



OZAUKEE COUNTY TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMISSION
1201 SOUTH SPRING STREET•P.O. BOX 245
PORT WASHINGTON, WISCONSIN 53074•0245
TELEPHONE: LOCAL (262)•284•8448 •(262)•METRO 238•8448

OCTOBER 24, 2007

**OZAUKEE COUNTY
TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMISSION MINUTES**

Chairperson Myers called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. at the Ozaukee County Justice Center, Room 16.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chairperson Fran Myers, Citizen, Lt. McCormick, Ozaukee County Sheriff's Department, Chief Steven Graff, Mequon Police Department, Jon Garms, Mequon Director of Public Works, Ozaukee County Highway Commissioner Bob Dreblow, Supervisor Frederick Kaul, , David Brantner-Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Michael Panosh, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Jean Clement, Citizen. Barbara Aagerup, Citizen, Supervisor Gerald Walker. David Albert, Citizen

Not present: Trooper Robert Simpson, Ozaukee County Corporation Counsel Dennis Kenealy, Coroner John Holicek

Chairperson Fran Myers asked if meeting was properly noticed. Lt. McCormick advised that the meeting was properly noticed.

GUESTS:

Sgt. Tim Huibbregtse-Wisconsin State Patrol, Mr. Bob Eichner, Director of Public Works, Town of Cedarburg, County Board Supervisor David Barrow III, Mr. Glen Ziebell, citizen, Town of Cedarburg

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Chairperson Myers move to adopt agenda. Kaul moved, Dreblow second, all aye. Agenda adopted.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Chairperson advised adoption of minutes. Corrections, date of minutes not entered. Adoption of minutes approval of minutes as corrected, all aye, no opposed

COMMUNICATIONS:

CRASH SPEED REVIEW -DECKERS CORNERS:

Lt. McCormick advised the questions/concerns of the area which the committee has addressed in the past with Deckers Corners crash rate in that area. As reviewed in the reports, it is a 55 mph zone on Washington Avenue/CTH NN. Grandville Road/CTHY intersects with CTH NN as well as Pleasant Valley Road. CTH NN is the only through road; traffic flows unimpeded east west or north or south. Granville Road has a north/south stop signs and Pleasant Valley Road has east west stop signs. The issues that have been brought forth are the speed limit too high and secondly, if the speeds are not too high, what is the answer for reducing the crashes at that intersection and is the accident at that intersection excessive.

In a summary of the crash surveys, they are broken down into three (3) specific areas. The accidents on CTH NN at CTH Y since 2002 to the present there was a total of 13 crashes. One was failure to stop at stop sign, 12 were failure to yield that to me does not indicate a speed issue, but an operator matter where the drivers are either impatient or for whatever reason are pulling into the intersection in front of the oncoming traffic. Pleasant Valley and CTH NN had a total of four (4) crashes. Three (3) were inattentive driving pulling out into traffic that they didn't see coming east and west bound and the other was failure to yield. Pleasant Valley and CTH Y there were a total of three (3). One was failure to stop and the other two were failure to yield. All crashes were driver induced. We have several concerns ahead of us: 1. Is the accident rate excessive that we need to be looking at this a problem area? Given the concerns that are voiced by the residents in the area, that is why we are looking at them. 2. Is it a speed issue? I would contend, no, but I'll leave it that open to discussion. 3. If we need to reduce the accident rate in this area, what are the answers? In the last paragraph of the conclusions and recommendations, I state that if we need to take action, I do believe that it is a physical issue with that intersection; this intersection was constructed years ago. It is obviously rural in nature just based on its design. I'll divert to Mr. Dreblow regarding any type of considerations that have gone into that intersection or why it was constructed that way or if they still construct them that way. However, if we are looking to reduce crashes, I would contend that if it becomes a physical issue in that area not necessarily a speed limit issue. I'll leave it to the committee for further discussion on this.

Mr. Dreblow advised that an intersection would not be designed in today's technical standards. There would substantial costs to improve the intersection. Obviously there would be right a way costs, you would have re-align roadways or look at some other alternatives such as a roundabout or something like that which would involve removal of one structure. It would be very difficult and expensive. Mr. Dreblow asked what time frame the crash history was. Lt. McCormick advised it was over a five (5) years; 2002 to present.

Mr. Dreblow stated that the crash history does not seem excessive in terms of the number of crashes at a safety stand point.

Mr. Dreblow advised that the one issue we had with speed related was really not speed related, it was weather related more than anything else. It doesn't appear that if you would reduce the speed that you would be eliminating crashes.

