



## Traffic Commission

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 505-8560, Fax: (314) 862-0694

### TRAFFIC COMMISSION MEETING VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 2022 6:30PM

#### **IMPOTANT NOTICE REGARDING PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE TRAFFIC COMMISSION MEETING & PARTICIPATION**

#### **Traffic Commission will Meet Electronically on MARCH 9, 2022**

On March 20, 2020, City Manager Gregory Rose declared a State of Emergency for the City of University City due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. Due to the current order restricting gatherings of people and the ongoing efforts to limit the spread of the COVID-19 virus, the March 9, 2022 meeting will be conducted via videoconference.

**Observe and/or Listen to the Meeting** (your options to join the meeting are below):

**Webinar** via the link below:

[https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN\\_JfUzsQ7BQGOqNAXxWzg4hA](https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_JfUzsQ7BQGOqNAXxWzg4hA)

#### **Audio Only Call**

Or iPhone one-tap :

US: +13017158592,,88281367095#,1#,441746# or +13126266799,,88281367095#,1#,441746#

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 929 205 6099 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 669 900 6833 or 888 788 0099 (Toll Free) or 877 853 5247 (Toll Free)

Webinar ID: 810 8446 6730

Pass code: 840977

#### **Citizen Participation**

Those who wish to provide a comment during the “Public Comments” portion as indicated on the Traffic Commission agenda: may provide written comments to the Senior Public Works Manager ahead of the meeting.

ALL written comments must be received **no later than 12:00 p.m. the day of the meeting.** Comments may be sent via email to: [salpaslan@ucitymo.org](mailto:salpaslan@ucitymo.org) or mailed to the City Hall – 6801 Delmar Blvd. – Attention Sinan Alpaslan, Public Works Director. Such comments will be provided to the Traffic Commission prior to the meeting. Comments will be made a part of the official record and made accessible to the public online following the meeting.

Please note, when submitting your comments, a **name and address must be provided.** Please also note if your comment is on an agenda or non-agenda item, and a name and address are not provided, the provided comment will not be recorded in the official record.

The City apologizes for any inconvenience the meeting format change may pose to individuals, but it is extremely important that extra measures be taken to protect employees, residents board/commission members and elected officials during these challenging times.



## Traffic Commission

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 505-8560, Fax: (314) 862-0694

# A G E N D A

## TRAFFIC COMMISSION MEETING

March 9, 2022, at 6:30 p.m.  
Via Zoom

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes
  - A. November 10, 2021 and January 12, 2022
5. Agenda items
  - A. Crixdale Ln. Extension to the east (See Attachment) – Discussion
6. Council Liaison Report
7. Miscellaneous Business
8. Adjournment.

Prior to the meeting, we recommend that you visit the site(s). Please email [salpaslan@ucitymo.org](mailto:salpaslan@ucitymo.org) to confirm your attendance.

*ALL written comments must be received **no later than 12:00 p.m. the day of the meeting.** Comments may be sent via email to: [salpaslan@ucitymo.org](mailto:salpaslan@ucitymo.org) or mailed to the City Hall – 6801 Delmar Blvd. – Attention Sinan Alpaslan, Public Works Director. Such comments will be provided to the Traffic Commission prior to the meeting. Comments will be made a part of the official record and made accessible to the public online following the meeting.*

*Please note, when submitting your comments, a **name and address must be provided.** Please also note if your comment is on an agenda or non-agenda item, and a name and address are not provided, the provided comment will not be recorded in the official record.*

TRAFFIC COMMISSION MEETING  
VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE  
WEDNESDAY, November 10, 2021

On March 20, 2020, City Manager Gregory Rose declared a State of Emergency for the City of University City due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. Due to the current order restricting gatherings of people and the ongoing efforts to limit the spread of the COVID-19 virus, the November 10, 2021, meeting will be conducted via videoconference.

