



# Rochester Hills

## Minutes - Draft

### City Council Special Meeting

1000 Rochester Hills Dr.  
Rochester Hills, MI 48309  
(248) 656-4600  
Home Page:  
[www.rochesterhills.org](http://www.rochesterhills.org)

*Erik Ambrozaitis, J. Martin Brennan, Greg Hooper, Vern Pixley, James Rosen,  
Michael Webber and Ravi Yalamanchi*

*Vision Statement: The Community of Choice for Families and Business*

*Mission Statement: "Our mission is to sustain the City of Rochester Hills as the premier  
community of choice to live, work and raise a family by enhancing our vibrant residential  
character complemented by an attractive business community."*

---

Wednesday, September 3, 2008

6:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

---

In accordance with the provisions of Act 267 of the Public Acts of 1976, as amended, the Open Meetings Act, notice was given that a Special Rochester Hills City Council Meeting would commence at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, September 3, 2008 for the purpose of discussing the 2009 Proposed Budget.

## CALL TO ORDER

*Vice President Brennan called the Special Rochester Hills City Council Meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. Michigan Time.*

## ROLL CALL

**Present** 6 - J. Martin Brennan, James Rosen, Erik Ambrozaitis, Ravi Yalamanchi, Michael Webber and Vern Pixley  
**Absent** 1 - Greg Hooper

## Others Present:

*Ed Anzek, Director of Planning and Development  
Tracy Balint, Water/Sewer Project Engineer  
Bryan Barnett, Mayor  
Scott Cope, Director of Building/Ordinance Compliance  
Ron Crowell, Fire Chief/Emergency Management Director  
Kurt Dawson, Director of Assessing/Treasury  
Bob Grace, Director of MIS  
Mike Hartner, Director of Parks and Forestry  
Julie Jenuwine, Director of Finance  
Captain Mike Johnson, Oakland County Sheriff's Department  
Bud Leafdale, General Superintendent  
Pamela Lee, Director of Human Resources  
Jane Leslie, City Clerk  
Roger Moore, Professional Surveyor  
Roger Rousse, Director of DPS/Engineering*

*Paul Shumejko, Major Roads - Construction/Transportation Engineer*

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

**A motion was made by Ambrozaitis, seconded by Pixley, that the Agenda be Approved as Presented. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:**

**Aye** 6 - Brennan, Rosen, Ambrozaitis, Yalamanchi, Webber and Pixley

**Absent** 1 - Hooper

## PUBLIC COMMENT

*None.*

## LEGISLATIVE & ADMINISTRATIVE COMMENTS

**Mayor Barnett** made the following announcements:

- He would be distributing the proposed Deer Management Implementation Plan for Council's review today, along with additional information provided by Mike Hartner, Director of Parks and Forestry.

- The Art and Apples Festival was scheduled for this coming weekend in the Rochester Municipal Park. The Older Persons' Commission will be selling 3,000 apple pies as a fundraiser to support the Older Persons Center.

**Mr. Webber** announced that donations collected at the entrance to the Art and Apples Festival would go to the Paint Creek Center for the Arts, as well as support other local organizations including the Rochester Jaycees, Optimist Club and Rochester College. He also stated that he and Mr. Yalamanchi took part in a Virtual Mackinac Island Walk on the Clinton River Trail on Labor Day, along with three hundred walkers.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** thanked Mr. Derek Delacourt, Deputy Director Planning for his help with a resident's concern. He also expressed appreciation to Mayor Barnett for scheduling an upcoming meeting between residents and DTE.

**Vice President Brennan** congratulated Oakland University for partnering with Beaumont Hospital for a new Medical School, stating that this will result in jobs, research and some very good things for the community of Rochester Hills.