Lt. McCormick advised that the Commission reviewed this in 2005. That would be the time that I suggested that we put the striping on the roadway to camp the vehicles. At that time, I offered for discussion that when we have vehicles that are pulling out southbound from CTH Y through CTH NN, those crashes were occurring with the front end of the southbound vehicle striking the eastbound vehicle and they were normally striking at or behind the rear passenger door. That is at 55 mph speed limit. Now, if we take those vehicles and put them in the same locations and bring that eastbound at 45 mph, those crashes will now be occurring where you are striking the front end or the driver's door of that eastbound vehicle if you slow that eastbound vehicle down. So I would offer for discussion that slowing those vehicles down could potentially increase the magnitude of these crashes that we are having at this intersection.

Mr. Dreblow inquired if the painted the stop lines aided in the reduction of crashes. Lt. McCormick advised that it did; however, its paint, we can drive over it. For one of the potential remedies, possibility of a curbed island, or a physical barrier might aid in the reduction of crashes.

Mr. Dreblow advised that if vehicles would follow the painted channelized lines that force the driver to turn your vehicle at a right angle to Washington Avenue.

Ms. Myer stated that there seems to be a problem with the vision at that intersection.

Lt. McCormick stated that the stop lines that are out there based on what Mr. Dreblow was stating, I think the best step at this time, would be to get those vehicles into that proper location. Would be an actual, physical channeling.

Supervisor Barrow advised that he lives a mile from the intersection and come through it almost daily. I requested a report when I first was elected on the County Board and my neighbor calls me every time she hears any screech of brakes and so I asked for a report from the Sheriff's office and it appears to be all driver error. I discussed with Commissioner Dreblow whether or not a trombone sign would help people stop northbound on CTH Y because it is coming over a hill to the stop sign. We discussed it and the cost at that time was suppose to be about \$3700.00 to put in the trombone, but the sheriff's report says that everybody stops at the intersection, and then proceeds in the face of oncoming traffic. With that as a report, I decided that it was not really worth pushing for the trombone, although I liked Lt. McCormick's idea for a physical island there to force people to approach it from a right angle. I do not all support a reduction in the speed limit. I don't think that it would be at all helpful it would just be a nuisance for people coming through if, in fact, it would be observed. If I read Northwestern Traffic studies correctly, the proper speed limit for a road is 85% percentile. I read that book about 20 years ago. I urge you not to do anything about the speed limit. I like the island idea.

Mr. Albert inquired if signage placed on both sides of Washington Avenue prior to the triangle just alerting traffic of a "dangerous intersection." Mr. Albert was advised that there is yellow warning sign advising to reduce speed to 45 mph.

Ms. Clement stated that the commission tried to do little things, and we had people cut their bushes down.

Mr. Dreblow stated that about 10 years ago, he spoke with the resident about removing some of that shrubbery and what we did is we gave him a couple of trees that he could put back on his property.

Mr. Glen Ziebell, 2209 Granville Road, town of Cedarburg resident, his wife has a business at that intersection. Has been in the area for 35 years. He is concerned about that intersection and I have some ideas.

Engineering problem as he can see it went back to when the state gave it to the county. At the intersection on the map: Mr. Ziebell diagramed the intersection for the members. Mr. Ziebell requested Mr. Dreblow to check the sight problems at that intersection.

Mr. Dreblow stated that he could check to see if a vision triangle would aid with the intersection.

Bob Eichner, Director of public works for the town of Cedarburg. I have on occasion, probably at least three (3) times a week to observe traffic through this intersection. Two observations: The first one is that we do have a lot of dump truck traffic on Pleasant Valley Road coming from the quarry on Wausaukee. One of the problems that I actually witnessed a very close call approximately a week and ½ ago; dump truck pulling out on Pleasant Valley Road, sticking his nose out because he's trying to see up the northbound and blocked the vision of the vehicle that was in front of me northbound on CTH Y and CTH NN. That vehicle started to pull out and go across the intersection and a vehicle came flying around the dump truck. I could not see the vehicle, nor could the vehicle in front of me see the vehicle traveling southbound on CTH NN because the dump truck was blocking the vision.

The second problem, which I agree with the raised island because one of the problems with the current striping is that if you are turning on CTH NN, you want to be 90 degrees to the intersection. If you are going straight north on CTH Y, you don't want to be, because it's a very uncomfortable; it's like there is no road in front of you to turn to. People will cheat that and you still at an askew angle and they are still getting that "looking back over their shoulder" trying to see one way or the other.

He further stated that some of these accidents weren't caused because of their vision was blocked on Pleasant Valley, and people just didn't see the vehicles traveling in the other direction.

Mr. Kaul complimented Lt. McCormick on his thorough survey that he did. He thought that the whole packet the committee received was extremely well done; he left nothing uncovered and thanked Lt. McCormick for his efforts.

Mr. Kaul further stated that when the state turned over the intersection, the engineering problems were too costly. We have looked at this intersection in the past. It looks like speed was not a factor, but vehicles pulling into the intersection.

