

APPENDIX H

Site

Site ID	Site Type	Synthesis	#	Dir	Street	NRHP	Thumbnail
P774	Site	Avon Township School District No. 7 School Rochester Hills Oakland	2498	W	Tienken Rd	More Information Needed / No Determination Made	
P24389	Site	Clinton-Kalamazoo Canal Rochester Hills Oakland			John R Rd and Bloomer Rd	Listed on the National Register of Historic Places	
P24390	Site	Lawnridge Hall Rochester Hills Oakland	1385	S	Adams Rd	More Information Needed / No Determination Made	
P24391	Site	Meadow Brook Farms Rochester Hills Oakland	480	S	Adams Rd	National Historic Landmark, Listed on the National Register of Historic Places	
P24393	Site	Stoney Creek Village Historic District Rochester Hills Oakland			Northeast of Rochester Rd, Van Hoosen Rd and Runyon Rd	Listed on the National Register of Historic Places	
P24394	Site	Terry, Albert, House Rochester Hills Oakland	1081	W	Auburn Rd	determined NR eligible by staff	
P24395	Site	Winkler's Mill (demolished) Rochester Hills Oakland	6381		Winkler Mill Rd	determined NR ineligible by staff	
P28606	Site	2040 Livernois Rochester Hills Oakland	2040		Livernois	determined NR eligible by staff	
P38784	Site	1100 Mead Rochester Hills Oakland	1100		Mead	More Information Needed / No Determination Made	
P38785	Site	1081 E. Auburn Rochester Hills Oakland	1081	E	Auburn	More Information Needed / No Determination Made	
P38786	Site	1950 Avon Road Rochester Hills Oakland	1950		Avon Rd	More Information Needed / No Determination Made	
P38787	Site	1005 Dutton Rochester Hills Oakland	1005		Dutton	More Information Needed / No Determination Made	

Yates Property



Site

P38788	Site	1481 Dutton Rochester Hills Oakland	1481		Dutton	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38789	Site	Brewster Cemetery Rochester Hills Oakland			Brewster Rd	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38790	Site	1207 Livernois Rochester Hills Oakland	1207		Livernois	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38791	Site	1425 E. Auburn Rochester Hills Oakland	1425	E	Auburn	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38792	Site	56187 Dequindre Rochester Hills Oakland	56187		Dequindre	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38793	Site	1160 South Boulevard Rochester Hills Oakland	1160		South Boulevard	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38794	Site	1580 South Boulevard Rochester Hills Oakland	1580		South Boulevard	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38795	Site	1365 W. Tienken Rochester Hills Oakland	1365	W	Tienken	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38796	Site	1750 W. Tienken Rochester Hills Oakland	1750	W	Tienken	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38797	Site	2498 W. Tienken Rochester Hills Oakland	2498	W	Tienken	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38798	Site	1585 S. Rochester Rochester Hills Oakland	1585	S	Rochester	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38799	Site	1812 S. Rochester Rochester Hills Oakland	1812	S	Rochester	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38800	Site	1568 W. Avon Rochester Hills Oakland	1568	W	Avon	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38801	Site	2332 W. Avon Rochester Hills Oakland	2332	W	Avon	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38803	Site	1385 S. Adams Rochester Hills Oakland	1385	S	Adams	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38804	Site	800 W. Avon Rochester Hills Oakland	800	W	Avon	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38805	Site	861 E. Avon Rochester Hills Oakland	861	E	Avon	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38806	Site	1841 Crooks Rochester Hills Oakland	1841		Crooks	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38807	Site	3030 Crooks Rochester Hills Oakland	3030		Crooks	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38808	Site	71 North Livernois Rochester Hills Oakland	71	N	Livernois	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38809	Site	1021 Harding Rochester Hills Oakland	1021		Harding	More Information Needed / No Determination Made