## PROPOSED 2009 BUDGET DISCUSSIONS

**(President Hooper entered at 6:34 p.m.)**

**Present** 7 - Greg Hooper, J. Martin Brennan, James Rosen, Erik Ambrozaitis, Ravi Yalamanchi, Michael Webber and Vern Pixley

**2008-0427** Discussion - Special Revenue Funds (200's) - 2009 Budget

**Attachments:** [Resolution.pdf](#)  
[081808 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)  
[082508 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)  
[090308 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)

### **MAJOR ROADS**

#### **202 - Major Road Fund/Revenue**

**Roger Rousse**, Director of DPS/Engineering, provided an overview of the Department of Public Service (DPS), stating that DPS is comprised of eight divisions and is responsible for managing, maintaining and operating City infrastructure. On a daily basis, the quality of life for more than 70,000 people are affected by DPS activities. The Department is shifting from a construction mode to a maintenance mode, and as such, staffing has been reduced from ninety-eight employees in 2003 to seventy-nine in 2009, a nearly twenty percent reduction in five years. To assist in this transition, broad-banding of job descriptions has been promoted to increase the flexibility needed to shift employees seasonally. A laborer who was reading water meters last year is repairing catch basins this year. An inspector who monitors construction in warm weather is performing sidewalk reviews in the winter. He gave the following staffing breakdown for the 79 employees, and stated that work crews are arranged on a daily basis for the tasks needed:

- 14 Light Equipment Operators
- 14 Technicians
- 11 Laborers
- 10 Managers
- 8 Clerical
- 6 Crew Leaders
- 5 Mechanics
- 5 Custodians
- 3 Heavy Equipment Operators
- 2 Pump Operators
- 1 Water Meter Technician

Mr. Rousse explained that the increasing workload due to the City's aging infrastructure, additional regulatory requirements and reduced staffing levels will challenge the Department for 2009. The 2009 DPS work environment includes a greater emphasis on environmental and conservation issues because the Department considers the services it provides as a cornerstone for quality of life in Rochester Hills.

Mr. Rousse gave an overview of Major Roads, stating that roads are the key to commerce and provide safe passage for residents and visitors of Rochester Hills. He stated that multiple road agencies are active in Rochester Hills, including the Road Commission of Oakland County (RCOC) and the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT). City roads provide connectivity with roadway networks,

including M-59, Auburn Road, Rochester Road and other County Roads. He stated that the City of Rochester Hills currently owns and operates over 37 miles of major roads. The Department of Public Service (DPS) through the Major Road Fund accounts for the maintenance, planning, design, construction, and improvement of the major road network. DPS also coordinates improvements to Oakland County's and the State of Michigan's road systems located within City limits in accordance with State Act 51 of the Public Acts of 1951 as amended. The DPS through their Major Road Fund recognizes needs as determined by the City's comprehensive 2007 Master Thoroughfare Plan and the Pavement Management System. DPS is responsible for winter maintenance activities, such as snow and ice removal, maintenance for 900 traffic signs, 375,000 feet of pavement striping and 500 pavement markings, and is responsible for performing traffic studies, traffic counts, traffic signal installation coordination, traffic sign fabrication and installation, bridge inspections, and special event traffic control coordination.

**Maintenance Objective:**

- Utilize the newly implemented Asset Management system to develop strategic programs for routine maintenance.

Mr. Rousse stated that the new Asset Management Program will provide an updated inventory, a condition assessment and maintenance strategies to prolong the life cycle of City owned assets.

Performance Indicators:

- Road and street sweeping is expected to increase in order to comply with the new and revised MS-4 standards including the duties required to properly dispose of the material collected from street sweeping and catch basin cleaning.
- Material collected through street sweeping is expected to increase.
- Winter maintenance responsibilities and number of hours required have increased since 2006. This is affected greatly by the amount of snowfall and frequency, and the increased traffic volume in the City.

**Significant Expenditure, Staff and Program Notes:**

\* 801000 / Professional Services decreased 85 % - \$29,230 due to an anticipated reduction in the number of private development projects and traffic studies, as well as a reduction in bridge inspections which are scheduled to occur every other year (2008,2010, etc.).