Mark Panosh- DOT. He does agree with Lt. McCormick as far as having a raised channelized island to get the vehicles coming in at 90 degrees as the pavement markings will wear out.

Ms. Myers had a question: She stated that as she was coming towards the intersection, I was on CTH NN going northbound approaching Grandville Road, and I decided to make right turn, and I know we have a short designated pull over to turn right there. I thought, if possible, there is the white striping before you come to the turn in, I was wondering if we could extend that back because if your going 55 mph and they are coming up to that intersection, you are trying to slow down because you are making a right turn, you can't do it so fast. I almost was rear-ended. Maybe we could extend that right turning lane pavement, the de-acieration lane. Maybe state patrol could keep an eye out there, if they have the manpower. They are really speeding on CTH NN.

Mr. Ziebell advised Mr. Dreblow if you are going southbound on CTH Y, you'll see the first stop warning sign is obstructed by trees branches hanging over. Just something for you to look at the next time you take a ride out there. The comment I made about why you or do you have to have the sign saying "Junction with NN" when you can see the other sign at the same time. Maybe placing a warning sign there.

Ms. Myers inquired as to what criteria are needed to place a sign stating "people do not stop on NN."

Mr. Dreblow stated having a sign saying "oncoming traffic does not stop." He'll take a look at the it.

Ms. Myers asked if everyone discussed this and the commission can further review what suggestions were made. Any other comments. Commission does not have to vote; it's just a review. No action.

REQUEST FOR LOWER SPEED LIMIT ON CTH NN NORTH OF STH 60

Lt. McCormick requested to meet with Mr. Dreblow before next meeting. Mr. Dreblow affirmed so he can review putting in that permanent channelization and checks the vision triangles check the signage; make sure that there are no blockages.

Lt. McCormick that will place it on the agenda for the meeting in January 2008.

REQUEST FOR LOWER SPEED LIMIT ON CTH NN NORTH STH 60

Lt. McCormick advised that the Town of Cedarburg is going to be reducing the speed limit on Washington Avenue south of STH 60 to 35 mph. The speed limit is currently at 55 mph from STH 60 north on CTH NN. They requested that we consider lowering our speed limit to 45 mph. Then another request came in to bring it to 35 mph as a buffer zone for the speed limit coming in south of the intersection.

There were no speed surveys done regarding that section because it is posted 55 mph. The assumptions that drivers are traveling 55. This request is merely for a buffer zone leading from south of STH 60 and into the City of Cedarburg.

A crash survey was conducted in the area from 2002 to current. There were a total of ten (10) crashes; the causes are listed. Two of the ten involved vehicles that were either entering or exiting Wayne's Roadhouse parking lot. The rest of the crashes occurred for other reasons: truck dumping its load, another vehicle slid off the road because of ice, drivers backing or rear ending each other because they weren't paying attention.

The speed limit at 55 mph for that area works; however, the request has been made by the Town of Cedarburg for initially reducing to 45 mph, or preferably 35 mph.

Lt. McCormick stated that he personally have no objections to it; he thinks it is a reasonable request. He believes the initial request was for 1400 feet north of the intersection. There was initially a request for 1400 feet, but what that would do, if you go from the west on CTH NN coming towards STH 60; that would give us a 55, 45, 55 and then a 45 or 35 mph. If we are going to reduce the speed limit for the Town of Cedarburg buffer, I would consider moving that all the way up to Cedar Creek Road.

Lt. McCormick further stated that section of roadway past where the Town is requesting, the 55 mph works. It's a good speed limit. However, just as we have seen in some of our other communities, you get five different speed limits in a row; how can you enforce it; who knows where you are going; you have squads that are in the area have trouble enforcing the speed limits. Lt. McCormick advised that to make it simple for everybody, he recommends lowering the speed limit out to Cedar Creek Road; however, the 45 or 35 mph, I would let Mr. Eichner make his argument for that.

Mr. Eichner stated that he doesn't have an argument for 35 or 45 mph. I don't have a preference for either one; 45 at a minimum. The feeling from the town board is that there is going to be some construction in that area in the next few years and if the County allows access on CTH NN there will be additional driveways onto CTH NN and just that more entry onto the roadway at that first four mile stretches. That is where the 1400 feet comes from. He advised that he forwarded a drawing with the request. His real concern is when he spoke with the Wisconsin DOT. The reduction in speed limit that they were requesting was only for a ½ mile which doesn't go to Cedar Creek Road. The concern was southbound, you are in a 45 mph and then you go to 55 mph at Cedar Creek Road, and then the 45 would be at the crest of hill. So all of the sudden you go over the hill and its 45 mph again. His concern is that if you are going to make it 45 mph, make it all the way through Horns Corners.

