



MOBILITY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

November 20, 2025 at 6:00 p.m.

Council Conference Room

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:01 pm.

ROLL CALL

Present: David Staudt (Chair), Brian Smith, Matt Heintz, Ed Roney, Jay Dooley, David Dismondy

Absent: Joe Tolkacz (excused)

Staff Present: Rebecca Runkel, Project Engineer, DPW
Barb McBeth, City Planner, Community Development
Lindsay Bell, Senior Planner, Community Development

APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

Chair Staudt called the meeting to order at 6:01 pm and asked for roll call. Clarification was given by Member Dooley that Joe Tolkacz would be stepping down and replaced by another commissioner. Chair Staudt made motions to approve the agenda and the minutes from August 21, 2025, both of which were supported and passed 6-0.

DISCUSSION

Chair Staudt began the meeting by introducing himself and stating some of the work he hopes to accomplish with the committee. Chair Staudt moved to the first item on the agenda, the 9 Line memo and follow up. Planner Bell gave an overview of the project and the study that was completed, of which Phase 2 included Novi to South Lyon. Planner Bell explained that the committee was introduced to the study at the last meeting, and the Mayor asked the committee members to look into it further. Planner Bell said she wrote a memo that compares the 9 Line recommendations to the City's Active Mobility Plan (AMP). Planner Bell then introduced two guests at the meeting, Rachel Bush (OHM) and Simon Rivers (Oakland County). Ms. Bush began by explaining the study and why 9 Mile was selected for the project (the starting point was 9 Mile in Oak Park due to the trailheads there, and the first segment was funded by a SEMCOG grant, but 9 Mile had been identified by Oakland County prior to that as a critical east-west connector for regional trail systems, and 9 Mile is relatively low traffic, slower speeds). Ms. Bush thanked Planner Bell for being a participant of the task force, which was established during phase one, and which meets quarterly. The project started in 2022, with Oakland County parks funding it. Mr. Rivers explained that local communities have spent their own capital improvement dollars on maintaining their sections, and there's been a lot of grants as well. Oak Park received over a million dollars in grants, and they're very proud of their section, it's spurred economic development in the area. Ms. Bush continued by

acknowledging the differences between Oak Park and communities like Novi and South Lyon, which are less densely populated.

Ms. Bush stated that they understand this vision isn't going to happen overnight, but that filling sidewalk gaps is critical and the idea is having a plan set for future developments. If farmland sells and a developer buys it then the township can go to them and say your site plan has to include a 8-ft or 10-ft shared use path and they can negotiate that way. Chair Staudt asked if South Lyon has shown any interest or commitment into investing in the 9 Line. Mr. Rivers replied that South Lyon has signed on to the memorandum of understanding (MOU) and they participate at all quarterly meetings. Chair Staudt asked what the Oakland County Road Commission's take on it is. Ms. Bush replied that they don't build non-motorized pathways, they don't focus on anything outside of the curb to curb street. The project could be paid by a combination of developers, City, or with grants. Mr. Rivers explained that one of the reasons Oakland County Parks is exited to continue their work with OHM is because we're going to be putting together a grant and funding strategy that will identify opportunities to receive funding and Oakland County Parks will continue to support grant applications or assist in any way we can.

Chair Staudt asked if Novi has signed the MOU yet. Planner Bell replied that is something we'd like this group to do tonight, if you're comfortable, is making a recommendation to City Council for approval of the MOU. Chair Staudt requested a little more information before deciding. Ms. Bush went onto to explain the format of the study, which was displayed on the screen. Planner Bell added that the memo has some of the plan blown up comparing the 9 Line to the AMP. Ms. Bush continued describing the contents of the study, pointing out that the cost estimates were prepared two years ago, and reiterating that they're in the process of recalibrating the plans to look at what's been completed and updating the cost estimates in a way that can be more useful to the communities. Ms. Bush went on to describe the priority ranking between one and five, five being high priority and one being low priority. Ms. Bush mentioned the gravel section of 9 Mile Rd which is more agricultural/residential, the recommendation there would be to build a separate pathway should the opportunity become available. Ms. Bush continued describing advisory shoulder treatments, signed bike routes, enhanced sidewalk, comfort hubs, shared use path. Some sections of 9 Mile that are pretty wet may require a boardwalk treatment.

Member Heintz asked if there's been discussions about the differences between communities and making it for work each of the communities as you go from 9 to 10 Mile or similar. Ms. Bush replied absolutely, yes, like Northville is included in this study because they wanted to participate even though they are not directly located on 9 Mile Rd, but we see that as an opportunity to connect to a downtown destination, and we've had these discussions with our task force and the participating members. Ms. Bush continued that we went to the community last October and asked for their ideas and comments, we think this is our best shot at tailoring it to each community and we can continue to tailor it. And there are opportunities to tailor the branding, to highlight each community and their assets and branding. Ms. Bush displayed an overall map showing some segments going down to 8 Mile Rd and some that go up to 10 Mile Rd, with the gravel section of 9 Mile Rd being where the advisory shoulder begins. Then users would be able to take the ITC Trail to connect up to the regional trail system and at the other end is the 275 Metro Trail. Ms. Bush continued describing each segment and what is proposed.

The committee spent the remainder of the meeting discussing the details and challenges of specific segments. Ms. Bush and Mr. Rivers wrapped up the discussion by describing the next steps of the project. Mr. Rivers explained that the MOU is a voluntary cooperative agreement among the communities and shall not be construed to create or

establish binding or enforceable commitments, responsibilities, burdens, obligations, or liabilities on the part of any participating community. And any participating community may terminate its participation upon notice to other communities, so it's very much non-binding. Mr. Rivers continued that Oakland County is interested in connecting our communities to the rest of the region. Chair Staudt asked if the interest in connectivity by the county is new. Mr. Rivers confirmed that the idea of the 9 Line is new from a few years ago. Chair Staudt asked if Rails to Trails is a separate organization and is Oakland County trying to connect some of these trails? Mr. Rivers confirmed that they are interested in connecting to the ITC Trail and I-275 Trail. Chair Staudt asked if there is interest in a crossing over I-96. The committee discussed some of the challenges in crossing I-96 along with a proposed City West development for which a pedestrian bridge over Grand River is being discussed. The conversation ended with clarification on what kind of staff commitment is needed and what would be needed from City Council. The committee agreed to bring the MOU to City Council for their consent. The meeting closed with a tentative meeting scheduled for January 15th, 2026. Engineer Runkel asked the committee to review the email correspondence in the packet before the next meeting.

REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS

There were no action items to review.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made to adjourn. The motion was seconded. The meeting adjourned at 7:05 pm.