1. Call to Order At 6:30 P.M. by Chairman Stewart

2. Roll Call

Bart Stewart	Commissioner & Chair - Present
Dennis Fuller	Commissioner - Present
Craig Hughes	Commissioner - Present
Cirri Moran	Commissioner - Present
Jane Schaefer	Commissioner - Present
Jerold Tiers	Commissioner – Present
Larry Zelenovich	Commissioner – Present
Errol Tate	Staff Liaison - Present
Sinan Alpaslan	PWP Director - Present
Tim Cusick	Council liaison - Present
Lt. Shawn Whitley	Police Liaison - Present
John Mulligan	City Attorney - Present

3. Approval of Agenda

Motion by Commissioner Tiers to approve the agenda and motion 2<sup>nd</sup> by Commissioner Schaefer. Motion approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Commission.

4. Approval of Minutes of: September 8, 2021, and October 13, 2021

Corrections: September 8, 2021; Pg 2, Section B-3, change “acceptation” to “acceptance.”  
Pg. 2 Section 3-G change “Mullins” to “Mulligan.”

Motion by Commissioner Tiers to approve the minutes of 9-8-2021 with corrections and 10-13-2021. Motion 2<sup>nd</sup> by Commissioner Schaefer. Motion approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Commission.

5. Agenda items

A. Delmar Roundabout – Traffic Calming

(1.) Requestor: Amanda Summers

(2.) Request: To install pedestrian signs with flashing lights at the Delmar circle.

(3.) Dept. Public Works Conclusion/Recommendation:

Since the installation of the Round-a-Bout there

has been several incidents with pedestrian safety at the crossings and the city has tried different approaches to bring awareness to drivers such as signage, pavement marking, and staged police

officers for enforcement. These measures have helped, but we still have a lot of drivers that are not aware or do not know that pedestrians are attempting to cross. With the Traffic Commission's approval we will advocate for lighted pedestrian signs in our next budget round. Following the first meeting of the request the City's traffic engineer has provided two options for pedestrian safety at the Delmar RAB. - The first option displays the RAB modifications with narrowed approach lanes, widened truck aprons, increased entry angles, and raised cross walks. [www.ucitymo.org](http://www.ucitymo.org) 2 - The second option includes everything in the first option in addition to a rapid flashing beacon. City staff agrees with both options and it is recommended that Traffic Commission review the proposal for approval to be considered for implementation into the capital budget plan.

(4.) Study by Lochmueller Group, prepared by Kelly Schaefer, PE, PTOE and Kevin Neil, AICP, (Provided to Traffic Commission). Lochmueller Group prepared a summary of recommended intersection modifications designed to enhance pedestrian safety, reduce motor vehicle speeds, and increase motor vehicle compliance at pedestrian crossing locations. The Lochmueller group suggested the following modifications: narrowed approach lanes, added / widen truck aprons, increased entry angles, raised crosswalk, and rectangular rapid flashing beacons. Lochmueller design and cost improvements to roundabout with flashing beacons estimated total, \$186,000. Kelly Schaefer present during meeting for discussion and questions.

(5.) Discussion:

- a. Mr. Alpaslan, "This was presented some time ago and now comes back from the Traffic engineer. City does not have funding for recommendations not but will be proposed for future budget".
- b. Commissioner Tiers asked Ms. Schaefer how many of these new traffic lights or "Traffic Hawks" are in the city, and how do they actually work. Schaefer replied there are only eight in the county right now and there's only one additional one in the city. The light is activated by the pedestrian it then goes to flashing yellow to a solid yellow and then to a red "wag".
- c. Commissioner Schaefer questioned how the truck apron works. Ms. Schaefer responded that it is simply a raised crossing to get driver attention. Commissioner Stewart added that it helps with educate the driver the first few times they drive through.
- d. Lieutenant Whitley recommends the flashing beacons, the raised crosswalk and adding an additional sign at the raised median. Ms. Schaefer responded that both vertical and horizontal signage used together to slow traffic are helpful.
- e. Commissioner Moran added that all three recommendations proposed would be helpful at this intersection.
- f. Commissioner Zelenovich questioned whether the two lanes of Delmar could be narrowed to one lane sooner going east from Big Bend. He also added that as much lighting as possible should be at the raised walks. Commissioner Moran agreed. Commissioner Tiers questioned whether the lights at the three crosswalks could be in synchrony. Miss Schaefer stated they would not but would be in synchrony on each side of the individual crosswalk.
- g. Commissioner Fuller agrees with narrowing Delmar as soon as possible from Big Bend going east and questioned if "rumble strips" or pavement grooving could be added to the lane to get drivers' attention to slow down.
- h. Commissioner Stewart asked if Commission could support these proposed recommendations. General discussion continued about including added features such as lane narrowing, pavement grooving, and added raised crosswalks could be added after the initial proposals are recommended and initiated. With Commissioners in agreement, Commission Chair Stewart called for a motion. One motion was presented to address study recommendations, and a second motion to add additional Commission suggestions.