Mr. Barrow stated many moons ago I was the town constable in the Town of Cedarburg and 20 years ago I had traffic enforcement authority. Occasionally, a citizen would call me up and state that people were speeding past my street, and please come and enforce the speed limit. The standard practice at the time was to wait three days and then take my station wagon and radar gun and sit there, and it was never more then the third vehicle that I stopped for doing more than 10 over the speed limit was the person that called to complain.

I sometimes think that some of our citizens want us to go back to the days of the Connecticut law which states that each horseless carriage must be preceded by a man with a lantern to warn people that they were coming, and they want us to slow down, and slow down and slow down.

I see no need to reduce the speed limit; I think the traffic light that is there and I see some more construction coming in the near future is sufficient to handle the decrease the speed south of there. I don't think there are enough driveways now, and I don't see them in the near future to warrant a decrease in the speed limit. I would urge you to keep it as it is.

Ms. Myers stated that having served on the Highway Committee for all most ten years, one of things that the highway committee enacted was the Access Control Policy. If the town, if you decided, or whatever the committee and the Highway or the County Board decides, you start lowering speeds, then you are going to have to have your distances from driveway access points to county truck have to be further away. Mr. Dreblow will explain.

Mr. Dreblow said that this roadway is involving many jurisdictions, not just the county or the town. The section where Wauwatosa Road intersects Washington Avenue, from that point northwest to Five Corners, this is technically is STH 181. That is why the State got involved in determining the appropriate speed limit. It was at the request of some of the property owners and possibly the Town to have the State examine that section of STH 181 and determine the appropriate speed. That is why you have this letter from Dick Pfeifer-DOT, saying that the Department has approved the 35 mph speed limit for that section. Will that piece of roadway between Wauwatosa Road and Five Corners, State is going to lower that to 35 mph while southeast of that, is currently 45 mph. So now the Town needs to reduce their speed limit in that segment to 35 mph, and there's a section of that roadway which is also in the City of Cedarburg and the City of Cedarburg needs to adopt the proper ordinance. That is what prompted Dick Pfeifer then to suggest that the County consider because you are going to have a 35 limit from Five Corners going southeast, he suggested that the County consider establishing a 45 mph zone for the first ½ mile going northwest away from Five Corners that is their recommendation based on their standards if that were a state road, that's what they would establish.

The other thing we heard from Mr. Eichner is that there is going to be an increase in development there. As the speed limit is lowered based on our Access Control ordinance, you shorten the distance between driveways; the driveways will be getting closer together. As you get driveways closer together, you have more potential conflicts; you are going to have more property owners coming saying that the speed is still to fast. If you drop it to 35 mph in advance of the development, you are going to have these driveways potentially close together (200 feet). Under our ordinance, we would administratively issue permits for those. The Town can control that through their own site planning authority. But, again, it depends on how they view these site plans for development. If they simply say that you have to get a county permit, we administratively issue a permit; we have no basis not to.

Traditionally what this body has done is said that we are not going to lower the speed limit in advance in anticipation of development, we will wait to the development happens. The only place we did that was a mistake (Marcus Theater project in Village of Saukville).

If you lower the speed limit in advance of any development, you run the risk of having more driveways, not less. That generates then the request to lower the speed limit even further. Then, how does your county highway function.

From my perspective, I would support the Dick Pfeifer's recommendation that the 45 zone would be just for that ½ mile rather than taking it all the way. If we maintain a 55 mph stretch, driveway separation will 500 feet, if you drop it down to 45 mph, it's going to be 300 feet, if you drop it down to 35 mph, and it's going to be 200 feet.

Ms. Clement inquired asked why is it 45 mph around Cedar Creek Road? Lt. McCormick's possibly somebody made an argument for a safety coming around that curve between Horns Corners and Cedar Creek.

Mr. Eichner, my request would be that if you honor the DOT request to lower it to 45 mph, either you take the 45 mph zone all the way to Cedar Creek Road, or change from Cedar Creek to Horns Corners back to 55 mph. His biggest concern is that drivers aren't going to honor the 45 mph coming southbound, if they are going back up to 55 mph, and then less than a ½ mile later, down to 45 mph; they just not going honor that.

Mr. Garms stated that he'd prefer that it should go 45 mph all the way or 55 mph because changing the speed limits and the enforceability of it and the driver perception.

Mr. Dreblow stated that the suggestion by DOT for those drivers heading southeast coming into that intersection to transition them down at an appropriate distance.

Mr. Garms stated that they should change the 45 mph north of Cedar Creek back to 55 mph and let the transition occur south of that point. One way or the other, the change should be consistent; it's not enforceable and driver perception is ugly.

Ms. Myers asked Mr. Eichner about the development in the area. Mr. Eichner stated that there is site planning for that area in the works.

