site (at the northeast corner of Bates St.) will require closure of the sidewalk and the parking lane for safety of the public. If construction of that building begins in 2021, and extends into 2022, this construction will work well if the City is then focusing on Phase 3, the reconstruction of S. Old Woodward Ave. If the Phase 2 and 3 project order was reversed, however, the use of the westbound Willits St. parking lane would conflict with the detour route for Maple Rd.
From a traffic phasing perspective, constructing Maple Rd. first is the preferred option.

**Project Funding**

The funding for the two projects is listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Maple Road Project</th>
<th>S. Old Woodward Ave. Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Costs (net of grants) *</td>
<td>$1,710,000</td>
<td>$3,638,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape *</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
<td>$1,212,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Replacement *</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetlights *</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$660,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,340,000</td>
<td>$5,560,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Items initially funded by General Fund

|$2,955,000 $5,310,000 |

If the timing for the two projects were switched, the General Fund would see an additional reduction in fund balance of $2,355,000 ($5,310,000 - $2,995,000) in 2019-2020 because the S. Old Woodward Project costs are more heavily weighted towards roads and streetscape (which are initially funded by the General Fund) than the Maple Road Project. There isn't sufficient time to build up the reserves in the General Fund or to rearrange current capital improvement projects to offset the increased costs to the General Fund.

To summarize, both from a traffic management perspective and from a funding perspective, the current plan of reconstructing Maple Rd. in 2020 and S. Old Woodward Ave. in 2022 (as reflected in the current five-year Capital Improvement Plan) is preferred. It is staff's recommendation to continue with the phasing previously planned for the reasons stated above.
Maple Road Project (and extension of current project)

- Full reconstruction Chester to Pierce and E of Old Woodward to Woodward
- Repaving from Southfield to Chester St.
- Potential realignment and signal upgrade at the Southfield intersection

Timeline: Bid Package by December
PHASE 1-No work west of Chester Street (March 15 - June 15)
PHASE 2-Work on entire length of Job (June 15 to Finish)
I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Patty Bordman, Mayor Pro Tem

II. ROLL CALL
ROLL CALL: Present, Mayor Pro Tem Bordman
Commissioner Boutros
Commissioner DeWeese
Commissioner Hoff
Commissioner Nickita
Commissioner Sherman
Absent, Mayor Harris

Administration: City Manager Valentine, Assistant City Manager Gunter, City Attorney Currier,
Senior Planner Baka, Fire Chief Connaughton, Fire Deputy Chief Donohue, Police Commander
Grewe, Planning Director Ecker, DPS Deputy Director Filipski, Assistant City Engineer Fletcher,
Finance Director Gerber, Building Official Johnson, City Clerk Mynsberge, City Engineer O'Meara,
BSD Director Tighe

III. PROCLAMATIONS, CONGRATULATORY RESOLUTIONS, AWARDS, APPOINTMENTS,
RESIGNATIONS AND CONFIRMATIONS, ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS, INTRODUCTION
OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.

10-267-18 INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS
Shelley Goodman Taub, County Commissioner, 12th District
Commissioner Taub reported on the balanced County budget, noting particular line items of
interest to Birmingham.

Mike McCready, State Representative, 40th District
Representative McCready provided a brief report on various legislative items.

10-268-18 ANNOUNCEMENTS
Mayor Pro Tem Bordman announced:
• Commissioner Sherman’s Birthday
• Tonight marked the official grand opening of Fire Station #2. The Public is invited to
tour the new station located on Chesterfield at open public tours on October 11th, 5:30-
8:00 pm, and on October 20th, 10:00am-1:00pm.
• Tomorrow, October 9th, is the deadline to register to vote to be eligible to vote in the
November general election. If you are not already registered to vote at your current
address go to Michigan.gov/Vote to register online, or contact the City Clerk’s office at
248-530-1880.
• The Birmingham Fire Department’s Annual Open House is Saturday, October 13th, from 1-4 p.m. at the Adams Fire Station. Attendees can operate a fire hose, learn about fire safety, and view an EMS and vehicle extrication display, along with HAZMAT apparatus and equipment. Enter a raffle and enjoy firehouse chili at this family-friendly event. For more information, contact the Birmingham Fire Department at 248.530.1900.
• The Baldwin Public Library is hosting “A Novel Wine Tasting”, a fundraiser to support the upcoming Youth Room Expansion and Renovation. The event takes place on Friday, October 19th, 6:00-9:00 pm. Purchase tickets at www.baldwinlib.org/booksandbites.

10-269-18 APPOINTMENTS TO THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
The City Commission interviewed current members Erik Morganroth and John Miller.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Boutros:
To appoint Erik Morganroth to the Board of Zoning Appeals as a regular member to serve a three-year term to expire October 10, 2021.

VOTE: Yeas, 6
Nays, 0
Absent, 1

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Nickita:
To appoint John Miller to the Board of Zoning Appeals as a regular member to serve a three-year term to expire October 10, 2021.

VOTE: Yeas, 6
Nays, 0
Absent, 1

City Clerk Mynsberge administered the Oath of Office to the appointees.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA
All items listed on the consent agenda are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion and approved by a roll call vote. There will be no separate discussion of the items unless a commissioner or citizen so requests, in which event the item will be removed from the general order of business and considered under the last item of new business.

10-270-18 APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA
The following items were removed from the Consent Agenda:
• Commissioner Hoff: Item B, Approval of the City Commission regular meeting minutes of September 17, 2018.
  Item N, FY2019 Municipal and Community Credit Funds and FY2018 Contract Addendum
  Item T, Lot 12 Parking County Survey
• Mayor Pro Tem Bordman: Item A, Approval of the City Commission special meeting minutes of September 17, 2018.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Sherman, seconded by Commissioner Boutros:
To approve the Consent Agenda with Items A, B, N, and T removed.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Bordman
Commissioner Boutros
Commissioner DeWeese
Commissioner Hoff
Commissioner Nickita
Commissioner Sherman

Nays: None
Absent: Mayor Harris

C. Resolution approving the warrant list, including Automated Clearing House payments, dated September 19, 2018 in the amount of $29,692,487.78.

D. Resolution approving the warrant list, including Automated Clearing House payments, dated September 26, 2018 in the amount of $2,757,529.68.

E. Resolution approving the warrant list, including Automated Clearing House payments, dated October 3, 2018 in the amount of $400,349.29.

F. Resolution accepting the resignation of Jeffery Jones from the Board of Zoning Appeals, thanking him for his service, and directing the City Clerk to begin the process of filling the vacancy.

G. Resolution accepting the resignation of John Rusche as Alternate Member of Parks and Recreation Board, thanking him for his service, and directing the City Clerk to begin the process of filling the vacancy.

H. Resolution accepting the resignation of Lauren Tolles from the Design Review Board, thanking her for her service, and directing the City Clerk to begin the process of filling the vacancy.

I. Resolution accepting the resignation of Adam Charles from the Design Review Board and from the Historic District Commission, thanking him for his service, and directing the City Clerk to begin the process of filling the vacancy.


K. Resolution setting a public hearing for October 29, 2018 to consider the proposed Lot rearrangement of 120 Hawthorne, Parcel #1935230015 and 125 Aspen, Parcel #1935230001.

L. Resolution authorizing an expenditure of $25,000 from the Parking Enterprise Fund #585-538.001-901.0300 in support of the BSD holiday television campaign.

M. Resolution approving the purchase of (2) workstations, (2) secure storage cabinets and (16) lateral files in the amount of $16,744.42 from Kentwood Office Furniture, Inc.; further authorizing this budgeted expenditure from account number 101-301-000-972.0000; further authorizing and directing the mayor and city clerk to sign the agreement on behalf of the city.

O. Resolution authorizing the City Manager to cast a vote, on the City’s behalf, for the two incumbent members of the Michigan Municipal League Liability and Property Pool Board of Directors for three year terms, beginning January 1, 2019.

P. Resolution awarding parts 2 and 3 of Contract 9-18(S) to Doetsch Industrial Services of Warren, MI, in the amount of $691,485.02, to be charged to account number 590-
536.001-981.0100. Further, approving the appropriation and budget amendment as outlined.

Q. Resolution authorizing the purchase of the Tennant Sweeper in the amount of $37,843.00. Funds are available in account #585-538.001-971.0100.

R. Resolution approving the purchase of one (1) new 2018 GMC Sierra 2500 HD from Todd Wenzel Buick GMC through the Oakland County cooperative purchasing contract #5222 in the amount of $36,838.00 from account #641-441.006.971.0100.

S. Resolution authorizing an increase in the authorized amount for the 2018 Sidewalk Trip Elimination Program, Contract #6-18(SW), to Precision Concrete Cutting, Inc., in the amount of $34,174, to be charged to the Sidewalk Fund, account number 101-444.001-981.0100.

U. Resolution approving the appointment of election inspectors, absentee voter counting board inspectors, receiving board inspectors and other election officials as recommended by the City Clerk for the November 6, 2018 General Election pursuant to MCL 168.674(1) and granting the City Clerk authority to make emergency appointments of qualified candidates should circumstances warrant to maintain adequate staffing in the various precincts, counting boards and receiving boards.

V. Resolution scheduling a meeting of the Election Commission on Monday, October 29, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. for the purpose of conducting the Public Accuracy Test for the November 6, 2018 General Election.

10-271-18 APPROVAL OF THE CITY COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2018 (ITEM A)
Mayor Pro Tem Bordman noted that Joseph Fazio is with the law firm Miller Canfield, not Beier Howlett.

MOTION: Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Bordman, seconded by Commissioner Boutros:
To approve the City Commission special meeting minutes of September 17, 2018, as corrected.

VOTE:  Yeas, 5
Nays, 0
Absent, 2 (Mayor Harris absent; Commissioner Nickita abstained due to his absence at the September 17, 2018 meeting.)

10-272-18 APPROVAL OF THE CITY COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2018 (ITEM B)
Commissioner Hoff noted that Teresa Bridges is the Assistant City Engineer, not the Assistant City Manager.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman asked that her last name be added after her title on page 8. She also asked that her comment near the bottom of page 11 regarding the disparity between DPZ’s community engagement budget and MKSK’s budget be added.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Hoff, seconded by Commissioner DeWeese:
To approve the City Commission regular meeting minutes of September 17, 2018, as amended.

VOTE:  Yeas, 5
Nays, 0
Absent, 2 (Mayor Harris absent; Commissioner Nickita abstained due to his absence at the September 17, 2018 meeting.)

10-273-18  
FISCAL YEAR 2019 MUNICIPAL AND COMMUNITY CREDIT FUNDS AND FISCAL YEAR 2018 CONTRACT ADDENDUM (ITEM N)
City Manager Valentine confirmed that the next new bus shelter to be built with these funds would be at the corner of Maple and Coolidge.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Hoff, seconded by Commissioner DeWeese:
To approve $19,760 in Municipal Credits and $7,217 in Community Credits from fiscal year 2019 and $1,901 in Community Credits from fiscal year 2018 to Next in support of their specialized transportation program; to approve $21,932 in Community Credits from fiscal year 2019 to purchase and install a bus shelter (location to be determined); and further to direct the Mayor to sign the Municipal Credit and Community Credit contract for fiscal year 2019 and the amendment to the fiscal year 2018 contract on behalf of the City.

VOTE: Yeas, 6
Nays, 0
Absent, 1

10-274-18  
LOT 12 PARKING COUNT SURVEY (ITEM T)
Commissioner Hoff stated a need to find out why people are not parking in Lot 12 before the City sells an additional 75 parking permits for the lot.

City Manager Valentine said:
- The goal of the Advisory Parking Committee (APC) was to take the intermediary step of selling more passes for Lot 12 while also assessing the parking conditions vis-a-vis the lot.
- Since only twelve of the passholders seem to be parking in Lot 12 on a regular basis, the APC is hoping that selling more passes would increase utilization of the lot.
- At the same time, the APC and staff can go back to the current passholders and investigate why they are not parking in Lot 12 more frequently.
- The 3,000-person waiting list number cited contains some redundancy, and is for all five parking structures in the City.
- There are approximately 135 spaces in Lot 12, and 150 passes have been sold thus far for the lot.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman agreed with Commissioner Hoff, saying that a survey of the current passholders is in order. She continued:
- That perhaps the Advisory Parking Committee could monitor those passholders underutilizing their parking pass, who would then be subject to a three-month limit, at which point the pass would be transferred to another person.
- It is embarrassing that the City has prepared this lot for parking and that it sits largely unused.

City Manager Valentine opined that even if the people holding passes are contacted for feedback, the City still needs to issue additional passes in order to increase utilization of the lot. The City always has the option to rescind passes that are not being used.
Commissioner Boutros agreed with Commissioner Hoff and Mayor Pro Tem Bordman as far as investigating the issues with the lot, while saying it is also a good idea to issue more passes.

Commissioner Hoff agreed to move the resolution as long as further research is done into the lot’s underutilization.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Hoff, seconded by Commissioner DeWeese:
To accept the recommendation of the Advisory Parking Committee to authorize an additional 75 parking permits for Lot 12 located at the southeast corner of Woodward and Maple Road, and to direct staff to contact the current pass holders for Lot 12 and determine why they are not utilizing their permits.

**VOTE:**
- Yeas, 6
- Nays, 0
- Absent, 1

**V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**10-275-18 CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING FOR BISTRO ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS**
Mayor Pro Tem Bordman suggested postponing this item due to the size of the agenda.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Sherman, seconded by Commissioner Nickita:
To continue the public hearing for Bistro Ordinance Amendments to December 3, 2018.
**VOTE:**
- Yeas, 6
- Nays, 0
- Absent, 1

**10-276-18 MASTER PLAN CONSULTANT SELECTION**
City Manager Valentine noted that the purpose of tonight’s item was to allow the Commission to pose questions for clarification to MKSK.

Planning Director Ecker stated that MKSK is available for questions, and the DPZ team returned should there be any further questions. She clarified that two rounds of scoring were done: one based on the initial submissions, and one after the Ad Hoc Master Plan Selection Committee (MPSC) completed interviews with both MKSK and DPZ.

Chris Hemann, MKSK, introduced members of the team: Megan O’Hara, Principal with United Design Associates, Brad Strader, Principal with MKSK, and Tom Brown, Principal with Nelson Nygaard.

Commissioner DeWeese asked for clarification regarding MKSK’s community engagement process. He also asked the MKSK team to differentiate their process from DPZ’s community engagement process.

Mr. Hermann said he could not speak to DPZ’s community engagement process, but that community involvement is essential. He continued that MKSK:
- Meets with stakeholders from development, neighborhoods, business, real estate, and retail early in the process, seeking to understand their critical issues.
- After these meetings, MKSK holds a weeklong Charrette process in which they begin to address the previous concerns and opportunities expressed by the community stakeholders during the initial meetings.
- Works further on the plan based on the initial meetings and the charette, returning to the community a final time to present recommendations and understand any further concerns the stakeholders have about how the plan has evolved.

Ms. O’Hara stated that United Design Associates (UDA) was founded 54 years ago and was one of the first firms in the world to involve citizens in making decisions in planning their communities. Public engagement and involvement is a standard part of their planning practices. Ms. O’Hara stressed:
- Listening is a central aspect of their process, and that the feedback from citizens is incorporated into the planning work.
- The people interviewing the citizens are the same ones designing the plans.
- There are many ways of soliciting community feedback, including lecture series, online invitations to provide feedback, MKSK team attendance at community soccer games, visits to schools, and public meetings, as some examples. The MKSK team would work with Birmingham to come up with the most appropriate avenues for community engagement.
- UDA is experienced in both neighborhoods and downtown, and they would be working with MKSK on both.

Mr. Hermann said:
- His team at MKSK and Ms. O’Hara’s team from UDA would be working primarily on the public engagement pieces, with other members of the team focusing on other aspects of the plan such as parking and the downtown.
- Comprehensive plans are an opportunity to both educate and engage the community. City staff and the Commission would highlight particular concerns, and the MKSK team would do presentations on those issues for the community, soliciting feedback on how those issues could be improved. Using their professional expertise, the MKSK team would synthesize the community’s goals and offer options for how to achieve those goals, highlighting both the benefits and drawbacks of each option.
- The goal is to find consensus on a number of issues which the City can then move forward, and to continue to work with the issues that remain as sticking points.

Mr. Strader emphasized:
- MKSK’s present involvement in Birmingham, adding that he lives in Birmingham, Ms. O’Hara grew up in Birmingham, and another member of their team lives in Royal Oak, meaning the team brings a lot of local knowledge. It also means that the community engagement activities would be led by local people who are already known entities to the community.
- MKSK’s work with Birmingham so far has included both recommendations that have been accepted and recommendations that have been influenced by the citizens’ preferences and concerns. Mr. Strader conceded that sometimes the resident feedback led MKSK to make even better recommendations than the ones initially offered.
- The process so far has led to more flexibility on both the MKSK team’s end and the community stakeholders’ end, moving them more towards consensus.
Commissioner Sherman said that previous interactions with the MKSK team vis-a-vis Old Woodward often ended with MKSK opining something ‘could not be done’, only to return to the Commission soon after to have implemented the request. Commissioner Sherman continued:

- This was a frustration the Commission had with the MKSK team.
- It would be a problem if the community, during a public engagement process, is told something ‘cannot be done’ because that is the MKSK team’s initial reaction.

Mr. Strader said the MKSK team now comes to the Commission earlier on in the process to solicit feedback and integrate it. He added that sometimes the things the Commission requested could not be done engineering-wise, but the MKSK team worked to find other solutions that met many of the original goals of the request.

Commissioner Nickita stated the City’s area plans are good. The goal of the Master Planning process is to explore the areas that have not yet been planned, and how they will integrate with the extant area plans. The Commission does not want to see already extant area plans redone.

Mr. Hermann confirmed that the MKSK understands Birmingham’s goals as stated by Commissioner Nickita.

Ms. O’Hara explained:

- The MKSK team recognizes Birmingham neighborhoods as very stable. This means the focus is not interventions like new parks, but becoming very clear on the specific characteristics of each neighborhood, tracking things such as whether the streets have curbs, the width of the streets, what the tree canopy looks like, the lot sizes, and the age and era of the houses. From this information, the MKSK team would recommend standards for construction, park types, tear-downs, re-builds, parking, and other relevant items for each neighborhood based on their specific characteristics.
- UDA has a copyrighted process through which they look at a City as a set of different systems. They then look at each system by itself to see what could be improved. Some of the systems looked at include street connections, park locations, commercial-use distribution, and multi-family residence distribution. UDA plans on doing this as part of its process with Birmingham.
- A pattern book documents the characteristics of a place, and then recommends guidelines for future interventions so that they would fit into that place. Pattern book houses historically referenced homes with similar floorplans and different architectural elevations. Pattern books also contain neighborhood and community patterns at a block level. It is something created for each community.

Mr. Hermann said:

- Discussing the benefits and potential drawbacks of the current area plans with stakeholders, seeing what gaps exist in the current planning, and discussing what the community would like to see further developed will all be part of the process of creating a master plan that integrates all the planning Birmingham has done to date.
- Designing appropriate transitions between the neighborhoods, especially the downtown and residential, will also be discussed with community members.
- The MKSK team will synthesize community feedback, discuss the new recommendations synthesized from that feedback with the community, and further revise those recommendations based on further feedback. In this way, MKSK generates community buy-in, as they see their ideas, concerns and goals reflected in the planning.
Mr. Hermann said that the team aims to meet with influential people early in the process who can then encourage other residents to participate as well.

Tom Brown, of Nelson Nygaard, stated he is the project manager for Birmingham’s current downtown parking study. He said:

- One of the key takeaways from the RFP in terms of parking was that there is a desire to explore parking in the planned districts like the Rail District and the Triangle District.
- Figuring out the different parking conditions and expectations in the different neighborhoods is critical as well.
- One example of an approach to parking issues is that residents who value being within walking distance from downtown are sometimes willing to allow employees to permit park on the residential streets during the day, with the understanding that this helps keep the downtown functioning and vibrant.

Mr. Hermann said aspects of a market study would be pulled in on a macro scale since Birmingham has already performed market studies. The goal would be focusing on the transition zones between neighborhoods. If Birmingham desires a further market study at any point, however, Mr. Hermann confirmed the MKSK team would be able to provide that as well.

Commissioner Hoff wanted to ask questions of DPZ. The DPZ team introduced themselves as Andres Duany, DPZ, Robert Gibbs, Gibbs Planning Group, Sara Trexler, of McKenna, Phil McKenna, former owner of McKenna and now consultant to McKenna, and John Jackson, owner of McKenna.

Mr. Jackson reviewed McKenna’s history in working with Birmingham.

Mr. Duany noted that DPZ invented the Charrette process 35 years ago. He then:

- Reviewed the Charrette process as described on pages 432-434 of the October 8, 2018 agenda packet. He noted that there is a high failure rate with Charrettes, but that DPZ has changed its process over the last five or six years and has become successful.
- Clarified that DPZ expects to make individualized reports for each neighborhood.
- Said the central focus is synthesizing the expertise of the residents and the expertise of the DPZ team. He said the residents are experts in the present and in the details of their neighborhoods. The DPZ team brings a different kind of expertise, with an eye towards general trends and evolving technology.
- Said DPZ provides reports with three different scenario types to provide perspective. The first is how the community would develop with no changes to its planning. The second is how the community would develop if all the residents’ preferences were implemented. The third scenario how the community would develop if the DPZ recommendations are implemented.
- Emphasized that the residents are experts in their neighborhoods, but only in the present, whereas planners endeavor to create something based on trends and forecasting for twenty or thirty years from now. He explained that DPZ clarifies the options before the stakeholders, rather than making the decisions for the community.
- Said older residents are usually resistant to the new ideas presented in Charettes, while younger residents are usually more interested in change. Often, when a younger resident speaks in favor of an idea in a Charrette, older residents also tend to take a more positive view. Because of this, DPZ always invites the youngest person in the Charrette to weigh in first, because the young people will be interacting most with the community changes being proposed.
● Said DPZ is careful to get a random sample of attendees to attend Charrettes now, because often the most resistant residents are the ones most likely to attend of their own accord. Inviting attendees randomly allows for a more accurate representation of the community’s view.

● Said that, during planning, DPZ correlates each concern raised by residents to the appropriate level of decision making: household, block, street, city, state, nation, or United Nations. In this way, DPZ is able to clarify for everyone involved that the decisions being focused on are city-level ones.

● Said in order not to lose the more advanced participants in a Charrette, more elementary questions are answered by providing written information that can be reviewed at the inquirer’s leisure.

● Said the Commission will be an integral and active part of the process the whole time, and can provide feedback all the way along.

● Said the market study mentioned in the submittal was probably a mistake of including boilerplate language, because the submittals are not usually taken as seriously by the planners or by the community. The plan receives DPZ’s utmost attention, however.

● Said DPZ goes after the problems in a community to see where the fundamental issues are, even if they are uncomfortable topics for the community to broach, because this allows for the best planning proposals.

● Said he would be running the Charrettes, and other members of his team would write up the plan.

Ms. Traxler stated the DPZ team plans on meeting with neighborhood associations, and on being available for follow-up conversations with residents. Residents are invited to participate in Charrettes in a number of ways determined early on in the process through discussions between the DPZ team, city staff, and the Commission. Addressing the budget presented in the RFP, Ms. Traxler explained the Charrette is included in plan preparation, whereas the comprehensive community engagement is included in DPZ’s preliminary work.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman noted that, within the RFP, Charrettes were included under comprehensive community engagement. Therefore, their inclusion under plan preparation makes little sense in terms of what the Commission asked for.

Commissioner Sherman pointed out that in paragraph six of the RFP, it is possible to have made the interpretation of the Charrette being part of the plan preparation phase. In addition, the Commission was provided an explanation by Mr. Lambert at the September 17, 2018 meeting as to how the time was allocated, which met the Commission’s expectations. He continued:

● Certain Commissioners have decided Mr. Lambert’s previous explanation was not good enough.

● The MPSC worked hard on vetting these proposals, and the Commission has now spent two hours tonight and two hours at the last meeting going over this information again. The Commission originally appointed the MPSC to avoid this kind of process.

● That some members from the MPSC are present at this meeting, and should be invited to share their perspective with the Commission.

Commissioner Hoff said the meeting minutes of the MPSC are very complete in providing the MPSC’s perspective, and that no further input should be necessary to make this decision.

Commissioner Nickita opined it was reassuring that both teams had similar ways of allotting time and resources to the various aspects of the planning process.
Mayor Pro Tem thanked both teams and asked for comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Boutros reviewed the process thus far, and said he now is sure DPZ is capable of carrying out the master planning process to the City's satisfaction. He made a motion to award DPZ the contract, and it failed due to a lack of a second.

Commissioner Hoff said that she was more confident in the MKSK team.

Commissioner DeWeese, Mayor Pro Tem Bordman, and Commissioner Nickita all said they would like to wait for a full Commission to make a decision.

Commissioner Sherman noted that Mayor Harris did not have the benefit of asking questions this evening. He continued that the Commission has made a habit of deferring decisions, and that the decision should be made by the Commissioners present. Both teams are capable of doing the job well. He opined the decision should not be made on a 4-3 vote.

Commissioner Hoff said this is not a deferral, even if the Commission often does defer decisions. She said the vote would be 3-3 tonight, and having the Mayor participate in the vote will be the tie-breaking vote.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman stated that Mayor Harris could review the video recording of the meeting to catch himself up on the discussion, and that a 4-3 vote will have to be an acceptable option for the Commission on this matter.

Commissioner Boutros urged the Commission to move forward with the vote because the Commission received a recommendation from the very qualified MPSC.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman noted two Commissioners in favor of voting now, and four in favor of waiting, so Mayor Pro Tem Bordman deferred the vote.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

10-276-18 PUBLIC HEARING FOR ORDNANCE LANGUAGE UPDATES FOR CHURCH & RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION USES
Commissioner Boutros temporarily left the commission table.

Senior Planner Baka reviewed the issue as presented in the agenda packet, explaining that church is more exclusively used with Christianity, and the goal is to be more inclusive of other religions.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman opened the public hearing at 9:59 p.m.

Commissioner Sherman excused himself from the meeting at 10:00 p.m. due to illness.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman closed the public hearing at 10:00 p.m.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner DeWeese, seconded by Commissioner Nickita:
To approve the following amendments to Chapter 126, Zoning, of the City Code to remove all references to Church or Churches and replace the terms with religious institution(s) and provide a definition for same:
1. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.03, R1A (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
2. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.05, R1 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
3. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.07, R2 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
4. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.09, R3 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
5. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.11, R4 (TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
6. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.13, R5 (MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
7. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.15, R6 (MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
8. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.17, R7 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
9. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.21, O1 (OFFICE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
10. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.25, P (PARKING) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
11. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.27, B1 (NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
12. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.29, B2 (GENERAL BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
13. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.31, B2B (GENERAL BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
14. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.33, B2C (GENERAL BUSINESS) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
15. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.37, B4 (BUSINESS-RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE PERMITTED USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
16. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.39, MX (MIXED USE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
17. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.43, TZ2 (TRANSITION ZONE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
18. TO AMEND ARTICLE 2, SECTION 2.45, TZ3 (TRANSITION ZONE) DISTRICT INTENT, PERMITTED USES, AND SPECIAL USES, TO AMEND THE USES REQUIRING A SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT, TO REMOVE CHURCH AND REPLACE WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
19. TO AMEND ARTICLE 3, SECTION 3.07 – PERMITTED USES AND SPECIAL USES, TO REMOVE CHURCH IN THE LAND USE MATRIX;
20. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.45 (G)(5)(a)(ii) and (iii) – PK-01 GENERAL PARKING STANDARDS – TO AMEND THE METHODS OF PROVIDING PARKING FACILITIES, TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
21. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, TO AMEND TABLE A – REQUIRED OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES, TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
22. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.66 (A)(1)(STORAGE AND DISPLAY STANDARDS), TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
23. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.84 TU-01 (A)(2)(TEMPORARY USE STANDARDS), TO REPLACE CHURCH OR OTHER RELIGIOUS FACILITY WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
24. TO AMEND ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4.86 TU-03 (A)(1)(TEMPORARY USE STANDARDS), TO REPLACE CHURCH WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
25. TO AMEND ARTICLE 7, SECTION 7.21 (A)(1) – REQUIREMENTS, TO REPLACE CHURCHES WITH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS;
26. TO AMEND ARTICLE 9, SECTION 9.02 – DEFINITIONS, TO ADD A DEFINITION OF RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION;
27. TO AMEND APPENDIX A, LAND USE MATRIX, TO MERGE CHURCH AND CHURCH AND RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION ROWS INTO ONE ROW UNDER RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION; AND
28. TO AMEND APPENDIX B, INDEX, TO ELIMINATE INDEXED PAGES WHERE CHURCH NO LONGER EXISTS, ADD RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION AND CORRESPONDING PAGE NUMBERS.

VOTE: Yeas, 4
Nays, 0
Absent, 2

10-277-18 EMERGENCY RESPONSE VEHICLE PURCHASES
Fire Chief Connaughton thanked the Commission for its continued support of the Fire Department and reviewed the issue on the agenda.

Commissioner Boutros returned to the table.

Assistant Fire Chief Donohue presented a short presentation on the two vehicles.

Fire Chief Connaughton explained the ambulance will be at the Adams Fire Station and the mini-pumper will be at the Chesterfield Fire Station. Each station will have a full-size engine as well. If the call is a rescue, the mini-pumper and the ambulance will go out. If the call is a fire, the full-size engine and the ambulance will go out.
Commissioner Boutros pointed out that the mini-pumper will be less expensive to maintain than a full-size engine, and that it is a necessary addition to the changing needs of the Birmingham community.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Boutros, seconded by Commissioner Hoff:
To authorize the purchase of a 2019 Life Line Type1 ambulance on a Ford F-450 chassis for the cost of $237,241.00 and a 2019 Danko mini-pumper mounted on a Ford F-550 chassis for a cost of $338,431.00; further to authorize this budgeted expenditure from account number 663-338.000-971.0100; further authorizing and directing the mayor to sign the respective agreements on behalf of the City.

**VOTE:**
- Yeas, 5
- Nays, 0
- Absent, 2

**10-278-18 MAPLE ROAD PAVING PROJECT - SOUTHFIELD ROAD TO WOODWARD AVENUE**

Planning Director Ecker introduced Brad Strader and Haley Wolf from MKSK, and Justin Rose from Fleis & Vanderbrink (F&V).

Mr. Strader made a presentation of the findings and recommendations made by F&V and endorsed by the Multi-Modal Transportation Board (MMTB) in the agenda packet. He continued that the design of the barrier-free spaces will be updated to meet current standards and expectations. As a result some of the barrier free spaces were relocated to accommodate the design change.

Mr. Rose explained that having the barrier-free spaces across from each other allowed them to be closer to the ‘X’, and the MMTB emphasized the desire to have the ‘X’s located in a consistent way.

City Engineer O’Meara explained:
- Handicapped parking standards require a certain number per block, not necessarily per smaller unit of road.
- His understanding is that the new ADA standards do require the proposed changes to the handicapped spaces, even though they are more invasive to the land- and street-scapes.

Mr. Rose clarified that:
- The changes to the handicapped spaces may be required if using federal funding, but not necessarily on a local project.
- MDOT's standard is 20-foot spaces with an eight-foot box, or 22-foot spaces. The only way F&V was able to get to 22-foot spaces was with Birmingham’s current 18-foot spaces and eight-foot boxes.

Mr. Strader said that F&V drew out both options, and the MMTB said to remove the ‘X’s if the yield increased, but to leave them if the yield remained the same.

Commissioner Nickita asked the team to consider whether these changes to the handicapped spaces should be done at all, or perhaps only at some spaces as they are not required.
The team confirmed for Commissioner Nickita that from Southfield to Old Woodward the proposed changes would remove seven spaces.

Commissioner DeWeese pointed out that wider sidewalks would mean businesses no longer need to use parking spaces to accommodate their decks, which could lead to an increase in available spaces. He added that the biggest issue with wheelchairs and parking is curb height. Lower curbs are easier to navigate.

Mr. Strader said that the team would get more clarity on the ADA requirements for parking and would look into potential modifications that would accommodate Commissioner DeWeese's observation about curb height.

City Engineer O'Meara confirmed Maple would have wall-to-wall, optic lines, and irrigation. The power lines were foregone because installing them was a large expense and the City can always light things on Maple by plugging in the lights.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman said that skipping the power lines on Maple may be unwise because it is a large east-west thoroughfare.

Mr. Strader said that MDOT projects do not have bid options, so the Commission would need to decide on installing power lines or not before moving the project on to MDOT.

Mayor Pro Tem Bordman replied that the City can then internally research the option.

Mr. Strader explained that benches and other amenities were not included in this early version because this presentation was just of the proposed infrastructure changes. Amenities would be included in the later design.

Mr. Strader continued with the presentation, reviewing the tree and landscaping options as included in the agenda packet.

Commissioner Nickita opined that canopy trees are essential to the quality of the streetscape.

Commissioner DeWeese noted that different kinds of canopy trees could be used in different locations as necessary instead of switching to columnar trees.

There was consensus among the Commissioners that canopy trees are to be maintained.

Mr. Strader continued with the presentation, next addressing the mast arm signal at Maple and Southfield. He confirmed that the light on Southfield is facing south.

Mr. Rose explained the new conditions would turn the road considerably, facing where the stop bar would be, which is not dead-on like the other ones are. The goal was to eliminate the pork chop for the right turns. The City got some safety funding from MDOT to do this reconfiguration which is why the City cannot do the mast arm and the box span, as the decision needs to be made prior.

Mr. Strader said the MMTB focused more on the view into the Museum, not the view of the signal.
Mr. Rose confirmed that the team would be putting more of a bend in the road. He continued that:

- The right turn movements along with the people turning left off of Maple yielded the most crashes.
- Going from Maple to Southfield, turning right and going eastbound, the road will look slightly different because the movement will be controlled with the intersection.
- Currently there is a yield situation in which many vehicles are not yielding to the left-turning vehicles, which is creating the conflict. After the proposed change, rights onto Southfield will still be possible, just within the confines of the intersection.

Commissioner DeWeese said it was wise to include mast arms at both locations, and that the 90° angle will increase safety. Commissioner Nickita concurred.

Commissioner Nickita continued that the width of the southbound lane may need further study. He said the width of the proposed lane is so wide as to be potentially dangerous.

Mr. Rose said that lane is not yet to scale, because these were the schematics used in the proposal. He agreed with Commissioner Nickita that the lane cannot be that wide.

There was Commission consensus on adopting Commissioner DeWeese's recommendation for mast arms.

Mr. Strader continued with the presentation, reviewing the intersection at Maple and Bates.

Mr. Rose said the intersection would work fine with left-turns onto Bates, even without a left-turn lane, according to models.

Mr. Strader continued with the presentation, reviewing the intersection at Maple and Henrietta.

Commissioner Nickita opined that the City needs to adhere to its plan of celebrating terminating vistas. He continued that where Henrietta terminates to the north something needs to be done to accentuate the end of that visual corridor.

Mr. Strader continued with the presentation, reviewing the mid-block crossing between Peabody and Old Woodward.

Mr. Rose confirmed that removing the three ‘X’s to the east of the crosswalk would not equal another parking space. This is because with the federal fund requirement, the spaces are the same at 22-feet or 20-feet with an eight-foot ‘X’.

Mr. Strader said that an eleven-foot lane is an MDOT standard, and was found to be no less safe than a 12-foot lane.

Commissioner Nickita said he liked the lane narrowing, that the taper-length is excessive, and that he would like to see less space on either side of the crosswalk.

Mr. Rose noted that a fifteen-foot lane tends to increase speeds, that the team would look into shortening the taper in order to add an additional space, and that the space on either side of the crosswalk is required by MDOT.
Mr. Strader continued with the presentation, reviewing the intersection at Maple, Park and Peabody.

Commissioner Nickita explained that this is one of the remnants of the ring road system from the 1960s that Birmingham has been replacing, and that this section of road should be fixed similarly. He suggested:

- Peabody should allow drivers to either go through or right, instead of limiting drivers’ options to a right turn.
- That then the five lanes become four lanes.