**MOTION 1.** by Commissioner Tiers:

Accept the Lochmueller Group study recommendations and add a raised cross walk with flashing beacon lights on the east side of the roundabout.

The motion was 2<sup>nd</sup> by Commissioner Zelenovich. Motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Commission.

**Motion 2** by Commissioner Tiers:

Add the additional suggestions of narrowing Delmar east of Big Bend sooner and add grooved pavement or “rumble strips” in this area. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Schaefer. Motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Commission.

**B. Wilson and Shaftesbury Reconfiguration**

(1.) Requester: Resident Sumner (unable to be present) through Errol Tate

(2.) Request: Improvement of Intersection of Wilson Avenue and Shaftesbury for Safety and vehicular movement improvement at the intersection.

(3.) Dept. of Public works Conclusion/Recommendation: Following the initial meeting of the request the city engaged its traffic engineer to propose a scope and fee for the re-design of the intersection. The proposal includes a conceptual design, final design, and construction administration cost for a reconfiguration to the intersection to reduce conflict points, improve control of right-of-way to reduce confusion, and increase safety for all users. The final improvement will be a “T” intersection. The proposal does not include an actual construction estimate, which will follow with the acceptance of the scope and fee. It is recommended that Traffic Commission review the scope and fee for approval to be considered for implementation into the capital budget plan.

(4.) Traffic Commission provided a Proposal for Transportation Engineering of Shaftesbury Avenue at Wilson Avenue Intersection Modifications, prepared by Lorne Jackson, Lochmueller Group. Proposed cost estimates presented: Conceptual Design \$7,500 Final Design \$30,500, Construction Administration \$30,000 (Estimated). Kelly Schaefer was online and discussed proposal.

(5.) Discussion:

a. Commissioner Tiers questioned whether the current traffic flow justifies the cost of changing this intersection. Tiers suggested the intersection could be changed to impede traffic flow by moving the Shaftesbury stop sign westbound up to the point of the island and limiting the Wilson left turn onto Shaftesbury with a traffic block and making Wilson a one way going north.

b. Mr. Tate stated the original request was a resident that complained about excessive traffic flow. The petitioning resident was not available for this evening's discussion. Lieutenant Whitley was questioned whether there have been complaints about accidents or excessive flow at this corner. Lieutenant Whitley indicated there were minimal complaints about either at this corner.

c. Mr. Tate was questioned whether the resident had presented other complaints. Commissioner Tiers suggested getting more input before proceeding with this project

**Motion** by Commissioner Tiers: Table this discussion and get more input before proceeding. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Zelenovich. Motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Commission. taking possession of their

property in February or March of 2021a the Costco slash markets at olive project is well underway with Costco

6. Council Liaison Report: Council Member Cusick announced the following:

A. The Markets at Olive and Costco projects are well underway. Costco will take possession of their property in February or March 2021, with a possible slated opening as early as September 2022.

B. Novaris Development has been taken over by Bob Clark and Larry Chapman, Clayco / CRG.

C. Council is putting together a third ward task force to implement projects for the earmarked money from the Markets at Olive / Costco project.

D. As of next month City Council will be meeting in chambers. Council is still in need of volunteers to serve on a variety of boards and commissions.

E. All were reminded that MSD we'll be sending out a storm water letter that will include a survey. All were encouraged to fill out the form and return it and remind your neighbors to do the same.

7. Miscellaneous Business:

A. Commissioner Tiers questioned that since Novaris Development is no longer the developer, will the original development agreement for ward three be honored by the new developers?