Site

P38810	Site	2371 South Livernois Rochester Hills Oakland	2371	S	Livernois	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38811	Site	3610 South Livernois Rochester Hills Oakland	3610	S	Livernois	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38814	Site	23 Mile and Dequindre Rochester Hills Oakland			23 Mile and Dequindre	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P38816	Site	3861 Adams Rochester Hills Oakland	3861		Adams	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P47342	Site	1025 Washington Rochester Hills Oakland	1025		Washington	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P47841	Site	Ferry Court Historic District Rochester Hills Oakland			Wayside Park, bounded by East Hamlin Rd to the south,	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P48047	Site	Stoney Creek School #1 Fractional Rochester Hills Oakland	1051		Washington Rd	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P48132	Site	Demay-Potere Farm Rochester Hills Oakland			Campus of Rochester College, Section 15 of the city of Rochester Hills	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P49094	Site	Winkler Mill Pond Historic District Rochester Hills Oakland	1921, 1740, 6400, 6081, 6381, 6425, 6250		The NW side of Washington St starting where Stony Creek HD ends, and going to Dequindre Rd/ N on Dequindre to..., Washington, Washington, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill	
P49094	Site	Winkler Mill Pond Historic District Rochester Hills Oakland	1921, 1740, 6400, 6081, 6381, 6425, 6250		The NW side of Washington St starting where Stony Creek HD ends, and going to Dequindre Rd/ N on Dequindre to..., Washington, Washington, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill	
P49094	Site	Winkler Mill Pond Historic District Rochester Hills Oakland	1921, 1740, 6400, 6081, 6381, 6425, 6250		The NW side of Washington St starting where Stony Creek HD ends, and going to Dequindre Rd/ N on Dequindre to..., Washington, Washington, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill	

Site

P49094	Site	Winkler Mill Pond Historic District Rochester Hills Oakland	1921, 1740, 6400, 6081, 6381, 6425, 6250		The NW side of Washington St starting where Stony Creek HD ends, and going to Dequindre Rd/ N on Dequindre to..., Washington, Washington, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill	
P49094	Site	Winkler Mill Pond Historic District Rochester Hills Oakland	1921, 1740, 6400, 6081, 6381, 6425, 6250		The NW side of Washington St starting where Stony Creek HD ends, and going to Dequindre Rd/ N on Dequindre to..., Washington, Washington, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill	
P49094	Site	Winkler Mill Pond Historic District Rochester Hills Oakland	1921, 1740, 6400, 6081, 6381, 6425, 6250		The NW side of Washington St starting where Stony Creek HD ends, and going to Dequindre Rd/ N on Dequindre to..., Washington, Washington, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill	
P49094	Site	Winkler Mill Pond Historic District Rochester Hills Oakland	1921, 1740, 6400, 6081, 6381, 6425, 6250		The NW side of Washington St starting where Stony Creek HD ends, and going to Dequindre Rd/ N on Dequindre to..., Washington, Washington, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill	
P49094	Site	Winkler Mill Pond Historic District Rochester Hills Oakland	1921, 1740, 6400, 6081, 6381, 6425, 6250		The NW side of Washington St starting where Stony Creek HD ends, and going to Dequindre Rd/ N on Dequindre to..., Washington, Washington, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill, Winkler Mill	
P49378	Site	920 South Boulevard Rochester Hills Oakland	920		South Blvd	More Information Needed / No Determination Made
P51261	Site	Yates Cider Mill Rochester Hills Oakland	1950	E	Avon Rd	More Information Needed / No Determination Made



Dequindre Rd

Lido

E Avon Rd

Dequindre Rd

Properties that are within the jurisdiction of the City of Rochester Hills Historic District Commission

13-426-002

13-426-003

13-426-001

13-427-001

13-427-002

13-427-003

13-477-001

13-477-002

13-477-003

022

A person seeking to perform work on a resource within a historic district shall proceed as follows:

- (1) *Information for commission.* Any such person shall provide the information in this subsection to the historic districts commission at least three weeks prior to the meeting at which the matter is to be considered. All required information shall be submitted in duplicate and shall include the person's name and address. The scale used for plans and drawings shall be indicated in the lower right corner. The following information shall be included:
 - a. *Site plan.* A site plan drawn to an appropriate scale and describing, dimensioning and identifying all major features including property lines, main buildings, outbuildings, parking areas, drives, walkways, fences, major trees, significant variations in grade elevation, relationship to adjacent streets and structures, and the relationship of major features to property lines. A north point shall be indicated on the plan.
 - b. *Plans and elevations for structure.* Plans drawn to scale (minimum scale of one-quarter inch equals one foot for residential and one-eighth inch equals one foot for commercial) illustrating the entire exterior perimeter of new resources, existing resources on which work is to be done, and any proposed work, together with pertinent dimensions and depiction of major exterior features including doors, windows, bays, porches, architectural trim and elevations. Details pertaining to exterior building materials shall also be provided including types, finishes and colors, kind and size of exterior wall material, and other significant architectural information. A north point shall be indicated on all plans or drawings.
 - c. *Other descriptive material.* The commission may consider photographs, research material or other descriptive information provided.