Mr. Rose agreed, saying the team would update the plan with these recommended changes.

Mayor Pro Tem suggested there should be a crosswalk installed on the east side, at Peabody and Park, going north to south.

Mr. Strader reviewed the Commission’s direction:

- Barrier-free parking will be reviewed to see if its frequency can be reduced.
- Electric systems as part of Maple will be reviewed.
- The next round of drawings will include amenities.
- Maple and Bates will have no left turns on either side, and there will be mid-block crossings.
- Canopy trees will be reviewed as the preferable option for landscaping.
- Maple-Southfield graphics will be cleaned up to show a better signal view.
- Terminating vistas which are part of this plan will be designed with an eye towards celebration.
- F&V will model removing the fifth lane at the Woodward, Peabody and Park intersection.

Commissioner Nickita excused himself from the meeting at 11:32 p.m. due to an early morning flight.

10-279-18 DOWNTOWN PARKING STRATEGIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT AND PRESENTATION

Assistant City Manager Gunter summarized the report as studying the effective management, use of capacity, and the City’s technological environment. She emphasized:

- This is a dynamic plan and a recommendation.
- The implementation guide for immediate action steps that the Advisory Parking Committee (APC) should consider.

Assistant City Manager Gunter concluded by introducing Tom Brown, Julie Dixon, and Brad Strader.

Mr. Brown provided an overview of pages ten through thirty-one of the September 2018 Final Downtown Parking Plan Report.

Ms. Dixon suggested that Lot 12’s underutilization could be because employees work from home a number of days a week. Thus, a potential option would be a pass that allows passholders to purchase a certain number of lot uses per month instead of the flat rate. This can encourage drivers to consider alternate forms of transportation. She continued:

- The Commission’s instinct to study Lot 12 is a good one, as it can be a study for how exactly to design a flexible pass that will work for Birmingham drivers.
When overselling passes, the process has to be increased incrementally beginning with an additional ten percent.

Factors like day-use passes or night-use passes could also be considered in the process of tracking the car counts.

A flex-pass is more similar to a ‘license to hunt’ than a guaranteed space. The pass would offer a good likelihood of finding a space. It would also be beneficial to the City to allow the pass to be used in a few different areas so a failure to find a space in one lot does not end a driver’s opportunity to find a space.

The most essential part of these recommendations is that someone needs to be interpreting the data and making recommendations based on that. If the data is ignored the recommendations are not sound.

Nelson-Nygaard tends to write the report, Dixon often helps municipalities interpret the data and implement the report, and through part of Dixon’s work they help municipalities design and hire for a permanent position monitoring parking trends and implementing changes. Several parking operators are able to do this. Municipal oversight has to be engaged in this process.

There are sustainable solutions that allow municipalities to retain their parking revenue.

Birmingham can definitely justify a dedicated parking manager for the City, given the age of the industry and the demand for parking in Birmingham.

Commissioner Hoff said she liked the idea of parking ambassadors.

Commissioner DeWeese said he appreciated the ‘Quick Wins’.

Mr. Brown noted that sometimes these decisions are sensitive, so one of the best approaches is to combine something like a rate hike with one of the recommended ‘Quick Wins’ or something else positive so that it is clear the changes are part of a program.

Al Vaitis, Chair of APC, liked the idea of a valet at Lot 6. He explained:

- One company bought a block of permits that are not being used at Lot 12, so the APC’s idea was to get more utilization.
- One of the negatives of Lot 12 is that it means people have to cross Woodward.
- SP+ has been doing a great job for the City.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Boutros, seconded by Commissioner DeWeese:
To accept the Downtown Parking Strategies and Recommendations report, as presented by the Nelson Nygaard Consultants and further to direct the APC to evaluate and prioritize implementation of the recommended strategies in future meetings.

**VOTE:**
- Yeas, 4
- Nays, 0
- Absent, 3

**VII. REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA**
The items removed were discussed earlier in the meeting.

**VIII. COMMUNICATIONS**
None.

**IX. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA**
None.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X. REPORTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10-280-18 COMMISSIONER REPORTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City Commission will interview for three positions on the Birmingham Shopping District Board on November 19, 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City Commission will appoint one member to the Cablecasting Board on November 19, 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City Commission will appoint one regular member to the Board of Zoning Appeals on November 19, 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City Commission will appoint one alternate member to the Parks and Recreation Board on November 19, 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City Commission will appoint two members to the Design Review Board on November 19, 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City Commission will appoint one member to the Historic District Commission on November 19, 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **10-281-18 CITY STAFF REPORTS** |
| The Commission received the Parking Utilization Report, as submitted by Assistant City Manager Gunter. |
| The Commission received the Oakland County Board of Commissioners Ad Hoc Committee on Election Infrastructure Report, as submitted by City Clerk Mynsberge. |
| The Commission received the CN Maple Road Bridge Update, as submitted by Director of Public Services Wood. |

**XI. ADJOURN**
Mayor Pro Tem Bordman adjourned the meeting at 11:58 p.m.

J. Cherilynn Mynsberge, City Clerk
Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Multi-Modal Transportation Board held Thursday, November 1, 2018.

Vice-Chairperson Lara Edwards convened the meeting at 6:04 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL**

   **Present:** Board Members Vice-Chairperson Lara Edwards, Amy Folberg, Daniel Rontal, Katie Schafer, Doug White; Alternate Board Member Daniel Isaksen

   **Absent:** Chairperson Johanna Slanga; Student Representative Alex Lindstrom

   **Administration:** Jana Ecker, Planning Director
   Austin Fletcher, Asst. City Engineer
   Scott Grewe, Police Dept. Commander
   Paul O'Meara, City Engineer
   Carole Salutes, Recording Secretary

   **Fleis & Vanderbrink ("F&V"):**
   Justin Rose, Traffic Engineer

   **MKSK:** Brad Strader

2. **INTRODUCTIONS**

   Mr. Strader introduced Scott Shogan from WSP who is their national speaker on autonomous connected vehicles.

3. **REVIEW AGENDA** (no change)

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES, MMTB MEETING OF OCTOBER 4, 2018**

   Motion by Ms. Folberg
   Seconded by Mr. Rontal to approve the MMTB Minutes of October 4, 2018 as presented.

   Motion carried, 6-0.
5. MAPLE RD. IMPROVEMENTS - SOUTHFIELD RD. TO WOODWARD AVE.

Mr. Strader recalled that since they last met and this board made recommendations, they went to the City Commission and the Commission agreed with most of the recommendations. However, there were some that they wanted to revisit in more detail, so MKSK and F&V have been working to respond to those and to the Commission's additional ideas as well. He offered the refined design in a PowerPoint presentation.

- Direction from the City Commission on the following topics and locations:
  - Parking spaces - MKSK and F&V went with the Xs and proposed a barrier free design. The City Commission felt the barrier free design intruded too much on the sidewalk and they wanted to go with the standard design with a wider sidewalk.
  - The street trees were revised to delete the columnar trees. Zelkova trees are now being recommended, in addition to Honey Locusts.
  - The City Commission wanted more detail on the Southfield Rd./Maple Rd. Intersection.
  - The Commission wanted to terminate the view at the intersection of Maple Rd. and Henrietta.
  - They requested clarity on the amenities.
  - Also, they requested additional options for the intersection at Maple Rd./Park/Peabody to meet MMTB goals.

- MKSK and F&V are still on their time line; coming back to this board in November for the final design recommendations, then beginning the engineering drawings and looking at a 2020 construction.

- Only five overall parking spaces will be lost after working with MDOT, City staff and the design team. Initially they thought 25 spaces would be lost. They were able to keep the Xs between parking spaces.

- There is very good coverage on barrier-free spaces along Old Woodward Ave. with one ADA accessible space for every 25 spaces in a block. With the angled parking, extra barrier space is allowed for van accessibility.

- The City Commission agreed with the flush tree grates if they are needed to get as much sidewalk width as possible. However, they think after working with MDOT that there is now enough width so the grates may not be needed.

- Mr. Rose took over the presentation at this point. He advised that the City Commission endorsed the mast arm signal recommendation and requested more design details to
ease pedestrian crossing but still accommodate truck turns. Their data collection consultant is scheduled to determine what size trucks need to be accommodated.

- Ms. Ecker commented that they don't want the big trucks to go through Downtown. However, once the truck counts are received they will see if it is worth dedicating all of that pavement to them.
- Mr. Rose said they are looking at something to differentiate and guide the passenger vehicles into the normal concrete but allow trucks to go over it.
- Mr. O'Meara verified that they have asked F&V to explore a couple of other ideas that are still in the design stages before this gets to the Commission.
- Mr. Rontal suggested if they do away with the bumpout on the SE corner and add a pedestrian refuge in between, it would effectively cut the crosswalk distance in half.

- Mr. Strader said at the intersection of Maple Rd. and Henrietta the terminating vista treatment could be a large art sculpture, seating, and/or enhanced landscaping.
- The amenities in Phase 1 will be included in Phase 2, such as bike racks near tapered zones, benches at intersections, and mid-block crossings.
- For the intersection at Maple Rd./Park/Peabody Mr. Rose recalled that everyone was in agreement that Option 4 which is a fully signalized intersection where there is stop control for the right turns heading WB would work the best. However, the City Commission's issue was the width of the sidewalk on the south side of Maple Rd. between Woodward Ave. and Park/Peabody. They asked that several different options be explored. However, every option to reduce the number of lanes forced cars to become backed up. So the conclusion was that five lanes are important. Also, eliminating the right turn lane ended up being a catastrophe.
- Then they went to MDOT and asked what else they could do. MDOT was open to reducing the five lanes to 10 ft. in width for that one block. That enabled them to get 11.5 ft. of sidewalk to the south which is enough room to continue all of the streetscaping elements.
- Discussion concluded that a gateway treatment at both the east and west would be a good idea.

- The City Commission wondered if they could include a pedestrian crossing on the east leg of the Park/Peabody intersection. However, analysis showed that if that crossing was added it would not work for vehicles or pedestrians.

**Motion by Ms. Folberg**  
Seconded by Mr. Rontal that with the understanding that the intersection of Southfield Rd. and Maple Rd. still needs some refinement, the Multi-Modal Transportation Board makes the following recommendations relative to the Maple Rd. conceptual design from Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave.:

1. The crossing of Maple Rd. on the eastern leg at Peabody/Park will not be pursued.
2. Three ADA accessible parking spaces will be provided in the corridor. The spaces shall be sized the same as the other parking spaces in the project area, and located near an intersection so as to be able to make use of the proposed ramps at the intersection.
3. Columnar trees will be deleted in favor of trees similar to those used on the Phase 1 project.
4. The Southfield Rd. intersection realignment will be refined to permit all truck turning movements, as shown.
5. The taper length east of Old Woodward Ave. will be reduced to the minimum required, thereby allowing the addition of two more parking spaces on the E. Maple Rd. block.
6a. The cross-section of Maple Rd. east of Park St. will be reconstructed with five 10 ft. wide lanes, pending approval of a design exception from MDOT.

Motion carried, 6-0.

VOICE VOTE
Yeas:  Folberg, Rontal, Edwards, Isaksen, Schafer, White
Nays:  None
Absent:  Slanga

6. COLLECTOR STREET PAVING PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS

Park St. – Oakland Blvd. to Hamilton Ave.
Peabody St. – E. Maple Rd. to E. Brown St.
Bowers St. – Woodward Ave. to S. Adams Rd.
Elm St. – Bowers St. to Woodward Ave.

The above commercial street segments are budgeted for maintenance work in 2019. The work varies from asphalt resurfacing to full depth pavement replacement. Other than Park St., no curb and gutter sections are planned for removal, other than patching. With that in mind, no street widths are being changed with this project. As is typically done, staff has reviewed the Multi-Modal Transportation Plan (MMTP) to verify if any multi-modal improvements should be incorporated into the project at this time. The following summarizes this review:

1. Park St. - Oakland Blvd. to Hamilton Ave.:  The MMTP does not call for any improvements on this segment.

Staff Recommendation:
- Replace handicap ramps and pavement markings at the Oakland Blvd. intersection with new 12 ft. wide walking surface.
- Replace handicap ramps and pavement markings at the mid-block crossing with new 8 ft. wide walking surface.

2. Peabody St. – E. Maple Rd. to E. Brown St.:  The MMTP does not call for any improvements on Peabody St.
Staff Recommendation:
- Require construction of a mid-block crossing at a later date as a part of the new construction as 34965 Woodward Ave.
- At Brown St., replace the handicap ramps and pavement markings to meet the City's current standards at the mid-block crossing at 8 ft. wide.

3. Bowers St. – Woodward Ave. to S. Adams Rd.: The MMTP recommended the addition of sharrows to mark this stretch as a part of a neighborhood connector route.

   Elm St. – Bowers St. to Woodward Ave.: The MMTP does not call for any improvements on Elm St. A widened crosswalk is also proposed on Elm St. where it meets Woodward Ave.

Discussion considered eliminating parking along the south side of Bowers St. and adding two bike lanes. Board members discussed adding markings for bicycles at a later date when there are other connections for the neighborhood connector route. Ms. Ecker noted the number one complaint from the Triangle District is the lack of parking. Further, getting rid of the parking would not provide enough room for bike lanes.

Staff Recommendation:
- On Bowers St., replace handicap ramps at the Elm St. and Adams Rd. intersections to meet the City's current crosswalk standards at 8 ft. wide.
- On Elm St., replace handicap ramps at the Elm St. and Woodward Ave. intersection to meet the City's current crosswalk standards at 6 ft. wide.

Motion by Mr. Rontal
Seconded by Ms. Folberg to recommend to the City Commission the following improvements to be included in the Collector Streets Paving Program, in accordance with the Multi-Modal Transportation Plan:

Regarding Park St.:
- Replace handicap ramps and pavement markings to meet the City’s current standards such that the Oakland Blvd. crossing has a 12 ft. wide walking surface, and the mid-block crossing has an 8 ft. wide walking surface.

Regarding Peabody St.:
- Postpone construction of a mid-block crossing until new construction at 34965 Woodward Ave. is completed.
- Replace handicap ramps and pavement markings to meet the City’s current crosswalk standards such that the Brown St. crossing has an 8 ft. wide walking surface.

Regarding Bowers St. and Elm St.:
- Replace handicap ramps and pavement markings to meet the City’s current crosswalk standards such that the Bowers St. intersections of Elm St. and
Adams Rd., as well as the Elm St. intersection at Woodward Ave. have 8 ft. wide walking surfaces.

There was no public present to comment.

**Motion carried, 6-0.**

**VOICE VOTE**

Yeas: Rontal, Folberg, Edwards, Isaksen, Schafer, White

Nays: None

Absent: Slanga

7. **CONTINUING EDUCATION: AUTONOMOUS VEHICLES**

**Guest Speaker:** Scott Shogan, PE, PTOE

Connected/Automated Vehicle Market Leader, WSP

Mr. Shogan presented background regarding the latest thinking on autonomous vehicles (AV). There is pressure on the companies that are developing this technology to race ahead. There will be opportunities opening up for new users that may not be able to access the system well today, such as the elderly and people with disabilities. The car companies are looking increasingly at how they would provide mobility as a service rather than selling vehicles directly to consumers.

Almost all of these automated vehicles are being built on electric vehicle platforms. So, advancing battery technology will be a big piece going forward. General Motors is talking about next year launching driverless fleets of taxis in three different locations.

Most of the automated vehicles do everything via sensors that are onboard as opposed to connected vehicles which use a cooperative communication system where the vehicles are actually talking digitally to one another, the roadside, and to the cloud interoperable systems that work across all equipment and manufacturers.

It's not just about the technology, there is also the reality of physical street space.

- Mr. Strader spoke about the new mobility era:
  - Ride hailing (Uber, Lyft, car-share)
  - Shared bike systems
  - Rapid bus systems
  - Communication technology
  - On-board vehicle safety features

25% of peak hour traffic in San Francisco is Uber/Lyft.

- Impacts on cities and timing will depend upon:
Will vehicle travel go up or down?  
Who will own the AVs - individuals or shared use?  
Where will the vehicles park and drop off?  
Will convenience of AVs reduce the willingness to walk or bike?

Self-driving vehicles are likely to increase total vehicle travel, although it depends on the ownership model and the level of supporting infrastructure.

Connected autonomous vehicles will improve the capacity of intersections.

- Impacts to certain land uses:  
  - Gas stations replaced by electric charging stations.  
  - Will we have fewer or more auto-oriented uses?

- Impacts on street design:  
  - Will more narrow lanes be feasible?  
  - Demands for curbside space.  
  - Cost to upgrade "Smart Transportation" infrastructure.

- Parking Impacts:  
  - How will autonomous vehicles affect parking demand?  
  - There is likely to be a reduced overall parking demand.  
  - Developers and cities may be less willing to build expensive parking structures, or seek alternatives.

Design new garages for flexibility, such as having flat floors to accommodate new uses in the future.

Mr. Rontal questioned if there is anything that can be done to try and future proof some of their plans and make it easier to do conversions down the road. Mr. Shogan suggested:  
- Putting in the conduit for fiber optic cable when doing a road project.  
- Plan parking structures in terms of re-use.  
- Consider drop-off space in design schemes.

Mr. Rose asked what can be done from a traffic signal perspective. Mr. Shogan replied:  
- Size the signal control cabinets to be ready.  
- Add inexpensive features to the traffic signal controller that would make it easier to add new functionality later.

Ms. Edwards asked if there are any plans for electric vehicle charging stations. Mr. Shogan advised that the range has been increasing a lot. Already they can go 300 miles without a charge. The technology will definitely improve. Mr. O'Meara said there hasn't been enough demand in Birmingham that they would close off parking spaces and make them only available to electric vehicles.

Ms. Edwards asked about cyber security for the connected vehicles. Mr. Shogan said that is a whole industry unto itself because of the disastrous effect if there is vulnerability.
8. **MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**
   (no public)

9. **MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS** (none)

10. **NEXT MEETING DECEMBER 6, 2018 at 6 p.m.**

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

   No further business being evident, the board members adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

   ____________________________________________
   Jana Ecker, Planning Director

   ____________________________________________
   Paul O'Meara, City Engineer
DATE: October 26, 2018

TO: Multi-Modal Transportation Board

FROM: Jana Ecker, Planning Director
ScottGrewe, Police Commander
Paul T. O’Meara, City Engineer

SUBJECT: Maple Rd. Reconstruction – Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave. Conceptual Plans

The City’s multi-modal transportation consultant (the MKSK/F&V team) has been working with the Multi-Modal Transportation Board (MMTB) to finalize plans for the reconstruction of Maple Rd. between Southfield Rd. and Woodward Ave. An initial presentation was provided to the City Commission at its meeting of October 8, 2018. Comments raised by the City Commission requiring further review and refinement are summarized below:

1. ADA Accessible Spaces Design

Staff was under the impression that the ADA requirements for reconstruction of streets with marked parallel parking spaces had been revised to require extra wide parking spaces, as presented on slide 17 of the attached presentation. As can be seen, the widened parking spaces would disrupt the flow of the City sidewalk and landscaping theme. The City Commission asked that we verify if this design is suggested or mandatory.

Since the meeting, F&V has confirmed that the widened parking spaces are suggested but not required. With that in mind, the accessible parking space locations will remain as proposed, but the size of the spaces will remain the same as the other parking spaces on the street.

2. Columnar Tree Recommendation

The Commission did not endorse the idea of installing columnar trees in areas of narrower sidewalks, such as adjacent parking spaces. It was noted that the sidewalk areas will be wider than they are now, and columnar trees have not been installed on Maple Rd. historically. The City Commission asked that all canopy trees be installed, but was open to larger and smaller varieties of canopy trees.

MKSK reviewed this idea, and have revised the conceptual plans to delete the columnar trees. Zelkova trees are now being recommended, in addition to Honey Locusts.
3. Southfield Rd. Intersection

The Commission commented that the southbound lane seems excessively wide. F&V has since studied the intersection in more detail to confirm the required size of the right turn truck turning radius. The design now included in this package has been designed to ensure that a WB62 truck can make the right turn off of Maple Rd. Extra pavement to the right of this turn is being recommended in order to support this movement.

F&V will be collecting traffic counts at this intersection to confirm the number and size of trucks that are making various turning movements currently to verify that the appropriate design is advanced to the City Commission. Pedestrian counts will be taken as well.


The Commission commented that the length of the taper from three lanes to two lanes east of Old Woodward Ave. seemed excessive. F&V looked at the design closer, and determined that the taper length could be shortened, and still meet AASHTO requirements. Doing so actually allowed for the installation of two more parking spaces as well, which is now reflected on the plan.

5. Maple Rd. east of Park St.

The City Commission had two comments relative to the far easterly block:

a. The consultant was asked to look at traffic demands closer to determine if one of the five lanes on this section of Maple Rd. can be deleted, which would then allow the sidewalks to be wider.

b. The installation of an additional marked crosswalk on the east side of the Park St./Peabody St. intersection should be added.

F&V has studied several options for traffic management on this block, labeled as:

Alternative 1 – Elimination of the right westbound lane.
Alternative 2 – Elimination of the right eastbound lane.
Alternative 3 – Five Lane Cross-section, using ten foot wide lanes.

As described in detail in the memo, removal of any of the five lanes on this segment of Maple Rd. is problematic, and not recommended. However, discussions with MDOT staff have been held about narrowing the lanes to 10 ft. wide each. Given the circumstances, it appears likely that a design exception will be approved for this option, therefore, the staff recommendation is to install five 10 ft. wide lanes on this block. Doing so will the installation of 11.5 ft. sidewalks on both sides of the street, a substantial improvement over the existing condition.

Regarding the installation of an east leg crosswalk at the Park St./Peabody St. intersection, F&V notes that the timing of the traffic signal at this intersection is critical for the success of traffic flows in this area. The longer distance that pedestrians would have to walk here would require a red time that is longer than can be fit into the timing sequence. The addition of a crosswalk
Based on the items noted by the City Commission, and subsequently refined, the following recommendation is provided for the Board.

SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION:

The Multi-Modal Transportation Board makes the following recommendations relative to the Maple Rd. conceptual design from Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave.:

1. Three ADA accessible parking spaces will be provided in the corridor. The spaces shall be sized the same as the other parking spaces in the project area, and located near an intersection so as to be able to make use of the proposed ramps at the intersection.
2. Columnar trees will be deleted in favor of trees similar to those used on the Phase 1 project.
3. The Southfield Rd. intersection realignment will be refined to permit all truck turning movements, as shown.
4. The taper length east of Old Woodward Ave. will be reduced to the minimum required, thereby allowing the addition of two more parking spaces on the E. Maple Rd. block.
5a. The cross-section of Maple Rd. east of Park St. will be reconstructed with five 10 ft. wide lanes, pending approval of a design exception from MDOT.
5b. The addition of a Maple Rd. crosswalk on the east leg of the Park St./Peabody St. intersection will not be pursued given that the traffic signal timing scheme will not allow it.
October 26, 2018

VIA EMAIL

Mr. Paul O’Meara
City Engineer
City of Birmingham
151 Martin Street
Birmingham, MI 48012

RE: Maple Road & Park Street Intersection Alternatives Analysis

Dear Mr. O’Meara,

The purpose of this letter is to provide a summary of the additional alternatives analysis performed for both the stretch of Maple Road between Park Street and Woodward Avenue, the pedestrian crossings at Maple Road and Park Street intersection, as well as the Maple Road and Southfield intersection, per the City Commission comments. The following alternatives were considered for the design of Maple Road between Park Street and Woodward Avenue:

- Alternative 1: Four lanes, removing westbound right turn lane
- Alternative 2: Four lanes, removing one eastbound through lane
- Alternative 3: Five lanes, using design variance to 10 foot lane widths

**ALTERNATIVE 1: FOUR LANES, REMOVING WESTBOUND RIGHT TURN LANE**

This configuration would allow for eastbound traffic to operate similar to the existing conditions; westbound traffic entering the downtown, however, will operate much more poorly. As shown, due to the high number of westbound left turners, the left turn lane could not be removed. Therefore, the existing through lane must be reconfigured to a through / right lane. While operationally this doesn’t appear to pose a huge problem as far as delays, this configuration will lead to the blocking of Woodward, which is unacceptable. Because of this blocking and the associated queuing of Maple Road east of Woodward (backing up well past Adams Road), this alternative is **NOT RECOMMENDED**.
**ALTERNATIVE 2: FOUR LANES, REMOVING ONE EASTBOUND THROUGH LANE**

This configuration would allow for westbound traffic to operate similar to the existing conditions; eastbound traffic leaving the downtown, however, will operate much more poorly. As shown, the existing two eastbound through lanes would have to be consolidated into a single through / right lane. This configuration will create a delay of **302.8 seconds**, or a Level of Service of F. Because of this large delay, and the associated queuing of Maple Road through the downtown past Southfield Road, this alternative is **NOT RECOMMENDED**.

**ALTERNATIVE 3: FIVE LANES, USING DESIGN VARIANCE TO ALLOW 10 FOOT LANE WIDTHS**

This configuration would allow for all traffic to operate similarly to existing conditions. Per conversations with MDOT, a design variance to go from 11’ lanes to 10’ lanes would likely be approved, as Maple Road is not a National Network truck route. By going from 11’ lanes to 10’ lanes, the sidewalk along the south side of Maple Road would be extended by 5’ for a total of 11.5’ on both the north and south sides of the road, allowing for a continuation of streetscaping elements through the downtown all the way to Woodward Avenue. This will create a great entrance to the downtown and will allow for optimal traffic operations. Therefore, this alternative is **RECOMMENDED**.

**MAPLE ROAD AT PARK / PEABODY**

The City Commission commented that they were in favor of adding a pedestrian crossing on the east leg of the Maple Road at Park/Peabody intersection. Based on the timing of the signal at Maple Road and Woodward Avenue, the optimal phase timing for Park and Peabody to prevent queuing onto Woodward is a maximum of 27 seconds. Based on ADA standards for pedestrian walk speed and MDOT guidance for minimum walk times, the minimum phase timing for Park and Peabody would be 32 seconds if the eastern leg had a pedestrian crossing (9 seconds for walk, 20 seconds for pedestrian clearance, and 3 seconds for the end of yellow/all red phase). With the pedestrian crossing staying on the west leg only, the minimum phase timing would be 23 seconds (9 seconds for walk, 11 seconds for pedestrian clearance, and 3 seconds for the end of yellow/all red phase). Based on the signal timing and the proximity to the Woodward pedestrian crossing, the crossing on the east leg is **NOT RECOMMENDED**.
MAPLE ROAD AT SOUTHFIELD ROAD

At the City Commission meeting, the commissioners expressed concerns about the width of the intersection and some of the lanes. In order to decrease the width of the turns and to allow for better turning movements, the intersection of Maple Road at Southfield Road was proposed to be moved further to the west along Maple Road. As shown in the attachments, the intersection would still need to be relatively wide, and would also encroach on the existing park space. Therefore, this is NOT RECOMMENDED.

Both Maple Road and Southfield Road are major mile roads and as such are frequently used by large trucks. Adding mountable curb to shorten the width of the southbound lane was also discussed, however this is not optimal as it will require pedestrians waiting to cross the southern leg of the intersection at the ADA ramp to be in conflict with large trucks turning both right and left; therefore, using pavement markings to channelize the right and left turners is RECOMMENDED. (see attached sketches)

SUMMARY

Maple Road between Park Street and Woodward Avenue

Alternative 1: Four Lanes, No Westbound Right Turn Lane
- This alternative will allow for similar eastbound operations through the downtown, however there will be a significant increase in the delay for westbound traffic. This alternative is not recommended.

Alternative 2: Four Lanes, One Eastbound Through Lane
- This alternative will allow for similar westbound operations, however there will be a significant increase in the delay for eastbound traffic with queuing throughout the downtown. This alternative is not recommended.

Alternative 3: Five Lanes, Design Variance to 10’ Lane Widths
- This alternative will operate in a manner similar to existing conditions, with the added benefit of widening the southern sidewalk by 5 feet. This will allow for streetscape elements to be added to this block while not adversely affecting traffic operations. This alternative is recommended.

Maple Road at Park/Peabody
- Due to signal timing issues, a pedestrian crossing on the east leg of the intersection is not recommended.

Maple Road at Southfield Road
- Pavement markings are recommended to better channelize motorists into more standard sized lanes, but the pavement is required for truck turning.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact our office.

Sincerely,

FLEIS & VANDENBRINK

[Signature]

Justin Rose, PE
Project Manager

JPR:jpr

Attachments:
DATE: November 10, 2018

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: Jana Ecker, Planning Director
     Scott Grewe, Police Commander
     Paul T. O’Meara, City Engineer

SUBJECT: Maple Rd. Reconstruction – Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave.
Conceptual Plans

INTRODUCTION:

At the October 8, 2018 City Commission meeting, the MKSK/F&V consulting team presented conceptual plans for the downtown segment of Maple Rd., based on recommendations from the Multi-Modal Transportation Board (MMTB). Focusing on comments from the City Commission, the plans were revised and then reviewed again by the MMTB at their regular meeting of November 1. Refinements to the plan are now being brought forward to the City Commission.

BACKGROUND:

Several points of concern were raised by the City Commission. The following is a list of those points, and the suggested revisions.

1. ADA Accessible Spaces Design

Staff was under the impression that the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements for reconstruction of streets with marked parallel parking spaces had been revised to require extra wide parking spaces, as presented in the previous presentation. The widened parking spaces would disrupt the flow of the City sidewalk and landscaping theme. The City Commission asked that we verify whether this design is suggested or mandatory.

More recently, F&V has confirmed that the widened parking spaces are suggested but not required. With that in mind, the accessible parking space locations will remain as proposed, but the size of the spaces will remain the same as the other parking spaces on the street. The MMTB endorsed this change.

2. Columnar Tree Recommendation

The Commission did not endorse the idea of installing columnar trees in areas of narrower sidewalks, such as adjacent to parking spaces. It was noted that the sidewalk areas will be wider than they are now, and columnar trees have not been installed on Maple Rd. historically.
The City Commission asked that all canopy trees be installed, but was open to larger and smaller varieties of canopy trees, depending on available space.

MKSK reviewed this idea, and have revised the conceptual plans to delete the columnar trees. Zelkova trees are now being recommended, in addition to Honey Locusts. The MMTB endorsed this change.

3. Electrical System for Maple Rd. Planter Boxes

When MKSK presented plans for Old Woodward Ave., it was represented that Old Woodward Ave. should be designed as Birmingham’s preeminent corridor, using the highest quality materials and landscaping features. One of those special features that had not been designed into any other downtown street was a separate City-owned electrical system. Other downtown streets have trees that are lit during the holiday season using electrical outlets that are contained on the City’s street lights. While this simplifies the design and the construction by having just one electrical system under the sidewalk, the street lighting system shuts off during the day with photocells. Using the separate City-owned electrical system, the holiday lights will be able to stay lit 24 hours a day. Other benefits of the electrical system include charging stations at benches, and power if needed in the future for other street features, such as kiosk displays. The electric system on Old Woodward Ave. cost approximately $290,000.

When preparing cost estimates for Maple Rd., the electrical system was not included. However, the City Commission expressed interest in having the system installed on the Maple Rd. corridor as well. Working with our electrical consultant, a preliminary cost estimate of $350,000 to $400,000 has been prepared for this system. Adding a system along Maple will cost more than it did along Old Woodward as the corridor is slightly longer, and there are approximately 20 more planters that will require receptacles than there were along Old Woodward. Please note this is also an estimate of the cost to install the system in 2020, and the $290,000 figure for the Old Woodward electrical system is the actual cost in install the system in 2018.

The other concern relative to the electrical system was the placement of the control boxes that are required to be located somewhere within or close to the corridor. The preliminary design for this system has indicated that two such control boxes will be required. Rather than installing them within a landscape bed, the other option is to install them on a side street or other City property, near Maple Rd. A control box is proposed on the southeast corner of Henrietta St. for the western portion of the corridor. On the eastern portion of the corridor a second control box will be required and the use of the via next to Social Kitchen (225 E. Maple) would be the best location. Pictures are attached to this report. Two sites are currently being studied within the City-owned via and the final recommendation on the control box placement will come back to the City Commission at a later date.

This information was not presented to the MMTB, as it was not available at the time of the meeting.

4. Southfield Rd. Intersection

The Commission commented that the southbound lane of Southfield Rd. seemed excessively wide. Since this is the intersection of two important regional streets, full truck turning movements must be designed for. When fully considering required truck turning movements, F&V determined that the lanes actually had to be widened even more than what had been presented, as shown in Option 1A (designed for a WB65 truck turn) and Option 1B (designed for a WB40 truck turn). The areas east and west of the southbound lane for Southfield Rd. represent pavement that would only be used as needed for truck turning movements. The excessive area to the west is the result of the difficult right turn movement from Maple Rd. to Southfield Rd.
Option 1A that was presented to the MMTB, as it was the only one that was available at the time the meeting agenda was being prepared. Staff was concerned that the design was a step backward in terms of the pedestrian crossings design, and other options had to be explored.

F&V researched the issue further, and determined that in areas where truck speeds are low and pedestrian traffic is high, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) recommends using the WB40 design, knowing that a WB65 can make the turn if it is done at a slower speed. With that information, F&V has since prepared two additional options, labeled as Option 2 and Option 3. Please note that none of the options infringe on Martha Baldwin Park. All changes are within the right-of-way.

Option 2 represents a modified version of the concept that was presented at the last meeting. Additional pavement is needed to the west of the southbound lane for right turns, but pavement markings would help guide smaller vehicles into a normal sized lane. A pedestrian island has been introduced to reduce the length of the pedestrian crossing, similar to the one that exists today. The safety benefits of this design compared to the existing intersection remain, however:

- Northbound traffic is required to make a conventional 90° for both left and right turns.
- Southbound turns on to Southfield Rd. would follow the more conventional pattern for making left turns. Westbound left turning traffic would yield to eastbound right turns, and a protected left turn traffic signal phase would be provided. The current merging traffic condition that is the main source for crashes would be eliminated.

Option 3 has also been provided as a hybrid that contains elements of the current condition with the new proposal:

- All turning movements would benefit from the more conventional 90° turning movements of Options 1 and 2, with the exception of northbound right turns.
- The main drawback of the current northbound right turn design is that it encourages higher speed right turns that then conflict with the Maple Rd. pedestrian crossing. On this design, however, the Maple Rd. pedestrian crossing has been moved to the west, where it will not conflict with any northbound Southfield Rd. traffic.
- The large pedestrian island as designed provides a large refuge area for pedestrians to use while crossing Southfield Rd.
- While extra pavement is still required for truck turning movements, it is not as excessive as it is in Options 1 and 2.

Given the many benefits of Option 3, staff and the consulting team recommend it as the best approach for a final design for this intersection.

5. Taper east of Old Woodward Ave.

The Commission commented that the length of the taper from three lanes to two lanes east of Old Woodward Ave. seemed excessive. F&V looked at the design closer, and determined that the taper length could be shortened, and still meet AASHTO requirements. Doing so actually allowed for the installation of two more parking spaces as well, which is now reflected on the plan.
6. Maple Rd. east of Park St.

The City Commission had two comments relative to the far easterly block:

a. F&V was asked to look at traffic demands closer to determine if one of the five lanes on this section of Maple Rd. can be deleted, which would then allow the sidewalks to be wider.

b. An additional marked crosswalk on the east side of the Park St./Peabody St. intersection should be added.

F&V has studied several options for traffic management on this block, labeled as:

Alternative 1 – Elimination of the right westbound lane.
Alternative 2 – Elimination of the right eastbound lane.
Alternative 3 – Five Lane Cross-section, using ten foot wide lanes.

As described in detail in the attached memo by F&V, removal of any of the five lanes on this segment of Maple Rd. is problematic, and not recommended. Not maintaining five lanes would result in unacceptably long traffic queues. However, discussions with MDOT staff have been held about narrowing the lanes to 10 ft. wide each. Given the circumstances, it appears likely that a design exception will be approved for this option, therefore, the staff recommendation is to install five 10 ft. wide lanes on this block. Doing so will maintain the existing 11.5 ft. sidewalk on the north side of Maple, and will increase the sidewalk on the south side of Maple from 6.5 ft. to 11.5 ft in width, which is a substantial improvement over the existing condition.