B. City attorney Mullins responded that this project is being conducted under University City Development LLC and Clark and Chapman have purchased Bob Brown's interest. This change will constitute no change in the original plan for Ward 3.

8. Adjournment. No further business appearing, Commissioner Schaefer made a motion to Adjourn, Motion was 2nd by Commissioner Moran, Meeting Adjourned at 7:50 PM by Commission Chairman Stewart.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Dennis Fuller, Commissioner

**TRAFFIC COMMISSION MEETING**  
**Virtual Zoom Meeting**  
**University City MO 63130**

IMPOTANT NOTICE REGARDING PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE TRAFFIC COMMISSION MEETING & PARTICIPATION On March 20, 2020, City Manager Gregory Rose declared a State of Emergency for the City of University City due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. Due to the current order restricting gatherings of more than 10 people and the ongoing efforts to limit the spread of the COVID-19 virus, the June 9, 2021, meeting will be conducted via videoconference

Date: 1/12/22

1. Call to Order At 6:30 P.M. by Chairman Stewart

2. Roll Call

Bart Stewart	Commissioner & Chair - Present
Dennis Fuller	Commissioner – Absent excused with illness
Craig Hughes	Commissioner - Present
Cirri Moran	Commissioner - Present
Jane Schaefer	Commissioner - Present
Jerold Tiers	Commissioner – Present
Larry Zelenovich	Commissioner – Present
Sinan Alpaslan	PWP Director - Present
Tim Cusick	Council liaison - Present
Shawn Whitley	Police Liaison - Present
John Mulligan	City Attorney - Present

3. Approval of Agenda

Motion by Commissioner Schaefer to approve the agenda and motion 2<sup>nd</sup> by Commissioner Moran. Motion approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Commission.

4. Approval of Minutes of:11/10/21 waved until March meeting due to absence of recording secretary.

5. Agenda items

A. Presentation by Plan Commission Chairperson Ms. Margaret Holly (See Attachment #1)

(1) As the Planning Commission chair as well as the Vision 2040 chair, Holly came to the Traffic Commission to request the following:

- a. Share Planning Commission's concerns of the current projects underway in the city as they pertain to various types of traffic.
- b. Project these traffic concerns / ideas into the vision 2040 project.

(2) Ms. Holly cited the need for the Planning Commission and Traffic Commission to work together on U. City development issues as these issues cross multiple commissions, impact daily lives of university city citizens, and have potential long-term impacts. Ms. Holly asked, "How can our respective commissions work together to ensure the best for University Citie's citizens?"

- a. Two current ongoing projects were cited as examples: the Mackenzie at 8400 Delmar project and Crown Center project.
- b. The CBB traffic study analysis is exemplary for vehicles, but no apparent analysis for bicycles or pedestrians.
- c. Parking: An on-going issue that impacts daily life. Lots of text in Zoning Code (Section 400.2130 E ) related to parking such as; Number of spaces, Sizes of spaces, Exception For Uses Located Near Transit Stations and Stops, For uses located within five hundred (500) feet of a public transit station or stop, the off-street parking requirement may be reduced by ten percent (10%). The Loop Trolley stops, and stations shall not be included in this exception. There is no definition of "public transit station or stop." Traffic Commission has expertise to provide recommendations.
- d. Comprehensive Plan Update (Vision 2040): Potential Traffic Commission issues/inputs; Self-driving cars, Delivery drones, Implementation of Master Walking/Cycling Plan, Access to transportation.
- e. How can we best proceed?