The commission may relax or waive any of the information submission requirements in this subsection if the commission deems such information is not necessary to the commission's deliberations.

- (2) *Application to building department.* A person requesting to do any work on a resource within a historic district shall apply to the building department and make such application by completing a building permit application accompanied by payment of any fees required in division 1 of article V of chapter 54 of this Code. The application shall be accompanied by required plans and drawings.
- (3) *Building department review.* The building department shall review the completed application to ensure the proposed work will comply with applicable setback and other planning, zoning, and environmental requirements and any other applicable

ordinances.

- a. *Approval.* If the proposed work complies with applicable setback and other planning, zoning, and environmental requirements, the building department shall approve, in writing, the application and forward a copy of the application to the historic districts commission along with all required supporting materials that make the application complete.
- b. *Denial.* The building department shall deny or reject the application if the proposed work fails to comply with applicable setback or other planning, zoning, and environmental requirements or other applicable ordinances. The denial shall be in writing and shall detail the reason for the denial.

(Code 1976, § 4-06.07.02; Ord. No. 449, § 2, 10-20-1999)

Sec. 118-163. - Limitation on building permit issuance.

A building permit shall not be issued nor shall proposed work proceed under this division until the historic districts commission has acted by issuing a certificate of appropriateness or a notice to proceed.

(Code 1976, § 4-06.07.03)

Sec. 118-164. - Review by commission.

- (a) *Standards.* In reviewing plans submitted pursuant to this division, the historic districts commission shall follow the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, as set forth in 36 CFR 67. Design review standards and guidelines that address special design characteristics of historic districts administered by the commission may be followed if they are equivalent in guidance to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines and are established or approved by the bureau of history of the department of state. The commission shall also consider all of the following:
- (1) The historic or architectural value and significance of the resource and its relationship to the historic value of the surrounding area;
 - (2) The relationship of any architectural features of the resource to the rest of the resource and to the surrounding area;
 - (3) The general compatibility of the design, arrangement, texture, and materials proposed to be used; and
 - (4) Other factors, such as aesthetic value, that the commission deems relevant to its determination under the review standards and guidelines in this subsection.
- (b) *Basis for denial.* Denial of any application shall be based only on the considerations set forth in subsection (a) of this section.
- (c) *Interior arrangement review limitation.* The historic districts commission shall review and act upon only exterior features of a resource and shall not review and act upon interior arrangements unless interior work will cause visible change to the exterior of the resource.
- (d) *Grounds for issuing notice to proceed.* In addition to approval of an application pursuant to the standards contained in subsection (a) of this section, work within a historic district shall be permitted by the historic districts commission through the issuance of a notice to proceed if any of the following conditions prevail and if the proposed work can be demonstrated by a finding of the commission to be necessary to substantially improve or correct any of the following conditions:
- (1) The resource constitutes a hazard to the safety of the public or to the resource's occupants;
 - (2) The resource is a deterrent to a major improvement program that will be of substantial benefit to the community, and the applicant proposing the work has obtained all necessary planning and zoning approvals, financing, and environmental clearances;
 - (3) Retaining the resource will cause undue financial hardship to the owner when a governmental action, an act of God, or other event beyond the owner's control created the hardship, and all feasible alternatives to eliminate the financial hardship, which may

include offering the resource for sale at its fair market value or moving the resource to a vacant site within the historic district, have been attempted and exhausted by the owner; or

- (4) Retaining of the resource is not in the interest of the majority of the community.