Regarding the installation of an east leg crosswalk at the Park St./Peabody St. intersection, F&V notes that the timing of the traffic signal at this intersection is critical for the success of traffic flows in this area. The longer distance that pedestrians would have to walk here would require a red time that is longer than can be fit into the timing sequence. The addition of a crosswalk here is not recommended. Fortunately, the distance to the crosswalk to the east (at Woodward Ave.) is only 130 ft.

LEGAL REVIEW:

No legal review is required for this project at this time.

FISCAL IMPACT:

As noted in the previous report, funding for this project will come from both local and federal sources. Funds to cover the cost of the project will be budgeted in the fiscal 2019-2020 budget request. The current design for the most part has followed within the expected cost range as was prepared in the current 2019-2020 budget proposal (the final approval for this budget will be forthcoming in June of next year). Items now being considered that will bring additional costs to the project over and above what had been anticipated include:

1. Mast arm signal upgrade at Southfield Rd. ($100,000 was originally estimated, however, the more complex signal required with Option 3 presented in this report is estimated to be a total of $150,000 extra.)
2. Additional mast arm signal for southbound Park St. at Maple Rd. ($50,000 estimated).
3. Electrical system to supplement street lighting system ($375,000 estimated).
Total extra costs if approved are currently estimated at $575,000.

SUMMARY:

The Maple Rd. reconstruction project represents the next important element of the three phase downtown reconstruction plan currently being undertaken by the City of Birmingham. Staff, working with the MKSK/F&V team, as well as the Multi-Modal Transportation Board, have assembled a conceptual plan that continues the successful design theme started with the Old Woodward Ave. reconstruction project. After working with the City Commission, and obtaining input from the Michigan Dept. of Transportation, the conceptual plans as prepared provide a solid working document that will provide direction to the design team, allowing the preparation of final bidding documents to be let in Fall.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Plan sheet comparing original accessible parking space proposal and revised design.
- Presentation slide featuring revised tree recommendations.
- Southfield Rd. intersection plans Options 1, 2, and 3.
- Presentation slide featuring revised design for taper east of Old Woodward Ave. intersection.
- F&V memo with drawings for five lane road section options and pedestrian crossing study at the Park St./Peabody St. intersection.
- Cover memo to MMTB for meeting of July 12, 2018.
- Presentation to MMTB for meeting of July 12, 2018.
- Cover memo to MMTB for meeting of August 2, 2018.
- Presentation to MMTB for meeting of August 2, 2018.
- Cover memo to City Commission for meeting of October 8, 2018.
- Memo regarding timing of Maple Rd. project.
- Presentation slide featuring project location map.
- Preliminary detour route plan.
- Original plan for Southfield Rd. intersection.
- Plans comparing conceptual parking and pavement marking layouts to existing conditions.
- F&V memo from September 28, 2018 regarding design options for the Park St./Peabody St. intersection.
- Agenda package to the MMTB for meeting of November 1, 2018.
- Relevant meeting minutes in chronological order.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:

To direct staff to proceed to final design for the Maple Rd. Reconstruction Project from Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave., intended for construction in 2020, featuring the following design elements:
1. Eleven foot wide travel lanes with eight foot wide parking lanes, and ten foot wide travel lanes between Park St./Peabody St. and Woodward Ave., subject to design exception approval by the Michigan Dept. of Transportation.

2. Parallel parking throughout the corridor using the standard Birmingham dimensions of 18 ft. long parking spaces and 8 ft. long "x" maneuvering spaces, as well as three standard sized accessible parking spaces in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

3. Installation of Honey Locust and Zelkova canopy trees with minimum 3.5 inch caliper size installed with structural organic sand mix and raised curbed planter boxes in accordance with the landscape plan presented.

4. Installation of a separate electrical system for 24 hour operation of holiday lighting and other electrical features.

5. Southfield Rd. intersection reconstruction using Option 3 and featuring mast arm traffic signals.

6. Mid-block pedestrian crossing featuring pedestrian plaza located at 300 E. Maple Rd.

7. Park St./Peabody St. intersection reconstruction using Option 4, featuring full signalization and conversion of Park St. to the north to two-way traffic.
2020 Maple Road Project (and extension of current project)

- Full reconstruction Chester to Pierce and E of Old Woodward to Woodward
- Repaving from Southfield to Chester St.
- Realignment and signal upgrade at the Southfield intersection
Project Goals: to the Degree Practical

• Consistency with the Phase 1 project
• Improve the pedestrian environment
• Ease pedestrian crossings
• Provide reasonable traffic operations
• Maximize the number of on-street parking spaces, upgrade to current ADA requirement
• Consider maintenance costs
• MDOT funding requires certain design specifications
Purpose of discussion tonight

Review overall concept

City Commission input on redesign options:

1. Parking space design
2. Landscape design
3. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
4. Intersection at Maple & Bates
5. Intersection at Maple & Henrietta
6. Mid-block crossing
7. Intersection at Maple/Park/Peabody

*The Multi Modal Board recommendations are noted in RED
GENERAL Cross sections

Design based upon:

- Consistency with Phase 1
- MDOT relaxed typical standards
- ADA compliant
- Lane widths reduced from 15 ft. to 11 ft.
- Sidewalk width increased to min. 8 ft.
- Overall street width reduced from 44 ft. to 38 ft.
Project Timeline

August:
Multi Modal Board Input

October:
City Commission Input on alternatives

November:
City Commission Approval on full concept

August 2019:
Submit for MDOT review

December:
Begin engineering design for bid package

March 2020:
Begin construction

Meeting with MDOT

November:
Final design recommendations by Multi Modal Board
Project Overview (see handout)

Existing

concept
1. Concept: Maple - Chester to Bates

*All views look to west*
2. Concept: Maple - Bates to Henrietta
3. Concept: Maple - Henrietta to Pierce

*All views look to west
4. Concept: Maple - Old Woodward to Park/Peabody

*This view looks to east
5. Concept: Maple - Park/Peabody to Woodward

*This view looks to east*
Preliminary concepts for input

1. Parking space design
2. Landscape design
3. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
4. Intersection at Maple & Bates
5. Intersection at Maple & Henrietta
6. Mid-block crossing
7. Intersection at Maple/Park/Peabody

Existing-
- 20 ft. spaces with 6-10ft. X’s
- Varying spacing from crosswalks
  = 68 total spaces

Concept-
- 18 ft. spaces with 8ft. X’s
- 20 ft. spacing from crosswalks
  = 58 total spaces + 3 on Park St.
• Spaces are highly used

• Some spaces lost due to mid-block crossing and MDOT requirements

• MDOT accepting shorter spaces and 20 ft. from crosswalks (typ. 30 ft. min)
1. PARKING Space Design: On-Street Parking Counts

Existing

```
Chester
| 13 |
Bates
| 15 |
Maple
| 15 |
```

- (Church ADA spot moved to rear of building)
- **3 additional spots added on Park St. (not included in Maple Rd. count)**

Concept

```
Chester
| 8 (-5) |
Bates
| 18 (+3) |
Maple
| 14 (-1) |
```

- (Church ADA spot moved to rear of building)
- **3 additional spots added on Park St. (not included in Maple Rd. count)**
Existing:
- 20 ft. spaces with 6-10ft. X’s
- Varying spacing from crosswalks
  = 68 total spaces

Concept:
- 18 ft. spaces with 8ft. X’s
- 20 ft. spacing from crosswalks
  = 58 total spaces

1. PARKING Space design: On-street Parking
• Parallel aisle configuration preferred near intersections

• Parallel aisle similar to shape of planter design, aligns with road edge
Preliminary concepts for input

1. Parking space design

2. Landscape design

3. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield

4. Intersection at Maple & Bates

5. Intersection at Maple & Henrietta

6. Mid-block crossing

7. Intersection at Maple/Park/Peabody

- Recommended street tree species
- Street tree placement
  - Landscape for narrow sidewalks:
    - Flush tree grate
    - Raised planter pots
    - Raised linear planter
Recommended Street Trees

- Segments of Maple Rd sidewalk are more narrow
- Businesses prefer that tree canopies do not hide storefronts
- Need for some shade for pedestrians and parked cars in warmer months
- However, some wide sidewalk zones can afford canopy trees (to match those on Old Woodward)

**Sidewalks with parking:**

Armstrong Maple

*Acer Rubrum*  
*Armstrong*

10-15ft. spread

**Bump-outs, intersections, and mid-block crossing:**

Thornless Honey Locust

*Gleditsia triacanthos f. inermis*

Min 30ft. spread

* Preferred option by Multi Modal Board
2. Recommended Street Trees

Overall Concept Placement

Sidewalks with parking:
Armstrong Maple*
10-15ft. spread

Bump-outs, intersections, and mid-block crossing:
Thornless Honey Locust*
Min 30ft. spread
2. Recommended Street Tree Layout

Concept Enlargement

- Canopy tree (Thornless Honeylocust)
- Columnar tree (Armstrong Maple)
2. Landscape for Narrow Sidewalks

- **Existing conditions**
- **Option 1:** Flush tree grate
- **Option 2:** Raised Planter Pots
- **Option 3:** Linear raised planters

**MMTB preferred option**
Preliminary Concepts for Input

1. Parking space design
2. Landscape design
3. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
4. Intersection at Maple & Bates
5. Intersection at Maple & Henrietta
6. Mid-block crossing
7. Intersection at Maple/Park/Peabody

- Multi Modal Board recommends mast-arm signal as downtown entry
- Intersection realignment
3. **Mast Arm Signal at Maple & Southfield**

- Two posts required
- Daylights views to museum
- Opportunity to add gateway feature relocated street areas
- Mast arm has **higher cost**: estimated as $100,000 more
- Bid alternative not allowed by MDOT
Raised Planter Pots

- Highly customizable
- Ideal for narrow spaces with not enough underground root space.
- Provide opportunity for showcasing seasonal/annual plantings
- Specialty irrigation/drainage systems and/or increased maintenance

With mast arm layout
CHOICES:
- Left turn lanes
- Wider sidewalk
- On-Street parking

1. Parking space design
2. Landscape design
3. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
4. Intersection at Maple & Bates
5. Intersection at Maple & Henrietta
6. Mid-block crossing
7. Intersection at Maple/Park/Peabody
4. Design at Maple & Bates Intersection

Option A - Left turn lanes

Option B - No left turn lanes, No left turns 7am-7pm*

*Current peak hour left turns:
- 33 from westbound Maple
- 6 from eastbound Maple

Option C - No left turn lanes, with parking

MMTB preferred option
Option B-

No left turn lanes,
no left turns 7am-7pm
Preliminary Concepts for Input

1. Parking space design
2. Landscape design
3. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
4. Intersection at Maple & Bates
5. Intersection at Maple & Henrietta
6. Mid-block crossing
7. Intersection at Maple/Park/Peabody

- Larger sidewalk area
- Shortened crosswalk length
5. Intersection at Maple & Henrietta

- Larger landscaped sidewalk area
- Shortened crosswalk lengths
Preliminary Concepts for Input

1. Parking space design
2. Landscape design
3. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
4. Intersection at Maple & Bates
5. Intersection at Maple & Henrietta
6. Mid-block crossing
7. Intersection at Maple/Park/Peabody

- Larger sidewalk area
- Shortened crosswalk length
- Alignment with southern Via
Mid-block Crossing: Overview

Alignment with southern alley
1. Parking space design
2. Landscape design
3. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
4. Intersection at Maple & Bates
5. Intersection at Maple & Henrietta
6. Mid-block crossing
7. Intersection at Maple/Park/Peabody

- Convert Park to 2 way
- Ease pedestrian crossings
7. Intersection at Maple/Park/Peabody: Existing Conditions

Existing Plan Enlargement:

Image of existing free-flow lane
7. **INTERSECTION** at Maple/Park /Peabody: Alternatives

**Option 1:** Channelized Right-Turn with Bump-out

**Option 2:** Full Intersection Operations

**Option 3:** Channelized Right-Turn with Center Island

**Option 4:** NB and SB Right-turn Only-Signalized E/W Ped Crossings
7. INTERSECTION at Maple/Park/Peabody: Preferred Alternative

- A single WB right-turn lane is provided
- Signalized control will be provided for all approaches, including signalized pedestrian crossings
- There is no room for an island on the north leg with the larger bump-out on the northeast corner
7. INTERSECTION at Maple/Park/Peabody: Sections

- A single WB right-turn lane is provided
- All lanes adjusted to consistent 11 ft. widths
Preliminary concepts for input

Confirm direction from City Commission:

1. Parking space design
2. Landscape design
3. Mast arm signal at Maple & Southfield
4. Intersection at Maple & Bates
5. Intersection at Maple & Henrietta
6. Mid-block crossing
7. Intersection at Maple/Park/Peabody
August:
Multi Modal Board Input

October:
City Commission
Input on alternatives

November:
City Commission
Approval on full concept

August 2019:
Submit for MDOT review

November:
Final design recommendations by Multi Modal Board

December:
Begin engineering design for bid package

March 2020:
Begin construction
DATE: November 29, 2018
TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager
FROM: Jana Ecker, Planning Director
       Scott Grewe, Police Commander
       Paul T. O’Meara, City Engineer
SUBJECT: Maple Rd. Reconstruction
          Southfield Rd. to Woodward Ave.
          Tree and Planter Alignment

INTRODUCTION:
At the meeting of November 19, the City Commission passed a resolution directing staff to proceed with the detailed design work and bid package preparation for the above project. One area of the design, that being the alignment of the trees and planter boxes in the area of the mid-block crossings, required additional information and discussion by the City Commission.

BACKGROUND:
As a part of the November 19 presentation, the planter boxes and trees at the mid-block crossing were shown stepped out closer to the center of the road, rather than in alignment with the other trees. The City Commission requested that MKSK provide other options to consider in this part of the design, wherein the trees would remain in the same alignment. In response, the attached presentation has been prepared by MKSK, depicting three ways that the landscape at the mid-block crossing can be prepared:

Option 1 – Trees and planter boxes would be moved out closer to the center of the road, providing additional sidewalk space between them and the adjacent buildings.

Option 2 – This option is similar to option 1, except that no trees are proposed at the mid-block crossing (this concept was used on the Old Woodward Ave. mid-block crossing).

Option 3 – The planter boxes are expanded in size, and trees are proposed on the same alignment as the other trees on the block.

LEGAL REVIEW:
No legal review is required.
FISCAL IMPACT:
None of the options offered make an impact on the overall budget for the Maple Rd. project.

SUMMARY
After review of the attached presentation by MKSK, the City Commission is asked to provide direction on which of the three options are preferred for design of the landscape areas at the mid-block crossing.

ATTACHMENTS:
- Presentation from MKSK providing details on the three landscape design options.
- Entire Maple Rd. package prepared for the November 19, 2018 City Commission meeting.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:
To direct staff to use Option _____ when preparing the landscape design in the area of the mid-block crossing on E. Maple Rd., east of Old Woodward Ave.
City Commission requested alternatives for the tree alignment at the midblock-crossings and bump-outs.

Options are as follows:
1. Trees centered in bump out planters
2. Planters only, no trees
3. Planters extended, all trees aligned
1. **Trees centered in bump-out planters**

- Sidewalk widths are maximized
- Trees emphasize mid-block crossing (different alignment, different species)
- Space for benches
2. **planters only, not trees**

- Sidewalk widths are maximized
- Break in trees will emphasize midblock crossing
- Maximum visibility for drivers/pedestrians
- Space for benches
• Sidewalk widths are reduced to ~8 ft.
• Alternate tree species may still visually emphasize midblock crossing
• Reduced space for benches
• Increased planter size
I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Patricia Bordman called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM.

II. ROLL CALL

ROLL CALL: Present:
- Mayor Bordman
- Mayor Pro Tem Boutros
- Commissioner DeWeese
- Commissioner Harris
- Commissioner Hoff
- Commissioner Nickita
- Commissioner Sherman

Absent: none

Administration: City Manager Valentine, Assistant City Manager Gunter, City Attorney Currier, IT Director Brunk, Police Chief Clemence, Planning Director Ecker, Assistant Engineer Fletcher, Finance Director Gerber, Police Commander Grewe, Assistant to the City Manager Haines, Building Official Johnson, City Engineer O'Meara, City Clerk Mynsberge

III. PROCLAMATIONS, CONGRATULATORY RESOLUTIONS, AWARDS, APPOINTMENTS, RESIGNATIONS AND CONFIRMATIONS, ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS, INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.

12-331-18 ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Mayor Pro Tem Boutros and Commissioner Hoff’s birthdays were celebrated.
- The pending retirements of Fire Chief Connaughton and Assistant Fire Chief Donohue were announced.
- City Manager Valentine introduced Assistant Fire Chief Wells, noting he will step into the Interim Fire Chief position.

12-332-18 APPOINTMENTS TO THE BIRMINGHAM SHOPPING DISTRICT BOARD

The Commission interviewed current Board members Amy Pohlod and Geoffrey Hockman.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Harris:
To concur with the City Manager’s appointment of Amy Pohlod to the Birmingham Shopping District Board, as a member who has an interest in property located in the District, for a four-year term to expire November 16, 2022.

VOTE: Yeas, 7
Nays, 0
Absent, 0
MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Boutros:
To concur with the City Manager’s appointment of Geoffrey Hockman to the Birmingham Shopping District Board, as a member representing a business located in the District, for a four-year term to expire November 16, 2022.

VOTE: Yeas, 7
Nays, 0
Absent, 0

12-333-18 APPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
The City Commission interviewed new applicant Jerry Attia and current alternate member Francis Rodriguez. Applicant Ron Reddy was unable to attend.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Boutros:
To appoint Francis Rodriguez to the Board of Zoning Appeals, as a regular member, for the remainder of a three-year term to expire October 10, 2019.

VOTE: Yeas, 6
Nays, 0
Absent, 0

Commissioner Sherman nominated Jerry Attia. However, the vote on the nomination for Francis Rodriguez was decisive, therefore Mayor Bordman announced the appointment of Mr. Rodriguez.

12-334-18 APPOINTMENTS TO THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
The City Commission interviewed new applicants Alexander Jerome, Patricia Lang, and Gigi Debbrecht.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner DeWeese:
To appoint Alexander Jerome to the Design Review Board, as an alternate member, for the remainder of a three-year term to expire September 25, 2019.

VOTE: Yeas, 7
Nays, 0
Absent, 0

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Boutros:
To appoint Gigi Debbrecht to the Design Review Board, as a regular member, for the remainder of a three-year term to expire September 25, 2021.

VOTE: Yeas, 7
Nays, 0
Absent, 0

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Nickita:
To appoint Patricia Lang to the Design Review Board, as a regular member, for the remainder of a three-year term to expire September 25, 2021.

VOTE: Yeas, 7
The City Commission interviewed new applicant Joe Zane.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner DeWeese:
To appoint Joseph Zane to the Multi-Modal Transportation Board, as an alternate member, for the remainder of a three-year term to expire October 27, 2019.

**VOTE:**
- Yeas: 7
- Nays: 0
- Absent: 0

City Clerk Mynsberge administered the Oath of Office to the appointees.

### IV. CONSENT AGENDA

All items listed on the consent agenda are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion and approved by a roll call vote. There will be no separate discussion of the items unless a commissioner or citizen so requests, in which event the item will be removed from the general order of business and considered under the last item of new business.

**12-336-18 APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA**

The following items were removed from the Consent Agenda:
- Commissioner Harris: Item H; Term Extension For The Ad Hoc Unimproved Street Study Committee
- Mayor Bordman: Item A; City Commission Meeting Minutes of December 3, 2018

**MOTION:** Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Boutros, seconded by Commissioner DeWeese:
To approve the Consent Agenda, with Items A and H removed.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**
- Ayes: Mayor Bordman
  - Mayor Pro Tem Boutros
  - Commissioner DeWeese
  - Commissioner Harris
  - Commissioner Hoff
  - Commissioner Nickita
  - Commissioner Sherman
- Nays: None

B. Resolution approving the warrant list, including Automated Clearing House payments, dated December 5, 2018 in the amount of $318,850.63.

C. Resolution accepting the resignation of Patricia Lang from the Historic District Study Committee, thanking her for her service, and directing the City Clerk to begin the process of filling the vacancy.
D. Resolution accepting the resignation of Gigi Debbrecht from the Historic District Study Committee, thanking her for her service, and directing the City Clerk to begin the process of filling the vacancy.

E. Resolution awarding the Zoning Ordinance codification services to enCode, in the amount of $11,610, to be funded from account 101-215.000-15.05200 and further, approving the appropriation and amendment to the 2018-2019 General Fund Budget as presented.

F. Resolution approving the street light agreement between the City of Birmingham and DTE Energy Co. regarding the installation of street lights at 2010 Cole Ave. Further, directing the Mayor to sign the agreement on behalf of the City. All costs relative to this agreement will be charged to the adjacent owner.

G. Resolution approving the proposed agreement by DTE Energy to replace forty-seven (47) light fixtures in the Rail District with a City approved product where the City would share in the cost equally with DTE Energy and apply a portion of an existing credit balance totaling $22,682.43 and DTE would absorb $22,682.44 for a total project cost of $45,364.87.

I. Resolution approving a request from Common Ground to hold the Street Art Fair in Shain Park and on the surrounding streets on September 14 & 15, 2019 contingent upon compliance with all permit and insurance requirements and payment of all fees and, further pursuant to any minor modifications that may be deemed necessary by administrative staff at the time of the event.

12-337-18 ITEM H: TERM EXTENSION FOR THE AD HOC UNIMPROVED STREET STUDY COMMITTEE
Commissioner Harris relayed a citizen’s question regarding the possibility of instituting special assessment districts instead of relying on resident petitions for the process of improving a street.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Harris, seconded by Commissioner Nickita:
To extend the term of the Ad Hoc Unimproved Street Study Committee through December 2019.

VOTE: 
Yeas, 7
Nays, 0
Absent, 0

12-338-18 ITEM A: CITY COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 3, 2018
Mayor Bordman asked that the minutes be amended to include further details of:
● Commissioner DeWeese’s appointment to the US voting delegation of the World Master’s General Assembly.
● Assistant to the City Manager Haines’ questions for Factory Detroit regarding ownership of the potential logo and Factory Detroit’s intent regarding the three logo designs.

Mayor Bordman also said Assistant to the City Manager Haines was not tasked with clarifying the timeline in the logo discussion with Factory Detroit.
Commissioner Hoff said one of the questions discussed at the meeting was Factory Detroit’s claim that they would complete the City’s logo process in six weeks. She asked that the reference to timing not be removed as a result, and suggested the language be changed from “timeline” to “timeframe”.

Mayor Bordman reiterated that the other two questions should be added to the minutes of the logo discussion, and said she did not understand that timing was one of the issues to be questioned.

**MOTION:** Motion by Mayor Bordman, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Boutros:
To approve the City Commission meeting minutes of December 3, 2018 as amended.

**VOTE:**
- Yeas, 7
- Nays, 0
- Absent, 0

**V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**12-339-18   GREENWOOD CEMETERY PAYMENT PLAN POLICY**
City Clerk Mynsberge presented her memo dated December 10, 2018.

Commissioner Hoff was not in favor of the contractor holding payments, and retaining any interest generated from those payments, until plot(s) on a payment agreement are paid in full.

City Clerk Mynsberge clarified for Commissioner Hoff:
- Previous materials showed 16 payment plans in effect, but one has recently been paid off, leaving only 15 contracts in place.
- The length of terms for the current 15 contracts were determined by the contractor and will remain as is. The proposed policy limits any future contracts to a maximum of 24 months.

Commissioner DeWeese stated:
- Eliminating payment plans would be contrary to the City’s policy of providing first class customer service. He sees no downside for the City in offering payment plans.
- Limiting a payment plan to 24 months is wise.
- The contractor is going to bear the extra work, not the Clerk’s Office, and it makes it a nice clean separation having such a policy in place, so he will be supporting the amendment to the Operational Procedures as proposed.
- The proposed policy gets rid of a number of inconsistencies, and puts control in the City’s hands.
- When a down payment is made it is basically a reservation for a spot. The customer does not own the plot until it is paid in full, and it is clear that if a customer has to use one of the plots, 20% of the cost of the remaining plots must be paid within a period of two to three months, which seems reasonable. Therefore he sees no downside to the policy as presented.

Commissioner Sherman remarked:
- The City’s portion of payments should be remitted probably quarterly or semi-annually.
- He is not in favor of the contractor holding payments until the end of a payment plan. If that provision were changed he would be supportive of policy.
• Payment arrangements are appropriate in this industry. It’s a fairly common practice, and he does not know why the City would not offer payment plans.
• The proposed plan addresses the rest of the issues that have been raised.
• For him, it comes down to when payment is made to the Perpetual Care Fund.

City Clerk Mynsberge commented the Perpetual Care Fund’s investment earnings are currently approximately 5%. Over the course of 24 months the interest on the City’s $2,250 share is approximately $112, which could be considered a nominal fee for the administration of the plan. The contractor sends out payment books, monthly statements, the accounting, and keeps in close contact with the purchasers.

City Manager Valentine explained the idea is that the contractor can do it cheaper and more efficiently than the City can do it, so it is a better deal for the City in the long run. Weighing what is given up against what is gained the City is benefitting from the arrangement.

Commissioner Sherman responded:
• The City has a contract with Elmwood to provide these services.
• Elmwood initially offered payment plans without the City’s agreement.
• He would feel differently if the split was opposite – the City getting 25% and the contractor getting 75% - but the City gets three-fourths of each sale and he believes that should go into the Perpetual Care Fund sooner rather than later.
• Investment return rates could exceed 5%.

Mayor Bordman:
• Indicated the contractor is receiving payment for the work they do under the payment plan.
• Noted money in the Perpetual Care Fund gains interest and accumulates over time which will help accomplish many projects in the cemetery. The money should come to the City, as Commissioner Sherman suggested, quarterly or so.
• Suggested that in the event someone could not complete their payment plan, the person should have the option of transferring their money to cover one (or more) plot, and then 50% of the remaining balance on account would be forfeited.

City Clerk Mynsberge confirmed that all money paid on a payment plan can be applied to a plot needed for burial. The customer will then be given a grace period to pay enough on the account to cover 20% of the remaining plot(s).

Commissioner Harris said:
The policy needs to be clear on the point just explained by City Clerk Mynsberge. The Commission should see the payment plan agreement to ensure it comports with the payment plan adopted.

Commissioner DeWeese noted:
• No one has expressed opposition to having payment plans for cemetery plots.
• Suggested the staff address the comments made and bring the proposed policy back to the Commission as soon as feasible.
• Encouraged a policy that is compassionate and works for the interests of the City.
• Referring to the question of when the City’s portion of plots sold under payment plans should be remitted, suggested there may be other options.
Commissioner Nickita said he concurs with the general comments made, and agreed with Commissioner Harris that the Commission needs to see the contract being used for payment plans.

City Manager Valentine confirmed staff will address the comments made and bring the policy back to the Commission for consideration.

**12-340-18 MAPLE ROAD RECONSTRUCTION SOUTHFIELD ROAD TO WOODWARD AVENUE, TREE AND PLANTER ALIGNMENT**

Commissioner Sherman shared concerns that information is coming to the Commission incomplete. He said this issue also occurred during the Old Woodward project.

Mayor Bordman reiterated her opposition to zelkova trees.

Commissioners DeWeese and Sherman stated that they did not recall approving zelkovas at the last meeting.

Planning Director Ecker said:
- She would return to the record for the November 19, 2018 Commission meeting and double-check the question of tree approval.
- The tree alignment chosen for the mid-block crossings can also be applied to the intersections with the bump-outs.

Commissioner Nickita stated the Commission had asked staff for clarification at their November 19, 2018 meeting regarding:
- How the streets would look with all the trees aligned; and,
- If the trees are all aligned, how other features of the intersections would be changed, such as landscaping, benches, extra space for pedestrians, and ramps.

Commissioner Nickita further commented:
- He was surprised that no information regarding proposed intersection feature changes had been submitted in the agenda materials.
- He would rather have all the information instead of addressing this issue piecemeal.

Commissioner DeWeese agreed with Commissioners Nickita and Sherman, adding that features such as benches should be approved once seen in-context as part of a plan. He noted the absence of plans that contextualized the recommended features.

Commissioner Sherman suggested postponing until staff returned with the requested information.

City Manager Valentine confirmed there would be time to clarify the plans for the space between the curb and the sidewalk.

Mayor Bordman requested a more complete picture of staff proposals for each of the places that are currently an issue: the Henrietta intersection, the crosswalks, and the tree types.

City Manager Valentine asked Mr. Strader and Ms. Wolfe if they had any questions.
Commissioner Nickita said he would like to see plans for a seating option and the landscape condition once the trees are aligned.

**12-341-18 CITY LOGO ADVANCEMENT FOLLOW UP REGARDING FACTORY DETROIT**

Assistant to the City Manager Haines reported that contact was made with Factory Detroit, who agreed to adhere to all terms laid out in the City’s RFP. As a result, Assistant to the City Manager Haines recommended that the Commission accept Factory Detroit’s proposal.

Commissioner Hoff confirmed that the $5,000 fee includes up to 8 meetings. The additional charge of $500 per meeting is for meetings over 8.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner DeWeese, seconded by Commissioner Nickita:

To accept the proposal from Factory Detroit to provide logo branding services in an amount not to exceed $5,000, charged to Account #101-299.000-729.0000, and further, to authorize the Mayor to sign the agreement on behalf of the City.

**VOTE:**

- Yeas, 7
- Nays, 0
- Absent, 0

**VI. NEW BUSINESS**

**12-342-18 PARKING LOT #6 REHABILITATION/ EXPANSION**

Assistant City Manager Gunter reviewed the item.

Assistant City Manager Gunter confirmed:
- The landscaping standards in option one were aspirational, not binding.
- Bicycle racks will be installed at Parking Lot #6.
- The primary goal for the Advisory Parking Committee was to maximize parking, given the current demand.

Commissioner DeWeese said:
- Either option would involve a considerable amount of landscaping.
- Option one would facilitate the farmer’s market more than option two, because option two breaks up the positioning of the vendors. Therefore option one would be more appropriate.
- With all the planned work, the cost of each space works out to about $37,000. Without any environmental work or fixing of the parking lot, the cost of each space works out to be nearly $6,000 per space.
- The City has put effort into encouraging walking, cycling, and other modes of transportation to limit the need for parking lots.

Commissioner DeWeese encouraged visitors to the downtown area to ride a moped, bicycle, or to walk whenever possible to decrease costs to the City.

Commissioner Nickita:
- Shared concern that the City does not adhere to the landscaping guidelines it requires private developers to follow.
- Suggested the City install the landscaping elements on the south side of the lot as shown in option two since they would be more visible and useful to pedestrians, and
eliminate the other suggested islands from option two. He said it would allow for a few more spaces in option two.

- Said the landscaping elements should not impede the farmer’s market set-up since all the stands are individual tents. He added the City should consider trees in the landscaping elements to provide shade and enhance the farmer’s market as well.

Assistant City Manager Gunter acknowledged sensitivity to the Commission’s concerns, adding that each space made available in Parking Lot #6 is critically important to the parkers visiting 280 N. Old Woodward since the City is unable to offer valet services in the area. She continued:

- In option one, the goal is to replace trees one-for-one. Once rendered, the engineering plans can be brought back to the Commission to provide more specificity.
- Lot #6 currently has 142 spaces.
- The Architectural Review Committee’s feedback was incorporated into option one.
- The Advisory Parking Committee recommends funding this project through the Parking Enterprise Fund.

City Manager Valentine explained there would be a special assessment when the City rebuilds the N. Old Woodward parking structure, so the APC decided to specially assess the property owners near Lot #6 and the N. Old Woodward structure only once.

Commissioner Sherman noted:

- Both options increase parking spaces.
- Agreement with Commissioner Nickita that the City’s lack of adherence to its own landscaping guidelines for private developers puts the City in a difficult position.
- Trees help establish place in open parking lots. The Commission needs to balance the needs of the area and the needs of the entire City.

Al Vaitas, Chair of the Advisory Parking Committee, stated that every parking space is essential in Lot #6. He noted:

- The enhanced landscaping in the back was thought to balance out the lack of landscaping elements in the lot.
- The City’s landscaping requirements have not been adhered to in other City parking lot projects.

City Engineer O'Meara confirmed that the City’s landscape guidelines were not adhered to with Lot #7.

City Manager Valentine confirmed that the river would remain accessible.

Subsequent to further discussion the Commission created a hybrid option for Lot #6.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner DeWeese, seconded by Commissioner Nickita:
To authorize City staff to proceed with the final design and bidding of Parking Lot #6 based on Preliminary Concept plan Option #1 as amended to include the three landscaping islands with trees on the west side of the lot nearest Old Woodward and the three landscaping islands with trees midway on the southern leg of the lot.

**VOTE:**

- Yeas, 7
- Nays, 0
- Absent, 0
VII. REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA
Items removed from the Consent Agenda were addressed earlier in the meeting.

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS
None

IX. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA
None

X. REPORTS

12-343-18 COMMISSIONER REPORTS
The City Commission will appoint two regular members to the Historic District Study Committee on January 14, 2019.

12-344-18 CITY STAFF

Annual Perpetual Care Fund Investment Report
Finance Director Gerber submitted the Annual Perpetual Care Fund Investment Report.

2017 Annual Report of the Greenwood Cemetery Advisory Board
Commissioner DeWeese said he would like more focus on encouraging plot purchases in areas other than Sections A, B, and C of the cemetery. He noted those areas are the most sensitive parts of the cemetery.

Commissioner Hoff said there were many good suggestions in the 2017 Annual Report, including establishing a baseline for the cemetery. She said she would like to see the HDSC and Friends of the Museum involved. She also said ground-penetrating radar to establish the records should be part of establishing the baseline.

City Clerk Mynsberge said the GCAB plans to discuss the process of establishing a baseline in-depth at their February 2019 meeting. In 2018 the GCAB put together a list in terms of where the Board wants to go for the Master Planning process. In February 2019, the Board will be reviewing:
- Quotes for ground-penetrating radar;
- Examples of the results from GPR;
- Whether GPR will help the GCAB reach their goals; and
- The results of a field study of the cemetery done by Birmingham DPS and Elmwood within the last four years.

City Clerk Mynsberge clarified that the City maintains records of plots sold and unsold in the cemetery. The GCAB will also be reviewing these records and determining whether it will help to pursue GPR in order to confirm these records.

City Manager Valentine noted that the GCAB spent time going out to bid for a consultant for a cemetery Master Plan. The GCAB has since changed approach and the new goals for February 2019 are an articulation of their newer efforts.

Mayor Bordman drew the Commission to Part Four, page three of the report. Noting that the report describes the City maintaining grave markers from before 1875, Mayor Bordman
suggested that the date should advance as time advances. One option she suggested is going by the definition of ‘antique’, defined as 100 years prior to the current date.

Parking Utilization Report
Assistant City Manager Gunter submitted the Parking Utilization Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XI.</th>
<th>ADJOURN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_______________________________
J. Cherilynn Mynsberge, City Clerk
BIRMINGHAM CITY COMMISSION MINUTES
MAY 20, 2019
MUNICIPAL BUILDING, 151 MARTIN
7:30 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Mayor Patty Bordman called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM.

II. ROLL CALL
Present: Mayor Bordman
Mayor Pro Tem Boutros
Commissioner DeWeese
Commissioner Harris (arrived at 8:46 p.m.)
Commissioner Hoff
Commissioner Nickita
Commissioner Sherman

Absent: none

Administration: City Manager Valentine, City Attorney Ballard, City Attorney Currier, City Planner Cowan, Planning Director Ecker, Finance Director Gerber, Police Commander Grewe, City Engineer O’Meara, City Clerk Mynsberge

III. PROCLAMATIONS, CONGRATULATORY RESOLUTIONS, AWARDS, APPOINTMENTS, RESIGNATIONS AND CONFIRMATIONS, ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS, INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS
05-123-19 ANNOUNCEMENTS
Mayor Bordman announced:

- The Birmingham Public Library will be closed Saturday, May 25th through Monday, May 27th, and City Offices will be closed on Monday, May 27th in observance of Memorial Day. Trash collection will be delayed one day the week of May 27.