(3) Points of Discussion by Traffic Commission:

- a. Commissioner Moran, who has served several years on the Planning Commission, stated the Traffic Commission frequently reviews projects after the Planning Commission has reviewed and questions whether traffic Commission notes and recommendations are reviewed by The Planning Commission. Commissioner Moran stated that on some projects the commissions need to meet as a group.
- b. Commissioner Tiers questioned who is charged with discussing pedestrians! Are pedestrians considered traffic? And when we have discussed pedestrian issues as it pertains to Delmar and Olive, because these streets are not controlled by University City what effect on pedestrian flow could we have anyway?
- c. Commissioner Stewart questioned whether city staff could monitor when committees had same or similar issues and then get chairs to call a special meeting.
- d. Commissioner Moran stated the Planning Commission is directed under city charter. Cty Attorney Mulligan indicated that Traffic Commission is an advisory Commission while the Planning Commission is chartered under city code. City attorney agrees that sometimes Planning Commission has decided issues and then turns to the Traffic Commission for input.
- e. Commissioner Stewart and Commissioner Tiers both suggested the Planning Commission notified traffic Commission when a joint meeting is needed.
- f. Commissioner Tiers Stated the commissions need to have the city manager or council consider defining pedestrians as "Traffic."
- g. Councilman Cusick questioned whether pedestrians are listed as a responsibility in the City code. City attorney Mulligan stated the powers and duties of traffic Commission are covered in city code section 120.420. This speaks to the general traffic Commission duties and the code is pretty broad on its explanation. The current list in code is not exclusive and Mulligan noted the traffic Commission acts as advisory to the city and at request of the city manager and city council. The powers and duties of the Traffic Commission could cover pedestrian and other traffic issues such as parking.



h. Commissioner Stewart thanked Planning Commissioner Holly for bringing these concerns to the Traffic Commission and recommended that perhaps city staff representative on Planning Commission could possibly monitor these issues in the future and notify Traffic Commission of such.

i. Ms. Holly encouraged all citizens of the city to please complete the city survey as the Vision 2040 will be using that data for their plan. And all were encouraged to attend the “think tank” sessions scheduled the last week in February.

#### B. Alanson Dr.-Golf Course Dr. Intersection Traffic Control (See Attachment #2)

**Requestor:** Area Resident presented through council member

**Request:** Updated Traffic Control Configuration at Golf Course-Alanson inters

(1) Sinan Alpaslan PWP Director presented following:

- a. Request: To review and update the traffic control configuration at the Alanson Dr.-Golf Course Dr. intersection. Consider Stop sign(s).
- b. **Conclusion/Recommendation:** This intersection is slightly skewed and sightlines are additionally impeded by grade at its northeast quadrant. That’s the location where the current Yield signage also displays a plaque that reads “cross traffic does not stop”. The current configuration with 2 Yield signs and a plaque referencing a stop condition is not compliant with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and it can be confusing to motorists.
- c. The Police Department has reviewed the request and listed 6 documented accidents on Alanson and Golf Course; however, only two of the reported incidents were documented at the intersection of these two streets. The most recent incident was on 12/27/2021, and the one before that was in 2016. This intersection meets the Yield or Stop sign warrants per MUTCD in which it is an intersection of two minor streets where the intersection has more than three approaches and the ability to see conflicting traffic on an approach is not sufficient to allow a road user to stop or yield in compliance with the normal right-of-way rule if such stopping or yielding is necessary. Per the above condition meeting the warrant, the usage of a Yield sign would still be compliant with MUTCD; however, staff recommends the usage of Stop sign instead to allow for a better ability of observation from Golf Course Dr. of the conflicting traffic on Alanson Dr. This is especially true for the northeast quadrant of the intersection where the sightlines are limited. The reciprocal side of the intersection on Golf Course Dr. would then also get a Stop sign. Plaques on both signage indicating “cross traffic does not stop” could also help with awareness at the intersection. An additional possible step is to notify the area residents of this change and obtain any input as applicable. The proposed Stop signage is not necessarily detrimental to curbside parking but in its immediate area, there may be additional requirements for no parking, if deemed necessary so some input from the area residents may shine some light onto how they would view this change
- d. Commission Discussion:
  1. Commissioner Stewart questioned whether city staff had reached out to the resident. PWP Director Alpaslan responded that this request had come through a council member but indicated Lieutenant Whitley and police officers had discussed this with neighbors.
  2. PWP Director Alpaslan stated what Traffic Commission recommends, the city well proceed with.