Ms. Myers concern for that area was that when she was coming up Washington Avenue, in the town of Cedarburg, people can see that when you are at that stop light heading north on CTH NN, you see that 55 mph sign and it's starring you right in your face at the stop light. But I understand what Mr. Dreblow is saying and we had some interesting history in our county with those access control points, and I, in my heart too, would rather see it stay the 55 mph. Many supervisors on the County Board for many years have always supported moving the traffic in a safe fashion and not changing the speed limit of 55 mph on county trunk roads. We are trying to move people in an efficient ways, and as Lt. McCormick had said, sometimes when you change speeds, then you can create more serious accidents at various intersections.

Ms. Myers, the request for lowering the speed limit on CTH NN north of STH 60 to 45 mph. Mr. Dreblow stated that there are three proposals: 1. Create a 45 mph zone on CTH NN from STH 60 northwesterly a ½ mile. 2. Create that 45 mph zone from STH 60 northwesterly to Cedar Creek Road. 3. From the town of Cedarburg, 35 mph zone from STH 60 northwesterly 1400 feet, and then 45 mph to Cedar Creek.

Ms. Clement added that there would be another request to have the speed limit 45 mph from STH 60 northwesterly ½ mile and then having it all 55 mph.

Mr. Dreblow said that would be the fourth alternative: Speed limit 45 mph from STH 60 northwesterly ½ mile and then changing the speed zone from Cedar Creek Road to Horns Corners from 45 mph to 55 mph.

Chief Graff- he doesn't see that this change should be immediate; that there should be a study about raising it to 55 mph consistently in that area, and if the study warrants that, then lower it to 45 mph in the first ½ mile. But if we lower it now, and then you have 45, 55 and 45, 55, we all agree that is a bad idea. So what is the compelling reason to vote on lowering it at this meeting without studying the raising existing 45 mph to 55 mph.

Mr. Dreblow stated that the only compelling reason that he could come with is that because of the multi-jurisdictions involved in the speed limits from STH 60 southeasterly into the City of Cedarburg, they would like to get those signs up. If they have adopted the ordinance, they would like to get the 35 mph zone established southeast of Five Corners and you would have this situation of a 55 mph north of Five Corners. I don't know if that would be compelling, but that was the recommendation that came from the DOT when they said they would like to set up a mutual date with Ozaukee County when the entire portion of the 35 mph zone can be posted by all three entities on or about the same day. So we don't have the situation of one day its 35 mph, 45 where you are going up and down.

I don't know how compelling that is once you get northwest of Five Corners. I don't think you'd have to change that. You could change the part going into the City and delay any action on that first one.

Ms. Myers- they did say something about the church and that they are going to put a school and whatever that could be a year or two. Because there is four to five items here affecting the request, in order to make a motion, or make any decision, the committee would have to separate those so that is it publicized to the public if there is any other concerns from people in that area; that they know that they have a voice here to come and discuss it.

Mr. Dreblow, it goes from this committee as a recommendation to the Public Works Committee and then it goes to full County Board for adoption of any ordinance. So there is a longer process; it just doesn't happen.

Mr. Garms stated that Dick Pfeifer's letter seems to indicate that Ozaukee County all ready committed to changing it to 45 mph?

Mr. Dreblow, that's an error. When he received the letter, I had a telephone conversation with Mr. Pfeifer and advised that the recommendation makes since, I'll pass it on to Lt. McCormick, will put in on the Traffic Safety Committee and then he wrote this letter to the Town saying that the County is committed. We are not committed to doing anything.

Mr. Garms, since we are at an impasse here, since we are not sure when the development will occur, we are not sure if the school is going to happen anytime soon, and we got some concerns about the up, down, up, down approach to this, I move that we leave the 55 mph zone alone north of STH 60 and that we stick with the present speed zones as they currently are for now.

Mr. Dreblow, second. Ms. Myers, motion by Mr. Garms, all in favor. Mr. Garms interjected that we should leave it the way it is until we get more on paper from the town and/or from the any other organization that are involved in it.

Ms. Myers, motion to leave things as is until we get the information needed necessary. And she suggested to the town to break some of this stuff down because I do remember that intersection of Deckers Corners why we lowered because people approaching into it, she meant Horns Corners, and we changed the speed limit. Mr. Dreblow can look on that. Somehow there were some changes of speed.

Mr. Dreblow didn't remember that. Ms. Myers stated was that when it was 143.

Ms. Clement, I don't remember that ever coming up here, and she has been on the committee for 30 some years.

Ms. Myers, all those in favor of motion to wait and leave the speeds as are:

All aye. Anyone one opposed? None. All in favor:

Lt. McCormick, Ozaukee County Sheriff's Department, Chief Steven Graff, Mequon Police Department, Jon Garms, Mequon Director of Public Works, Ozaukee County Highway Commissioner Bob Dreblow, Supervisor Frederick Kaul, David Brantner-Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Michael Panosh, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Jean Clement, Citizen. Barbara Aagerup, Citizen, Supervisor Gerald Walker. David Albert, Citizen.