**Construction Objectives:**

**Paul Shumejko**, Transportation Engineer, gave a summary of upcoming projects:

- Hamlin Road Widening (East of Crooks to Livernois), includes a roundabout at the intersection of Hamlin and Livernois. The Federal Highway Administration funding is now in place. Bidding was estimated for November or December of 2008, with construction to commence in Spring of 2009. An educational component regarding roundabouts was also planned for residents.

- Crooks Road Rehabilitation (M-59 to Hamlin) including a short segment south of M-59. He stated that the Tri-Party Agreement for this work would be coming to Council shortly, however, this would be an interim fix, with base repairs and an overlay. The overpass, and adjacent road approximately 500 feet in either direction, remains under MDOT jurisdiction, and will not be done as a part of this project.
- Walton Boulevard Rehabilitation (Adams Road to the City Limits east of Livernois). Tri-Party funding can be utilized now, with Federal funding for 2011 used to reimburse the City for this work.
- Tienken Road Corridor Improvements:
  - \* Environmental Assessment (EA) is currently underway. The EA is 100 percent funded with a \$1.2 million earmark. All avenues are being explored as to what the improvements will entail, whether recommendation would be for a three-lane, five-lane or boulevard construction. A Public Hearing will be held to review the results of the EA.
  - \* Right of Way acquisition is expected for 2009 and 2010.
  - \* Construction is expected to commence in 2011.
  - \* Project to be coordinated with the replacement of the Stoney Creek Bridge in the Historic District in 2010 and Washington Road paving in 2012. The proposed replacement bridge will be a two-lane bridge with eight-foot shoulders and a pathway crossing incorporated on the south side of the bridge.
- Major Road Traffic Calming Program. This project relates to speeding within subdivisions and collector roads within subdivisions, most effectively controlled with the installation of speed humps. No City funds are available for installing these speed humps. If a subdivision wishes to pursue this, the funding must come from that subdivision. This project was included to gauge whether there would be Council support to contribute \$25,000 per year toward installing speed humps.

Mr. Shumejko outlined challenges in the area of Major Roads:

- Funding and project prioritization: Many roads are not under the City's jurisdictions and the City encounters difficulties in moving projects forward due to limited Federal dollars.
- Developing a policy on funding the rehabilitation of the City's "Industrial Park" concrete roads.

#### **Council Discussion:**

**Mr. Webber** inquired what the development of a program to install speed humps into subdivisions would cost.

**Mr. Shumejko** replied that the cost for speed hump construction is about \$2,500, which includes retrofitting an asphalt speed hump or molded concrete to a concrete road. Cost savings would be realized if the speed hump was made a part of a road rehabilitation or initial construction project. Additional costs associated with speed hump installation includes the costs for signage and paint markings, which the City has historically contributed and amounts to another \$300 per speed hump for installation and maintenance of these markings every other year or so. A longer roadway requires speed humps in series, and these could result in a \$7,000 to \$10,000 cost range for three or four speed humps.

**Mayor Barnett** stated that should this move forward, a Council policy for funding the installation of these speed humps was needed. He commented that there was an expectation on the City's side that there would be some contribution by a homeowner's association, but that a policy should be established as to what level of contribution that would be, and how a subdivision would get into the queue to have a speed hump project funded.

**Mr. Webber** stated that the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board could provide some expertise in developing a policy. He also commented that he was pleased to see the Crooks Road project moving forward.

**Mr. Shumejko** added that there were hopes that the State's work on the Crooks Road interchange would be reinstated, but that the projected date for that interchange work was now 2020. The Road Commission has now elected to put funding into the rehabilitation, with the hopes of realizing a 10 to 12 year life out of the work.

**Mr. Rosen** expressed disappointment that the interchange project was now delayed until 2020. He stated that while it was reasonable in his opinion to get a 12-year window out of the rehabilitation work; the money for a full 15-20 year life of a project would be wasted.