- The annual Memorial Day ceremony, in memory and appreciation of military veterans, is Monday, May 27th at 10:00 a.m. in Shain Park.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA
All items listed on the consent agenda are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion and approved by a roll call vote. There will be no separate discussion of the items unless a commissioner or citizen so requests, in which event the item will be removed from the general order of business and considered under the last item of new business.

05-124-19 APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA
The following items were removed from the Consent Agenda:

- Commissioner Hoff
- Item A, Approval of May 6, 2019 City Commission meeting minutes
- Item B, Approval of May 11, 2019 City Council Budget Hearing minutes
- Item J, Piano in Shain Park

MOTION: Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Boutros, seconded by Commissioner Sherman:
To approve the Consent Agenda, excluding Items A, B, and J.
C. Resolution approving the warrant list, including Automated Clearing House payments, dated May 8, 2019 in the amount of $455,452.27.

D. Resolution approving the warrant list, including Automated Clearing House payments, dated May 15, 2019 in the amount of $640,141.07.

E. Resolution delegating to the Birmingham City Clerk and her authorized assistants, those being the members of her staff, the following duties of the election commission for the August 6, 2019 and November 5, 2019 elections:
   - Preparing meeting materials for the election commission, including ballot proofs for approval and a listing of election inspectors for appointment;
   - Contracting for the preparation, printing and delivery of ballots;
   - Providing candidates and the Secretary of State with proof copies of ballots;
   - Providing election supplies and ballot containers; and
   - Preliminary logic and accuracy testing.

F. Resolution designating Finance Director Mark Gerber, Assistant Finance Director Kim Wickenheiser, DPS Director Lauren Wood, Building Official Bruce Johns on, Assistant Building Official Mike Morad, Birmingham Museum Director Pielack, and Police Commander Scott Grewe as representatives for Election Commission members Mayor Patty Bordman, Mayor Pro Tem Pierre Boutros, and Commissioners Carroll DeWeese, Andrew Harris, Rackeline Hoff, Mark Nickita and Stuart Sherman for the purpose of conducting the Public Accuracy Tests of the electronic tabulating equipment which will be used to count votes cast at the August 6, 2019 and November 5, 2019 elections.

G. Resolution setting Monday, June 24, 2019 at 7:30 PM for a public hearing to consider approval of a Special Land Use Permit Amendment for 250 & 280 E. Merrill, to expand the existing Sidecar Slider Bar restaurant into a portion of the neighboring restaurant, RoJo in accordance with Article 7, Section 7.34 of the Zoning Ordinance.

H. Resolution setting Monday, June 24, 2019 at 7:30 PM for a public hearing to consider an amendment to Article 3, Section 3.04(E)(12) of the Zoning Code - Balcony, Railing and Porch Materials in the Downtown Overlay District.

I. Resolution setting Monday, June 24, 2019 at 7:30 PM for a public hearing to consider an amendment to Article 4, Section 4.54(B)(8) of the Zoning Code – Screening Materials for Trash Enclosures.

K. Resolution appointing City Engineer Paul T. O’Meara as Representative and Assistant City Engineer Austin W. Fletcher as Alternate Representative of the City of Birmingham on the SOCWA Board of Trustees for the fiscal year starting July 1, 2019.

L. Resolution appointing City Manager Joseph A. Valentine as Representative and DPS Director Lauren Wood as Alternate Representative of the City of Birmingham on the SOCRRA Board of Trustees for the fiscal year starting July 1, 2019.
M. Resolution accepting the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Unimproved Streets Committee to authorize engagement with an outside Engineering firm, for a cost not to exceed, $7,000 to conduct research and information gathering and provide a final report to the committee regarding road design alternatives for converting unimproved roads to be paid using fund #203-449.007-804.0100.

N. Resolution approving a special event permit as requested by Woodward Camera for the Veterans Hospitality Tent during the Cruise on Saturday, August 17, 2019 from 9:00 a.m. – 9:00 p.m., with set-up on August 16 and tear-down on August 18, contingent upon compliance with all permit and insurance requirements and payment of all fees and, further pursuant to any minor modifications that may be deemed necessary by administrative staff at the time of the event.

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

05-125-19 MAPLE ROAD RECONSTRUCTION, SOUTHFIELD ROAD TO WOODWARD AVE. BENCHES, TREE, AND PLANTER ALIGNMENT

Planning Director Ecker introduced Brad Strader and Haley Wolfe from MKSK.

Mr. Strader:
- recommended placing Frontier Elm trees adjacent to parking and Honey Locust trees at bump-outs and mid-block crossings based on the street tree guide that the City published.
- briefly outlined eight options, noting site furnishings will be like the materials used in Phase I. noted five of the options have street trees and benches at the corners.
- suggested flush tree grates on corners and all other trees in planter boxes.
- confirmed the pedestrian zone on each side will be 12’.

Commissioner Nickita would like to see trees at the intersections but articulated differently from those between intersections, to help designate the intersection. He felt there should be less landscape on the corners than between intersections.

MSK representatives explained the following:
- The tree grates are ADA compliant and do not pose a hazard to public safety.
- Storm water will flow through the tree grates.
- The grates can be made any color.
- Weeds may come through the grates and require maintenance.
- Normal irrigation via irrigation lines is sufficient for watering.
- The planter boxes will require more maintenance and there will be similar weed growth.
- It is best to put trees in a greater amount of soil, but grates using structural soil do very well. Examples can be found in Columbus, Ohio.

Mr. Strader expressed MKSK’s preference is Option 2B (planter with tree grate and bench). In the instance where there is no need for a bench and space is available, Option 2A (planter with tree grate) is an appropriate choice.

After discussion on the application of the arrangements, Mr. Strader explained that Option 2B could extend the planter to accommodate the trees in the planter rather than in a grate. He also confirmed that the recommendation is to have consistency at the intersections.

Mayor Bordman reminded the commission that the decision made today will affect the City of Birmingham’s infrastructure for decades to come. She also shared that she is inclined to put
benches everywhere because, if the goal is to have a walkable city, people get tired and need a place to sit down.

**MOTION:** Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Boutros, seconded by Commissioner DeWeese:
To direct staff to use Option 2B, with an extended planter box rather than a flush grate, for the landscape and street furnishing design of the Maple Road Reconstruction Project and further, to use Frontier Elms along all on-street parking zones, and to use Honey Locusts at pedestrian crossing and street transition locations.

**VOTE:** Yeas, 6
Nays, 0

**05-126-19 E. MAPLE ROAD AND ETON ROAD INTERSECTION – MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS**
Planning Director Ecker presented the item and introduced Julie Kroll from Fleis and Vandenbrink.

Ms. Kroll:
- presented numerous options for the configuration of the intersection and recommended Option 3 WB40 Splitter Island that would prohibit anything larger than a WB40 (truck with a 40’ wheelbase) from turning from westbound Maple to southbound Eton.
- stated all options maintain the prohibition on all articulated trucks turning right from northbound Eton to eastbound Maple.
- noted all options have 3’ extra width of sidewalk on west side.

There were discussions about moving the stop bar forward on westbound Maple Road to allow more stacking under the bridge, the number of trucks that will have to travel west to go south, how the businesses on Eton will be affected, sizes of islands, and the significant increase in cost.

Director Ecker stated that the recommendation from MMTB is Option 1A WB65, but they did not understand that option would not allow enhanced sidewalks on the west side. She confirmed Option 3 includes wider sidewalks and a larger island.

Ms. Kroll clarified a WB40 truck pulling a 33’ trailer can make the right turn from northbound Eton; trucks over 39’ will be prohibited. For left turns from westbound Maple onto Eton, there can be no trucks over 46’.

Mayor Bordman compared the size of the proposed island in Option 3 to the size of a living room. She called for reactions from the commission and asked Ms. Kroll why an island that large is recommended.

Ms. Kroll commented:
- The idea is to look at ways to make the space pedestrian friendly and to slow traffic.
- Planning a large island will achieve these goals.

Commissioner Nickita was in favor of the size of the island as shown in Option 3.

Commissioner Hoff expressed concern for the safety of pedestrians standing on the island while traffic is turning in every direction. She felt there should be rolling curbs.

Commissioner DeWeese saw advantages to the island as shown.
Commissioner Harris arrived at 8:46 p.m.

Mayor Pro Tem Boutros was in favor of Option 3.

**MOTION:** Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Boutros, seconded by Commissioner Nickita:
To direct staff to proceed with the pedestrian enhancement Option 3 for the block of S. Eton Rd. from Maple Rd. to Yosemite Blvd. Further, to direct staff to amend the 2019 Concrete Sidewalk Program, Contract #6-19(SW), to construct these improvements in the 2019 construction season. Further, to approve the appropriations and amendments to the 2018 - 2019 Major Street Fund budget as presented.

Jason Eddleston, Birmingham Public Arts Board and trucking company owner, suggested restricting the time of day when trucks can make turns.

**VOTE:** Yeas, 7  
Nays, 0

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Sherman, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Boutros:  
To move the stop bar on the westbound Maple lanes further west by approximately two car lengths.

**VOTE:** Yeas, 7  
Nays, 0

**VI. NEW BUSINESS**

**05-127-19 CHANGES TO 2019-2020 RECOMMENDED BUDGET AND 2019-2020 BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION**

Finance Director Gerber presented the item, and noted the only change to the recommended budget as presented on May 11, 2019, is to adjust the Sewage Disposal Fund’s revenue and expense budgets for updated sewage disposal costs and related user fee revenues as detailed in his May 14, 2019 memo to City Manager Valentine.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Sherman, and seconded by Commissioner Hoff:  
To approve the budget appropriations resolution adopting the City of Birmingham’s budget and establishing the total number of mills for ad valorem property taxes to be levied for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 2019 and ending June 30, 2020. (*Complete resolution appended to these minutes as Attachment A.*)

**VOTE:** Yeas, 7  
Nays, 0

**05-128-19 WATER/SEWER RATE CHANGES FOR 2019-2020**

Finance Director Gerber presented the item. He presented a revised memo which corrected the proposed fees for the industrial surcharge.

**MOTION:** Motion by Commissioner Sherman, seconded by Commissioner Nickita:  
To amend the Schedule of Fees, Charges, Bonds and Insurance, Water and Sewer Service Sections, for changes in sewer, storm water, industrial surcharge, and industrial waste control charge rates effective for bills with read dates on or after July 1, 2019 as recommended Finance Director Gerber’s May 14, 2019 memo to City Manager Valentine.
VOTE: Yeas, 7
Nays, 0

05-129-19  ELECTRICAL BOX PAINTING
City Planner Cowan presented the item.

Commissioner Nickita would like to discuss policy for consistency in the approach to terminating vistas.

Commissioner DeWeese agreed with Commissioner Nickita that all of the electrical boxes should be examined immediately. He also expressed the following:

- The most iconic building in the City is the theater and the proposed concept fits in with the current landscape and is fun.
- The worst case scenario is that the box may need to be repainted.
- He is supportive of adopting this project and wants to give the challenge to the Public Arts Board to suggest what could be done at other locations.

City Planner Cowan stated that terminating vistas throughout the city had not been considered; the proposal by the Public Arts Board is a one-time solution for this specific vista.

Commissioner Hoff liked the idea but noted that the vista is partially in front of Hyde Park Steakhouse. She asked if anyone spoke with the owners of Hyde Park.

Mr. Cowan said that while he has not heard back from Ted Fuller, Hyde Park Steakhouse owner, the employees and staff liked the idea.

City Manager Valentine explained that decorating power boxes and creation of terminating vistas are two separate things.

Mayor Bordman felt the proposal was a very clever idea and fun. However, she agrees that the City must come up with something that is more appropriate for terminating vistas. She supported Commissioner Sherman’s suggestion to use “and” instead of “or” in the resolution language.

Mayor Bordman further inquired about the paint that will be used on this project. Barbara Miller Heller, Chair of Public Arts Board and painting conservator, explained:

- The paint can be removed from metal.
- It is the same type of paint that is used on all metal utility boxes.
- The surface must be prepared again before repainting.
- The paint is for outdoor use and is supposed to last for a number of years.
- A lot of cities paint these boxes in a number of artistic ways, and the Public Arts Board has a lot of ideas.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Sherman, seconded by Commissioner Nickita:
To accept the recommendation that the electrical box in the planter on the east sidewalk on S. Old Woodward at the intersection of Merrill Street be painted by Anne Ritchie as the popcorn box design created by Anne Ritchie and recommended by the Public Arts Board in an amount not to exceed $250 charged to account #101-299-000-811-0000.

AND
To direct the Public Arts Board to pursue alternative concepts for this location and work with adjoining businesses to develop a concept that will incorporate a design or sculpture that will

---

1 As corrected on June 3, 2019
meet the objective of creating a terminating vista at Merrill and South Old Woodward, Hamilton and Old Woodward, and Henrietta and Maple.

Commissioner Nickita was interested in studying this topic more to understand what a terminating vista should be. He also believed the artwork should be something thoughtful.

Mayor Bordman added that she would like to see the Public Arts Board take an inventory around the City for other potential possibilities.

Mayor Pro Tem Boutros suggested the Public Arts Board use alternative concepts tailored to Birmingham’s downtown as a whole rather than a particular business.

VOTE: Yeas, 7
Nays, 0

05-130-19 CLOSED SESSION
MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Sherman, seconded by Commissioner Hoff:
To meet in closed session pursuant to the Open Meetings Act, Section 8(h) to consider material exempt from discussion or disclosure by state or federal statute.

(A roll call vote is required and the vote must be approved by a 2/3 majority of the commission. The commission will adjourn to closed session after all other business has been addressed in open session and reconvene to open session, after the closed session, for purposes of taking formal action resulting from the closed session and for purposes of adjourning the meeting.)

ROLL CALL VOTE: Ayes: Mayor Bordman
Mayor Pro Tem Boutros
Commissioner DeWeese
Commissioner Harris
Commissioner Hoff
Commissioner Nickita
Commissioner Sherman

Nays: None

VII. REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

05-131-19 CITY COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 6, 2019 (ITEM A).

Commissioner Hoff noted on page 11 and several other instances, that there is a reference to Alternate Bid #3 in regards to N. Old Woodward project. She wants to see a description of Alternate Bid #3 at the first reference.

Commissioner Nickita noted on Page 15, under the 3rd from last bullet point, the word “need” should be added after “fills a parking”.

Mayor Bordman asked that the comments on the Special Event Permit for Art in the Alley, on page 4, be expanded to include her comments about the student representatives, to include their names, and to note that she asked Mr. Wohlfiel to speak about the project.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Hoff, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Boutros:
To approve the Regular City Commission minutes of May 6, 2019 as corrected
VOTE: Yeas, 7
Nays, 0

05-132-19 RESOLUTION APPROVING THE CITY COMMISSION BUDGET HEARING MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 11, 2019. (ITEM B)

Commissioner Hoff noted, on Page 7 under Greenwood Cemetery Perpetual Care Fund, “1718” should be changed to “FY2017-18”.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Hoff, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Boutros:
To approve the City Commission Budget Hearing minutes of May 11, 2019 as corrected.
VOTE: Yeas, 7
Nays, 0
Abstain 1 (Harris)

05-133-19 PIANO IN SHAIN PARK (ITEM J)
Commissioner DeWeese expressed concerns about keeping a piano outdoors in the weather.

City Planner Cowan explained the band shell cover will partially protect the piano in Shain Park. While he knows that the cover will not protect the piano from humidity and heavy rains, Mr. Cowan was advised that instruments in the park are intended to be a fun thing and will eventually become decommissioned. Therefore, it is planned as a summer activity that is budgeted to be moved at the end of the season.

Commissioner Hoff expressed that this is a unique idea that should receive publicity. She asked that the donation from Michael and Marybeth Flynn be publicly acknowledged and that the Flynns be thanked for their generosity to the City of Birmingham.

Mayor Bordman mentioned that Cole Wohlfriel, student representative, is doing a lot of work on this project. She expressed appreciation for the enthusiasm of the student representatives on the Public Arts Board, commended Jason Eddleson for his leadership, and commented it is wonderful to have this donation.

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Hoff, seconded by Commissioner Nickita:
Resolution recommending the piano donated by Michael and Marybeth Flynn be placed in the location beneath the pavilion at Shain Park as suggested by the Public Arts Board for the time period of June 1st, 2019 to August 31st, 2019, with the conditions that the piano be equipped with industrial grade wheels, a cover be provided during Shain Park events, and that the City Commission vote on whether or not to keep the piano in the park beyond August 31st, 2019 in August 2019. Also, that the painting of the piano occur at a space outside of Shain Park, and that the Public Arts Board be responsible for funding the moving of the piano if the City Commission chooses to have the piano removed on August 31st, 2019, or any time before that. And further, authorizing funds in an amount not to exceed $750 from account #101-299-000-811-0000.

Commissioner Nickita expressed that he has seen this in a number of cities including Detroit at Campus Martius. He went on to advise that the piano be creatively painted and coated with a preservative finish.
Jason Eddleston, Birmingham Public Arts Board, suggested doing some epoxy work on the upright piano, since the plan was to paint it anyway. He also asked for suggestions from Commission on design.

Mayor Pro Tem Boutros advised the details be left to the Public Arts Board.

VOTE: Yeas, 7
Nays, 0

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS
None

IX. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA
None

X. REPORTS

05-134-19  COMMISSIONER COMMENTS
Commissioner Nickita stated that there are three issues he wants to bring to the attention of the commission and City Manager Valentine in downtown where concrete is a problem and needs to be addressed:
- Depression of concrete on the southwest corner of Old Woodward and Maple by the new building.
- Very fine scoring in front of the Mediterranean restaurant north of Salon 6. The edges are chipped away and inconsistent with everything else in downtown.
- The deconstructing conditions of the amphitheater.

City Engineer O'Meara confirmed that work is planned for all three areas in 2019. The first two will be addressed by Iafrate in late June. The 3rd issue is part of the 2019 sidewalk repair program.

Commissioner Hoff, in reference to the annual Celebrate Birmingham Hometown Parade, thought the turnout was much less than in previous years. She cited weather as a probable factor and suggested the City Clerk's Office look at bringing in more student which should draw more spectators. She also suggested more publicity.

Mayor Bordman agreed with Commissioner Hoff regarding the parade and expressed that it is one of her favorite events. She suggested having float contests with local schools, and commented that maybe the student representatives on the Public Arts Board would have some ideas to improve turnout. She went on to say that given the string of bad weather in recent years and declining participation, a change in date could be in order.

Mayor Pro Tem Boutros believed, along with others he encountered the morning of the parade, that weather was a factor on this year's attendance. He agreed with Commissioner Hoff and Mayor Bordman that there is a need to create more awareness and more participation from local groups.

City Manager Valentine complimented City Clerk Mynsberge and her staff for their work and commitment to the parade and party in the park.
05-135-19  CITY STAFF
Review of the 2019 Asphalt Paving Program; Contract #9-19(P) as submitted by City Engineer O'Meara.

Parking Utilization Dashboard as submitted by Assistant City Manager Gunter.

XI.  ADJOURN
Mayor Bordman adjourned the meeting to closed session at 9:43 p.m.

Mayor Bordman reconvened the regular meeting at 9:54 p.m. and adjourned the meeting at 9:54 p.m.

J. Cherilynn Mynsberge, City Clerk
RESOLUTION NO. 05-127-19
BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the City Manager has submitted the proposed 2019-2020 Budget, and:

WHEREAS, the City Commission has reviewed the 2019-2020 Budget, and;

WHEREAS, the City Commission has held a Public Hearing on the 2019-2020 Budget;

WHEREAS, Chapter VII, Section 14 of the Birmingham City Charter requires that the City Commission pass an annual appropriations resolution, and;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Commission does hereby adopt the following estimated revenues for the City of Birmingham for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 2019, and ending June 30, 2020:

GENERAL FUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>$ 26,114,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses &amp; Permits</td>
<td>3,053,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Revenue</td>
<td>2,157,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>3,403,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines &amp; Forfeitures</td>
<td>1,776,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest &amp; Rent</td>
<td>621,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td>418,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions from Other Funds</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Fund</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 37,745,520</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAJOR STREETS FUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Revenue</td>
<td>$ 1,457,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest &amp; Rent</td>
<td>40,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions from Other Funds</td>
<td>3,246,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw from Fund Balance</td>
<td>934,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Major Streets Fund</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 5,678,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCAL STREETS FUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Revenue</td>
<td>$ 592,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest &amp; Rent</td>
<td>26,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td>395,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions from Other Funds</td>
<td><strong>2,500,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Local Streets Fund</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,513,880</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Revenue</td>
<td>$ 33,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Community Development Block Grant Fund</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 33,630</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL FUND:
- **Taxes**: $1,935,000
- **Intergovernmental**: 4,200
- **Charges for Services**: 18,000
- **Interest**: 31,820
- **Draw from Fund Balance**: 95,840

**Total Solid Waste Disposal Fund**: $2,084,860

### LAW AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT FUND:
- **Fines & Forfeitures**: $35,000
- **Interest**: 1,100
- **Draw from Fund Balance**: 61,760

**Total Law and Drug Enforcement Fund**: $97,860

### DEBT SERVICE FUND:
- **Taxes**: $1,609,500
- **Intergovernmental**: 3,660
- **Interest**: 2,990

**Total Debt Service Fund**: $1,616,150

### GREENWOOD CEMETERY PERPETUAL CARE FUND:
- **Charges for Services**: $80,000
- **Interest**: 16,800

**Total Greenwood Cemetery Perpetual Care Fund**: $96,800

### PRINCIPAL SHOPPING DISTRICT FUND:
- **Special Assessments**: $1,054,970
- **Charges for Services**: 150,000
- **Interest**: 13,700
- **Other Revenue**: 190,000
- **Draw from Fund Balance**: 96,320

**Total Principal Shopping District Fund**: $1,504,990

### BALDWIN LIBRARY FUND:
- **Taxes**: $3,370,950
- **Intergovernmental Revenue**: 1,029,190
- **Charges for Services**: 81,150
- **Interest**: 52,290
- **Draw from Fund Balance**: 1,677,170

**Total Baldwin Library Fund**: $6,210,750

### BROWNFIELD REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY FUND:
- **Taxes**: $264,870
- **Charges for Services**: 1,500
- **Interest**: 11,340
- **Other Revenue**: 20,000

**Total Brownfield Redevelopment Authority Fund**: $297,710
### TRIANGLE DISTRICT CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT AUTHORITY FUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$ 470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Triangle District Corridor Improvement Authority Fund $ 470

### CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$ 45,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution from Other Funds</td>
<td>$ 814,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Capital Projects Fund $ 859,520

### AUTOMOBILE PARKING SYSTEM FUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>$ 7,049,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$ 386,510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Automobile Parking System Fund $ 7,436,220

### WATER-SUPPLY SYSTEM RECEIVING FUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>$ 4,773,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$ 77,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw from Net Position</td>
<td>$ 892,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Water-Supply System Fund $ 6,743,020

### SEWAGE DISPOSAL FUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>$ 1,691,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Revenue</td>
<td>$ 3,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>$ 9,144,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$ 68,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw from Net Position</td>
<td>$ 1,120,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Sewage Disposal Fund $ 12,029,120

### LINCOLN HILLS GOLF COURSE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>$ 705,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$ 62,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td>$ 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw from Net Position</td>
<td>$ 55,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Lincoln Hills Golf Course Fund $ 823,460

### SPRINGDALE GOLF COURSE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>$ 486,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest &amp; Rent</td>
<td>$ 19,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td>$ 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw from Net Position</td>
<td>$ 65,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Springdale Golf Course Fund $ 571,090

### COMPUTER EQUIPMENT FUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>$ 635,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$ 19,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td>$ 3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw from Net Position</td>
<td>$ 316,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Computer Equipment Fund $ 666,780
AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Commission does hereby adopt on a budgetary center basis the following expenditures for 2019-2020:

### GENERAL FUND:
- **General Government** $6,177,180
- **Public Safety** 14,314,400
- **Community Development** 3,136,700
- **Engineering & Public Services** 6,201,150
- **Transfers Out** 7,846,380
- **Contribution to Fund Balance** 69,710

**Total General Fund** $37,745,520

### MAJOR STREETS FUND:
- **Maintenance of Streets and Bridges** $371,310
- **Street Cleaning** 157,670
- **Street Trees** 266,270
- **Traffic Controls & Engineering** 943,100
- **Snow and Ice Removal** 301,800
- **Administrative** 20,510
- **Capital Outlay-Engineering and Construction of Roads and Bridges** 3,617,740

**Total Major Streets Fund** $5,678,400

### LOCAL STREETS FUND:
- **Maintenance of Streets and Bridges** $964,340
- **Street Cleaning** 186,190
- **Street Trees** 526,790
- **Traffic Controls & Engineering** 70,790
- **Snow and Ice Removal** 165,030
- **Administrative** 28,980
- **Capital Outlay-Engineering and Construction of Roads and Bridges** 651,740
- **Contribution to Fund Balance** 920,020

**Total Local Streets Fund** $3,513,880

### COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUND:
- **Community Development** $33,630

### SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL FUND:
- **Personnel Services** $187,380
- **Supplies** 12,000
- **Other Charges** 1,869,480
- **Capital Outlay** 16,000

**Total Solid Waste Disposal Fund** $2,084,860

### LAW AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT FUND:
- **Law and Drug Enforcement** $97,860

### DEBT SERVICE FUND:
- **Debt Service** $1,610,300
- **Contribution to Fund Balance** 5,850
Total Debt Service Fund $1,616,150

GREENWOOD CEMETERY PERPETUAL CARE FUND:
Expenditures $20,000
Contribution to Fund Balance 76,800
Total Greenwood Cemetery Perpetual Care Fund $96,800

PRINCIPAL SHOPPING DISTRICT FUND: $1,504,990

BALDWIN LIBRARY FUND:
Expenditures $6,210,750

BROWNFIELD REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY FUND:
Expenditures $189,280
Contribution to Fund Balance 108,430
Total Brownfield Redevelopment Authority Fund $297,710

TRIANGLE DISTRICT CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT AUTHORITY FUND:
Contribution to Fund Balance $470

CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND:
Expenditures $579,000
Contribution to Fund Balance 280,520
Total Capital Projects Fund $859,520

AUTOMOBILE PARKING SYSTEM FUND:
Expenses $6,743,020
Contribution to Net Position 693,200
Total Automobile Parking System Fund $7,436,220

WATER-SUPPLY SYSTEM RECEIVING FUND: $6,743,020

SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEM FUND: $12,029,120

LINCOLN HILLS GOLF COURSE: $823,460
SPRINGDALE GOLF COURSE: $571,090

COMPUTER EQUIPMENT FUND: $974,580

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the budget summary above be approved as the 2019-2020 City Budget and that this resolution shall be known as the City of Birmingham 2019-2020 General Appropriations Act.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Commission does hereby designate $27,649,010 to be raised by 11.1206 mills levied for General Purposes on the taxable valuation of all real and personal property subject to taxation in the City.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Commission does hereby designate $3,409,680 to be raised by 1.3714 mills levied for Library Operations on the taxable valuation of all real and personal property subject to taxation in the City.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Commission does hereby designate $2,717,900 to be raised by 1.0861 mills levied for Debt Service Requirements on the taxable valuation of all real and personal property subject to taxation in the City.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Commission does hereby designate $1,940,000 to be raised by 0.7803 mills levied on the taxable valuation of all real and personal property subject to taxation in the City for the purpose of the collection and removal of garbage and trash of the City as authorized by MCL 123.261, et. seq.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Manager is hereby authorized to make budgetary transfers within the budgetary centers established through the adoption of this budget, and that all transfers between budgetary centers may be made only by further action of the City Commission pursuant to the provisions of the Michigan Uniform Accounting and Budgeting Act.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the 2019-2020 budget shall be automatically amended on July 1, 2019, to re-appropriate encumbrances outstanding and reserved at June 30, 2019.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the City Treasurer be authorized to add to all taxes paid after September 3, 2019, three-fourths of one percent (3/4 of 1%) penalty each and every month, or fraction thereof, that remains unpaid. On all taxes paid after February 14, 2020, and through March 2, 2020, there shall be added a late penalty charge equal to three percent (3%) of such tax.

I, J. Cherilynn Mynsberge, City Clerk of the City of Birmingham, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was passed by the Commission of the City of Birmingham, Michigan at a regular meeting held May 20, 2019.

J. Cherilynn Mynsberge, City Clerk
### NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

**BIRMINGHAM CITY COMMISSION**

**PUBLIC HEARING OF NECESSITY**

**PUBLIC HEARING OF CONFIRMATION**

| Meeting Date, Time, Location: | HEARING OF NECESSITY FOR SPECIAL ASSESSMENT DISTRICT  
Monday, September 16, 2019, 7:30 PM  
Municipal Building, 151 Martin, Birmingham, MI |
| --- | --- |
| Meeting Date, Time, Location: | HEARING OF CONFIRMATION FOR SPECIAL ASSESSMENT DISTRICT  
Monday, September 23, 2019, 7:30 PM  
Municipal Building, 151 Martin, Birmingham, MI |
| Location: | Lakeview Avenue from Harmon Street to Oak Avenue |
| Nature of Improvement: | Improvements to Lakeview Avenue from Harmon Street to Oak Avenue, consistent with City policy |
| City Staff Contact: | Paul O'Meara 248.530.1836  
pomeara@bhamgov.org |
| Notice Requirements: | Mail to affected property owners  
Publish August 25th and September 1st, 2019 |
| Approved minutes may be reviewed at: | City Clerk’s Office |

You or your agent may appear at the hearings to express your views; however, if you fail to protest either in person or by letter received on or before the date of the hearing, you cannot appeal the amount of the special assessment to the Michigan Tax Tribunal. Mail any correspondence to: City Clerk, P.O. Box 3001, Birmingham, MI 48012.

The property owner may file a written appeal of the special assessment with the State Tax Tribunal within 30 days after the confirmation of the special assessment roll if that special assessment was protested at the hearing held for the purpose of confirming the roll.

All special assessments, including installment payments, shall, from the date of the confirmation thereof, constitute a lien on the respective lots or parcels assessed, and until paid shall be charged against the respective owners of the lots or parcels assessed.

Persons with disabilities needing accommodations for effective participation in this meeting should contact the City Clerk’s Office at 248.530.1880 (voice) or 248.644.5115 (TDD) at least one day in advance to request mobility, visual, hearing or other assistance.
MEMORANDUM
Finance Department

DATE:    September 17, 2019

TO:   Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM:   Teresa Klobucar, Deputy Treasurer
Mark Gerber, Finance Director/Treasurer

SUBJECT:   Resolution for Confirming S.A.D. # 893 – Lakeview Avenue Paving Project-Oak to Harmon

To defray the cost of paving Lakeview Avenue, it is requested that the City Commission adopt the following resolution confirming S.A.D. No. 893 at the regular City Commission meeting of September 23, 2019. Comments during the hearing of confirmation are limited to those questions specifically addressing the assessment roll pursuant to Section 94-9 of the City Code. The hearing declaring the necessity of the Special Assessment District was held at the City Commission meeting of September 16, 2019.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:
To confirm Special Assessment Roll No. 893, to defray the cost of construction for Lakeview Avenue Paving:

WHEREAS, Special Assessment Roll, designated Roll No. 893, has been heretofore prepared for collection, and

WHEREAS, notice was given pursuant to Section 94-7 of the City Code, to each owner or party-in-interest of property to be assessed, and

WHEREAS, the Commission has deemed it practicable to cause payment of the cost thereof to be made at a date closer to the time of construction and

Commission Resolution 09-217-19 provided it would meet this 23th day of September, 2019 for the sole purpose of reviewing the assessment roll, and

WHEREAS, at said hearing held this September 23, 2019, all those property owners or their representatives present have been given an opportunity to be heard specifically concerning costs appearing in said special assessment roll as determined in Section 94-9 of the Code of the City of Birmingham,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Special Assessment Roll No. 893 be in all things ratified and confirmed, and that the City Clerk be and is hereby instructed to endorse said roll, showing the date of confirmation thereof, and to certify said assessment roll to the City Treasurer for collection at or near the time of construction of the improvement.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that special assessments shall be payable in ten (10) payments as provided in Section 94-10 of the Code of the City of Birmingham, with an annual interest rate of six and one half percent (6.25%) on all unpaid installments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-25-301-001</td>
<td>870 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$11,949.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-301-002</td>
<td>856 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-301-003</td>
<td>836 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-301-004</td>
<td>790 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-301-005</td>
<td>784 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-301-006</td>
<td>764 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-301-007</td>
<td>888 Vinewood</td>
<td>$14,495.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-304-001</td>
<td>684 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,660.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-304-009</td>
<td>666 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-304-010</td>
<td>650 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-304-011</td>
<td>636 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-304-012</td>
<td>620 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-304-013</td>
<td>608 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-304-014</td>
<td>590 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$12,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-304-046</td>
<td>560 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$11,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-304-048</td>
<td>550 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$14,690.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-304-049</td>
<td>540 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$13,877.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25-304-050</td>
<td>530 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$18,154.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-015</td>
<td>887 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$14,571.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-016</td>
<td>859 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-017</td>
<td>831 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-018</td>
<td>763 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-019</td>
<td>755 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-020</td>
<td>739 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$21,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-023</td>
<td>675 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$11,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-024</td>
<td>667 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-025</td>
<td>655 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-026</td>
<td>647 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,985.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-027</td>
<td>633 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$9,815.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-028</td>
<td>619 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-029</td>
<td>611 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-030</td>
<td>591 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-031</td>
<td>587 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,887.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-032</td>
<td>563 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-033</td>
<td>555 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-034</td>
<td>549 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-036</td>
<td>523 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$10,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-037</td>
<td>507 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$9,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26-427-038</td>
<td>707 Lakeview Ave</td>
<td>$20,312.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$458,172.65</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIRMINGHAM CITY COMMISSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC HEARING OF NECESSITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC HEARING OF CONFIRMATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Meeting Date, Time, Location:</strong></th>
<th><strong>HEARING OF NECESSITY FOR SPECIAL ASSESSMENT DISTRICT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, September 16, 2019, 7:30 PM</strong></td>
<td><strong>Monday, September 16, 2019, 7:30 PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Building, 151 Martin, Birmingham, MI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Municipal Building, 151 Martin, Birmingham, MI</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Meeting Date, Time, Location:</strong></th>
<th><strong>HEARING OF CONFIRMATION FOR SPECIAL ASSESSMENT DISTRICT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, September 23, 2019, 7:30 PM</strong></td>
<td><strong>Monday, September 23, 2019, 7:30 PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Building, 151 Martin, Birmingham, MI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Municipal Building, 151 Martin, Birmingham, MI</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Location:** | Lakeview Avenue from Harmon Street to Oak Avenue |

| **Nature of Improvement:** | Improvements to Lakeview Avenue from Harmon Street to Oak Avenue, consistent with City policy |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>City Staff Contact:</strong></th>
<th>Paul O'Meara 248.530.1836</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:pomeara@bhamgov.org">pomeara@bhamgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Notice Requirements:</strong></th>
<th>Mail to affected property owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publish August 25th and September 1st, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Approved minutes may be reviewed at:** | City Clerk’s Office |

You or your agent may appear at the hearings to express your views; however, if you fail to protest either in person or by letter received on or before the date of the hearing, you cannot appeal the amount of the special assessment to the Michigan Tax Tribunal. Mail any correspondence to: City Clerk, P.O. Box 3001, Birmingham, MI 48012.

The property owner may file a written appeal of the special assessment with the State Tax Tribunal within 30 days after the confirmation of the special assessment roll if that special assessment was protested at the hearing held for the purpose of confirming the roll.

All special assessments, including installment payments, shall, from the date of the confirmation thereof, constitute a lien on the respective lots or parcels assessed, and until paid shall be charged against the respective owners of the lots or parcels assessed.