Mr. Eichner, he requested signage "Reduce Speed" southbound on CTH NN.

Mr. Dreblow, yes.

Ms. Myers, we will do that because when he checks the signage handbook, we will probably have to note that.

Five minute break at 10:00 a.m.

Meeting continued at 10:08 a.m.

REQUEST FOR LOWERING SPEED LIMIT ON WESTERN ROAD WEST OF CEDARBURG

Lt. McCormick stated that the Commission has spoken about this in length at the last meeting. At that point, it was decided that there was no information to support lowering the speed limit. He received the request from the Town of Cedarburg to revisit it again. At this point, he did have a speed survey done and also had the crash surveys done. The specific crashes were not enumerated as they were for the Decker's Corners area as it became a time issue. As of January 2002 to present, a total of eight (8) crashes. As you see from the speed survey, we did three (3) of them west of CTH Y and three (3) of the east of CTH Y. The 85 percentile we are right in the 55, 56, 57 mph zone. As Mr. Dreblow has pointed out at the last meeting, there is some construction going on in the new subdivision on CTH Y; however, based on what was learned from the Marcus Theater, Village of Saukville, we shouldn't make a preemptive move until we learn what is going on with the development as to the traffic flow.

Nothing has changed. We are still here at a 55 mph zone; the road is carrying the traffic. I would recommend to the Board that speed limit stay at 55 mph. Motion made by Lt. McCormick to keep the speed limit on Western Road at 55 mph. Mr. Dreblow second. Lt. McCormick, Ozaukee County Sheriff's Department, Chief Steven Graff, Mequon Police Department, Jon Garms, Mequon Director of Public Works, Ozaukee County Highway Commissioner Bob Dreblow, Supervisor Frederick Kaul, , David Brantner-Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Michael Panosh, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Jean Clement, Citizen. Barbara Aagerup, Citizen, Supervisor Gerald Walker. David Albert, Citizen, all aye.

Mr. Eichner stated that he understands the data presented and whatever the Committee decides is fine.

Ms. Myers inquired as to who made the request? Lt. McCormick advised that he did receive a letter from the Town of Cedarburg requesting the speed limit reduction.

Ms. Myers, the requests should be more specific on the agenda. Mr. Dreblow advised that what's on the agenda is sufficient.

NO PARKING SIGNS ON CTH I AND CTH O

Lt. McCormick this request is coming from the Sheriff's Department. Over the years, we have had different civic events. Now we have Tendick Park on CTH O that's very popular for cross country meets from different high schools. We also have Stoney Hill School in the town of Fredonia being used for Flag Day etc.

In the past, the Sheriff's Department has placed "no parking" signs that the Highway Shop had made for our department and then the officers would place them where the event would be, when the event would be finished, the officers would have to remove the signs. This has been becoming a more frequent event.

The Sheriff's Department is requesting that we adopt an ordinance and post "no parking" signs in the area of the Stoney Hill School, Pioneer Village and Tendick Park on CTH O, town of Saukville after consideration by the Traffic Safety Committee.

Mr. Kaul advised that no one should be parking on those roads; there is no development in those areas.

Mr. Dreblow stated that we should review the Tendick Park request. The Tendick Park issue the sheriff's department is requesting placing "no parking" signs beginning at the point of .6 of a mile north of Center Road to a point .85 miles (1/4 mile). That isn't going to do it. He feels that we should be far beyond that. Tendick Park is not just on the west side of CTH O, there is a section on the east side, and this section doesn't cover that. At Public Works we discussed this at length because we had between 600 and 800 cars parked along CTH O for the North Shore Conference Cross Country meet. They are having more and more of these meets; it's becoming a matter of safety. The temporary "no parking" signs cannot be enforced. Looking at the map, we should be going from Center Road to Deerfield; there is no reason for people to be parking along CTH O; that's mile long stretch.

Mr. Kaul stated that more school conferences are planning on using Tendick Park.

Mr. Dreblow stated that they are trying to work with the schools and they are setting up a shuttle on the east side of Tendick Park, they actually had parking attendants getting people to park there and shuttling them in a bus from there to the cross country meet area on the west side of CTH O. The problem is that people are parking any place they can; it's just uncontrolled. The schools are attempting to direct others where to park, but it just not effective.

What the Parks Director is doing, is working with the schools athletic directors to work out some arrangement for shuttling to get people to park off-site somewhere.

Ms. Myers asked Mr. Dreblow is this a seasonal; does it happen once or twice?

Mr. Dreblow doesn't know exactly how many, but regardless if it's seasonal, if you drive CTH O, it's narrow, no shoulders, limited visibility.

Ms. Myers is there any land down by the boat launch. Mr. Dreblow said that they will park on the grass. You don't want to design a parking lot for your peak time; you park them on the grass and do the same thing over on the west side of CTH O.