3. Commissioner Zelenovich question whether the proposed stop sign would go on Golf Course Dr only and not on Alanson. PWP Director Alpaslan responded that this would be an option, or you could put stop signs on both Golf Course Dr and Allison, but not recommending Alanson alone.
4. Commissioner Schaefer recommended doing a four way stop at Golf Course Dr and Alanson. Commissioner Tiers responded that the stop should at least go on Golf Course but the day he drove on Golf Course, he saw more cars on Alanson.
5. Commission chairman Stewart, with no further discussion presented, called for a motion.

**Motion:** Commissioner Schaefer made a motion to place two stop signs at Golf Course Dr and Alanson as recommended by city staff with plaques below stop sign indicating cross traffic does not stop.

The motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

#### 6. Council Liaison Report

- A. Councilman Cusick extended a "Thank You" to Commissioners Tiers, Hughes, and Fuller for agreeing to serve additional terms on Traffic Commission and noted that these appointments were approved by City Council at last meeting.
- B. Quick trip Corporation has officially purchased and taken ownership of the property at the corner of North and South and Olive. Development of the property it's expected to begin this spring.
- C. The city has raised the level of the property at the corner of Midland and Olive above the floodplain.

#### 7. Miscellaneous Business

- A. Commissioner Tiers requested follow up on the Mayflower court neighborhood access to the school. PWP Director Alpaslan stated the city planning director had worked with the school and had resolved the situation.
- B. Commissioner Tiers requested follow up on the Shaftesbury, Wilson configuration. PWP Director Alpaslan stated this is still an open, outstanding issue.

8. Adjournment: No further business appearing, Commissioner Tiers made a motion to Adjourn, Motion was 2nd by Commissioner Hughes. Meeting Adjourned at 7:51 PM by Commission Chairman Stewart.

Respectfully submitted,  
Commissioner Dennis Fuller, Recording Secretary



## Department of Public Works

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 505-8560, Fax: (314) 862-0694

### STAFF REPORT

MEETING DATE: March 9, 2022  
Requestor : Staff  
Request: Crixdale Ln. Extension to the east and north to 82<sup>nd</sup> Blvd.-Olive Blvd.  
Attachments: Prospective layout of Crixdale Ln. as extended and pictures

---

#### **Existing Conditions:**



Crixdale Ln. – Coolidge Dr. intersection (looking east)

#### **Request:**

To review feasibility of Crixdale Ln. extension to east and north to 82<sup>nd</sup> Blvd.-Olive Blvd. intersection.

#### **Conclusion/Recommendation:**

Below are some notes from a preliminary analysis of the proposed extension:

- The creek and park located south of Crixdale present significant barriers to development opportunities for the parcels between Crixdale and Olive.
- Extending Crixdale Avenue further east to connect to Olive Boulevard will not have a significant impact on travel patterns.
- Extending Crixdale Avenue further east does not-- on its own-- improve development potential of the south side of the Olive Boulevard and does not open new development potential south of Crixdale.
- Based on the findings of the economic development plan, future land use on the norther portion of Olive in this area is not suitable for regional retail due to shallow lot depth. Three potential options for land use were recommended. It is advised that community engagement with the area residents take place to determine a preferred future before any further action is taken.
- Due to the physical restrictions, future land use on the southern portion of Olive in this area is not suitable for regional retail due to shallow lot depth and current building orientations.
- Assembling the various general commercial parcels on the south of Olive in the study area may provide some opportunity to clear the sites and construct a new building/ buildings with larger setbacks to accommodate smaller regional retail development. There would be no potential for out-parcels on these small regional retail sites due on the lot depth limitations resulting from the creek and park.
- To ensure the overall vision for the corridor as a gateway is preserved, it is recommended that further efforts be taken to determine what land use is preferred north of Olive Blvd, and then apply the appropriate complimentary land use strategy to the southern portion of the street.
- Crixdale is currently a low volume residential street. If additional traffic were to use the corridor as retail access or a cut-thru to avoid congestion at Olive, it may change the character of the street.

The discussion of this item is intended to produce comments/suggestions from the Traffic Commission to be taken into account for further feasibility analysis of the request.





Picture 1 – looking east



Picture 2 – looking east



Picture 3 – looking west





Picture 4 – looking east