**Mr. Shumejko** added that the estimated cost is about \$700,000 to rehabilitate that stretch of Crooks Road.

**Mr. Rosen** asked for the cost to do a four-lane project, including the bridges, and questioned whether the City's share could be \$10 to \$12 million.

**Mr. Shumejko** replied that there were various estimates, but at one point the estimate was \$12 million just to do the bridge. He stated that bridge work could necessitate an upgrading of the ramps. He stated that there was already an M-59 widening project, from east of Crooks to Ryan Road. He stated that MDOT's priority right now is adding a third lane on M-59; and that project placeholder date is 2015. He stated that of the \$700,000 required for the Tri-Party Agreement to rehabilitate the surface, the City's share would be one third.

**Mr. Rosen** stated his opinion that the priorities of the City should be to complete the Crooks Road project, the Hamlin Road project and then move on to Dequindre, as these were critical roads to the City.

**Mayor Barnett** commented that the number they have heard for the State's project for a third lane on M-59 is approximately \$60 million dollars.

**Mr. Shumejko** stated that all of these projects have been in the queue for so long, that what originally was the adding of a third lane has now turned into a complete reconstruction project, almost doubling the original cost estimates.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** questioned what the City's share would be of the project to widen M-59.

**Mr. Shumejko** replied that he was not positive whether the City's share would be as low as three percent, and asked Mr. Davis to comment.

**Paul Davis**, City Engineer, stated that for the M-59 widening, he expected the City's share to be approximately 10 percent of the total project cost. Through Act 51, the City is required to participate 12.5 percent of the project, therefore 80 percent of the 12.5 percent equals 10 percent. On other MDOT projects, the City's share has often been 3 percent. For Crooks Road and the interchange project, the City would have a 3 percent share of the MDOT portion of the project. He commented that the City's share is not the same for each project.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** commented that it is important for the City to remember that no matter what the City's percentage of cost is, it is still City money. He expressed his concern over the amount of money that the City would have to earmark for this work, including future cost increases as these projects are delayed, and commented that the City should consider redirecting some other projects and priorities. He questioned how the City could guarantee that the work done on these projects would be up to acceptable standards. He commented that the Avon Road intersection at Adams Road was still substandard and bumpy even though work was done to address that road surface.

**Mr. Shumejko** responded that even though Oakland County did repair work on the existing surface last summer, because of the downward grade and damage from heavier vehicles, the repair did not last. He stated that Council would see that addressed in coordination with efforts for the upcoming Brooksie Way Half-Marathon to work on the pavement on Adams Road south of Walton Boulevard, where safety concerns were being raised because the pavement was peeling off of the concrete in the through lane. He stated that an asphalt contractor was on retainer doing work within the County and a Tri-Party Agreement could be arranged to resurface that entire stretch of Adams from Hamlin to Walton. He stated that as a part of that project, they could address about 800 feet of surface on west bound Avon.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** questioned whether the City could receive any guarantee from Oakland County that this repair would not have to be redone again at the City's expense.

**Roger Rousse** explained that more permanent repairs were planned for next year. He stated that both Adams and Avon are County roads, and the City has to work with the County's schedule for projects on these roads. He stated that this upcoming repair would improve that stretch greatly.

**Mr. Davis** stated that a discussion was held with Ms. Jenuwine approximately six to ten months ago about designating or reserving funds for large road projects. He stated that the City does have some larger fund commitments such as the M-59 project for the future.