Persons with disabilities needing accommodations for effective participation in this meeting should contact the City Clerk’s Office at 248.530.1880 (voice) or 248.644.5115 (TDD) at least one day in advance to request mobility, visual, hearing or other assistance.
DATE: September 9, 2019
TO: Joseph Valentine, City Manager
FROM: Austin W. Fletcher, Assistant City Engineer
SUBJECT: Petition for Special Assessment
Lakeview Avenue Paving – Harmon Street to Oak Avenue

INTRODUCTION:

The Engineering Department received a petition to pave Lakeview Avenue between Harmon Street and Oak Avenue.

BACKGROUND:

Earlier this year (June), the Engineering Department received a petition request to improve Lakeview Avenue from Harmon Street to Oak Avenue. Since more than half of the property owners were represented, the Engineering Department started the process of moving toward a paving project. An informational booklet was prepared and distributed to all of the residents within the project limits. An informational meeting was held on July 16\textsuperscript{th} at 7:00 P.M. to further discuss the potential project and answer any questions. Thirty (30) residents attended the meeting representing twenty-four (24) of the properties within the project limits. A copy of the agenda and sign-in sheets are attached.

Since the time of the informational meeting, two (2) property owners have requested to have their names removed from the petition (i.e. 647 Lakeview and 666 Lakeview). Based on this, the revised percentages of property owners in favor of the project are:

By Parcel.................................................................19 out of 39 (48.7%)
By Front Foot Assessed.................................1,003.22 ft. out of 2,262.27 ft. (44.5 %)

The attached map indicates the proposed assessment district and the highlighted properties are those in favor of proceeding.

To move the process to the next step, the City Commission is required to invite all potential members of the special assessment district to a public hearing, which is scheduled for September 16\textsuperscript{th}. All residents have been notified per the attached mailed notice. The City Commission is the final authority as to whether the project should proceed or not, no matter what the final level of support is on the street. If the City Commission declares that the project is a necessity, a second public hearing of confirmation must be scheduled and held, as reflected in the previously passed motion. At that time, the estimated costs will become a lien on the properties. Payment provisions are outlined in the booklet attached.
Since this project was not budgeted, and since there are not sufficient funds in the Local Streets budget to add this project to the current fiscal year, if it were to move forward, we recommend that the funding to prepare the plans and bidding documents be expended in the current fiscal year, and that the project be let for bid earlier next year. Construction would then proceed in August of 2020, and be completed by October/November, using budgeted funds from the 2020/2021 fiscal year. The City would ultimately pay 15% of the project costs (for paving), and collect back the expended funds for the remaining 85% from the adjacent owners. Sewer and water improvements are also anticipated, which would come from the Sewer and Water Funds.

In accordance with City policy, the pavement is proposed to be constructed at twenty-six (26) feet wide with integral concrete curbs. Serious drainage problems on the street will be corrected primarily by hauling out excess earth, and installing a new road that is below the level of the existing sidewalks. Although a detailed cost estimate has not been done for this street, the assessment for this project is estimated at $195 per front foot of road with this cross-section. Concrete driveway approaches would be constructed and appropriately assessed to each owner based on the square footage of the drive approach constructed. As referenced elsewhere, all homes with a sewer lateral over fifty (50) years old should be replaced as a part of the project, under a separate special assessment district. We estimate about 50% of the homes will be subjected to this charge, which should be approximately $2,000. Similarly, all homes with a ¾ inch water service should be replaced as a part of this project, under a separate special assessment district. We estimate about 50% of the homes will be subjected to this charge, which should be approximately $2,000.

LEGAL REVIEW:

No legal review required at this time.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Based on the preliminary cost estimates, the following are the anticipated costs to the various City Funds:

- Local Streets Fund – $550,000
- Sewer Fund – $200,000 - $400,000
- Water Fund – $200,000

SUMMARY:

From the time of the petition was initiated to the writing of this memo, the percentage in favor of the petition has wavered from 53.8% to 48.7%. As a result, two (2) recommendations are presented for consideration given the decline in support for the petition.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Revised Map of SAD limits (1 page)
- City Commission Memo (dated July 29, 2019)
- Copy of Emails withdrawing support (4 pages)
SUGGESTED ACTIONS:

A) To authorize necessity for the paving of Lakeview Avenue from Harmon Street to Oak Avenue and adopt the resolution for this project.

OR

B) To take no action
WHEREAS, The City Commission has received the petition submitted by Ms. Christina McKenna Walton requesting the paving of Lakeview Avenue from Harmon Street to Oak Avenue; and

WHEREAS, The City Commission is of the opinion that construction of the improvement herein is declared a necessity; and

WHEREAS, The City Commission has not declared it practicable to cause estimates of cost thereof and plans to be made at this time, now therefore be it,

RESOLVED, that there be constructed an improvement to be hereinafter know as:

LAKEVIEW AVENUE – HARMON STREET TO OAK AVENUE

consisting of the construction of a twenty-six (26) foot wide concrete pavement (face to face) with integral curb and gutter, be it further

RESOLVED, that at such time as the Assessor is directed to prepare the assessment roll, eighty-five percent (85%) of the estimated cost be levied against the assessment district, and fifteen percent (15%) of the estimated cost be charged against the City at large, be it further

RESOLVED, that there be a special assessment district created and special assessments levied in accordance with the benefits against the properties within such assessment district, said special assessment district shall be all properties, both public and private, within the following district:

“Greenwood Sub, N.”
Lots 22 to 51

“Donald W. Young Subdivision”
Lots 1 to 8

“Vinewood Subdivision”
Lot 1

be it further

RESOLVED, that the Commission shall meet on Monday, September 23, 2019 at 7:30 P.M., for the purpose of conducting a public hearing to confirm the roll for the paving of Lakeview Avenue from Harmon Street to Oak Avenue.
DATE: September 12, 2019

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: Jana Ecker, Planning Director
Scott Grew, Police Commander
Paul T. O’Meara, City Engineer
Austin Fletcher, Assistant City Engineer

SUBJECT: Cranbrook Rd., Maple Rd. to 14 Mile Rd. Multi-Modal Transportation Board Review

INTRODUCTION:

The Road Commission for Oakland County plans to resurface the above section of County road in 2020. As a result, City staff worked with our traffic consultant F&V to review the multi-modal improvements that are proposed in the master plan with the Multi-Modal Transportation Board (MMTB).

BACKGROUND:

A detailed memo dated August 28, 2019 was prepared for the Board to review the recommended improvements that are planned already, as well as what should be prioritized at this time. The extent of the improvements are significant, with the final cost of the improvements in excess of $900,000. As a result, the improvements have been prioritized and are funded from multiple sources. Installation of the sidewalk and bike path improvements planned would provide significant multi-modal benefits to not only Birmingham residents, but to Bloomfield Twp. and Beverly Hills residents as well. With that in mind, we believe an application for federal funding in the form of a Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) grant would be appropriate.

The following serves as both an executive summary and a potential timeline for the improvements that are envisioned. Details relative to how the different components became the favored alternative are provided in the attached documentation that was prepared for the MMTB:

Autumn, 2019:

Bloomfield Twp. has proposed the installation of a standard five foot wide sidewalk on the west side of Cranbrook Rd. from its current terminus one half block north of Westbourne Rd. to Middlebury Rd. (The installation of a marked crosswalk at the Cranbrook Rd. and Middlebury Lane intersection, which would make the new sidewalk more useful, is proposed as a part of the 2020 resurfacing project.)
**Spring, Summer, 2020:**

The Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) will resurface Cranbrook Rd. from Maple Rd. to 14 Mile Rd. The segment north of Lincoln Ave. will be reduced from its current four lane cross-section to three 11 ft. lanes, with paved shoulders on both sides about 3.5 ft. wide. (The RCOC has indicated that they will not entertain lanes narrower than 11 ft., which precludes the introduction of on-street bike lanes on this segment, as was proposed in the Multi-Modal Master Plan.) The RCOC staff has indicated that they will entertain the inclusion of a locally funded pedestrian crosswalk island in the area of the new left turn lane. The island would be installed at the south side of the Midvale Rd. intersection, as an enhancement to the existing signalized crosswalk.

**Fiscal Year 2020-21:**

After much study and review by both staff, F&V, and the MMTB, the following mix of multi-modal improvements are now recommended, with federal funding to be requested in the form of a TAP grant (from north to south):

- Neighborhood Connector Route signs and sharrows on Midvale Rd., from Cranbrook Rd. to Larchlea Rd. (connecting Cranbrook Rd. to the existing Neighborhood Connector Route already in place on Larchlea Rd.)
- Shared Use Path (10 ft. wide) on the east side of Cranbrook Rd. from Midvale Rd. to the Seaholm High School service drive north of Lincoln Ave. (providing a pedestrian and bicycle facility for the entire Cranbrook Rd. frontage of the Seaholm High School property).
- Shared Use Path (10 ft. wide) on the west side of Cranbrook Rd. from Middlebury Rd. to 14 Mile Rd. (primarily Lincoln Hills Golf Course and Birmingham Bloomfield Art Center frontage).
- Standard sidewalk (5 ft. wide) on the south side of Lincoln Ave. from Cranbrook Rd. to Golfview Blvd. (subject to a special assessment).
- Standard sidewalk (5 ft. wide) on the east side of Cranbrook Rd. from Lincoln Ave. to Northlawn Blvd. (subject to a special assessment).
- Marked pedestrian crossing (with crosswalk markings, ramps, and signs) on Cranbrook Rd. at the Northlawn Dr. intersection.
- Standard sidewalk (5 ft. wide) on the north side of 14 Mile Rd. to connect to existing sidewalk to the west at Crosswick Rd. (Lincoln Hills Golf Course and Birmingham Dog Park frontage).

**LEGAL REVIEW:**

No legal review is required at this time.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

The following summarizes the financial impact that these proposals will have on the budget:

**Cranbrook Rd. Resurfacing**

The RCOC has estimated the cost of the road resurfacing project at $1.6 million. They have suggested a funding split as follows:
RCOC = $800,000  
Birmingham = $400,000  
Bloomfield Twp. = $400,000

The County has a Tri-Party Road Funding program wherein each Oakland Co. jurisdiction is allotted an amount of funds based on the number of County road miles within the jurisdiction, that can be spent as the local agency suggests. Currently, Birmingham has banked funds in the program since 2011, which will allow the Road Commission and the County general government to assist in the local share costs, bringing the City’s actual cost for this project down to about $290,000. Funding at this level has been included in the current 2019-20 fiscal year approved budget.

In addition to the above, the City will be requesting the inclusion of a pedestrian crossing island at the Midvale Rd. intersection. The RCOC will include this feature, but will not participate in the cost. The construction cost is estimated at $25,000. We propose to ask Bloomfield Twp. to share equally in the cost of this improvement, which would bring Birmingham’s share down to $12,500. Once plans have been finalized, and a firm cost estimate has been prepared, it is anticipated that during first months of 2020, the City would ask Bloomfield Twp. to sign a cost sharing agreement for 50% of the cost of the island, which would then be due and payable to RCOC in the spring of 2020. No funds for this island were designated in the current fiscal year budget.

Multi-Modal Master Plan Improvements

The improvements listed above have an estimated cost of $912,000. Given the proximity to a high school, as well as the important gaps that this proposal would resolve, the City may qualify for a Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) grant. Up to 80% of the cost could be funded by the federal government, leaving a local match of about $182,000.

There is also an opportunity to raise funds through a special assessment district, when new sidewalk is being installed adjacent to private properties. Given the long distances located adjacent to City or school system owned properties, only about $329,000 of the $912,000 cost could be subject to a special assessment district. Current estimates relative to the cost of this work is higher than typical sidewalk projects, due to the need to construct storm sewers, make grade changes, install retaining walls, etc. The extent to which the City will choose to pass this cost on to the adjacent property owners will have to be studied in more detail, if and when the grant is obtained, and if and when it appears that construction will proceed.

Since the potential improvements would involve a special assessment district, all sixteen homeowners involved were notified by letter and invited to the Multi-Modal Transportation Board meeting. No residents spoke at the meeting, but two residents have called and asked for information about the project. Both appeared to be in favor of the project at this time.

The Facilities Manager for Birmingham Public Schools was also notified about the project. Although the City would not be able to collect from the district to help defray the cost, the district would become responsible for future snow removal in this area. The Facilities
Manager indicated that the district would welcome the installation of the shared use path in this area.

If the City is not successful in obtaining a TAP grant, staff will return to the Commission to obtain direction about how to prioritize and/or phase these sidewalk improvements, in relation to upcoming fiscal year budget requests.

SUMMARY:
The City Commission is requested to endorse the recommendation of the Multi-Modal Transportation Board, consisting of the crosswalk improvements on Cranbrook Rd. to be built in 2020, and more significantly, the preparation of a TAP Grant application for sidewalk and shared use path improvements on sections of Cranbrook Rd., W. Lincoln Ave., and W. 14 Mile Rd.

ATTACHMENTS:
- Updated concept plan reflecting the recommendations of the MMTB.
- Revised cost estimate to reflect recommendation of the MMTB.
- Cranbrook Rd. project memo to the MMTB, dated August 28, 2019.
- Pertinent excerpts of the Multi-Modal Master Plan detailing recommendations for the Cranbrook Rd. corridor.
- Concept plan as prepared for the MMTB.
- Cost estimate of 10 ft. wide shared use path as previously proposed (does not include some sections of sidewalk on Cranbrook Rd. and Lincoln Ave. ultimately included).
- Notice mailed to Cranbrook Rd. and W. Lincoln Ave. corridor property owners that would be included in potential sidewalk special assessment district.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:
To approve the following recommendations of the Multi-Modal Transportation Board:

1. The installation of improved pedestrian crossings at the intersections of Cranbrook Rd. at both Midvale Rd. and Middlebury Lane, to be included in the upcoming resurfacing project to be completed by the Road Commission for Oakland County.

2. To direct staff to apply for a Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) grant to obtain federal funds to cover up to 80% of the construction cost of multi-modal improvements to consist of:

   a. The installation of a 10 ft. wide concrete mixed-use path for pedestrian and bicycle usage on the east side of Cranbrook Rd. from Midvale Rd. to Lincoln Ave., and on the west side of Cranbrook Rd. from Lincoln Ave. to 14 Mile Rd.

   b. Extension of Neighborhood Connector Route signs and sharrows on Midvale Rd. from Cranbrook Rd. to Larchlea Rd.

   c. The installation of 5 ft. wide concrete sidewalks on the east side of Cranbrook Rd. from Lincoln Ave. to Northlawn Dr., and on the south side of Lincoln Ave., from Cranbrook Rd. to Golfview Blvd.

   d. The installation of a 5 ft. wide concrete sidewalk on the north side of 14 Mile Rd. from Crosswick Rd. to Cranbrook Rd. (Lincoln Hills Golf Course frontage).
S. CRANBROOK ROAD
NON-MOTORIZED IMPROVEMENT PLAN
BIRMINGHAM, MI

LEGEND
- RCOC Improvements
- 10' Shared Use Path
- Bloomfield Twp Improvements
- 5' Concrete Sidewalk
**Preliminary Construction Cost Estimate**

**Cranbrook Road**

10' Mixed-Use & 5' Concrete Walk

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flatwork</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation/Undercutting</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>CYD</td>
<td>$ 50.00</td>
<td>$ 32,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10' Wide Mixed Use Path, Cranbrook, East</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>LFT</td>
<td>$ 55.00</td>
<td>$ 77,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10' Wide Mixed Use Path, Cranbrook, West</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>LFT</td>
<td>$ 100.00</td>
<td>$ 240,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk, 4in, Cranbrook</td>
<td>7750</td>
<td>SFT</td>
<td>$ 15.00</td>
<td>$ 116,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk, 4in, Lincoln</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>SFT</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
<td>$ 22,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk, 4in, 14 Mile Road</td>
<td>6875</td>
<td>SFT</td>
<td>$ 15.00</td>
<td>$ 103,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk, 6in</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>SFT</td>
<td>$ 6.00</td>
<td>$ 6,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detectable Warning Surface</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>LFT</td>
<td>$ 40.00</td>
<td>$ 5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flatwork Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 603,275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavement Markings &amp; Signage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>SFT</td>
<td>$ 10.00</td>
<td>$ 1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$ 100.00</td>
<td>$ 1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalk</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$ 20.00</td>
<td>$ 800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavement Markings &amp; Signage Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 3,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization, 10% Max</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LSUM</td>
<td>$ 61,007.50</td>
<td>$ 61,007.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Fees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LSUM</td>
<td>$ 1,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LSUM</td>
<td>$ 2,000.00</td>
<td>$ 2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency, 20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LSUM</td>
<td>$ 122,015.00</td>
<td>$ 122,015.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 186,022.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 793,097.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 63,447.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Administration (7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 55,516.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 912,062.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Road Commission for Oakland Co. (RCOC) has jurisdiction of Cranbrook Rd. in Birmingham. They have scheduled the resurfacing of the above segment as part of their 2020 construction program. The City and Bloomfield Twp. have each been asked to pay 25% of the cost of this project, with the Road Commission paying the remaining 50%. The City has agreed to this cost and has budgeted for it accordingly.

Substantial multi-modal improvements are suggested on this corridor in the City’s Multi-Modal Master Plan. Several discussions have already occurred with the Road Commission and with Bloomfield Twp. in order to identify a proposal that can be achieved. The following details are provided for your review and input, starting from the north, and moving south.

MULTI-MODAL MASTER PLAN

Applicable excerpts of the master plan are attached for your review.

Recommended projects are broken into four phases in the master plan. Recommendations for this area are included in Phases 2 and 3. Phase 2 recommendations are considered a higher priority than Phase 3.

a. Phase 2:

1. Convert the four lane segment of Cranbrook Rd. (Maple Rd. to Lincoln Ave.) from four lanes to three lanes. Provide bike lanes as shown in detail on page 94.

2. Extend a Neighborhood Connector Route for bikes on Midvale Rd., from Cranbrook Rd. to Larchlea Rd.

3. Install a pedestrian crossing island on the south side of the signalized Midvale Rd. intersection, in the new left turn lane (in conjunction with #1 above).

4. Install new 6 ft. wide sidewalk on the east side of the road from Midvale Rd. to Northlawn Dr., and on the west side of the road from Northlawn Dr. to 14 Mile Rd.
Further, install a new sidewalk along the north side of 14 Mile Rd., across the frontage of Lincoln Hills Golf Course, thereby connecting to an existing sidewalk at Crosswick Rd. that allows pedestrians to walk west on 14 Mile Rd. to Lahser Rd. and Telegraph Rd.

b. **Phase 3:**

5. Install a crossing island at the north side of the Seaholm High School service driveway, just north of the Lincoln Ave. intersection.

6. Install a sidewalk on the west side of Cranbrook Rd. from Lincoln Ave. to Northlawn Dr. (filling the gap created if the sidewalk work on Phase 2 was completed). Further, install a sidewalk on the south side of Lincoln Ave. from Cranbrook Rd. to Golfview Blvd.

7. Install bike lanes from Lincoln Ave. to 14 Mile Rd., by paving the existing gravel shoulders.

**RECOMMENDED MULTI-MODAL IMPROVEMENT DETAILS:**

Information about how each of the above recommendations can be implemented is provided below. However, it must first be noted that the recommendations are extensive, and the cost to implement them is significant. Here are some funding issues to first consider:

- Cranbrook Rd. is a County road, therefore, the City has not traditionally budgeted funds for its maintenance. However, the RCOC has operated with a short funded operation for many years. One way it has stretched its dollars is to expect that local jurisdictions that are benefitting from road projects to help provide funding. Cranbrook Rd. is in poor condition, and is in need of attention. The RCOC initially prioritized it for construction in 2019. When it approached Birmingham last year to suggest that the City share in the cost, the total job was estimated at $1.6 million. Birmingham’s share was estimated at $400,000 (25%). Since the project had not been budgeted in time to support a 2019 project, the City could not agree to this commitment. It was subsequently budgeted for fiscal 2019/20. The RCOC agreed to postpone the job for one year in order to allow for Birmingham to budget for the project.

- Staff worked with F&V to conceptually design improvements for the corridor. The cost for just the Phase 2 work noted is estimated at $640,000. While it is acknowledged that many of the Multi-Modal recommendations would be beneficial to the public at large, given their location, the improvements would likely benefit Bloomfield Twp. and Beverly Hills residents as much as it would benefit Birmingham residents. Given current funding constraints, it may be difficult to expend funds at this level along Cranbrook Rd. at this time.

- Since the City was successful in the past, we believe that a TAP (Transportation Alternatives Program) Grant, using federal dollars, should be attempted.

With the above in mind, the recommendations as referenced in the Master Plan (in the order noted above) are detailed below:
a. Phase 2:

1. The Master Plan suggests that Cranbrook Rd. be marked as a three lane road, providing 11 ft. driving lanes, and 5.5 ft. wide bike lanes. The cross-section shown in the master plan assumes that the pavement is 44 ft. wide. Unfortunately, the existing pavement is only 40.5 ft. wide. In order to install marked bike lanes, which must be a minimum of 5 ft. wide each, the driving lanes would have to narrowed to 10.25 ft. for the driving lanes, and 10 ft. wide for the left turn lane. The City has asked the RCOC to consider this design so that bike lanes can be provided. While the RCOC supports going to a three lane cross-section, they have consistently indicated that they cannot build this road with lanes less than 11 ft. wide. They plan to resurface the road with three 11 ft. lanes, leaving just 3.75 ft. on each side for a paved shoulder. Bike lanes signage cannot be installed at this width.

Earlier this year, two concept plans were prepared. Concept A was designed assuming the RCOC may allow for narrower lane markings on the north half of this project. Concept A would have included installation of the most important sidewalks along the corridor, as well as paved shoulders on the southerly half of the project area. If the RCOC did not approve this concept, Concept B was prepared. In Concept B, the paved bike shoulders are deleted, and instead widened sidewalk is proposed along the Cranbrook Rd. corridor to allow for a shared-use path. The shared use path would be installed from Midvale Rd. to 14 Mile Rd. Bikes would be encouraged to use Midvale Rd. to connect with the existing Neighborhood Connector Route on Larchlea Rd., rather than ending the bike lane facility at Maple Rd. with no designated place to go. Just this week, the RCOC has confirmed that it cannot support travel lanes at less than 11 ft. wide. As a result, the rest of this report will focus on working with the Concept B plan.

2. If a shared use path is built on Cranbrook Rd. along the Seaholm High School frontage, signs and sharrows would be added to Midvale Rd. to encourage the use of Midvale Rd. as a Neighborhood Connector Route to the existing route at Larchlea Rd.

3. The installation of a pedestrian island at the south side of the Midvale Rd. intersection, which is signaled, is recommended. Staff suggests that this element be prioritized whether the TAP grant is approved or not. Further, it should be built as a part of the Cranbrook Rd. resurfacing project, with 50% of the cost being paid by Bloomfield Twp., and 50% being paid by Birmingham. An endorsement from the Board is requested, so that staff can request the RCOC to proceed with the inclusion of this improvement in 2020. (The RCOC is not interested in building most of the other recommendations, particularly if they are being paid for with federal funds, which would complicate the administration of this project. If a TAP grant is received, it is anticipated that the work would be built by the City of Birmingham under a separate contract no later than 2021.)

4. The high priority sidewalks along both Cranbrook Rd. and 14 Mile Rd. were recommended at 6 ft. wide in the master plan. It is recommended that they be
proposed at 10 ft. wide to create a combination pedestrian and bicycle facility that would extend for \( \frac{3}{4} \) of a mile on Cranbrook Rd. The 14 Mile Rd. section would still be improved with a standard 5 ft. wide sidewalk, to match the existing sidewalk to the west. Note the following considerations:

- The City Code stipulates that when sidewalks are installed for the first time, 100% of the cost is charged to the adjacent property owners, through a special assessment. Public school properties are not required to pay special assessments, therefore the \( \frac{1}{4} \)-mile long section adjacent to Seaholm High School would have to be paid for by the City. Similarly, the long sections along the Lincoln Hills Golf Course and Birmingham Bloomfield Art Center is adjacent to City owned property, so they would also be funded by the City. A special assessment district could be created to help pay for the segment from Lincoln Ave. to Northlawn Blvd. Since a 10 ft. wide path is recommended instead of the normal 5 ft. sidewalk, a cost reduction should be considered to be consistent with the intent of the City Code. Considering the large percentage of cost that would have to be borne by the City, the effort to obtain a federal grant for 80% of the total cost is appropriate.

- The Concept B plans were prepared with a 10 ft. wide mixed use path along the 14 Mile Rd. frontage of the Lincoln Hills Golf Course. The cost of this work is estimated high due to the regrading and/or retaining walls that would need to be constructed in order to create sufficient space for this path. Since there are no other bike facilities on this section of 14 Mile Rd. for bikes to connect to, it is recommended that a typical 5 ft. wide sidewalk be installed on 14 Mile Rd., which would simplify the construction, and the overall cost of this segment.

b. Phase 3:

5. It is expected that a crossing island just north of the Seaholm High School service drive (just north of Lincoln Ave.) would not be appropriate, as this area is needed as a left turn lane for southbound traffic wishing to turn on to Lincoln Ave. However, Bloomfield Twp. already plans to construct a sidewalk on the west side of Cranbrook Rd. from south of Cranbrook Cross to Middlebury Lane (about 1\( \frac{1}{2} \) blocks), to fill in the remaining gap of sidewalk in this area. As a part of that work, they plan to build a marked crosswalk to encourage pedestrians to cross from Middlebury Lane across to the high school, without an island. Given the circumstances, this represents a worthwhile substitute.

6. While beneficial, the sidewalk recommendations along the remaining frontage of the Lincoln Hills Golf Course (north of Northlawn Dr.), and the sidewalk along the south side of Lincoln Ave. would be considered a lower priority. This cost was not included in the Concept B cost estimate. However, if funding for this work can be achieved at 20% local cost, the additional sidewalks would help improve the accessibility of the entire area. If built, the properties on the south side of Lincoln Ave. would be subject to a special assessment. Input from the Board is suggested. Property owners that would be included in the special assessment are receiving the attached mailed notice, so that they are aware of this discussion.
7. Since the RCOC will not be providing a pavement where bicycle use can be encouraged north of Lincoln Ave., installing paved shoulders for bicycle lanes south of Lincoln Ave. would not be appropriate. This recommendation is not a part of the Concept B plan.

SUMMARY

To summarize, the following improvements are already authorized and currently being planned:

1. Sidewalk installation on the west side of Cranbrook Rd., from south of Cranbrook Cross to Middlebury Lane, as well as a marked crosswalk north of Lincoln Ave. (by Bloomfield Twp.), to be completed in late 2019 (recommendation #5 (modified)).
2. Cranbrook Rd. resurfacing from Maple Rd. to 14 Mile Rd., to be completed in 2020, which will include reducing the current four lane section from Maple Rd. to Lincoln Ave. to three lanes, with paved shoulders on both sides. The City will pursue the inclusion of a pedestrian island and crosswalk improvement at the Midvale Rd. intersection (recommendations #1 and #3 (modified)). Funding of the island would be split between Bloomfield Twp. and Birmingham.

If recommended by the Board and endorsed by the City Commission, a TAP Grant application will be put together for submittal by the October 16 deadline, with the intention of constructing the improvements in 2021 if awarded. Improvements funded under the grant would include:

1. Mixed use path (10 ft. wide) installation on the east side of Cranbrook Rd. from Midvale Rd. to Northlawn Dr., and on the west side of Cranbrook Rd. from Northlawn Rd. to 14 Mile Rd., further, sidewalk (5 ft. wide) installation on the north side of 14 Mile Rd. from Crosswick Rd. to Cranbrook Rd. (recommendations #2, #4, & #7 (modified)).
2. An optional recommendation for additional 5 ft. wide sidewalk to fill in remaining gaps on Cranbrook Rd. and Lincoln Ave. can also be included in the TAP grant application, pending Board input (recommendation #6).

A recommendation to the City Commission is provided below. The fourth component is considered optional, based on feedback from the Board:

SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION:

The Multi-Modal Transportation Board recommends that the City Commission endorse the installation of a pedestrian island and improved crosswalk on Cranbrook Rd. at the south side of the Midvale Rd. intersection, to be built in conjunction with the Cranbrook Rd. resurfacing project, scheduled for 2020 construction by the Road Commission of Oakland Co.

Further, to direct staff to apply for a Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) grant to obtain federal funds to cover up to 80% of the construction cost of multi-modal improvements on Cranbrook Rd. to consist of:
1. The installation of a 10 ft. wide concrete mixed-use path for pedestrian and bicycle usage on the east side of Cranbrook Rd. from Midvale Rd. to Northlawn Dr., and on the west side of Cranbrook Rd. from Northlawn Dr. to 14 Mile Rd.

2. Extension of Neighborhood Connector Route signs and sharrows on Midvale Rd. from Cranbrook Rd. to Larchlea Rd.

3. The installation of a 5 ft. wide concrete sidewalk on the north side of 14 Mile Rd. from Crosswick Rd. to Cranbrook Rd. (Lincoln Hills Golf Course frontage).

4. (Optional) The installation of 5 ft. wide concrete sidewalks on the west side of Cranbrook Rd. from Lincoln Ave. to Northlawn Dr., and on the south side of Lincoln Ave., from Cranbrook Rd. to Golfview Blvd.
4.3 PHASE 2

PHASE 2: OVERVIEW
Phase 2 objective is to provide connections across the community and create a backbone for the City’s long-range multi-modal system. This phase achieves this by building on the existing multi-modal system.

The following pages provide a more detailed breakdown of Phase 2.

FIGURE 4.3A. PHASE 2
PHASE 2: PROPOSED BIKE FACILITIES

The following provides a list of on-road bike facilities that can be implemented in the near-term with minimal changes to the roadway. Please note that at time of implementation all bike facilities should be accompanied by appropriate signage.

On S Eton Road between Yosemite Boulevard and E Lincoln Street, remove parking on the west side of the street and add a buffered bike lane. On the east side of the street keep on-street parking and add a shared-lane marking. The buffer between the bike lane and travel lane should be cross hatched.
Add bike lanes to S Cranbrook Road between W Maple Avenue and W Lincoln Street through a four-lane to three-lane conversion. Add bike lanes to N Adams Road between Madison Street and Evergreen Drive through a four-lane to three-lane conversion. Please note that prior to implementation a micro-simulation may be necessary to see how school traffic timing affects both corridors.

**S CRANBROOK ROAD AND N ADAMS ROAD**

Add colored shared lane markings to E Lincoln Street between Woodward Avenue and Adams Road.

Add bike lanes to Oak Avenue between Lake Park Drive and Lakeside Drive by adding an edge stripe 6’ out from the curb on both sides of the road.

Add shared lane markings to the following roadways:

- W Lincoln Street between S Cranbrook Road and Southfield Road
- E Lincoln Street between Adams Road and S Eton Road
- S Eton Road between W Maple Rd and Yosemite
- N Eton Road between Yorkshire Road and W Maple Road
- Bowers Street between Woodward Avenue and Adams Avenue
- Oakland Avenue between N Old Woodward Avenue and Woodward Avenue
- Willits Street between N Chester Street and N Old Woodward Avenue
- W Maple Road between Southfield Road and N Old Woodward Avenue
- S Bates Street between W Lincoln St and Willits Street
- Cole Street east of S Eton Street
- Adams Road between Madison Street and Woodward Avenue
- Oak Avenue between Lake Park Drive and Woodward Avenue
- Chesterfield Avenue between Oak Avenue and W Maple Road
- One-way on S Old Woodward Ave between Landon Rd and E Lincoln St

Add colored shared lane markings to E Lincoln Street between Woodward Avenue and Adams Road.
**PHASE 2 BICYCLE FACILITIES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes through 4 to 3 lane conversion (stripe removal, pavement markings and signage):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Cranbrook Rd</td>
<td>W Maple Rd</td>
<td>W Lincoln Rd</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Adams Rd</td>
<td>Evergreen Dr</td>
<td>Madison St</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buffered Bike Lane (pavement markings and signage in one direction)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Eton Rd</td>
<td>Yosemite Blvd</td>
<td>E Lincoln St</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bike Lanes through Lane Narrowing:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ave</td>
<td>Lake Park Dr</td>
<td>Lakeside Dr</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Lane Markings (placed every 200' - 250'):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Lincoln St</td>
<td>S Cranbrook Rd</td>
<td>Southfield Rd</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Lincoln St</td>
<td>Adams Rd</td>
<td>S Eton Rd</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Eton Rd</td>
<td>W Maple Rd</td>
<td>Yosemite</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Eton Rd</td>
<td>Yorkshire Rd</td>
<td>W Maple Rd</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowers St</td>
<td>Woodward Ave</td>
<td>Adams Rd</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Ave</td>
<td>N Old Woodward Ave</td>
<td>Woodward Ave</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willis St</td>
<td>N Chester St</td>
<td>N Old Woodward Ave</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Maple Rd</td>
<td>Southfield Rd</td>
<td>N Old Woodward Ave</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Bates</td>
<td>W Lincoln St</td>
<td>Willis St</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole St</td>
<td>East of S Eton St</td>
<td>Woodward Ave</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams Rd</td>
<td>Madison St</td>
<td>Woodward Ave</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ave</td>
<td>Lake Park Dr</td>
<td>Woodward Ave</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield Ave</td>
<td>Oak Ave</td>
<td>W Maple Rd</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Lane Markings (placed every 200' - 250' in one direction):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Eton Rd</td>
<td>Yosemite Blvd</td>
<td>E Lincoln St</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Old Woodward Ave</td>
<td>Landon Rd</td>
<td>E Lincoln St</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colored Shared Lane Markings (placed every 200' - 250' with solid green paint the entire length):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Lincoln St</td>
<td>Woodward Ave</td>
<td>Adams Rd</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHASE 2: PROPOSED NEIGHBORHOOD CONNECTOR ROUTES

The following map displays the neighborhood connector routes that should be implemented first. Initially, implementation along these routes is as simple as providing wayfinding signage identifying the direction of the route and key destinations. Eventually, other enhancements such as rain gardens, traffic calming measures, and street art may be incorporated. Please note that some of these routes are dependent on road crossings which are proposed in Phase 1 and Phase 2.