Ms. Myers stated that if we don't allow people to not park on CTH O, we should have a plan for the extra vehicles somewhere. We want people to use the county parks as much as they can, as conveniently as they can.

Mr. Dreblow stated that for the normal use of the park, there is a big parking lot on the west side of the road; there's ample parking on the east side for those that are launching a canoe, archery, etc., it's just these peak usage events when they have the cross country meets. Then there's disc golf in the park. Parks in putting in concrete tee boxes and that might bring those types of events to the park.

Mr. Albert stated that if there's a need, we are obligated to provide some parking, and there is certainly plenty of room on the east side of the park.

Mr. Dreblow stated that they filled that up and they had people parking on the roadway; the roadway is so narrow, once you park, you can't get by them.

Mr. Kaul stated that mowing a bigger portion of the east side of the road where people would park rather than have them park down by the river. We will have to look at that.

Lt. McCormick stated that even with that, the issue is that there is such an overflow that we just don't have the physical capabilities given that property to place all these cars even if we made more accommodations, we still have the issue of all this overflow. We would clip down an area, maybe we could get another 100 vehicles in there; we still have another 600 to deal with. We need to keep them off the road.

Ms. Clement stated they have to have shuttle buses from the high schools.

Mr. Dreblow stated that for this last event, they had over a dozen buses, but he didn't know if they were just the team buses, or if they were spectators also. They ran the buses down on the east side, but some parked on the roadway; vehicles couldn't get around. Maybe we could make a more efficient use of the space we have. He don't know if that will solve the problem, but what I hate to see is to create a problem on CTHO because it's not safe when people parking on both sides of CTH O; they ignore the "no parking" signs.

Chief Graff makes a motion to approve the Stoney Hill, Pioneer Village as written and extend the signs by Tendick Park from Center Road to Deerfield. Lt. McCormick second.

Mr. Garms asked if there is an existing ordinance that the Sheriff's Department can enforce the "no parking" signs.

Mr. Dreblow stated that wherever the ordinance adopts a "no parking" zone, then we post it, sign it, and then the Sheriff's Department can enforce it.

Mr. Garms stated so it would go into the Ozaukee County ordinance as a "no parking area" and it would be officially signed that way.

Mr. Dreblow stated that was correct; that this was not just a request for signage; it's a request for a "no parking" ordinance in these areas. Where we had to do it most recently was on south side of Pioneer Road from Washington Avenue west. We had people parking in a thru lane and accessing the bike trail. Because east of Washington Avenue, that's the city, and they had "no parking" signs posted there. We had to adopt a "no parking" ordinance for that stretch, establish it and sign it.

Mr. Garms stated that without making it enforceable, it wouldn't make any sense not to.

Mr. Dreblow stated that this would follow a similar process as a speed zone, it would go to Public Works Committee, Public Works would recommend an ordinance to the County Board, the County Board would adopt it, and we would post the signs.

Mr. Garms stated assume that it would be enforceable, when the Parks Commissioner makes arrangements with them, Mequon had the same problem when we have these massive soccer tournaments in our parks; we do not have large parking lots, but they are forced to figure out a way to get people in and out without parking on STH 57 or wherever they chose to park. The Parks Commissioner needs to publish that right with the meet regarding the parking restrictions.

Mr. Albert needed further clarification; this is permanent now; Mr. Dreblow stated that this would be permanent, no parking at any time.

Ms. Myers stated that the only concern that she had is: Pioneer Village, not a problem. Stoney Hill School is that the Flag Day people run that now. If we put those "no parking" signs; I know they have the Americanism Center on the other side of Waubeka; they possible could shuttle there to. We need to notify because that road is a very bad one too.

Ms. Myers asked if there were any more discussions on this matter.

None.

Motion made by Chief Graff to approve the Stoney Hill, Pioneer Village as written and extend the signs by Tendick Park from Center Road to Deerfield, second by Lt. McCormick, all those in favor, Lt. McCormick, Ozaukee County Sheriff's Department, Chief Steven Graff, Mequon Police Department, Jon Garms, Mequon Director of Public Works, Ozaukee County Highway Commissioner Bob Dreblow, Supervisor Frederick Kaul, , David Brantner-Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Michael Panosh, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Jean Clement, Citizen. Barbara Aagerup, Citizen, Supervisor Gerald Walker. David Albert, Citizen, aye. Ms. Myers opposed. Motion passed.

Ms. Myers stated that she opposed because it sets up people who want to use the parks on off-times; it's just another way of controlling and creating revenue by issuing tickets. I understand the safety issue.

Lt. McCormick stated that the revenue is not an issue; the revenue wasn't even a consideration. It's just a matter of having 400, 500 or 600 vehicles on a stretch of road that should not have parking on it to begin with; it's not built four lanes wide. What are going to do when somebody breaks a leg, when a vehicle starts on fire, when someone is having a seizure; you're not getting emergency traffic in and out; the road was not designed to be a parking lot.