(Code 1976, § 4-06.07.04)

The Secretary of the Interior is responsible for establishing standards for all national preservation programs under Departmental authority and for advising federal agencies on the preservation of historic properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

*The Standards for Rehabilitation address the most prevalent historic preservation treatment today: **rehabilitation**. Rehabilitation is defined as the process of returning a property to a state of utility, through repair or alteration, which makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions of the property which are significant to its historic, architectural, and cultural values.*

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

The standards that follow were originally published in 1977 and revised in 1990 as part of Department of the Interior regulations (36 CFR Part 67, Historic Preservation Certifications). They pertain to historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes, and occupancy and encompass the exterior and the interior of historic buildings. The standards also encompass related landscape features and the building's site and environment as well as attached, adjacent or related new construction.

The Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials for alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of

missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Note: To be eligible for Federal tax incentives, a rehabilitation project must meet all ten Standards. The application of these Standards to rehabilitation projects is to be the same as under the previous version so that a project previously acceptable would continue to be acceptable under these Standards.

Certain treatments, if improperly applied, or certain materials by their physical properties, may cause or accelerate physical deterioration of historic buildings. Inappropriate physical treatments include, but are not limited to: improper repointing techniques; improper exterior masonry cleaning methods; or improper introduction of insulation where damage to historic fabric would result. In almost all situations, use of these materials and treatments will result in denial of certification. In addition, every effort should be made to ensure that the new materials and workmanship are compatible with the materials and workmanship of the historic property.

Guidelines to help property owners, developers, and Federal managers apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are available from the National Park Service, State Historic Preservation Offices, or from the Government Printing Office. For more information, write:

National Park Service
Preservation Assistance Division-424
P.O. Box 37127
Washington D.C. 20013-7127

John Katers

From: David Conn
Sent: Wednesday, May 8, 2019 1:34 PM
To: 'jobrien@rcoc.org'; Brad Knight; Junco, Kelley K.; Siegel, Kimberly; davis@rochesterhills.org; roedigers@rochesterhills.org; kristine@kidorfpreservationconsulting.com
Cc: John Katers
Subject: Avon Dequindre 23 Mile - RH HDC pre design site visit notes
Attachments: YatesHistoricPropertyLocations.pdf

All,

Please find my notes from yesterday's meeting below. Please feel free to add / comment as necessary. I apologize if I have missed anyone, please forward if needed.

Thanks,

Avon / Dequindre / 23 Mile Corridor Analysis: Rochester Hills HDC Preliminary Planning Meeting with Rochester Hills DPS

Date and Time: 5/07/2019, 2:00 pm – 3:00pm

Location: onsite meeting

Meeting notes / takeaways:

- Kristen Kidorf (Kidorf Preservation Consulting) implied that The Rochester Hills Historic District Commission will focus on the two properties in their jurisdiction:
 - Please find a PDF attached from Paul Davis showing the properties hatched in green. (15-13-427-002 & 15-13-426-001)
 - Kristen recommended providing any potential improvement options to her for review and comment prior to submitting to the HDC
 - There was some question whether the HDC jurisdiction limits include the road ROW.
 - It might depend on the legal descriptions of the parcels but I don't know.
 - It was questioned due to pending a Great Lakes Water Authority (GLWA) water main project. (Not federally funded, will HDC approval be required if constructed in the ROW?)
- GLWA is proposing a 96 inch water main down the center of Dequindre road in front of Yates Cider Mill.
 - Paul thought that the GLWA indicated the water main would be constructed with open cut method.
 - Project is currently scheduled for 2020 construction
 - Design process is still in the preliminary stage – GLWA and RCOC are currently working on a RFP for design services
 - Project is not scheduled to utilize federal funding therefore a section 106 review (SHPO) is not required
- Yates facilities
 - Jeff noticed the condition of the Yates Cider Mill Building and recommended that a conditional survey be completed before any work is performed. (loose bricks in foundation)
 - Kristen noted that the existing Yates Mill and Mill Race are important historical elements to the HDC
 - Existing fence and brick pavers are thought to be newer (non-historical) elements that could potentially be replaced in-kind if impacted.