In Phase 2 only wayfinding signage is proposed. In the future, the City may consider adding some additional enhancements such as mini traffic circles, pavement markings, chicanes, street diverters, and pedestrian street lighting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midvale</td>
<td>S Cranbrook Rd</td>
<td>Larchlea Dr</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larchlea Dr</td>
<td>W Maple Rd</td>
<td>W Lincoln St</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Lincoln St</td>
<td>Larchlea Dr</td>
<td>Pleasant St</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant St</td>
<td>W Lincoln St</td>
<td>Fairway Dr</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairway Dr</td>
<td>Pleasant St</td>
<td>Northlawn Blvd</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northlawn Blvd</td>
<td>Fairway Dr</td>
<td>Latham St</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham St</td>
<td>Northlawn Blvd</td>
<td>Worthington Rd</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Rd</td>
<td>Latham St</td>
<td>Southfield Rd</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Southlawn Blvd</td>
<td>Southfield Rd</td>
<td>Peirce St</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce St</td>
<td>W Southlawn Blvd</td>
<td>W Southlawn Blvd</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Southlawn Blvd</td>
<td>Pierce St</td>
<td>Grand St</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant St</td>
<td>E Southlawn Blvd</td>
<td>Emmons Ave</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmons Ave</td>
<td>Grant St</td>
<td>Woodward Ave</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapin Ave</td>
<td>Woodward Ave</td>
<td>Troy St</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torry St</td>
<td>Haynes St</td>
<td>Chapin Ave</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway (north of Torry St)</td>
<td>Bowers St</td>
<td>Haynes St</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowers St</td>
<td>Adams Rd</td>
<td>S Eton Rd</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams Rd</td>
<td>Bowers St</td>
<td>Bowers St</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowers St</td>
<td>Woodward Ave</td>
<td>Adams Rd</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowers St</td>
<td>S Old Woodward Ave</td>
<td>Woodward Ave</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Old Woodward Ave</td>
<td>E Frank St</td>
<td>Bowers St</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Frank St</td>
<td>Purdy St</td>
<td>S Old Woodward Ave</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdy St</td>
<td>E Frank St</td>
<td>George St</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George St</td>
<td>Floyd St</td>
<td>Purdy St</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd St</td>
<td>George St</td>
<td>E Lincoln St</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Lincoln St</td>
<td>Edgewood Rd</td>
<td>Floyd St</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood Rd</td>
<td>E Lincoln St</td>
<td>E Southlawn Blvd</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Bates St</td>
<td>W Brown St</td>
<td>Southlawn Blvd</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Blvd</td>
<td>W Lincoln St</td>
<td>W Southlawn Blvd</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield Ave</td>
<td>Oak Ave</td>
<td>W Maple Rd</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ave</td>
<td>Chesterfield Ave</td>
<td>Woodward Ave</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood St</td>
<td>Oak Ave</td>
<td>Willits St</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willits St</td>
<td>Greenwood St</td>
<td>N Chester St</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodward Ave Sidepath</td>
<td>Oak Ave</td>
<td>Wimbledon Dr</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimbledon Dr</td>
<td>Woodward Ave</td>
<td>Oxford St</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford St</td>
<td>Wimbledon Dr</td>
<td>Mohegan St</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohegan St</td>
<td>Oxford St</td>
<td>N Adams Rd</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poppleton St</td>
<td>Mohegan St</td>
<td>Oakland Ave</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Ave</td>
<td>Poppleton St</td>
<td>Woodward Ave</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby Rd</td>
<td>N Adams Rd</td>
<td>N Eton Rd</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Eton St</td>
<td>Derby Rd</td>
<td>E Maple Rd</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Maple Rd Sidepath</td>
<td>S Eton Rd</td>
<td>N Eton Rd</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Eton St Sidepath</td>
<td>E Maple Rd</td>
<td>Yosemite Blvd</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Ave</td>
<td>S Eton Rd</td>
<td>Villa Rd</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Rd</td>
<td>Villa Ave</td>
<td>Proposed Pathway</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Pathway extending from Villa Rd to Troy Transit Station: 0.2 MI
PHASE 2: PROPOSED ROAD CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS
The proposed road crossing improvements include both new road crossings and recommended upgrades to existing road crossings. Due to the high volume of walking that already exists in the City, it is important to improve the existing crossings and provide new crossings where there is high demand in order to create a safer environment for everyone.

A crossing island is proposed on S Cranbrook Road at Midvale on the south side of the intersection to be implemented concurrent with the proposed 4 to 3 lane conversion. A crossing island is proposed on N Adams at Abbey Road on north side of the intersection to be implemented concurrent with the proposed 4 to 3 lane conversion. And a crossing island is proposed at N Adams at Buckingham Avenue on the south side of intersection in the unused center turn lane.
Curb extensions are proposed throughout the downtown to help eliminate the stepped curbed and provide ramps to make the downtown more accessible to everyone. Because of the cluster of proposed curb extensions it would make more sense to implement as part of a road reconstruction project.

Curb extensions are proposed along S Eton Road near the Rail District. They should extend into the roadway 5’ on the west side of the street and 8’ on the east side of the street.

There are a few locations where pedestrian crossings are needed and/or minor improvements should be made.

- North side of Haynes Street between Bowers Street and Columbia Street – improvements include ramp, detectable warning, sidewalk extension, signs, high visibility pavement marking
- Bowers Street between Haynes Street and Columbia Street – improvements include detectable warnings, signs, high visibility pavement markings
- Villa Road at Yankee – improvements include detectable warnings, signs, high visibility pavement markings
- S Cranbrook Road at Northlawn Boulevard - improvement include ramps, detectable warnings, signs and high visibility pavement markings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE 2 ROAD CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crossing Islands (Bollards, landscaping, concrete curbs, striping):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Cranbrook Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Adams Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Adams Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curb Extensions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Eton Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Eton Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Eton Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Eton Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Eton Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Maple Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Maple Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Maple Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Maple Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor Upgrades (high visibility markings, ramps and signs)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haynes St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowers St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Cranbrook Rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHASE 2: PROPOSED PATHWAYS & SIDEWALKS

Due to the nearly complete existing sidewalk system in the City of Birmingham, only a few key sidewalk and pathway connections have been proposed in the initial phases.

Sidewalks are proposed along the west side of S Cranbrook Road between Midvale and Northlawn Boulevard and south of Northlawn Boulevard on the east side of the road down to W 14 Mile Road providing a connection between the high school and dog park. The City should coordinate with the high school when implementing the sidewalk segment along school property.

A sidewalk is proposed along the north side of W 14 Mile west of S Cranbrook Road to provide a connection to the existing sidewalk in Bloomfield Township.

A sidewalk is proposed along the north side of Cole Street east of S Eton Street to help provide connections to businesses along the corridor and in preparation for future connections to the Troy Intermodal Transit Center.
A pathway is proposed at the end of Villa Road to connect the rail district to the future Troy Intermodal Transit Center. The implementation of this pathway should be coordinated with property owners and the final design and construction of the Troy Intermodal Transit Center. Easements may be required to make this connection.

A pathway is proposed through Poppleton Park connecting Woodward Avenue to Oxford Street. Implementation of this pathway should be coordinated with the upcoming waterline project in Poppleton Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S Cranbrook Rd (east)</td>
<td>Midvale</td>
<td>Northlawn Blvd</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Cranbrook Rd (west)</td>
<td>Northlawn Blvd</td>
<td>W 14 Mile Rd</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole St (north)</td>
<td>East of S Eton St</td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 14 Mile Rd</td>
<td>1200' west of S Cranbrook Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asphalt Pathway (10' wide, does not include cost of acquiring easement)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail District - Connecting Villa Rd to Troy Transit Station (easement required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>650</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poppleton Park - Connecting Woodward Ave to Oxford St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHASE 2: PROPOSED BICYCLE PARKING

Two types of bicycle parking are proposed in the downtown.

Temporary/Seasonal bicycle racks should be placed where there are large curb extensions or where space is available adjacent to outdoor dining decks. Based on their success, additional racks may be added as needed.

An enclosed and secured bike room should be placed on the ground floor (level 2) of the northeast corner of the Pierce Street parking garage.
APPROXIMATE COST ESTIMATE FOR PHASE 2 IMPLEMENTATION: $1,000,000

APPROXIMATELY 17 MILES OF NEW MULTI-MODAL FACILITIES ARE PROPOSED IN PHASE 2:

- 1.1 MILES OF BIKE LANES
- 0.5 MILES OF BUFFERED BIKE LANES
- 5.7 MILES OF SHARED LANE MARKINGS
- 0.1 MILES OF COLORED SHARED LANE MARKINGS
- 11 MILES OF NEIGHBORHOOD CONNECTOR ROUTES
- 0.8 MILES OF SIDEWALKS & PATHWAYS
- 16 ROAD CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS
- 1 ENCLOSED & SECURED BIKE ROOM (NOT SHOWN ON MAP)
4.4 PHASE 3

PHASE 3: OVERVIEW
This phase focuses on completing the multi-modal network and includes the remaining network improvements. Due to the length of time it is going to take to complete the first two phases, the remaining improvements have been grouped into Phase 3. When the first two phases are near completion, a more thorough evaluation should be done to determine what new opportunities are available and what the costs may be.

The following pages outline the remaining infrastructure improvements to complete the multi-modal network.

FIGURE 4.3A. PHASE 3
PHASE 3: RECOMMENDED PATHWAYS & SIDEWALKS

Phase 1 and Phase 2 focus on addressing some of the more critical gaps in the sidewalk system. Phase 3 should focus on completing the remaining gaps in the system. Completing sidewalk gaps can be costly so it is important to utilize opportunities, especially when a road is reconstructed or a property is developed.

The remaining sidewalks and pathways are on City property, school property or in the road right-of-way.

In the future, whenever a site is redeveloped, non-motorized connections should be provided either as a sidewalk along a roadway with bike lanes or a shared-use pathway.
PHASE 3: RECOMMENDED ROAD CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS
Many of the remaining road crossing improvements align with the neighborhood connector routes, provide mid-block crossings and increase visibility between motorists and pedestrians in the downtown.
PHASE 3: RECOMMENDED NEIGHBORHOOD CONNECTOR ROUTES
This phase focuses on completing the neighborhood connector routes. While the neighborhood connector routes are relatively easy and economical to implement some are dependent on the construction of proposed pathways and road crossing improvements. It will be important to prioritize the implementation of the neighborhood connector routes in this phase based on the progress of pathways implementation and road crossing improvements.
PHASE 3: RECOMMENDED BICYCLE FACILITIES
With the exception of paving the shoulder on S Cranbrook Road, the remainder of the proposed bicycle facilities can be implemented quite easily within the existing roadway with pavement markings.

With time, as bicycle levels increase there may be a desire to add a designated bike lane in place of shared lane markings. For many of the roadways this would mean removing on-street parking or widening the roadway. Where the removal of on-street parking is not an option or not desired, the cost to add bike lanes to the roadway independent of a road reconstruction project would be significant. Thus to maximize the impact of finite resources bicycle lanes should be implemented when the road is completely reconstructed.
PHASE 3: RECOMMENDED BICYCLE PARKING

It is recommended that 2 bike racks be placed on each proposed curb extension along Maple Road in the downtown.

Based on the success of the proposed bike room in the Pierce Street Parking Garage, the City should evaluate if bike rooms should be implemented in other parking garages in the downtown.
PHASE 3: RECOMMENDED ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION HUBS
As the multi-modal system begins to develop and the first two phases are complete, Active Transportation Hubs should be placed in key locations around town such as Booth Park, Millrace Park, outside City Hall and in the Rail District.
APPROXIMATELY 15 MILES OF NEW MULTI-MODAL FACILITIES ARE PROPOSED IN PHASE 3:

- 0.7 MILES OF BIKE LANES
- 4 MILES OF SHARED LANE MARKINGS
- 5 MILES OF NEIGHBORHOOD CONNECTOR ROUTES
- 1.3 MILES OF ASPHALT PATHWAYS
- 1.3 MILES OF SIDEWALK
- 17 ROAD CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS
- 4 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION HUBS (NOT SHOWN ON MAP)
- 20 BICYCLE HOOPS (NOT SHOWN ON MAP)
- 2 BIKE ROOMS (NOT SHOWN ON MAP)
## Preliminary Construction Cost Estimate

**Cranbrook Road**

**10' Mixed-Use Path**

August 29, 2019  
Estimate by: JPR  
Checked by: JLC

### Flatwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excavation/Undercutting</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>CYD</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$16,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10’ Wide Mixed Use Path, Cranbrook</td>
<td>2850</td>
<td>LFT</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$285,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk, 4in, 14 Mile Road</td>
<td>6750</td>
<td>SFT</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$101,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk, 6in</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>SFT</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$8,610.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detectable Warning Surface</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>LFT</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$6,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flatwork Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>417,510.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pavement Markings & Signage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>SFT</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalk</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavement Markings &amp; Signage Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,800.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization, 10% Max</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LSUM</td>
<td>$42,831.00</td>
<td>$42,831.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Fees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LSUM</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LSUM</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Refuge Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency, 20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LSUM</td>
<td>$85,662.00</td>
<td>$85,662.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>136,493.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Construction Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Total</td>
<td>$556,803.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (8%)</td>
<td>$44,544.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Administration (7%)</td>
<td>$38,976.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$640,323.45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 30, 2019

NOTICE!

CITY SIDEWALK PROPOSAL
CRANBROOK RD. & LINCOLN AVE. CORRIDORS

The Road Commission for Oakland County plans to repair and resurface Cranbrook Rd. from Maple Rd. to 14 Mile Rd. in 2020. As a part of their work, the four lane segment from Maple Rd. to Lincoln Ave. will be changed to a 3 lane road, with the center lane being reserved for left turns only.

As a result of this proposal, the City’s Multi-Modal Transportation Board will be reviewing other possible improvements that could be made to the area. A meeting of the Board is scheduled for Thursday, September 5, 2019, at 6 PM. The agenda for that meeting, with full details, can be found on the City’s website at www.bhamgov.org. Information on City Boards can be found by clicking the “Residents” tab on the home page, followed by “City Government.”

The City Code specifies that when new sidewalk is installed in an area where none currently exists, the abutting property owner is responsible for 100% of the cost of construction, if the sidewalk will cross the front face of the property. If the sidewalk will cross the side (or rear) of the abutting property, the abutting property owner shall pay 33% of the cost, with the City paying the remainder.

Two sections of sidewalks being considered that could be subject to a special assessment include:

Cranbrook Rd., east side, from Lincoln Ave. to Northlawn Dr. – A 10 ft. wide mixed-use path is proposed along this segment as part of a larger facility that would provide a facility for both pedestrians and bicyclists wishing to use the Cranbrook Rd. corridor from Midvale Rd. to 14 Mile Rd.

Lincoln Ave., south side, from Cranbrook Rd. to Golfview Blvd. – A 5 ft. side sidewalk is proposed along this segment, to fill in this missing gap in the current sidewalk system.

Note that this will be the first time that these proposals have been discussed at a public meeting. If the proposal is endorsed by the Multi-Modal Transportation Board, it will then be reviewed by the City Commission. The City would then attempt to obtain a grant from the federal government to defray the overall cost of this work, which includes other improvements beyond what is described here. If the City is successful in obtaining a grant, you will be invited to a public hearing to consider creation of the special assessment district referenced above.

Please review the City’s website, or contact the Engineering Dept. at 248-530-1836, if you have any questions.
INTRODUCTION:
The Old Woodward Ave. & Willits St. intersection was last reconstructed in 2007 as a part of the N. Old Woodward Ave. reconstruction project. More recently, the south leg of the intersection was modified last year as a part of the 2018 Old Woodward Ave. reconstruction project. The City Commission has raised concerns about the poor pedestrian environment for some aspects of this intersection, and requested that it be studied by the Multi-Modal Transportation Board (MMTB) for possible improvements.

BACKGROUND:
Staff requested the City’s traffic engineering consultant to review the existing conditions, and then make recommendations for improvements. F&V prepared a draft report that was summarized by staff, and presented at the May 2, 2019 MMTB meeting. The main focus of the discussion was the crosswalk that extends across N. Old Woodward Ave. on the north leg of the intersection. Not only is the crosswalk very long at 75 ft., the traffic signal phasing encourages left turns from eastbound Willits St. on to N. Old Woodward Ave. at the same time that pedestrians have the right-of-way, which leaves pedestrians feeling vulnerable. After input from the Board, it was clear that some of the recommendations needed further study, and that this topic should be returned to the Board at a later date.

At the MMTB meeting of June 6, 2019, a more thorough report was presented by F&V. After discussion, the MMTB passed the following motion:

To recommend to the City Commission a combination of three improvements as depicted in F&V’s report dated May 31, 2019:
- To add bumpouts at both the NE and NW corners of the Old Woodward and Willits St./Oakland Blvd. intersection (after completion of the Maple Rd. reconstruction project), and
- To provide protected-only phasing for the east/west left turn movements from Willits St. and Oakland Blvd.

The recommendations are explained in further detail below:
1. **Bumpouts at the Northwest and Northeast corners of the intersection:**

Referring to Figure 5 in the F&V report from May 31, 2019 (attached), the suggested conceptual plan for bumpouts at the northwest and northeast corners has the following features:

a. The left turn and through lanes for southbound Old Woodward Ave. traffic are left in their current configuration. The right turn lane has been moved east so that it is adjacent to the through lane, removing the extra pavement between that currently exists. Moving this lane provides extra space for an 8 ft. bumpout at the northwest corner. Doing so not only reduces the crosswalk length, it also opens the opportunity for an additional three metered parking spaces in front of 325 N. Old Woodward Ave.

b. At the northeast corner, the City has installed a bus shelter and landscaped urban park area. In order for the bus stop to function without disrupting the intersection operation, the extra street pavement in this area has been left open and available for buses. However, it is much wider than it needs to be. By reducing the bus lane to the minimum necessary (10 ft.), the crosswalk can be reduced another 12 ft. at the northeast corner. (Figure 5 indicates a 12 ft. wide bus lane, but we are proposing that this be constructed at 10 ft. wide, allowing the bumpout to extend another two feet into the street.)

c. As long as bumpout improvements are being considered at this island, the third westbound lane on Oakland Blvd. that is no longer being used could also be removed, providing more green space and an enlarged island, as shown. Doing so would also reduce the length of the crosswalk for the east leg of the intersection (crossing Oakland Blvd.).

If changes are implemented at both corners, this crosswalk could be reduced in length from 75 ft. to about 55 ft. Clearly, bumpouts at this intersection would improve the pedestrian experience. However, as was explained to the MMTB, Willits St. and Oakland Blvd. will be used as the detour route for westbound Maple Rd. in 2020 when that street is closed for reconstruction. Constructing bumpouts in this area would conflict with the use of this area while it is needed for traffic management in 2020. Further, all of Oakland Blvd. from Old Woodward Ave. to Woodward Ave. is in need of pavement repairs and other multi-modal improvements that have been identified in the Multi-Modal Master Plan. With that in mind, while these improvements are desirable, it is recommended that they be postponed until 2021, thereby allowing the Maple Rd. reconstruction project to be finished.

2. **Protected Left Turns from Willits St.**

While it would be difficult to implement the bumpout recommendations at this time, the traffic signal changes that are also being recommended can be implemented much sooner.

As described as Option #4 in the F&V memo dated May 31, 2019, the left turn phases for Willits St. and Oakland Blvd. traffic turning left on to Old Woodward Ave. currently have “protected” and “permissive” phases. During the protected phase, drivers are given a solid green arrow to turn, during which time pedestrians are given a “DON’T WALK” red signal. Later in the same cycle, left turn drivers are given a permissive phase. The traffic signal has a flashing yellow left arrow, indicating that drivers can proceed to make their
left turn if cross traffic is clear. However, during this time, pedestrians are also given the white signal to proceed across the street. Given the length of the north leg crosswalk, this is problematic.

F&V has recommended that the permissive phase for left turns be removed from the cycle, and extending the protected left turn phase timing accordingly. The timing adjustment would reduce the current uncertainty pedestrians feel when using this crossing. The removal of the permissive left turn phase without other adjustments would reduce the Level of Service for eastbound traffic to an unacceptable level. With that in mind, the protected left turn phase time must be increased. F&V is recommending removal of the previously implemented LPI (Leading Pedestrian Interval) for this crosswalk in order to achieve the proper balance in the timing cycle. Given the removal of the permissive left turns, this is considered a reasonable compromise.

LEGAL REVIEW:
No legal review is needed at this time.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Implementing the traffic signal changes recommended above would require removal and replacement of the two left turn signals with new three-head signals that would operate the protected left turn phase for Willits St. and Oakland Blvd. traffic. F&V estimates that these changes would cost approximately $17,000, which was not provided for in the current budget. The City could hire the Road Commission for Oakland Co. to make these relatively simple changes, through an appropriation to the Major Street Fund.

The cost estimates for the bumpout recommendations provided have not been thoroughly reviewed at this time. We recommend a complete analysis of the Oakland Blvd. corridor at a later date with the assistance of the MMTB, and then making recommendations in conjunction with the planned Oakland Blvd. resurfacing project currently budgeted for the 2021 construction season.

SUMMARY
It is recommended that the City Commission approve the recommendation of the Multi-Modal Transportation Board traffic signal changes for the N. Old Woodward Ave. & Willits St./Oakland Blvd. intersection, to remove the permissive left turn phase for eastbound and westbound traffic. Once a proposal has been received from the Road Commission for Oakland Co., approval of a budget appropriation will be requested.

ATTACHMENTS:
- Cover memo to the MMTB for the May 2, 2019 meeting.
- Approved minutes of the MMTB meeting of May 2, 2019.
- Cover memo to the MMTB for the June 6, 2019 meeting.
- Draft minutes of the MMTB meeting of June 6, 2019 meeting.
SUGGESTED RESOLUTION:
To accept the recommendation of the Multi-Modal Transportation Board for traffic signal changes at the N. Old Woodward Ave. & Willits St./Oakland Blvd. intersection, to remove the permissive left turn phase for eastbound and westbound traffic and extending the protected left turn phase timing accordingly.
INTRODUCTION:

This memo summarizes considered pedestrian improvements for the intersection of Old Woodward Avenue & Willits Street. There is a possibility for pedestrian/vehicle conflicts within the E/W crosswalk on the north side of the intersection. The purpose of this analysis is to evaluate alternatives to improve pedestrian safety at this intersection. Included herein is project background information, improvements previously evaluated, and new improvements for consideration.

BACKGROUND:

Fleis and VandenBrink previously prepared a report regarding a Leading Pedestrian Interval (LPI) program at several intersections throughout the downtown. An LPI provides pedestrians with an opportunity to enter an intersection and establish their place in the crosswalk before the vehicles in the same direction of travel are given the green indication. The benefits of an LPI are the increased visibility of pedestrians in the crosswalk, additional time for slower pedestrians, and decreased potential for pedestrian/vehicle conflicts. While LPIs are beneficial to pedestrian safety, they also reduce the available green time for vehicles and can cause additional delay at an intersection. Based on the recommendations from the LPI study, the following LPIs are currently implemented at the Old Woodward and Willits intersection:

- East/West crossing: 10 second LPI
- North/South crossing: 7 second LPI

However, since the East/West crosswalk length is approximately 75 feet on the north leg, the implemented LPI only provides pedestrians enough time to travel less than halfway across the street before left-turning vehicles are permitted to enter the intersection. F&V further evaluated this intersection to develop several alternatives for consideration. The analysis for each alternative evaluated is summarized herein.

1. CURB EXTENSIONS (NE CORNER)

A bumpout extends the line of the curb out into the road, reducing the amount of street space pedestrians have to cross. This pedestrian improvement increases safety for slower pedestrians and improves pedestrian visibility to drivers; while also reducing the turning speed of vehicles. The northeast corner of the intersection of Old Woodward & Willits currently has a painted curb extension; this however, does not physically reduce the crosswalk distance. This curb extension
would reduce the east-west crosswalk distance and could be expanded into the hatched-out area along the east leg of the intersection to reduce that crosswalk length.

If the City is going to expend funds to install a bumpout, the work should encompass Oakland Blvd. as well, where currently a third unused lane makes the east leg crosswalk longer than it needs to be. The segment of Oakland Blvd. from this point east to Woodward Ave. was originally scheduled for resurfacing in 2019, given that the pavement is in poor condition. However, this street will be used for a part of the designated Maple Rd. detour for westbound traffic when that project is underway in 2020. To ensure appropriate traffic flows, two lanes of westbound traffic will be provided through this intersection, during which time the existing width of the street will be needed. With that in mind, a permanent bumpout improvement cannot be implemented at this location until the completion of the Maple Rd. paving project in 2020.

Key Findings
- The total crosswalk distance is reduced from 75-feet to 65-feet.
- The curb extension could be expanded to the hatched-out portion of the east leg of the intersection, in order to reduce the total N/S crosswalk distance for the east leg.
- While a permanent bumpout will make significant improvements, it is impractical to proceed with this construction until the Maple Rd. project is completed in 2020.

2. LANE REDUCTION & CURB EXTENSIONS (NW CORNER)

This alternative considered a lane reduction for southbound Old Woodward at the intersection, in combination with a curb extension on the NW corner. The southbound Old Woodward approach with Willits currently provides three lanes (left-turn, through, and right-turn lanes). This alternative evaluated eliminating the southbound right-turn lane and converting the southbound through lane into a shared through/right lane. By eliminating the right-turn lane, the NW curb could be extended through the existing right-turn lane in order to reduce the existing crosswalk distance. The primary concern with this alternative is the operational impacts of removing the exclusive right-turn movement and associated overlap phasing. An analysis showed that eliminating the exclusive right-turn lane will increase both the Level of Service (LOS) and the vehicle queueing.

Right turn demand for southbound traffic at this intersection has always been significant. Through traffic traveling south on Woodward Ave. and then heading west or south of Birmingham often use these streets to do so. While the computer analysis predicts that the LOS would decline from C to D in the PM period, the actual impact could be tested by setting up a right lane closure and then timing the delays experienced during the PM peak. If the MMTB wishes to explore this further, such a test could be implemented.

Key Findings
- The total crosswalk distance will be reduced from 75-feet to approximately 60-feet.
- The LOS and vehicle queueing will increase. A test to determine actual impacts is recommended if this bumpout is desired.
- The southbound right turn overlap phase will be eliminated.
- A curb extension on the NE corner could also be constructed with this alternative to reduce the total crosswalk distance from the existing 75-feet to approximately 50-feet.
- Would result in three additional parking spaces.

3. PROTECTED LEFT TURNS (E/W APPROACH)
One of the most common conflicts at signalized intersections is the competition between vehicles permissively turning left and pedestrians crossing during the concurrent parallel pedestrian signal phase. Protected left-turn phasing provides a green arrow for left-turning vehicles while stopping both on-coming traffic and parallel pedestrians’ crossings, therefore eliminating all potential conflict. Currently, the intersection of Old Woodward & Willits provides protective/permissive phasing for E/W left-turns from Willits and provides permissive only phasing for the N/S left-turns from Old Woodward. This alternative considered providing protected-only phasing for the E/W left-turn movements from Willits; removing the permissive phase in order to eliminate vehicle-pedestrian conflicts for the E/W pedestrian crossings. By eliminating the potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts during the E/W crossings, there is no longer the need to provide an LPI along the E/W crossings; therefore, the allotted all-red time is available for additional green time elsewhere. This additional green time within the cycle helps to minimize the impact of removing the E/W permissive phase. The primary concern with this alternative is the operational impacts of eliminating the permissive phase.

Key Findings
- The LPI phase for the E/W crossings will be available as additional green time for other movements, by eliminating the potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts for E/W crossings.
- The LOS will increase for the E/W left turn movements; however, it will decrease for the E/W through movements. CALL JULIE – CALCS SEEM WRONG
- All potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts will be eliminated for pedestrians crossing in the E/W directions
  - Vehicle-pedestrian conflicts will still exist for N/S crossing pedestrians

4. BARNES DANCE (PEDESTRIAN SCRAMBLE)

This pedestrian improvement restricts all vehicular movements at an intersection and provides a pedestrian only walking phase. This type of treatment allows pedestrians to travel without any potential for vehicle-pedestrian conflicts. The level of service for vehicles would deteriorate to unacceptable levels if this option was implemented. For example, delays of up to 2 minutes to drive through the intersection are calculated during the PM peak. Such delays would result in queues that would impact other nearby intersections and valet operations in the immediate area.

Key Findings
- Pedestrian movements will be fully separated from vehicular movements.
- This treatment would require a reduction in green time for all movements; resulting in the LOS and vehicle queuing increasing along all approaches and movements.
- Push-buttons or other pedestrian detection is recommended in order to minimize vehicle delays when pedestrians are not present.
- This option cannot be recommended given the deterioration of the LOS that would occur.

5. ADDITIONAL SIGNAGE
The effectiveness that additional signage has on driver yielding compliance is influenced by several factors, including vehicular speed, traffic volume, and whether the driver perceives yielding as a courtesy or the law. This option would be the lowest cost alternative; however, it would rely on driver compliance and attentiveness.

Key Findings
- A “Left turns yield to pedestrians” sign would provide advanced warning for drivers making left-turns, ideally increasing their attention to crossing pedestrians.
- Additional signage will only be effective when motorists observe and obey the signage.
- Overuse of signs may breed noncompliance and disrespect.
- Visibility of signs will be of difficult due to on-street parking.

SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the alternative analysis indicate that Alternative 1 (NE Curb Extension) and Alternative 3 (Protected-Only Left-Turns) provide a noticeable pedestrian improvement, without causing a significant impact to the intersection operations.
- Alternative 1 will reduce the crosswalk distance to 65 ft for the E/W crossings without impacting vehicle operations; however, this work cannot proceed until after the Maple Rd. project has been completed in 2020.
- Alternative 2 has a similar cost to the other alternatives; however, the overall intersection operations will experience larger delays. Not Recommended, however, a field test could be conducted to further explore this option, if desired.
- Alternative 3 will eliminate all potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts for the E/W crossings; however, the LOS for the E/W left turn movements will be increased. HOLD
- Alternative 4 provides the lowest cost to remove all potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts; however, the vehicle operations on all approaches will experience significant increases in delay and queuing. Typically implemented at intersection locations in dense urban areas with high pedestrian volumes. Not Recommended
- Alternative 5 could be paired with any other options or used alone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall LOS</th>
<th>Crosswalk Length</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>AM: C</td>
<td>E/W: 75 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-day: C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM: C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1- NE Corner Bumpouts</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>E/W: 65 ft</td>
<td>$2,000-$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2- Lane Reduction &amp; NW Corner Bumpouts</td>
<td>AM: C</td>
<td>E/W: 60 ft /50 ft.</td>
<td>$2,000-$20,000</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-day: C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM: D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3- Protected Left Turns</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>~$17,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4- Barnes Dance</td>
<td>AM: D</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>~$2,500</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-day: D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM: F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 5- Additional signs</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>$200-$600 per sign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 26, 2019

Cmdr. Scott Grewe
Operations Commander
Birmingham Police
151 Martin Street
Birmingham, MI 48012

RE: Old Woodward Avenue & Willits Street
Pedestrian Improvements Summary

Dear Cmdr. Grewe:

The purpose of this letter is to provide a summary of the pedestrian improvements for consideration at the intersection of Old Woodward Avenue & Willits Street. It is our understanding that there have been observed pedestrian/vehicle conflicts within the E/W crosswalk on the northside of the intersection as illustrated in Figure 1 below. The purpose of this analysis is to evaluate mitigation alternatives to improve pedestrian safety at this intersection. Included herein is project background information, improvements previously evaluated, and new improvements for consideration.

Figure 1: Old Woodward Avenue & Willits Street Intersection
PROJECT BACKGROUND

Fleis and VandenBrink previously prepared a report (dated February 2018) regarding a Leading Pedestrian Interval (LPI) program at several intersections throughout downtown Birmingham. An LPI provides pedestrians with an opportunity to enter an intersection and establish their place in the crosswalk before the vehicles in the same direction of travel are given the green indication. The benefits of an LPI are the increased visibility of pedestrians in the crosswalk, additional time for slower pedestrians, and decreased potential for conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. While LPIs are beneficial to pedestrian safety, they also reduce the available green time for vehicles and can cause additional delay at an intersection. Based on the recommendations from the LPI study, the following LPIs are currently implemented at the Old Woodward Avenue and Willits Street intersection:

- East/West crossing: 10 second LPI
- North/South crossing: 7 second LPI

However, since the East/West crosswalk length is approximately 75 feet on the north leg, the implemented LPI only provides pedestrians enough time to travel less than halfway across the street before left-turning vehicles are permitted to enter the intersection. F&V further evaluated this intersection to develop several other alternatives that were also evaluated for consideration. The analysis for each alternative evaluated is summarized herein.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

F&V developed several potential pedestrian improvements that were evaluated for consideration. The analysis for each improvement evaluated is summarized herein.

1. CURB EXTENSIONS (NE CORNER)

A bumpout extends the line of the curb out into the traveled way, reducing the amount of street space pedestrians have to cross. This pedestrian improvement increases safety for slower pedestrians (children and the elderly) and improves pedestrian visibility to drivers; while also reducing the turning speed of vehicles, as a result of smaller curb radii.

Currently, the northeast corner of the intersection of Old Woodward Avenue & Willits Street has a painted curb extension. However, since the curb extension is painted, it does not physically reduce the crosswalk distance, in order to provide a raised, safe waiting area for the pedestrian.

Therefore, a paved curb extension was evaluated for the northeast corner of this intersection. At this intersection, westbound right-turns are channelized to the north; therefore, this curb radius can be minimized, as the eastbound left-turn movement for trucks is the only turning movement that needs to be considered. A curb extension at this location may also reduce the turning speeds for eastbound left-turning vehicles, by shrinking the available pavement to complete their turning movements. This curb extension would reduce the existing 75-foot crosswalk distance on the north leg to approximately 65 feet. This curb extension could also be expanded into the hatched-out area along the east leg of the intersection to reduce that crosswalk length. The proposed design for this curb extension is shown on the attached Figure 2.

Key Findings

- The total crosswalk distance is reduced from 75-feet to 65-feet.
  o A Smart bus stop is located where the proposed bump out is considered. The bus stop would need to be relocated since a stop at this location has the potential to block the intersection with the addition of a bump out.
- The curb extension could be expanded to the hatched-out portion of the east leg of the intersection, in order to reduce the total N/S crosswalk distance for the east leg.
- Structure and fire hydrant relocation should be taken into consideration when designing curb extensions.
2. **LANE REDUCTION & CURB EXTENSIONS (NW CORNER)**

This alternative considered a lane reduction for southbound Old Woodward Avenue at the intersection, in combination with a curb extension on the NW corner. The southbound Old Woodward approach with Willits Street currently provides three lanes (left-turn, through, and right-turn lanes). This alternative evaluated eliminating the southbound right-turn lane and converting the southbound through lane into a shared through/right lane. By eliminating the right-turn lane, the NW curb could be extended through the existing right-turn lane in order to reduce the existing 75-foot crosswalk distance to approximately 60 feet. The proposed design for this curb extension is shown on the attached Figure 3.

The primary concern with this alternative is the operational impacts of removing the exclusive right-turn movement and associated overlap phasing. An analysis was performed to determine the measure-of-effectiveness (MOE) of this alternative as compared to existing operations. The MOE summary is provided in Table 1. The results of the analysis show that eliminating the exclusive right-turn lane will increase both the vehicle delay (LOS) and the vehicle queueing. The network simulations indicate that eliminating the southbound right-turn lane will result in longer vehicle queues for southbound traffic; resulting in the southbound left-turn lane becoming blocked for a portion of each peak hour. Additionally, the increased vehicle queues for the southbound traffic will reduce the number of acceptable gaps available for northbound vehicles attempting to make permissive left-turns.

**Table 1: Lane Reduction MOE Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Existing Conditions (Exclusive SB RT)</th>
<th>Proposed Conditions (Shared SB Thru/Right)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (s/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Delay (s/veh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Woodward Avenue &amp; Willits Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings

- The total crosswalk distance will be reduced from 75-feet to approximately 60-feet.
- The vehicle delay (LOS) and vehicle queueing will increase.
- The southbound right turn overlap phase will be eliminated.
- Fire hydrant relocation should be taken into consideration when designing curb extensions.
- This alternative could be constructed in conjunction with a curb extension on the NE corner to reduce the total crosswalk distance from the existing 75-feet to approximately 50-feet.

3. PROTECTED LEFT TURNS (E/W APPROACH)

One of the most common conflicts at signalized intersections is the competition between vehicles permissively turning left and pedestrians crossing during the concurrent parallel pedestrian signal phase. Drivers typically focus on opposing traffic to identify gaps for left turns and may not pay due attention to pedestrians approaching or in the parallel crosswalk. Additionally, permissive left turns at congested intersections contribute to drivers accepting smaller gaps, turning at higher speeds, and “sneaking” through the intersection during the yellow or all-red signal intervals. Protected left-turn phasing provides a green arrow for left-turning vehicles while stopping both on-coming traffic and parallel pedestrians’ crossings, therefore eliminating all potential conflict.