**Public Comment:**

**Melinda Hill**, 1451 Mill Race, stated she was glad to hear updates on the

progress of these road projects. She is disappointed, however, that these updates come during the budgeting process. She expressed concerns about the following Road issues:

- Regarding the Tienken Road project, she stated that she was disappointed to see patches being done on other roads while Tienken was in such bad shape. She questioned whether a larger patch or repair could be done on the few areas of Tienken that were the worst, so that the winter season would not be as bad.
- Regarding Metro Act Funds, she commented that the City is receiving approximately \$200,000 per year, and last year's funding was slated for irrigation on the Livernois boulevard. She questioned the timing of funds for the Crooks Road boulevard work, the Adams Road work, and questioned what funding would be available in 2009.
- She questioned what the Fund Balance was for the Metro Act Funds and questioned whether these funds were being used annually for right-of-way maintenance. She expressed her opinion that the City should utilize these funds for all maintenance costs before allocating them to additional projects.
- She questioned what the annual maintenance would be for all the City boulevards, including lawn mowing and water.
- Regarding traffic calming, she expressed her concerns that the City may not be able to afford to do these projects. She stated that the neighborhoods should contribute toward these projects. She stated that if Council decides that the City should contribute toward subdivision traffic calming, it should make a firm determination of what roads would qualify.
- She questioned whether the Local Development Finance Authority (LDFA) had the funding available to do the Austin Road project, or whether the City would have to borrow to fund this.

**President Hooper** responded that there was \$100,000 allocated in the budget for right-of-way acquisition and \$100,000 for engineering for the Tienken Road project. He questioned what the timeline of events would be for this project.

**Mr. Shumejko** responded that the County has a \$1.2 million earmark which will go toward the Environmental Assessment and the Preliminary Engineering portion of the project, both commencing now. The City will not have any participation in those costs. The City's cost participation will begin next year once the right-of-way acquisition begins and that is estimated at \$2 million for 2009, and \$2 million in 2010. The City's ten percent share for 2009 would be \$200,000, and that would be the first cost that the City would see toward the project.

**President Hooper** commented that the budget currently shows \$100,000 each for right-of-way and engineering, and questioned whether that amount would be revised.

**Mr. Shumejko** replied that these new estimates were just received within the last three weeks.

**President Hooper** inquired whether these amounts should be adjusted in the Budget. He questioned how much should be allocated for engineering.

**Mr. Shumejko** reiterated that engineering for the project would be one-hundred



percent covered by the \$1.2 million earmark and that the \$100,000 currently in the budget could be moved over.

**President Hooper** asked when the construction would occur.

**Mr. Shumejko** replied that construction would possibly start in 2011 with carryover to 2012. He commented further on the coordination of the project with two others; The Stoney Creek Bridge replacement project has received funding from the Michigan Critical Bridge List. It will be replaced as a two-lane bridge with a pedestrian crossing on the south side, and would also incorporate some aesthetic features to blend with the museum area. He stated that it was yet to be determined what the City's participating share would be. The paving of Washington Road was slated for 2012.

**President Hooper** asked if the City has a Metro Act Fund balance reported in the City's budget.

**Ms. Jenuwine** stated that the Metro Funds are currently co-mingled into the Major Road Fund. An annual report is prepared and submitted to the State each March on these funds. To date approximately \$469,000 remains in the Fund. She stated that this included most, but not all of the expenditures for Livernois, which came in essentially at the budgeted amount. She stated that the Crooks Road project came in significantly under budget at \$60,000, rather than \$200,000. Routine maintenance costs are running between \$40,000 and \$50,000 currently, but with the increased number of boulevards, this figure was anticipated to increase. She stated that the CIP indicated that the future operating costs for those boulevards were approximately \$2,000 per mile.

**President Hooper** questioned whether the Adams Road irrigation figure could be revised, based on the Crooks project being completed under budget.

**Roger Rousse** responded that the costs for the Crooks Road project came in lower than estimated because of the preliminary work done during the road construction phase.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** commended Bud Leafdale for the flex-force type of management used on DPS personnel. He also questioned whether the Crooks Road interchange timing could be altered from a projected 12 years to 15 years.

**Mr. Shumejko** responded that the Road Commission has put that timeframe in there as an estimate. All that is known for certain is that the M-59 widening is not a part of MDOT's five-year plan; therefore the interchange is most likely not going to be done before the widening, which puts it in the range of the 2020 estimate.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** commented that it had become very challenging to drive on that section of Crooks. Regarding traffic calming, he hoped that the Engineering Department would put together a policy for Council to discuss, and indicated that a fifty-percent cost sharing could be explored.