Mr. Dreblow stated that you don't have shoulder width that allows you to safely pull off the roadway.

Ms. Myers stated that she understands that. It was just something.

FATAL ACCIDENTS:

Lt. McCormick advised that there were two (2) fatalities in our county this quarter which the Sheriff's Department investigated.

One was on STH 57 and CTH K which was a failure to yield from a stop sign. The second one was on CTH I north of Cedar Creek Road it was actually in Cedar Creek. Vehicle was traveling northbound, lost control on the slight curve, went across the southbound traffic lane, struck a bridge barrier and came to final rest in the creek; subject's blood alcohol concentration which was a .12 at the time of the crash.

Road design and/or speed in either case, I don't believe to be issues that the Commission needs to review.

STATE REPORT:

Mr. Brantner, he would like to thank Lt. McCormick and Cindy and the Chairperson for all their hard work. In addition to this committee, I go 66 of these meetings in 15 different counties. Some of them that I go to if he didn't say anything, the meeting lasts about 45 seconds. So it's nice when I come to such an active committee. It's wonderful to hear all the discussion and people are so passionate about safety in the county. The packet that comes, I don't need to bring a stack of materials to hand out. He just wanted to say thanks.

DOT just handed out information the enforcement grants for next year. The Bureau of Transportation Safety we get federal dollars that we then pass on to local law enforcement agencies which pays for overtime, enforcement, speed, alcohol, click it or ticket it.

In Ozaukee County, through the Sheriff's Department, we are going to have an alcohol grant; that's going to be focused in the town of Cedarburg. How they chose the town of Cedarburg, we take a three year data run of crash data throughout the state and then we rank townships, villages, cities, communities in terms of their crash data. Wherever the highest numbers are, that's where we go.

An alcohol enforcement grant in the township of Cedarburg that will run from the beginning of December 2007 until September 2008. This grant will place more officers on the roads within the township of Cedarburg.

The other grant that we are going to do in the county is again going through the Sheriff's Department; it's going to be for a speed enforcement grant in the township of Saukville. This will be for an extended period too.

These grants are a case of "doing bad, doing good"; if your doing a real good job, no grant money.

Mr. Brantner also stated that there is legislation pending: Primary seatbelt law, AB113, SB120. There are several cell phone bills out there. One in particular, A464, which addresses drivers with probationary and instructional permits.

Ms. Myers had a questions regarding cell phone usage. Would it be lawful for someone to have a hands free cell phone; there should be consistency throughout the country.

Lt. McCormick advised that if it would go throughout the country, it would be come from the federal courts.

Mr. Panosh stated road project in the City of Mequon should be finished by Thanksgiving.

Ms. Myers stated that she has received complaints from citizens that some of those barrels are not in the right place, or the lanes aren't wide enough. She stated that if some of those barrels would have been moved over to make double lanes for right turns, it would have been nice. She said people have been very polite and someone wrote a letter in the News Graphic about citizens giving people a chance, if they are at the gas station or McDonald's that are trying to cut over, or people trying to cut through on the side streets.

Mr. Dreblow stated that in defense of the City of Mequon, it wasn't their project. You should refer them to the state.

LOCAL REPORT:

Mr. Dreblow stated that the final walk through inspection is going on today on CTH I. So that project should be complete and we can take the signage down and open it up to traffic.

The other project within about two weeks or so, we expect the signals to be functioning at Highland and CTH W.

EDUCATION:

Lt. McCormick he included some information that was taken from the DOT website reference the seatbelt usage by age and gender and the crash facts just showing the trends with the ages of the drivers and also included the 2006 annual comparisons for crash statistics by county.

Reminder to media about regarding informational items for plows and emergency vehicles in the inclement weather.

Mr. Myers inquired if the schools in the area get information concerning the young driver's. Do we forward this information to the schools.

Mr. Panosh advised that the driver's education instructors usually get the information from DOT.

Ms. Clement stated that maybe we should send copies to different high schools in the area and see if they wanted to include it in their newspaper.

Mr. Barrow stated that if we would send it to them via an e-mail it would be easier for them.

Ms. Myers stated that our next meeting date is January 23, 2008.

Ms. Myers, all those in favor of adjourning, Lt. McCormick, Ozaukee County Sheriff's Department, Chief Steven Graff, Mequon Police Department, Jon Garms, Mequon Director of Public Works, Ozaukee County Highway Commissioner Bob Dreblow, Supervisor Frederick Kaul, , David Brantner-Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Michael Panosh, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Jean Clement, Citizen. Barbara Aagerup, Citizen, Supervisor Gerald Walker. David Albert, Citizen, all aye. Meeting adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 11:02 a.m.

Cynthia C. Mintner,
TSC Assistant