- David noted that existing slopes at the cider mill are not ADA compliant and would require significant changes) to force into compliance.
 - Not clear if ADA or HDC / SHPO jurisdiction will provide the final ruling design guidelines.
- It was discussed that the proposed pathway on the south side of the road would need to be installed approximately over the existing roadway shoulder to avoid impacts to the Yates facilities.
- Mill Race
 - The existing mill race from the Clinton river to the functioning water wheel at the mill is thought to be a historic in nature. It's alignment appears to run diagonal under the roadway from the inlet structure to approximately the center of the main cider mill building before bending to feed the water wheel.
 - The culvert pipe under the roadway is thought to be an elliptical corrugated metal pipe approximately 5' in height. The inlet on the north side of the roadway is a combination weir/grate structure adjacent to a poured concrete wall.
 - Information was provided by the property owner. He indicated that he cleans the pipe out every winter by boarding off the inlet and walking through the pipe shoveling as he goes.
 - The existing materials are newer in nature and are not original.
 - It might be that the functionality of the mill race is historic, but the actual physical structure materials are not?
 - If the proposed GLWA water main is installed via open cut method, as preliminary indicated, the existing mill race will likely be impacted / restored.
- If impacts are unavoidable, Kristen thought the preference would be to push the road and pathway to the northwest, encroaching on the existing mill race inlet vs increasing impacts to the existing cider mill property.
- The Cider Mill owner seemed in favor of pathway on both sides of the roadway and mentioned an existing drainage issue.
 - He indicated that currently roadway water sheets down toward the cider mill and collects near the mills main customer entrance.
- The property owner expressed concerns over prolonged / multiple year construction impacts to his business and asked that RCOC and GLWA efforts be coordinated into one construction season.
 - It was explained that this might be difficult as the bridge is funded for 2021 and the GLWA project is preliminary scheduled to begin construction fall of 2020.
- Intersection of 23 Mile and Dequindre Rd
 - Northeast property is developed with newer paved parking lot
 - Southeast property is an existing home (greater than 50 years old) associated with the Yates Mill. Prefer to keep the existing trees. The property is outside of HDC jurisdiction and not specifically flagged by SHPO.
 - West side of Dequindre is currently a gravel parking lot.
 - Area is included in the HDC jurisdictional limits however Kristen did not consider the gravel parking lot or cleared area to be historic in nature.
- Section 106 Review (SHPO)
 - The section 106 Review process has been started and available documentation has been provided to the project team.
 - RCOC / OHM are currently examining the available documents and investigating potential impacts. The topic will continue to be discussed during and after the proposed May 17th meeting.
 - Multiple houses are greater than 50 years old
 - Yates identified as a historic property
 - Trails / canal / other features
 - RCOC is currently in the process of determining the next steps regarding Tribal and Archeological reviews
- Avon Bridge over Clinton River

- Existing scour occurring behind the bridges south west wing wall. (on the outside of the bend on the north west side of Avon Rd)
- Discussed shifting the proposed bridge west to better align with the existing river alignment
 - Will need to check utility impacts
- Need to maintain under clearance for canoes and kayaks
- Jeff indicated that Bulb-Tee is preferred vs Box-Span (note this will result in +/- 1.5' elevation increase)

Thanks,

DAVID CONN, PE
PROJECT ENGINEER

OHM Advisors®
D (734) 466-4428 O (734) 522-6711

Advancing Communities®

OHM-Advisors.com | [twitter](#) | [facebook](#) | [vimeo](#) | [linkedin](#)

Award Winning By Design: Engineering News-Record (ENR)'s Top 500 Design Firms, 2018 | Crain's Detroit Business Cool Places to Work, 2018 | Metro Detroit's Best and Brightest Companies to Work For, 2018 | The Zweig Group Hot Firm List, 2018 | Columbus CEO Magazine's Top Workplaces in Central Ohio Award, 2016 | Zweig Group Best Firms To Work For, 2016

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

Meeting Summary

Avon / Dequindre / 23 Mile Corridor Study: Meeting with Yates

Date and Time: Wednesday, July 17, 2019 @ 10:00am

Location: RCOC – Yates Cider Mill

Desired Outcome of Meeting: Convey the proposed roadway concept and other key project elements to Yates representatives. Receive feedback and discuss next steps.

Attendees: Sign in sheet is attached.