Currently, the intersection of Old Woodward Avenue & Willits Street provides protective/permissive phasing for E/W left-turns from Willits Street and provides permissive only phasing for the N/S left-turns from Old Woodward Avenue. This alternative considered providing protected-only phasing for the E/W left-turn movements from Willits Street; removing the permissive phase in order to eliminate vehicle-pedestrians conflicts for the E/W pedestrian crossings. By eliminating the potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts during the E/W turn movements, there is no longer the need to provide an LPI along the E/W crossings; therefore, the allotted all-red time (10 seconds) is available for additional green time elsewhere. This additional green time within the cycle helps to minimize the impact of removing the E/W permissive phase. The primary concern with this alternative is the operational impacts of eliminating the permissive phase. An analysis was performed to determine the measure-of-effectiveness (MOE) of this alternative as compared to existing operations. The MOE summary is provided in Table 2. The results of the analysis show that eliminating the permissive movement will increase both the vehicle delay (LOS) and the vehicle queueing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Average (ft)</th>
<th>95th % (ft)</th>
<th>Average (ft)</th>
<th>95th % (ft)</th>
<th>Average (ft)</th>
<th>95th % (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Woodward Avenue &amp; Willits Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Protected E/W Left-Turn MOE Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Existing Perm/Prot</th>
<th>E/W Protected Only Left-turn</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (s/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Delay (s/veh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Woodward Avenue &amp; Willits Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Average (ft)</th>
<th>95th % (ft)</th>
<th>Average (ft)</th>
<th>95th % (ft)</th>
<th>Average (ft)</th>
<th>95th % (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Woodward Avenue &amp; Willits Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings

- The LPI phase for the E/W crossings will be available as additional green time for other movements, due to eliminating the potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts along the E/W crossings.
- The vehicle delay (LOS) will increase for the E/W left turn movements; however, it will decrease for the E/W through movements.
- All potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts will be eliminated for pedestrians crossing in the E/W directions
  - Vehicle-pedestrian conflicts will still exist for N/S crossing pedestrians
- The existing signal 4-section signal heads on the east and west approaches would need to be replaced with a 3-section signal heads to operate as protected only.

4. **Barnes Dance (Pedestrian Scramble)**

This pedestrian improvement restricts all vehicular movements at an intersection and provides a pedestrian only walking phase. At intersections with this type of pedestrian treatment, an “X” crosswalk through the middle of the intersection is often implemented, in addition to the four typical crossings connecting each corner. This type of treatment allows pedestrians to travel without any potential for vehicle-pedestrian conflicts; however, this is typically implemented at intersection locations in dense urban areas with high pedestrian volumes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Existing LPI Delay (s/veh)</th>
<th>Pedestrian Phase Delay (s/veh)</th>
<th>Difference Delay (s/veh)</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Woodward Avenue &amp; Willits Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>C &gt; D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>129.0</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>107.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>111.6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>C &gt; F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Findings
- Pedestrian movements will be fully separated from vehicular movements.
- This treatment would require a reduction in green time for all movements; resulting in the vehicle delay (LOS) and vehicle queuing increasing along all approaches and movements.
- Push-buttons or other pedestrian detection is recommended in order to minimize vehicle delays when pedestrians are not present.

### 5. ADDITIONAL SIGNAGE
The effectiveness that additional signage has on driver yielding compliance is influenced by several factors, including vehicular speed, traffic volume, and whether the driver perceives yielding as a courtesy or the law. Enhancing signage with pedestrian activated lights or flashing beacons has been shown to be more effective than those signs that flash/blink continuously. Pedestrian signage placed in advance of the crosswalk location has been shown to be effective at reducing vehicle-pedestrian conflicts.

#### Key Findings
- A “Left turns yield to pedestrians” sign would provide advanced warning for drivers making left-turns, ideally increasing their attention to crossing pedestrians.
- Additional signage will only be effective for those motorists who observe and obey the signage.
- Overuse of signs may breed noncompliance and disrespect.
- Visibility of signs will be of difficulty due to on-street parking.

### SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS
The results of the alternative analysis indicate that Alternative 1 (NE Curb Extension) and Alternative 3 (Protected-Only Left-Turns) provide a noticeable pedestrian improvement, without causing a significant impact to the intersection operations.
- Alternative 1 will provide a reduced crosswalk distance (75-ft to 65-ft) for the north leg of the intersection without impacting vehicle operations; however, the Smart bus stop location will need to be relocated.
- Alternative 3 will eliminate all potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts for the E/W crossings; however, the vehicle delay (LOS) for the E/W left turn movements will be increased.

An additional option for consideration is Alternative 5 and to provide a “Left turns yield to pedestrians” sign. This option would be the lowest cost alternative; however, it would rely on driver compliance and attentiveness.
Alternatives 2 and 4 are not recommended. Alternative 2 has a similar cost to the other alternatives; however, the overall intersection operations will experience larger delays. Alternative 4 provides the lowest cost to remove all potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts; however, the vehicle operations on all approaches will experience significant increases in delay and queuing.

Table 4: Pedestrian Improvement Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Treatment</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. NE Curb Extension</td>
<td>$2,000 - $20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NW Curb Extension</td>
<td>$2,000 - $20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. E/W Protected-Only Phase</td>
<td>~ $17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “X” crosswalk pavement markings</td>
<td>~$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Signage</td>
<td>$200 - $600 per sign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We hope that this information provides adequate clarification to address the questions of the City. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact our office.

Sincerely,

FLEIS & VANDENBRINK

Julie M. Kroll, PE, PTOE
Sr. Project Manager
FIGURE 2A
NORTHEAST CORNER BUMPOUT
FIGURE 2B
NORTHEAST CORNER
FULL BUMPOUT

CITY OF BIRMINGHAM
OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN
WILLITS ST. & WOODWARD AVE.
IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Multi-Modal Transportation Board held Thursday, May 2, 2019.

Chairwoman Johanna Slanga convened the meeting at 6:03 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

Present: Chairwoman Johanna Slanga, Vice-Chairwoman Lara Edwards; Board Members Daniel Rontal, Doug White; Alternate Board Member Daniel Isaksen; Student Representatives Chris Capone, Bennett Pompi

Absent: Board Members Amy Folberg, Katie Schafer, Joe Zane

Administration: Jana Ecker, Planning Director
Scott Grewe, Police Commander
Paul O'Meara, City Engineer
Laura Eichenhorn, Transcriptionist
Austin Fletcher, City Engineer

Fleis & Vanderbrink ("F&V"): Julie Kroll

Regional Transit Authority: Ben Stupka

SMART: Robert Kramer

MKSK: Brad Strader

2. Introductions (none)

3. Review Agenda (no change)
4. Approval of MMTB Minutes of March 7, 2019

Motion by Mr. White
Seconded by Dr. Rontal to approve the MMTB Minutes of March 7, 2019 as presented.

Motion carried, 5-0.

VOICE VOTE
Yeas: White, Rontal, Slanga, Edwards, Isaksen
Nays: None

5. Willits / Oakland and S. Old Woodward – Pedestrian Improvements

Assistant Planner Lauren Chapman presented the item.

City Engineer O’Meara stated that the Commission wanted the MMTB to study this intersection in terms of potential pedestrian improvements that could be made.

Vice-Chairwoman Edwards asked about potential changes in signal timing.

Ms. Kroll explained:
- There are leading pedestrian intervals (LPI) at this intersection, with a 10 second leading pedestrian interval for east-west crossing and a seven second leading pedestrian interval for north-south.
- The permissive protected left turn at this intersection is different from other Birmingham intersections. If a driver is trying to make a left turn on Willits to go north on Old Woodward, the driver would proceed with a protected green arrow requiring pedestrians to yield to the vehicle. When this light goes to red, the east-west LPI begins.
- At this point, there are often cars in the intersection because they expected the signal to turn into a flashing yellow arrow while it actually turns to a solid red. This leads to east-west pedestrian hesitation because they both see cars in the middle of the road and have a walk signal.
- There were some pedestrian-vehicle conflicts on the north side of the intersection, but the majority of pedestrians cross this intersection on the south side.
- A lagging left turn was evaluated as a possible solution, which would have had the 10 second LPI, followed by a flashing yellow, followed by a solid green. This configuration would have caused longer back-ups in the intersection.
- The F&V team then decided to focus on altering signal timing to make the biggest improvement, with the intention of improving specific parts of the intersection even further after that.
● This intersection is most challenging between 5:00 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. on weekdays. The rest of the time it works well. At this time the team is considering altering the signal timing during the peak 4:00 p.m.-6:00 p.m. timeframe, while leaving the LPIs intact other hours of the day.
● The various options available for improving the intersection are still being studied.
● When the bus stops at the stop adjacent the intersection, its latter half will remain in the intersection, effectively blocking part of the intersection.

City Engineer O'Meara concurred. He said that they are currently considering removing 10 feet from the northbound lane in order to provide enough room for the bus to sit and for traffic to pass. He said recommendations for how to update the signal timing would be available for the June 2019 meeting.

Mr. Isaksen suggested taking the hashed triangular wedge divider on southbound Old Woodward between the right turn lane and the straight traffic, removing ten feet, and creating a 60 foot crossing, which would be more tenable.

Dr. Rontal spoke in favor of that suggestion.

Mr. Isaksen said bump-outs are a great idea here.

Chairwoman Slanga noted that these were ideas for the future.

Vice-Chairwoman Edwards noted there was a lot of room on Oakland due to the current hashing as well, said she saw a lot of room for future improvements, and said she looked forward to hearing the signal timing recommendations.

6. 2019 Asphalt Resurfacing Program

City Engineer O'Meara presented the item.

Vice-Chairwoman Edwards said it would be good to have a survey regarding the bicycle connector route on the City website.

Dr. Rontal said increased signage designating the bicycle connector route would be beneficial. He also said he would like to see further plans for encouraging use and implementation of the bicycle connector route. He said he lives near the route as it passes through Emmonds, Catalpa, and Southlawn, and that there is no signage encouraging use of the route and notifying cyclists to its existence.

Planning Director Ecker said the improvements Dr. Rontal was talking about are part of phase two of the multi-modal plan, and that it will be addressed towards the beginning of that phase. For the building, painting, and signage, that would need to be included in the budget, the opportunity for which occurs annually. She said it would go in the Engineering budget.
City Engineer O’Meara said the budget request would be better phased over a few years, as opposed to in one year.

Chairwoman Slanga, summarizing the Board’s views and concerns, asked Staff to come up with a recommended plan for implementation of all the bicycle information in the Multi-Modal Plan, and possibly a loose schedule.

City Engineer O’Meara emphasizes that Staff would want the Board’s feedback on the pending bicycle recommendations as well in order to determine where the priorities are.

7. Board Training – Transit Oriented Development

Brad Strader from MKSK, Ben Stupka from the Regional Transit Authority (RTA), and Robert Kramer from SMART spoke to the Board. Mr. Kramer spoke on SMART service, the regular routes, and the FAST service. Mr. Strader spoke about transit-oriented development (TOD), some examples of TOD, and how it relates to Birmingham such as how development, design, and density effect the viability of different types of transit. Mr. Stupka talked about the change from TOD to mobility-oriented development.

Mr. Kramer, Deputy General Manager at SMART, reviewed the routes that pass through Birmingham. He explained that the FAST bus serves communities with more use and investment in the service, and skips other communities that have not invested in the service in order to provide a higher quality of service overall. Birmingham will be getting enhanced FAST bus shelters that will have ‘Next Bus Arrival’ screens, and more substantial financial investment in those stops. Focusing investment along nodes that are transit supportive has been successful, with the utilization of the FAST Woodward line up 50% over the year prior. Some of the ways SMART would alter its service in order to be more supportive of TOD are:

● Altering the routes in small ways in order to pass through more densely populated areas with more walkable amenities, which will generate increased ridership and in turn generate more walkable, dense development.
● Increasing the comfort provided at the stops, including the example of the ‘Next Bus Arrival’ screens at the FAST shelters.
● Expanding or shortening routes in order to better accommodate the locations of higher demand.

Mr. Kramer continued:

● SMART is currently undergoing operations analysis to determine how best to connect riders to the major routes.
● The service quality of some of the minor routes may not be ideal, he also noted that sometimes those minor routes are the only ways people in those areas have to get around, so route changes are being considered with great caution.
● Increasing the accessibility and rider volume of the major routes can be an engine of economic and walkable development in the areas those routes pass through.
● The aim is to redeploy SMART’s resources to increase bus frequency on more heavily used routes, and to use other resources to keep bus accessibility open for people who rely significantly on what were previously lower-quality routes.
● Adding more frequent buses to the most commonly used routes will also be supportive of
SMART is working with MDOT to develop signal priority implementation which would include connected vehicle infrastructure. This would allow green lights to stay green longer or turn green earlier if a bus is running behind schedule.

SMART is looking at constructing Park-and-Ride facilities along the FAST corridors, which he conceded is somewhat opposite to TOD but still supports a better level of service.

SMART is also looking for ways to collaborate with other transit businesses and models in the area, such as ride-sharing, as well.

It takes about 40 minutes to get from Birmingham to Hart Plaza in downtown Detroit. The FAST service is about 15% faster than the local service. It ends up being about 5-7 minutes longer than driving.

SMART and DDOT unveiled a unified payment system called DART on May 1, 2019, allowing for passes of 4-hour, 24-hour, 7-day and 31-day increments which would eliminate transfer charges and streamline fare options.

SMART has found Birmingham is very responsive to bus-related suggestions, and that there is an open line to the City. SMART works on demarcating bus stops clearly and locating them in locations that are as safe for pedestrians as possible.

Planning Director Ecker noted that SMART has also been very responsive to Birmingham’s requests about topics such as bus shelter customization or similar matters.

Brad Strader from MKSK defined TOD as development that typically is very pedestrian-, transit-, and bicycle-oriented, and less car oriented. It is typically mixed-use and higher density so that the local transit is used throughout the day, instead of only during rush hour, for instance. He continued:

- Maintaining a mixture of uses along the transit line is good in addition to maintaining mixed-use developments in single spots along the transit line.
- Reduction in parking needs have been more subtle than some planners anticipated because people prefer the flexibility of having a car, but TOD does yield some reduction in parking necessity.
- Some of the benefits include more transit options for younger individuals and independent seniors looking for alternatives to single occupant vehicles and development closer to high-quality transit has a higher value. While the tendency towards higher property values near TOD is more true in larger urban areas, the trend is also starting to appear in parts of Michigan as well.
- TOD depends on a municipality’s transit-oriented goals. Some of the possible reasons for TOD include building ridership, economic development, creating higher density living which can reduce both housing and transportation costs, getting people healthier through walking and bicycling, and shifting the primary transit modalities used.
- TOD can vary depending on the type of roadway, type of development, and type of community.
- TOD requires many stakeholders to be involved from both the public and private sectors. Developers need to see that there is a return on investment, and might be hesitant to do TOD if they anticipate a stop or station might move in a year. Birmingham would need to work with MDOT to make changes in the MDOT right of way and with transit agencies like the RTA and SMART to create viable TOD.
- Mr. Stupka has been able to meet with developers in his RTA capacity to explain, for instance, how developments can meet the needs of major employers and make using
transit more convenient for the employees.

- Factors which influence transit usage include proximity, convenience, quality of the bus stop and amenities, travel time reliability, and the permanence of a stop or station.
- Fast bus services encourage more TOD than a regular bus line, bus rapid transit or exclusive bus lanes encourage more TOD than fast bus services, street car encourages more TOD than bus rapid transit. Commuter rail can vary from a purely park-and-ride situation to the impetus for a lot of development.
- One way of approaching TOD is determining objectives, coming up with a plan to be implemented over a period of time, looking at code and development issues, and continuing to enhance transit as density and quality of development increases.
- The Woodward Avenue Action Association (WA3) has been an advocate in the local area towards encouraging TOD along Woodward.

Mr. Strader then reviewed a number of case studies, and advised the Board that Planning Director Ecker had the presentation should Board Members want to review those examples further.

Planning Director Ecker said that Cleveland’s TOD was a particularly compelling example to compare to Birmingham, and that in some areas along its recent transit development it looked strikingly like the Woodward Corridor.

Ben Stupka from RTA explained that mobility-oriented development (MOD) explores how different modes of transportation access the major transit corridors and how development fits into that. The RTA is currently developing a study looking at MOD along Woodward and along the Ann Arbor-Detroit Rail Corridor. He continued that the RTA is also looking at some potential pilots to parlay some of its resources into an Uber- or Lyft-style on-demand service for individuals living in the lower density areas.

In reply to Planning Director Ecker’s question, Mr. Stupka explained that the RTA is working on regional transit via considering another ballot initiative in 2020 and renewing its master plan to determine what the values and priorities are around regional transit. Determining the ideals and values around regional transit allows the RTA to inspire people, maintain flexibility, accommodate different funding outcomes, and better incorporate stakeholders’ objectives. The RTA is also working on its coordinated service plan for seniors and people with disabilities, which would allow on-demand services for qualifying people under the ADA. There are over 100 non-profits, community services, and other providers in the region offering similar resources to seniors and disabled people, and the RTA is trying to figure out how to better coordinate those efforts. Newer technologies for fare-paying across transit are also being explored. MDOT also gave the RTA a grant to work on centralizing booking for ADA services.

Chairwoman Slanga said she looked forward to further hearing about how Birmingham’s planning decisions could better connect the City with the surrounding communities. She then thanked Mr. Kramer, Mr. Strader, and Mr. Stupka for their presentations.

Planning Director Ecker thanked Mr. Kramer, Mr. Strader, and Mr. Stupka as well.

8. Meeting Open to the Public for items not on the Agenda

9. Miscellaneous Communications
City Engineer O'Meara explained a resident in the West Maple-Chesterfield area would like to see a crossing area in front of the First United Methodist Church, which previously went unendorsed by the MMTB and the Commission due to residents’ comments at the public hearing requesting it not be installed.

City Engineer O'Meara said he was inclined to ask the resident in support of the crossing area for more positive feedback from residents before the MMTB would pursue the issue further.

10. Next Meeting – June 6, 2019

11. Adjournment
No further business being evident, the board members adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Jana Ecker, Planning Director

Paul O'Meara, City Engineer
INTRODUCTION:

This memo summarizes considered pedestrian improvements for the intersection of Old Woodward Avenue & Willits Street. There is a possibility for pedestrian/vehicle conflicts within the E/W crosswalk on the north side of the intersection. The purpose of this analysis is to evaluate alternatives to improve pedestrian safety at this intersection. Included herein is project background information, improvements previously evaluated, and new improvements for consideration.

BACKGROUND:

Fleis and VandenBrink previously prepared a report regarding a Leading Pedestrian Interval (LPI) program at several intersections throughout the downtown. An LPI provides pedestrians with an opportunity to enter an intersection and establish their place in the crosswalk before the vehicles in the same direction of travel are given the green indication. The benefits of an LPI are the increased visibility of pedestrians in the crosswalk, additional time for slower pedestrians, and decreased potential for pedestrian/vehicle conflicts. While LPIs are beneficial to pedestrian safety, they also reduce the available green time for vehicles and can cause additional delay at an intersection. Based on the recommendations from the LPI study, the following LPIs are currently implemented at the Old Woodward and Willits intersection:

- East/West crossing: 10 second LPI
- North/South crossing: 7 second LPI

However, since the East/West crosswalk length is approximately 75 feet on the north leg, the implemented LPI only provides pedestrians enough time to travel less than halfway across the street before left-turning vehicles are permitted to enter the intersection. F&V further evaluated this intersection to develop several alternatives for consideration. The analysis for each alternative evaluated is summarized herein.

1. CURB EXTENSIONS (NE CORNER)

A bumpout extends the line of the curb out into the road, reducing the amount of street space pedestrians have to cross. This pedestrian improvement increases safety for slower pedestrians and improves pedestrian visibility to drivers; while also reducing the turning speed of vehicles. The northeast corner of the intersection of Old Woodward & Willits currently has a painted curb extension; this however, does not physically reduce the crosswalk distance. This curb extension
would reduce the east-west crosswalk distance and could be expanded into the hatched-out area along the east leg of the intersection to reduce that crosswalk length.

If the City is going to expend funds to install a bumpout, the work should encompass Oakland Blvd. as well, where currently a third unused lane makes the east leg crosswalk longer than it needs to be. The segment of Oakland Blvd. from this point east to Woodward Ave. was originally scheduled for resurfacing in 2019, given that the pavement is in poor condition. However, this street will be used for a part of the designated Maple Rd. detour for westbound traffic when that project is underway in 2020. To ensure appropriate traffic flows, two lanes of westbound traffic will be provided through this intersection, during which time the existing width of the street will be needed. With that in mind, a permanent bumpout improvement cannot be implemented at this location until the completion of the Maple Rd. paving project in 2020.

**Key Findings**
- The total crosswalk distance is reduced from 75-feet to 65-feet.
- The curb extension could be expanded to the hatched-out portion of the east leg of the intersection, in order to reduce the total N/S crosswalk distance for the east leg.
- While a permanent bumpout will make significant improvements, it is impractical to proceed with this construction until the Maple Rd. project is completed in 2020.

2. LANE REDUCTION & CURB EXTENSIONS (NW CORNER)

This alternative considered a lane reduction for southbound Old Woodward at the intersection, in combination with a curb extension on the NW corner. The southbound Old Woodward approach with Willits currently provides three lanes (left-turn, through, and right-turn lanes). This alternative evaluated eliminating the southbound right-turn lane and converting the southbound through lane into a shared through/right lane. By eliminating the right-turn lane, the NW curb could be extended through the existing right-turn lane in order to reduce the existing crosswalk distance. The primary concern with this alternative is the operational impacts of removing the exclusive right-turn movement and associated overlap phasing. An analysis showed that eliminating the exclusive right-turn lane will increase both the Level of Service (LOS) and the vehicle queueing.

Right turn demand for southbound traffic at this intersection has always been significant. Through traffic traveling south on Woodward Ave. and then heading west or south of Birmingham often use these streets to do so. While the computer analysis predicts that the LOS would decline from C to D in the PM period, the actual impact could be tested by setting up a right lane closure and then timing the delays experienced during the PM peak. If the MMTB wishes to explore this further, such a test could be implemented.

**Key Findings**
- The total crosswalk distance will be reduced from 75-feet to approximately 60-feet.
- The LOS and vehicle queueing will increase. A test to determine actual impacts is recommended if this bumpout is desired.
- The southbound right turn overlap phase will be eliminated.
- A curb extension on the NE corner could also be constructed with this alternative to reduce the total crosswalk distance from the existing 75-feet to approximately 50-feet.
- Would result in three additional parking spaces.
3. PROTECTED LEFT TURNS (E/W APPROACH)

One of the most common conflicts at signalized intersections is the competition between vehicles permissively turning left and pedestrians crossing during the concurrent parallel pedestrian signal phase. Protected left-turn phasing provides a green arrow for left-turning vehicles while stopping both on-coming traffic and parallel pedestrians’ crossings, therefore eliminating all potential conflict. Currently, the intersection of Old Woodward & Willits provides protective/permissive phasing for E/W left-turns from Willits and provides permissive only phasing for the N/S left-turns from Old Woodward. This alternative considered providing protected-only phasing for the E/W left-turn movements from Willits; removing the permissive phase in order to eliminate vehicle-pedestrians conflicts for the E/W pedestrian crossings. By eliminating the potential vehicle-pedestrians conflicts during the E/W crossings, there is no longer the need to provide an LPI along the E/W crossings; therefore, the allotted all-red time is available for additional green time elsewhere. This additional green time within the cycle helps to minimize the impact of removing the E/W permissive phase. The primary concern with this alternative is the operational impacts of eliminating the permissive phase.

Key Findings

- The LPI phase for the E/W crossings will be available as additional green time for other movements, by eliminating the potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts for E/W crossings.
- The LOS will increase for the E/W left turn movements; however, it will decrease for the E/W through movements. CALL JULIE – CALCS SEEM WRONG
- All potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts will be eliminated for pedestrians crossing in the E/W directions
  - Vehicle-pedestrian conflicts will still exist for N/S crossing pedestrians

4. BARNES DANCE (PEDESTRIAN SCRAMBLE)

This pedestrian improvement restricts all vehicular movements at an intersection and provides a pedestrian only walking phase. This type of treatment allows pedestrians to travel without any potential for vehicle-pedestrian conflicts. The level of service for vehicles would deteriorate to unacceptable levels if this option was implemented. For example, delays of up to 2 minutes to drive through the intersection are calculated during the PM peak. Such delays would result in queues that would impact other nearby intersections and valet operations in the immediate area.

Key Findings

- Pedestrian movements will be fully separated from vehicular movements.
- This treatment would require a reduction in green time for all movements; resulting in the LOS and vehicle queuing increasing along all approaches and movements.
- Push-buttons or other pedestrian detection is recommended in order to minimize vehicle delays when pedestrians are not present.
- **This option cannot be recommended given the deterioration of the LOS that would occur.**
5. ADDITIONAL SIGNAGE

The effectiveness that additional signage has on driver yielding compliance is influenced by several factors, including vehicular speed, traffic volume, and whether the driver perceives yielding as a courtesy or the law. This option would be the lowest cost alternative; however, it would rely on driver compliance and attentiveness.

Key Findings
- A “Left turns yield to pedestrians” sign would provide advanced warning for drivers making left-turns, ideally increasing their attention to crossing pedestrians.
- Additional signage will only be effective when motorists observe and obey the signage.
- Overuse of signs may breed noncompliance and disrespect.
- Visibility of signs will be of difficult due to on-street parking.

SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the alternative analysis indicate that Alternative 1 (NE Curb Extension) and Alternative 3 (Protected-Only Left-Turns) provide a noticeable pedestrian improvement, without causing a significant impact to the intersection operations.
- Alternative 1 will reduce the crosswalk distance to 65 ft for the E/W crossings without impacting vehicle operations.; This work cannot proceed until after the Maple Rd. project has been completed in 2020.
- Alternative 2 has a similar cost to the other alternatives; however, the overall intersection operations will experience larger delays. Not Recommended, however, a field test could be conducted to further explore this option, if desired.
- Alternative 3 will eliminate all potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts for the E/W crossings; however, the LOS for the E/W left turn movements will be increased. HOLD
- Alternative 4 provides the lowest cost to remove all potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts; however, the vehicle operations on all approaches will experience significant increases in delay and queuing. typically implemented at intersection locations in dense urban areas with high pedestrian volumes. Not Recommended
- Alternative 5 could be paired with any other options or used alone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Overall LOS</th>
<th>Crosswalk Length</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>No recom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>AM: C</td>
<td>E/W: 75 ft</td>
<td>~$17,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- NE Corner Bumpouts</td>
<td>Mid-day: C</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>$2,000-$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 NW Corner Bumpout</td>
<td>PM: C</td>
<td>E/W: 65 ft</td>
<td>$200-$600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Lane Reduction &amp; NW Corner Bumpouts</td>
<td>AM: C</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>~$17,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Alternative 3- Protected Left Turns</td>
<td>Mid-day: C</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>~$2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Alternative 4- Pedestrian Scramble</td>
<td>PM: D</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>$200-$600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>per sign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 31, 2019

DRAFT VIA EMAIL

Mr. Paul O’Meara
City Engineer
City of Birmingham
151 Martin Street
Birmingham, MI 48012

RE: Old Woodward Avenue & Willits Street
Pedestrian Improvements Summary

Dear Mr. O’Meara:

The purpose of this letter is to provide a summary of the pedestrian improvements for consideration at the intersection of Old Woodward Avenue & Willits Street. It is our understanding that there are have been observed pedestrian/vehicle conflicts within the E/W crosswalk on the northside of the intersection as illustrated in Figure 1 below. The purpose of this analysis is to evaluate mitigation alternatives to improve pedestrian safety at this intersection. Included herein is project background information, improvements previously evaluated, and new improvements for consideration.

Figure 1: Old Woodward Avenue & Willits Street Intersection
PROJECT BACKGROUND

Fleis and VandenBrink previously prepared a report (dated February 2018) regarding a Leading Pedestrian Interval (LPI) program at several intersections throughout downtown Birmingham. An LPI provides pedestrians with an opportunity to enter an intersection and establish their place in the crosswalk before the vehicles in the same direction of travel are given the green indication. The benefits of an LPI are the increased visibility of pedestrians in the crosswalk, additional time for slower pedestrians, and decreased potential for conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. While LPIs are beneficial to pedestrian safety, they also reduce the available green time for vehicles and can cause additional delay at an intersection. Based on the recommendations from the LPI study, the following LPIs are currently implemented at the Old Woodward Avenue and Willits Street intersection:

- East/West crossing: 10 second LPI
- North/South crossing: 7 second LPI

However, since the East/West crosswalk length is approximately 75 feet on the north leg, the implemented LPI only provides pedestrians enough time to travel less than halfway across the street before left-turning vehicles are permitted to enter the intersection. F&V further evaluated this intersection to develop several other alternatives that were also evaluated for consideration. The analysis for each alternative evaluated is summarized herein.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

F&V developed several potential pedestrian improvements that were evaluated for consideration. The analysis for each improvement evaluated is summarized herein.

1. BUMPOUT (NE CORNER)

A bumpout extends the line of the curb out into the traveled way, reducing the amount of street space pedestrians have to cross. This pedestrian improvement increases safety for slower pedestrians (children and the elderly) and improves pedestrian visibility to drivers; while also reducing the turning speed of vehicles, as a result of smaller curb radii.

Currently, the northeast corner of the intersection of Old Woodward Avenue & Willits Street has a painted bumpout. However, since the bumpout is painted, it does not physically reduce the crosswalk distance, in order to provide a raised, safe waiting, area for the pedestrian. Additionally, there is an existing bus stop located along Old Woodward within the painted bumpout area.

Therefore, a paved bumpout was evaluated for the northeast corner of this intersection. In order to accommodate bus operations, it is recommended to stripe an exclusive bus lane in conjunction with the proposed bumpout. This bumpout would also be expanded into the hatched-out area along the east leg of the intersection to reduce that crosswalk length. At this intersection, westbound right-turns are channelized to the north; therefore, this curb radius can be minimized, as the eastbound left-turn movement for trucks is the only turning movement that needs to be considered. A bumpout at this location may also reduce the turning speeds for eastbound left-turning vehicles, by shrinking the available pavement to complete their turning movements.

This bumpout would reduce the existing 75-foot crosswalk distance on the north leg to approximately 67 feet. The proposed design for this bumpout is shown on the attached Figure 2.

Key Findings

- The total crosswalk distance is reduced from 75-feet to 67-feet.
- The bumpout would also be expanded to the hatched-out portion of the east leg of the intersection, in order to reduce the total N/S crosswalk distance for the east leg.
- The striping of an exclusive bus lane should be included in conjunction with the proposed bumpout
- Structure and fire hydrant relocation should be taken into consideration when designing the bumpout.
2. BUMPOUT (NW CORNER)

On southbound Old Woodward at Willits Street there is a hatched taper that is approximately 64-ft long and 7-ft at the widest. This alternative considered the elimination of this taper and the construction of a paved bumpout on Old Woodward for the northwest corner of this intersection. A potential extension of the paved bumpout onto Willits Street was evaluated as well; however, there are significant utility conflicts on Willits Street at this intersection. Therefore, it is not recommended to extend the bumpout onto Willits Street.

In lieu of expanding the sidewalk width along the west side of Old Woodward to match the proposed bumpout, the existing lane widths may be reduced to 11-ft each; increasing the available pavement width enough to provide a few additional parking spaces.

The proposed bumpout would reduce the existing 75-foot crosswalk distance on the north leg to approximately 68 feet. The proposed design for this bumpout is shown on the attached Figure 3.

Key Findings
- The total crosswalk distance is reduced from 75-feet to 68-feet.
- The bumpout should be limited to Old Woodward due to significant utility conflicts at this intersection on Willits Street.
- The addition of a few parking spaces along the west side of Old Woodward could be provided by reducing the existing lane widths to 11-ft each.

3. LANE REDUCTION & BUMPOUT (NW CORNER)

This alternative considered a lane reduction for southbound Old Woodward Avenue at the intersection, in combination with a bumpout on the NW corner. The southbound Old Woodward approach with Willits Street currently provides three lanes (left-turn, through, and right-turn lanes). This alternative evaluated eliminating the southbound right-turn lane and converting the southbound through lane into a shared through/right lane. By eliminating the right-turn lane, the NW curb could be extended through the existing right-turn lane in order to reduce the existing 75-foot crosswalk distance to approximately 60 feet. The proposed design for this bumpout is shown on the attached Figure 4.

The primary concern with this alternative is the operational impacts of removing the exclusive right-turn movement and associated overlap phasing. An analysis was performed to determine the measure-of-effectiveness (MOE) of this alternative as compared to existing operations. The MOE summary is provided in Table 1. The results of the analysis show that eliminating the exclusive right-turn lane will increase both the vehicle delay (LOS) and the vehicle queuing. The network simulations indicate that eliminating the southbound right-turn lane will result in longer vehicle queues for southbound traffic; resulting in the southbound left-turn lane becoming blocked for a portion of each peak hour. Furthermore, the increased vehicle queues for the southbound traffic will reduce the number of acceptable gaps available for northbound vehicles attempting to make permissive left-turns. Additionally, with signal timing modifications necessary to accommodate the lane reduction; the eastbound left-turn movement will experience significant increases in delay and queue length.
Table 1: Lane Reduction MOE Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Existing Conditions (Exclusive SB RT)</th>
<th>Proposed Conditions (Shared SB Thru/Right)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (s/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Delay (s/veh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Woodward Avenue &amp; Willits Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Average (ft)</th>
<th>95th % (ft)</th>
<th>Average (ft)</th>
<th>95th % (ft)</th>
<th>Average (ft)</th>
<th>95th % (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Woodward Avenue &amp; Willits Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Findings
- The total crosswalk distance will be reduced from 75-feet to approximately 60-feet.
- The vehicle delay (LOS) and vehicle queueing will increase.
  - Significant increases in delay and queuing were observed for the eastbound left-turn movement during the PM peak hour.
- The southbound right turn overlap phase will be eliminated.
- Fire hydrant relocation should be taken into consideration when designing this bumpout.
4. **Protected Left Turns (Willits St.)**

One of the most common conflicts at signalized intersections is the competition between vehicles permissively turning left and pedestrians crossing during the concurrent parallel pedestrian signal phase. Drivers typically focus on opposing traffic to identify gaps for left turns and may not pay due attention to pedestrians approaching or in the parallel crosswalk. Additionally, permissive left turns at congested intersections contribute to drivers accepting smaller gaps, turning at higher speeds, and “sneaking” through the intersection during the yellow or all-red signal intervals. Protected left-turn phasing provides a green arrow for left-turning vehicles while stopping both on-coming traffic and parallel pedestrians’ crossings, therefore eliminating all potential conflict.

Currently, the intersection of Old Woodward Avenue & Willits Street provides permissive/protected phasing for E/W left-turns from Willits Street and provides permissive only phasing for the N/S left-turns from Old Woodward Avenue.

This alternative considered providing protected-only phasing for the E/W left-turn movements from Willits Street; removing the permissive phase in order to eliminate vehicle-pedestrians conflicts for the E/W pedestrian crossings. By eliminating the potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts during the E/W crossings, there is no longer the need to provide an LPI along the E/W crossings; therefore, the allotted all-red time (10 seconds) is available for additional green time elsewhere. This additional green time within the cycle helps to minimize the impact of removing the E/W permissive phase. The primary concern with this alternative is the operational impacts of eliminating the permissive phase. An analysis was performed to determine the measure-of-effectiveness (MOE) of this alternative as compared to existing operations. The MOE summary is provided in Table 2. The results of the analysis shows that eliminating the permissive movement will increase the vehicle delay (LOS) at the intersection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Existing Perm/Prot</th>
<th>E/W Protected Only Left-turn</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (s/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Delay (s/veh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Woodward Avenue &amp; Willits Street</td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Old Woodward Avenue & Willits Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Average (ft)</th>
<th>95th % (ft)</th>
<th>Average (ft)</th>
<th>95th % (ft)</th>
<th>Average (ft)</th>
<th>95th % (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Old Woodward Avenue &amp; Willits Street</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>Old Woodward Avenue &amp; Willits Street</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Old Woodward Avenue &amp; Willits Street</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Findings

- The LPI phase for the E/W crossings will be available as additional green time for other movements, due to eliminating the potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts along the E/W crossings.
- The vehicle delay (LOS) will increase for the E/W left turn movements; however, it will decrease for the E/W through movements.
- All potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts will be eliminated for pedestrians crossing in the E/W directions.
  - Vehicle-pedestrian conflicts will still exist for N/S crossing pedestrians
- The existing 4-section signal heads on the east and west approaches would need to be modified to provide 3-section signal heads and operate as protected only.