- **Purpose of the Corridor Study:** Improve traffic flow, enhance vehicular / pedestrian safety, preserve historical / business / recreational / environmental context, and to replace the Bridge over the Clinton River
- **Findings of Corridor Study:**
 - E. Avon / Dequindre intersection is the bottleneck for traffic flow
 - Traffic signal option with five lane roadway will have substantial impacts to the surrounding areas and therefore is not a viable option.
 - Traffic signal option with extended or new turn lanes does not improve projected traffic flow
 - Roundabout option improves projected traffic flows and provides a better fit with existing constraints from a business, recreational, and environmental perspective.
- **Proposed Corridor Improvement Concepts:**
 - Roundabouts & Bridge over the Clinton River
 - Multi-lane roundabouts are proposed at both the intersection of E. Avon Rd @ Dequindre Rd and Dequindre Rd @ 23 Mile Rd.
 - Existing and estimated future traffic volumes have been studied and modeled vs various intersection improvements as a part of the corridor study. The proposed roundabout concepts resulted in the highest level of service for both intersections.
 - Based on recent information from the Great Lakes Water Authority (GLWA), it is highly likely that the 96" water main installation will occur after the RCOC's E. Avon Rd @ Dequindre Rd intersection and bridge project. The RCOC's E. Avon Rd @ Dequindre Rd intersection and bridge project is currently targeting a late 2021 construction start and a mid-summer 2022 for open to traffic / substantial completion. These dates are tentative. See "Schedule" discussion below. The RCOC's project limits would be at approximately the driveway to Yates Park.
 - The E. Avon Rd Bridge over the Clinton River will be replaced as a part of the RCOC's E. Avon Rd @ Dequindre Rd project. The roadway will be closed for the bridge replacement. The design and construction of the intersection and bridge will require significant coordination with multiple agencies. (FEMA - floodplain, OCWRC-66" inceptor sewer, Rochester Hills - 36" watermain, DTE Energy, AT&T, EGLE – Clinton River, MDNR – wildlife restrictions, and others)
 - Two Options for the lane configuration between the roundabouts have been evaluated (*Note: As of 8/14/2019, the RCOC has decided to proceed with Option A*):
 - Option A (3 Lane Section on E. Avon between roundabouts)
 - Three 11-foot lanes including a center left turn lane with standard curb and gutter
 - Potential for driveway consolidations, relocations, and left turn restrictions to improve safety and functionality.



- Rochester Hills Emergency Medical Services prefers this option due to reduced response times.
 - Yates indicated that they prefer this option.
 - Option B (Raised Center Median on E. Avon between roundabouts)
 - Two 12-foot lanes separated by a 5-foot mountable center median (excluding curb widths) with standard curb and gutter on the outside creating a boulevard.
 - All driveways become right in right out. Roundabouts would facilitate cross over / turn around maneuvers.
 - Raised median with right in/out driveways reduces the number conflict points at driveways.
 - Yates expressed concern about the capacity of the roundabouts due to U-turn movements for Option B. Rochester Hills Emergency Medical Services has indicated that they prefer Option A over Option B. Option B makes it more difficult to navigate the corridor during heavy flow periods potentially increasing response time.
 - Non-Motorized Improvements
 - 8' sidewalk is proposed for:
 - Both sides of E. Avon Rd between the two intersections (Dequindre and 23 Mile)
 - The southwest quadrant of E. Avon Rd and Dequindre Rd adjacent to the proposed road work.
 - All three sides of the proposed Dequindre and 23 Mile roundabout tying into the existing sidewalk infrastructure. Sidewalk will not be extended beyond the intersection on the northwest side of Dequindre Rd.
 - The feasibility of a pedestrian tunnel between the Yates Cider Mill and the Clinton River under E. Avon Rd was investigated. It was found that required tunnel heights, drainage and floodplain concerns, impacts to the existing grades, and surrounding land changes would likely be too impactful to Yates Cider Mill and Yates City Park.
 - Yates inquired if a pedestrian walkway could be constructed under the bridge. RCOC indicated that this would not be known until the detailed design.
 - A HAWK signal is being considered to facilitate pedestrians crossing E. Avon Rd in front of the Yates Cider Mill, approximately in the same location as the existing pedestrian crossing
- **Yates Cider Mill - Land Use Feedback, Concerns and Improvement Preferences**
 - Before the meeting started Mike Titus (owner of Yates Cider Mill) provided an exhibit showing their preferred improvements, which depicted roundabouts at both intersections, pedestrian path connecting the cider mill to the Dequindre Rd @ 23 Mile intersection, and rolled curb on the southeast side of E. Avon Rd in front of the mill to resolve an existing drainage problem.
 - The property in the southwest quadrant of E. Avon and Dequindre Rd is used as a pay for parking lot during peak cider mill operations. (separate ownership)
 - Yates indicated it would be ideal to have the Yates Trail / Clinton Kalamazoo canal continue via new bridge crossing over the Clinton River just downstream of the dam.
 - Yates expressed a desire to perform a traffic/parking analysis of their facilities this fall to better utilize the space available. Any updates to their parking lot beyond the driveway approaches would likely utilize gravel surfacing to maintain historic / country farm context.
 - The old home on the southeast side of E. Avon Rd (near the Clinton River and surrounded by mill parking) is currently being used for living purposes. They have no plans to demolish or repurpose the structure. Yates indicated they are open to consolidating some of the driveways on their property to improve traffic flow and safety. Yates indicated that it would be acceptable to consolidate the driveway to the old home and the driveway immediately to the northeast.
 - Yates is considering a new parking lot on the east side of Dequindre Rd south of the Clinton River bend. A pedestrian bridge to the cider mill would be constructed as a part of the project.



- A double trailer truck comes to the mill once a week during busy times. The truck utilizes the lot on the northeast side of the mill and typically approaches from the southwest and backs in. Trucks must back in as there is insufficient room to turn around. A refrigerated trailer is also permanently parked on this side of the mill. Yates is considering constructing a permanent structure built into the hill. The driveway servicing the home on top of the hill is used frequently.
- Yates described drainage concerns along E. Avon Rd on both sides of the mill. Today, water and gravel drain toward the front door to the mill with ponding along the main pedestrian pathway. The east side of the mill encounters a similar fate when the existing curb inlet clogs with debris or is overwhelmed during heavy rains.
- When roadway options were discussed (see above), Yates indicated that they preferred the center turn lane associated with option A.
- Mid-August – October is the busy season for Yates, accounting for ~80 – 90% of the annual sales. They have asked that construction efforts be scheduled to avoid impacts during mid-August - October.
- Yates inquired if the DTE pole near the mill can be buried. RCOC indicated that this pole is outside the limits of their project and resides within the limits of the GLWA project; Yates can make this request to GLWA.

- **Overall Schedule (Tentative)**
 - Corridor Study Report – Complete fall 2019
 - Fall 2019 - Begin detailed design for RCOC project (a new bridge over the Clinton River and roundabout at E. Avon and Dequindre Road). The RCOC's project design must be complete by May 2021 in order to meet federal funding obligations.
 - Construction Schedule and Maintaining Traffic Tentative Concept (*Note: The RCOC refined the construction schedule and maintaining traffic plan after the 7/17/2019 meeting based on feedback received from the Yates Cider Mill, especially regarding peak business timeframes. The schedule and maintaining traffic plan is subject to change, depending on detailed design.*):
 - November 2021 through March 2022 – Begin bridge construction. Close the east leg of the E. Avon Road and Dequindre Road intersection. Maintain NB to WB and EB to SB traffic only at the E. Avon Road and Dequindre Road intersection. Access to Yates Cider Mill would only be available from the Dequindre Rd @ 23 Mile Rd intersection.
 - March 2022 through July 2022 – Construct E. Avon and Dequindre Road roundabout and finish the bridge over the Clinton River. Close all traffic movements within the intersection. Access to Yates Cider Mill would only be available from the Dequindre Rd @ 23 Mile Rd intersection.
 - November 2022 and Spring 2023 – Turf restoration and punch list items primarily on the roadside. Two-way traffic is maintained with periodic lane closures under flag control.
 - GLWA Project schedule is not finalized. The following is the RCOC's understanding of GLWA's schedule, based on conversations with GLWA In June 2019:
 - Spring 2020 - Begin project design, permitting, and ROW acquisitions.
 - Design phase could take multiple years.
 - Construction efforts for the entire GLWA project, which extends several miles along Dequindre, are anticipated to last approximately 6 years.