5. Permissive / Protected Left-turn (Lagging Left)

Currently, the intersection of Old Woodward Avenue & Willits Street provides permissive/protected phasing for E/W left-turns from Willits Street. The permissive/protected phasing for left-turns provided has a leading protective phase for left-turns. The existing left-turn and pedestrian signal timing with the LPI is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Left Turn Signal</th>
<th>← Green</th>
<th>← Yellow</th>
<th>← Red</th>
<th>← Red</th>
<th>← Flashing Yellow</th>
<th>← Red</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Signal</td>
<td>Don’t Walk</td>
<td>Don’t Walk</td>
<td>Don’t Walk</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Flash Don’t Walk</td>
<td>Don’t Walk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F&V observed confusion for both vehicles and pedestrian during the LPI phase (highlighted in red). Left-turning vehicles have a green arrow and vehicles are expecting the protected green to continue into a permissive (flashing yellow) left-turn. However, before the flashing left-turn movement, the LPI turns on the WALK sign for pedestrians. Vehicles are waiting in the intersection for the flashing yellow arrow, while pedestrians are waiting for the vehicle to turn or vehicles are running the red light during the all red and LPI phase. In the end, the LPI time is wasted because pedestrians are uncertain of who has the ROW and vehicles are unsure if the light will change for them to complete their movement.

This alternative looked at switching the signal phasing to eliminate the confusion currently experienced by both pedestrians and drivers. This signal phasing modification will create a smoother transition by starting the LPI phase after the north/south phase rather than in between the east/west through and left-turn phases. The proposed left-turn and pedestrian signal phasing for this alternative are summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Left Turn Signal</th>
<th>← Red</th>
<th>← Flashing Yellow</th>
<th>← Green</th>
<th>← Yellow</th>
<th>← Red</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Signal</td>
<td>Walk (LPI)</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Flash Don’t Walk</td>
<td>Don’t Walk</td>
<td>Don’t Walk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Permissive/Protected E/W Lagging Left-Turn MOE Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Existing (Leading) Perm/Prot</th>
<th>Proposed (Lagging) Perm/Prot</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (s/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Delay (s/veh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Woodward Avenue &amp; Willits Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Average (ft)</th>
<th>95th % (ft)</th>
<th>Average (ft)</th>
<th>95th % (ft)</th>
<th>Average (ft)</th>
<th>95th % (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Woodward Avenue &amp; Willits Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings

- This alternative would eliminate the existing pedestrian and driver confusion with the use of the LPI.
- The eastbound left-turn vehicle queues during the mid-day peak period showed a significant increase in delay and queue lengths as a result of conflicting westbound movements and only having 6 seconds of green time for the protected left-turn movements.

6. PEDESTRIAN SCRAMBLE

This pedestrian improvement restricts all vehicular movements at an intersection and provides a pedestrian only walking phase. At intersections with this type of pedestrian treatment, an ‘X’ crosswalk through the middle of the intersection is often implemented, in addition to the four typical crossings connecting each corner. This type of treatment allows pedestrians to travel without any potential for vehicle-pedestrian conflicts; however, this is typically implemented at intersection locations in dense urban areas with high pedestrian volumes.

### Table 3: Pedestrian Scramble MOE Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Existing LPI</th>
<th>Pedestrian Phase</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (s/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Delay (s/veh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B &gt; C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Woodward Avenue &amp;</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willits Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>116.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>95th %</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>95th %</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>95th %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Woodward Avenue &amp; Willits Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBTR</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings

- Pedestrian movements will be fully separated from vehicular movements.
- This treatment would require a reduction in green time for all movements; resulting in the vehicle delay (LOS) and vehicle queuing increasing along all approaches and movements.
- Since a pedestrian phase would not be required at all times, push-buttons or other pedestrian detection is recommended in order to minimize vehicle delays when pedestrians are not present.

7. ADDITIONAL SIGNAGE

The effectiveness that additional signage has on driver yielding compliance is influenced by several factors, including vehicular speed, traffic volume, and whether the driver perceives yielding as a courtesy or the law. Enhancing signage with pedestrian activated lights or flashing beacons has been shown to be more effective than those signs that flash/blink continuously. Pedestrian signage placed in advance of the crosswalk location has been shown to be effective at reducing vehicle-pedestrian conflicts.

Key Findings

- A “Left turns yield to pedestrians” sign would provide advanced warning for drivers making left-turns, ideally increasing their attention to crossing pedestrians.
- Additional signage will only be effective for those motorists who observe and obey the signage.
- Overuse of signs may breed noncompliance and disrespect.
- Visibility of signs will be of difficulty due to on-street parking.

8. COMBINATION OF IMPROVEMENTS

This alternative considered implementation of several of the alternatives together for a combined effect on the pedestrian safety and operations. This alternative includes:

1) Bumpout (NE Corner)
2) Bumpout (NW Corner)
4) Protected Left-turns (Willits St.)

The proposed design for the combination of improvements is shown on the attached Figure 5. The MOE for this alternative is the same as presented in Alternative 4 and shown in Table 2.

Key Findings

- The total crosswalk distance is reduced from 75-feet to 60-feet.
- The addition of a few parking spaces along the west side of Old Woodward could be provided by reducing the existing lane widths to 11-ft each.
SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the alternative analysis are summarized in Table 5. The recommended mitigation measures improve the pedestrian facilities and provide acceptable intersection operations.

Table 5: Alternative Analysis Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Crosswalk Length (ft)</th>
<th>Safety Enhancement</th>
<th>Acceptable LOS</th>
<th>Signal Change</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bumpout (NE Corner)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bumpout (NW Corner)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lane Reduction with Bumpout (NW Corner)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Protected Left-Turns</td>
<td>75 (No change)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Permissive/Protected Lagging Left-turns</td>
<td>75 (No change)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pedestrian Scramble</td>
<td>75 (No change)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Signage</td>
<td>75 (No change)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO w/ Reservations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Combination of Improvements (1,2,4)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact our office.

Sincerely,
FLEIS & VANDENBRINK

Julie M. Kroll, PE, PTOE
Sr. Project Manager
FIGURE 2
NORTHEAST CORNER BUMPOUT

CITY OF BIRMINGHAM
OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN
WILLITS ST. & WOODWARD AVE.
CONCEPT PLAN
Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Multi-Modal Transportation Board held Thursday, June 6, 2019.

Vice-Chairwoman Lara Edwards convened the meeting at 6:03 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

Present: Vice-Chairwoman Lara Edwards; Board Members Amy Folberg, Katie Schafer (arrived at 6:09 p.m.), Doug White; Alternate Board Member Daniel Isaksen; Student Representatives Chris Capone, Bennett Pompi

Absent: Chairwoman Johanna Slanga; Board Members Daniel Rontal, Joe Zane

Administration: Jana Ecker, Planning Director
                    Scott Grewe, Police Commander
                    Paul O'Meara, City Engineer
                    Austin Fletcher, Assistant City Engineer
                    Laura Eichenhorn, Transcriptionist

Fleis & Vanderbrink ("F&V"): Julie Kroll

2. Introductions (none)

3. Review Agenda

Maple Road and Southfield Pedestrian Improvements was heard before Willits / Oakland and N. Old Woodward – Pedestrian Improvements.

4. Approval of MMTB Minutes of May 2, 2019

Austin Fletcher was present at the May 2, 2019 meeting and requested the minutes be updated to reflect his attendance.

Motion by Mr. White
Seconded by Mr. Isaksen to approve the MMTB Minutes of May 2, 2019 as presented.
Motion carried, 4-0.

VOICE VOTE
Yeas: White, Isaksen, Edwards, Folberg
Nays: None

5. Smith and Cummings Stop Sign Request

Police Commander Scott Grewe presented the item.

Mr. Isaksen said the problem with the intersection is that there is a two-way stop at the intersection of two streets of similar character. He suggested that given the similar character of the streets, it is not always clear to a driver whether it is a two-way or four-way intersection. In those cases, a driver may think it is a four-way stop, and that may be what causes the accidents because the driver does not know to yield the right of way.

Mr. Isaksen suggested some possible remedies to the situation:

- The stop signs at the intersection could have "Cross Traffic Does Not Stop" added to the signage.
- The stop signs could be converted to yield signs, which could reduce the confusion regarding whether the intersection is a two-way or four-way stop.

Police Commander Grewe explained that the accident data from the last ten years of the intersection showed two accidents, both of which resulted from failure to yield.

Ms. Folberg said she drove around the intersection and noted that it was slightly challenging to see oncoming traffic due to the density of cars parked on the street. Acknowledging the infrequency of accidents at the intersection, Ms. Folberg said Mr. Long's assertion that there are many near misses still seemed plausible to her after viewing the conditions. As a result, Ms. Folberg said she would not be opposed to making the intersection a four-way stop. Opining that Mr. Isaksen's suggestion to convert the stop signs to yield signs could also be useful, Ms. Folberg stated that it would be prudent for the MMTB to recommend the intersection experience some change given the level of confusion the current signage seems to cause.

Planning Director Ecker said the "Cross Traffic Does Not Stop" suggestion could address the issue, given that similar signage has resulted in clearer intersections elsewhere in the City.

Vice-Chairwoman Edwards said her thoughts aligned with Mr. Isaksen's, and asked if it would be necessary to study whether yield signs were warranted.

Police Commander Grewe cautioned the Board that replacing the stop signs with yield signs may be perceived as reducing the level of traffic control at the intersection, which would likely not be well-received by the residents.

Ms. Folberg said "Cross Traffic Does Not Stop" would add the necessary clarity to the intersection.
**Motion Mr. Isaksen**  
**Second Ms. Folberg** to install "Cross Traffic Does Not Stop" signs on the stop signs at the intersection of Smith and Cummings.

City Engineer O'Meara stated that when he sees signage like "Cross Traffic Does Not Stop", it often seems to indicate that there is something unique about the intersection. He asked Police Commander Grewe whether that is a correct interpretation for this intersection.

Police Commander Grewe said he was unsure about the specific implications of the signage, and asked Ms. Kroll whether she knew.

Ms. Kroll stated she would need to consult the MUTCD for a clearer answer.

Mr. Isaksen stated that he looked at the MUTCD for the signage, and that the signage was recommended when it could improve the functioning of the intersection. He explained that signage indicating the intersection was a two-way stop had fallen out of favor, even though signage indicating a four-way stop is often recommended. Because of this, Mr. Isaksen said "Cross Traffic Does Not Stop" remained the best solution.

City Engineer O'Meara restated his comments that signage like "Cross Traffic Does Not Stop" often seems to indicate a particularly unique intersection.

Ms. Folberg said the intersection is sufficiently unclear as to merit the specification that cross traffic does not stop.

Mr. Isaksen read from the MUTCD, quoting that "the placard may be used in combination with a stop sign when conditions are present that are causing or could cause drivers to misinterpret the intersection as an all-way stop." He said that description seems to be exactly the case at the Smith and Cummings intersection.

Vice-Chairwoman Edwards called for a vote on the motion.

Motion carried, 5-0.

VOICE VOTE  
Yeas: Isaksen, Folberg, White, Edwards, Schafer  
Nays: None

**6. Maple Road and Southfield Pedestrian Improvements**

City Engineer Paul O'Meara presented the item.

Mr. Isaksen said he was comfortable with both suggestions for pedestrian improvements, stating that leading pedestrian intervals (LPIs) seem to be effective elsewhere in the City.

Ms. Folberg asked if there would be a way for the signage to light up when a pedestrian was in the crosswalk.
Staff explained that since this signage would be a temporary measure, the expenditure of installing an illuminated sign would not be the best course of action.

Ms. Folberg said she was unsure if this measure would benefit pedestrian safety.

City Engineer O’Meara told the Board the measure would last until Spring 2020, or less than a year.

Vice-Chairwoman Edwards said she thought LPIs were very effective because it allows a driver to view a pedestrian in a crosswalk before the vehicle begins to enter the intersection. She asked whether a four-second LPI would be sufficient.

City Engineer O’Meara said a four-second LPI prevents the level of service of the intersection from being negatively impacted.

**Motion by Dr. Schafer**

Second by Ms. Folberg to recommend to the City Commission the following improvements at the Maple Rd. and Southfield Rd. intersection, as an interim measure to improve pedestrian safety prior to the reconstruction of the intersection in 2020:

1. Modification of the traffic signal timing to add a 4 second LPI for those using the north/south crosswalk located on the east leg of the intersection.
2. Installation of an R10-15(R) sign stating TURNING VEHICLES YIELD TO PEDS sign for the northbound right turn lane.

Motion carried, 5-0.

VOICE VOTE
Yeas: Schafer, Folberg, Isaksen, White, Edwards
Nays: None

7. Willits / Oakland and N. Old Woodward – Pedestrian Improvements

Ms. Kroll presented an overview of the item.

City Engineer O’Meara added the recommendation had the extraneous benefit of adding more parking in front of Fleming’s Steakhouse.

**Motion by Mr. Isaksen**

Second by Ms. Folberg to recommend approval of Alternative 8 – Combination of Improvements (1, 2, and 4) as depicted in F & V’s report dated May 22, 2019: to add bumpouts at both the NE and NW corners of the Old Woodward and Willits/ Oakland intersection (after the completion of the Maple Road reconstruction project) and provide protected-only phasing for the E/W left-turn movements from Willits.

Motion carried, 5-0.
VOICE VOTE
Yeas: Isaksen, Folberg, Schafer, White, Edwards
Nays: Non

8. Meeting Open to the Public for items not on the Agenda (none)

9. Miscellaneous Communications

Dr. Schafer said she was pleased to see the painting on Eton that the MMTB had previously advocated for.

10. Next Meeting – July 11, 2019

Due to possible low attendance, the Board said it would determine whether the July 2019 meeting would be held closer to the date.

11. Adjournment
No further business being evident, the board members adjourned at 6:33 p.m.

Jana Ecker, Planning Director

Paul O'Meara, City Engineer
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO APPOINT TO DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AND HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

At the regular meeting of Monday, October 7, 2019 the Birmingham City Commission intends to appoint four (4) regular members to the Design Review Board and three (3) members to the Historic District Commission to serve three-year terms to expire September 25, 2022.

Interested parties may submit an application available from the City Clerk's office on or before noon on Wednesday, October 2, 2019. Applications will appear in the public agenda at which time the City Commission will discuss recommendations, and may make nominations and vote on appointments.

The function and duty of the Design Review Board is to advise the City Commission in regards to the proper development of the City. The Design Review Board is specifically charged with carrying out the goals, objectives and intent of the City's adopted master plan and urban design plan and other development-oriented plans which may subsequently be adopted. The Design Review Board is authorized to advise and cooperate with the City Commission, City Planning Board, Historic District Commission and other City advisory boards and cooperate with the planning, historic district and legislative bodies of other governmental units in any area outside the boundaries of the City.

The function and duty of the Historic District Commission is to advise the City Commission with respect to the proper development of the City with primary emphasis upon the City’s established historic districts, sites, properties and historic resources. The Commission is also authorized to recommend for the guidance of the City Commission amendments to the City Code relating to the control and development of lands within historic districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Qualifications of Open Position - Design Review Board</th>
<th>Date Applications Due (by noon)</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Members shall represent, insofar as possible, different occupations and professions such as, but not limited to, the legal profession, the financial or real estate professions, and the planning or design professions. Members shall be residents. One member of the board shall be an architect duly registered in this state, if such person is available.</td>
<td>10/2/2019</td>
<td>10/7/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criteria/Qualifications of Open Position-Historic District Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Qualifications of Open Position-Historic District Commission</th>
<th>Date Applications Due (by noon)</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A majority of the members shall have a clearly demonstrated interest in or knowledge of historic preservation. Two members shall be appointed from a list submitted by duly organized local historic preservation organizations. If available, one member shall be an architect who has two years of architectural experience or who is duly registered in the State of Michigan.</td>
<td>10/2/2019</td>
<td>10/7/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** All members of boards and commissions are subject to the provisions of City of Birmingham City Code Chapter 2, Article IX, Ethics and the filing of the Affidavit and Disclosure Statement.
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO APPOINT TO BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

At the regular meeting of Monday, October 7, 2019 the Birmingham City Commission intends to appoint two regular members to the Board of Zoning Appeals to serve a three-year term to expire October 10, 2022.

Interested parties may recommend others or themselves for these positions by submitting a form available from the City Clerk’s office. Applications must be submitted to the City Clerk’s office on or before noon on Wednesday, October 2, 2019. Applications will appear in the public agenda at which time the City Commission will discuss recommendations, and may make nominations and vote on appointments.

**Duties of Board**

The Board of Zoning Appeals acts on questions arising from the administration of the zoning ordinance, including the interpretation of the zoning map. The Board hears and decides appeals from and reviews any order, requirement, decision or determination made by the Building Official.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Qualifications of Open Position</th>
<th>Date Applications Due (by noon)</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members shall be property owners of record and registered voters.</td>
<td>10/2/2019</td>
<td>10/7/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** All members of boards and commissions are subject to the provisions of City of Birmingham City Code Chapter 2, Article IX, Ethics and the filing of the Affidavit and Disclosure Statement.
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO APPOINT TO THE MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION BOARD

At the regular meeting of Monday, October 7, 2018 the Birmingham City Commission intends to appoint one (1) Alternate member to the Multi-Modal Transportation Board to serve the remainder of a three-year term to expire October 27, 2022.

Interested citizens may submit an application available at the city clerk’s office or online at www.bhamgov.org/boardopportunities. Applications must be submitted to the city clerk’s office on or before noon on Wednesday, October 2, 2019. These documents will appear in the public agenda for the regular meeting at which time the City Commission will discuss recommendations, and may make nominations and vote on appointments.

In so far as possible, the seven member committee shall be composed of the following: one pedestrian advocate member; one member with a mobility or vision impairment; one member with traffic-focused education and/or experience; one bicycle advocate member; one member with urban planning, architecture or design education and/or experience; and two members at large living in different geographical areas of the city. Applicants for these positions may or may not be electors or property owners in the City.

Duties of the Multi-modal Transportation Board
The purpose of the Multi-Modal Transportation Board shall be to assist in maintaining the safe and efficient movement of motorized and non-motorized vehicles and pedestrians on the streets and walkways of the city and to advise the city commission on the implementation of the Multi-Modal Transportation Plan, including reviewing project phasing and budgeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Qualifications of Open Position</th>
<th>Date Applications Due (by noon)</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In so far as possible, members shall represent pedestrian advocacy, mobility or vision impairment, traffic-focused education/experience, bicycle advocacy, urban planning, architecture or design education/experience, or different geographical areas of Birmingham.</td>
<td>10/2/19</td>
<td>10/7/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members may or may not be electors (registered voter) or property owners of the City of Birmingham.

NOTE: All members of boards and commissions are subject to the provisions of City of Birmingham City Code Chapter 2, Article IX, Ethics and the filing of the Affidavit and Disclosure Statement.
MEMORANDUM

Planning Division

DATE: September 18, 2019

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: Jana Ecker, Planning Director

SUBJECT: Master Plan Update

Over the past few months, the DPZ team hired by the City to update our comprehensive master plan has been conducting information gathering sessions with members of the public. The team conducted a web survey this spring with a strong participation rate among residents. In addition, the team conducted many stakeholder meetings during April and May, meeting with property owners, residents, neighborhood groups, business owners and institutional partners in the City to solicit detailed input on the City’s needs, specific concerns and recommendations for the future vision of the City.

From May 14, 2019 through May 21, 2019 the DPZ team also conducted a public visioning charrette to gather input from residents and business owners for integration into a strategic vision for the neighborhood and commercial areas within the Plan. An analysis of the findings from the survey and the stakeholder meetings was incorporated into the sessions running during the charrette and the key findings and proposals that were presented in the final presentation at the end of the weeklong charrette.

A second web survey was released to solicit additional input from residents based on the proposals developed during the charrette process to gage how these ideas resonated with the public. In addition, a public open house was held July 8 – 10, 2019 in the former charrette space at 255 S. Old Woodward to discuss and evaluate some the key findings and discuss their refinement and progression into a draft master plan.

DPZ team members attended both the City Commission and Planning Board meetings on July 8 and 10, 2019, respectively to provide an update on the findings and progress to date, to solicit input, and to promote the next steps of the master planning process.

The first draft of the Citywide master plan is scheduled to be completed this fall, and is currently under development. The DPZ team will be present at the joint meeting of the City Commission and the Planning Board on Thursday, October 17, 2019 to present the first draft of the master plan. The initial draft will be completed and distributed for your review by October 4, 2019 to allow ample review time prior to the discussion at the joint meeting.

For further information on the master planning process and to stay involved, please visit the project’s website at www.birminghamplan.com.
DATE: September 18, 2019

TO: Joseph A. Valentine, City Manager

FROM: Jana Ecker, Planning Director
Paul O’Meara, City Engineer

SUBJECT: Street Lighting Update – Triangle District & Downtown

After the adoption of the Triangle Plan in 2007, the City Commission adopted new streetscape standards for the Triangle District, including street lighting and furnishings with a more contemporary design distinctive from the traditional Downtown street lighting and furnishings. Since 2007, DTE has been installing the light fixtures approved by the City Commission in the Triangle District.

Similar to the lighting issue that arose in the Rail District, DTE has now advised the City that they are unable to supply the previously approved streetlights for the Triangle District, and a new model is available that is similar (but not exact), that provides efficiency upgrades. DTE has also advised that they are unable to supply the previously approved traditional streetlights for Downtown, but again has a very similar fixture selected as a replacement.

City staff has been working with DTE to review the specifications of existing and proposed streetlights for both the Triangle District and Downtown. DTE has installed a sample proposed Triangle District streetlight on Elm Street just south of the All Seasons driveway adjacent to the previously approved model to allow City staff to evaluate both fixtures side by side. The chart below indicates the exact specifications of both the existing and proposed streetlights for the Triangle District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Triangle District:</th>
<th>Existing LED Triangle District Fixture</th>
<th>Proposed LED Triangle District Fixture*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Fixture</td>
<td>LED – 40 total</td>
<td>LED – 64 total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixture &amp; Lens Dimensions</td>
<td>28.35” by 30.26”</td>
<td>28.35” by 30.14”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lens Material</td>
<td>Sealed acrylic lens (metal fixture roof)</td>
<td>Clear prismatic acrylic lens (metal fixture roof)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color Temperature</td>
<td>3000K (Warm White)</td>
<td>3000K (Warm White)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color Rendering Index</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output (in lumens)</td>
<td>3000 lumens</td>
<td>3560 lumens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wattage</td>
<td>44 watts</td>
<td>39 watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Distribution Pattern</td>
<td>Type V - Circular</td>
<td>Type V - Circular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New Triangle District fixture has visible LED through clear lens, and lens has a different striation pattern / texture.

Both the existing and proposed fixtures have been inspected both during daylight hours and at night by City staff. By day, the only noticeable difference is the striation pattern or texture of the
acrylic lens. By night, there is a difference in the striation pattern and texture of the existing and proposed acrylic lenses can also be seen, and it is evident that the proposed LED light configuration behind the lens is different from the configuration on the existing Triangle District street lights. However, based on the specifications provided by DTE, the color temperature of the light remains the same, and the color rendering values and output of each are very similar.

DTE has also installed the proposed replacement fixture for the Downtown Birmingham streetlight on N. Old Woodward south of Oakland adjacent to a previously approved model to allow City staff to evaluate both fixtures side by side. The chart below indicates the exact specifications of both the existing and proposed streetlights for Downtown Birmingham.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Business District:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Fixture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing LED CBD Fixture</td>
<td>LED –10 array, 80 total</td>
<td>LED – 64 total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed LED CBD Fixture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixture &amp; Lens Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing LED CBD Fixture</td>
<td>16” by 33.5”</td>
<td>16.23” by 33.95”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed LED CBD Fixture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lens Material</td>
<td>Opal smooth acrylic</td>
<td>Opal acrylic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color Temperature</td>
<td>4000K (Neutral White)</td>
<td>4000K (Neutral White)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color Rendering Index</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output (in lumens)</td>
<td>2300 lumens</td>
<td>2363 lumens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wattage</td>
<td>85 watts</td>
<td>68 watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Distribution Pattern</td>
<td>Type V - Circular</td>
<td>Type V - Circular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the existing and proposed fixtures have been inspected both during daylight hours and at night by City staff. By day, the only noticeable difference is the whiter color of the acrylic lens on the fixture. By night, both the existing and proposed lights are very similar with no noticeable differences. Based on the specifications provided by DTE the color temperature of the light remains the same, and the color rendering values and output of each are very similar.

DTE has advised that as they are no longer able to obtain the previously approved fixtures for both the Triangle District and Downtown Birmingham. The proposed fixtures specified above will be installed as new or replacement streetlights are ordered in each district.
# Birmingham Parking System

## Transient & Free Parking Analysis

**Months of August 2018 & August 2019**

### August 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GARAGE</th>
<th>TOTAL CARS</th>
<th>FREE CARS</th>
<th>CASH REVENUE</th>
<th>% FREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEABODY</td>
<td>17,851</td>
<td>10,051</td>
<td>$28,386.02</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>21,696</td>
<td>9,618</td>
<td>$49,665.02</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHESTER</td>
<td>7,874</td>
<td>2,661</td>
<td>$49,817.03</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD</td>
<td>13,536</td>
<td>6,227</td>
<td>$34,215.02</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE</td>
<td>27,771</td>
<td>13,586</td>
<td>$67,893.03</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

88,728 | 42,143 | $229,976.12 | 47%

### August 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GARAGE</th>
<th>TOTAL CARS</th>
<th>FREE CARS</th>
<th>CASH REVENUE</th>
<th>% FREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEABODY</td>
<td>19,996</td>
<td>11,256</td>
<td>$41,608.00</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>22,708</td>
<td>9,614</td>
<td>$57,415.00</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHESTER</td>
<td>6,758</td>
<td>2,896</td>
<td>$41,177.00</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD</td>
<td>13,171</td>
<td>5,945</td>
<td>$40,971.00</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE</td>
<td>28,713</td>
<td>13,062</td>
<td>$77,805.00</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

91,346 | 42,773 | $258,976.00 | 47%

### BREAKDOWN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL CARS</th>
<th>+3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FREE CARS</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH REVENUE</td>
<td>+13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# MONTHLY PARKING PERMIT REPORT

For the month of: August 2019  
Date Compiled: September 11, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pierce</th>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Peabody</th>
<th>N.Old Wood</th>
<th>Chester</th>
<th>Lot #6/$210</th>
<th>Lot #6/$150</th>
<th>South Side</th>
<th>Lot B</th>
<th>35001 Woodward</th>
<th>Lot 12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>4143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. Total Spaces | 706 | 811 | 437 | 745 | 880 | 174 | 79 | 40 | 40 | 150 | 4070 |
| 2. Daily Spaces | 370 | 348 | 224 | 359 | 425 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1726 |
| 3. Monthly Spaces | 336 | 463 | 213 | 386 | 560 | 174 | 79 | 30 | 40 | 150 | 2439 |
| 4. Monthly Permits Authorized | 550 | 750 | 400 | 800 | 1140 | 150 | 40 | 8 | 30 | 50 | 225 |

**5. Permits - end of previous month**
- Pierce: 550
- Park: 750
- Peabody: 400
- N.Old Wood: 800
- Chester: 1140
- Lot #6/$210: 150
- Lot #6/$150: 40
- South Side: 8
- Lot B: 30
- 35001 Woodward: 50
- Total: 4133

**6. Permits - end of month**
- Pierce: 550
- Park: 750
- Peabody: 400
- N.Old Wood: 800
- Chester: 1140
- Lot #6/$210: 150
- Lot #6/$150: 40
- South Side: 8
- Lot B: 30
- 35001 Woodward: 50
- Total: 4138

**7. Permits available at end of month**
- Pierce: 0
- Park: 0
- Peabody: 0
- N.Old Wood: 0
- Chester: 0
- Lot #6/$210: 0
- Lot #6/$150: 0
- South Side: 0
- Lot B: 0
- 35001 Woodward: 0
- Total: 0

**8. Permits issued in month includes permits effective 1st of month**
- Pierce: 0
- Park: 7
- Peabody: 0
- N.Old Wood: 2
- Chester: 4
- Lot #6/$210: 0
- Lot #6/$150: 0
- South Side: 0
- Lot B: 0
- 35001 Woodward: 0
- Total: 13

**9. Permits given up in month**
- Pierce: 0
- Park: 7
- Peabody: 0
- N.Old Wood: 2
- Chester: 4
- Lot #6/$210: 0
- Lot #6/$150: 0
- South Side: 0
- Lot B: 0
- 35001 Woodward: 0
- Total: 13

**10. Net Change**
- Pierce: 0
- Park: 0
- Peabody: 0
- N.Old Wood: 0
- Chester: 0
- Lot #6/$210: 0
- Lot #6/$150: 0
- South Side: 0
- Lot B: 0
- 35001 Woodward: 0
- Total: 0

**11. On List - end of month**
- Pierce: 1245
- Park: 1426
- Peabody: 1191
- N.Old Wood: 1576
- Chester: 1120
- Lot #6/$210: 27
- Lot #6/$150: 0
- South Side: 0
- Lot B: 22
- 35001 Woodward: 0
- Total: 6607

**12. Added to list in month**
- Pierce: 11
- Park: 8
- Peabody: 6
- N.Old Wood: 11
- Chester: 4
- Lot #6/$210: 0
- Lot #6/$150: 0
- South Side: 0
- Lot B: 0
- 35001 Woodward: 0
- Total: 40

**13. Withdrawn from list (w/o permit)**
- Pierce: 0
- Park: 0
- Peabody: 0
- N.Old Wood: 0
- Chester: 0
- Lot #6/$210: 0
- Lot #6/$150: 0
- South Side: 0
- Lot B: 0
- 35001 Woodward: 0
- Total: 0

**14. Average # of weeks on list for permits issued in month**
- Pierce: 143
- Park: 82
- Peabody: 141
- N.Old Wood: 126
- Chester: 57
- Lot #6/$210: 0
- Lot #6/$150: 0
- South Side: 0
- Lot B: 0
- 35001 Woodward: 0
- Total: 109.8

**15. Transient parker occupied**
- Pierce: 251
- Park: 347
- Peabody: 106
- N.Old Wood: 171
- Chester: 76
- Lot #6/$210: N/A
- Lot #6/$150: N/A
- South Side: N/A
- Lot B: N/A
- 35001 Woodward: N/A
- Total: 951

**16. Monthly parker occupied**
- Pierce: 287
- Park: 441
- Peabody: 270
- N.Old Wood: 513
- Chester: 598
- Lot #6/$210: N/A
- Lot #6/$150: N/A
- South Side: N/A
- Lot B: N/A
- 35001 Woodward: N/A
- Total: 2109

**17. Total parker occupied**
- Pierce: 538
- Park: 788
- Peabody: 376
- N.Old Wood: 684
- Chester: 674
- Lot #6/$210: N/A
- Lot #6/$150: N/A
- South Side: N/A
- Lot B: N/A
- 35001 Woodward: N/A
- Total: 3060

**18. Total spaces available at 1pm on Wednesday 8/14**
- Pierce: 168
- Park: 23
- Peabody: 61
- N.Old Wood: 61
- Chester: 206
- Lot #6/$210: N/A
- Lot #6/$150: N/A
- South Side: N/A
- Lot B: N/A
- 35001 Woodward: N/A
- Total: 519

**19. "All Day" parkers paying 5 hrs. or more**
- A: Weekday average.
  - Pierce: 244
  - Park: 247
  - Peabody: 128
  - N.Old Wood: 153
  - Chester: 78
  - Lot #6/$210: N/A
  - Lot #6/$150: N/A
  - South Side: N/A
  - Lot B: N/A
  - 35001 Woodward: N/A
  - Total: 850

- B: Maximum day
  - Pierce: N/A
  - Park: N/A
  - Peabody: N/A
  - N.Old Wood: N/A
  - Chester: N/A
  - Lot #6/$210: N/A
  - Lot #6/$150: N/A
  - South Side: N/A
  - Lot B: N/A
  - 35001 Woodward: N/A
  - Total: 0

**20. Utilization by long term parkers**
- Pierce: N/A
- Park: N/A
- Peabody: N/A
- N.Old Wood: N/A
- Chester: N/A
- Lot #6/$210: N/A
- Lot #6/$150: N/A
- South Side: N/A
- Lot B: N/A
- 35001 Woodward: N/A
- Total: #DIV/0!

(1) Lot #6 does not have gate control, therefore no transient count available  
(2) (Permits/Oversell Factor + Weekday Avg.) / Total Spaces  
* Average Maximum day not available currently in Skidata  
** Unique individuals represent the actual number of unique people on the wait list regardless of how many structures they have requested.
STATE OF MICHIGAN
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
NOTICE OF HEARING
FOR THE ELECTRIC AND GAS CUSTOMERS OF
CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY
CASE NO. U-20372


- The information below describes how a person may participate in this case.

- You may call or write Consumers Energy Company, One Energy Plaza, Jackson, MI 49201, 517-788-0550 for a free copy of its application. Any person may review the documents at the offices of Consumers Energy Company.

- A pre-hearing will be held:

  DATE/TIME:  Wednesday, October 2, 2019, at 9:00 AM BEFORE:

  Administrative Law Judge Sally Wallace

  LOCATION:  Michigan Public Service Commission
              7109 West Saginaw Highway Lansing, Michigan 48917

  PARTICIPATION: Any interested person may attend and participate. The hearing site is accessible, including handicapped parking. Persons needing any accommodation to participate should contact the Commission's Executive Secretary at (517) 284-8090 in advance to request mobility, visual, hearing or other assistance.

The Michigan Public Service Commission (Commission) will hold a pre-hearing to consider Consumers Energy Company’s (Consumers Energy) August 1, 2019 application requesting the Commission to approve: 1) Consumers Energy’s proposed 2020-2023 Energy Waste Reduction (EWR) Plan proposing for electric: approximately $137.3 million in 2020, $157.2 million in 2021, $161.5 million in 2022, and $164.4 million in 2023, and for natural gas: approximately $67.1 million in 2020, $66.4 million in 2021, $67.7 million in 2022, and $69.2 million in 2023; 2) the requested 2020-2023 EWR Plan natural gas and electric surcharges; 3) the requested accounting authority described to roll forward any unspent funds into future approved EWR plans, and to pull back up to 5% of the following year’s total electric and gas budget to be invested in the then-current year, if needed; 4) issuance of the tariff sheets; 5) Consumers Energy’s EWR incentive proposal; and 6) other relief.

INFORMATION ONLY
All documents filed in this case shall be submitted electronically through the Commission’s E-Dockets website at: michigan.gov/mpsceedockets. Requirements and instructions for filing can be found in the User Manual on the E-Dockets help page. Documents may also be submitted, in Word or PDF format, as an attachment to an email sent to: mpsceedockets@michigan.gov. If you require assistance prior to e-filing, contact Commission staff at (517) 284-8090 or by email at: mpsceedockets@michigan.gov.

Any person wishing to intervene and become a party to the case shall electronically file a petition to intervene with this Commission by September 25, 2019. (Interested persons may elect to file using the traditional paper format.) The proof of service shall indicate service upon Consumers Energy Company’s Legal Department – Regulatory Group, One Energy Plaza, Jackson, MI 49201.

Any person wishing to appear at the hearing to make a statement of position without becoming a party to the case may participate by filing an appearance. To file an appearance, the individual must attend the hearing and advise the presiding administrative law judge of his or her wish to make a statement of position. All information submitted to the Commission in this matter becomes public information, thus available on the Michigan Public Service Commission’s website, and subject to disclosure. Please do not include information you wish to remain private.

Requests for adjournment must be made pursuant to Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules R 792.10422 and R 792.10432. Requests for further information on adjournment should be directed to (517) 284-8130.

A copy of Consumers Energy Company’s application may be reviewed on the Commission’s website at: michigan.gov/mpsceedockets, and at the office of Consumers Energy Company. For more information on how to participate in a case, you may contact the Commission at the above address or by telephone at (517) 284-8090.


[THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION MAY APPROVE, REJECT, OR AMEND PROPOSALS MADE BY CONSUMERS ENERGY.]

1908-C