**Mr. Shumejko** stated that, aside from the funding, there is policy in place as to

*what steps need to be taken by homeowner associations. Petitions need to be submitted by residents and 100 percent approval must be obtained from homeowners that directly abut the traffic humps. Once installed, if an association desires to remove them, the cost would be 100 percent to the association. He also stated that there is a policy in place as to the type of road eligible for speed humps, explaining that a road such as John R would not be eligible. A formal traffic study must also be submitted to the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board, with a Department recommendation.*

**Mr. Yalamanchi** questioned whether these policies were in a written form or were just by practice.

**Mr. Shumejko** stated that these are written guidelines, but did not believe they were formally adopted by City Council. He stated that the guidelines were approved by the Traffic Board dating back to approximately 1999.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** asked whether the policy could be formally presented to Council for adoption, including a policy regarding funding. He commented that there were funds in the Local Roads budgeted for Traffic Calming.

**Mr. Shumejko** confirmed this, stating that originally it was intended that traffic calming on local streets would receive 50/50 funding and major collector roads would be 100 percent City-funded. He explained the reason for suggesting that major collector roads be funded at 100 percent was because the collector roads are wider, straighter and have a long design presenting more need for the calming. These roads were also funded through Major Roads.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** stated he would be open to the City not requiring a contribution if a construction or rehabilitation project was already in process; however, if an association were to come in and specifically ask for traffic calming, they would be required to contribute. He then questioned why the boulevard improvement at Adams was proposed, rather than boulevard improvements for Hamlin.

**Mr. Rousse** responded that Hamlin project was set for the following year and would include the entire section from Auburn Hills to Livernois. He stated that these projects are being consolidated based on available funding and to combine projects whenever possible.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** questioned how the funds were budgeted from year to year and how they carried on to the next year. He asked whether these figures were influenced by the timing of the projects.

**Mr. Rousse** explained that the City has a number of outstanding projects, including Drexelgate, Meadowfield and Adams that are yet to be completed this year. He stated that he was not aware of any project that had been set aside. Some may carry over to next year for restoration, but he expected to utilize all the funding.

**Mr. Shumejko** added that the Hamlin Road project was included because there was the potential that construction would begin this fall. He stated that \$1.2 million of the funds budgeted for 2008 would be moved to 2009.

**President Hooper** asked for clarification whether the \$2.5 million included in the Budget for Hamlin Road in 2009 would be increased by the remaining \$1.2 million from 2008.

**Mr. Shumejko** confirmed that whatever had been earmarked for 2008 will be carried over and added to the 2009 Budget.

**Mr. Davis** added that the City has made some right-of-way payments on Hamlin to date and still has some obligation outstanding. He explained that there was a point where the City thought the project would commence in 2008; however, the bidding will most likely occur in November, with some utility relocation occurring either at the end of this year or the beginning of 2009. Some monies will be spent in 2008, but most likely not all that was budgeted previously.

**Ms. Jenuwine** stated that the Hamlin Road project only has \$220,000.00 allocated in the current Budget. The original figure of \$1.2 million was reduced in the Second Quarter Budget Amendment.

**Discussed.**

**2008-0431** Discussion of the Capital Funds (400's) - 2009 Budget

**Attachments:** [Resolution.pdf](#)  
[081808 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)  
[082508 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)  
[090308 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)

**MAJOR ROADS:**

**442 - Transfer Out**  
**452 - Construction**  
**462 - Routine Maintenance**  
**472 - Traffic Service**  
**482 - Winter Maintenance**  
**492 - Administration**

**See Legislative File 2008-0427.**

**Discussed.**

**2008-0427** Discussion - Special Revenue Funds (200's) - 2009 Budget

**Attachments:** [Resolution.pdf](#)  
[081808 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)  
[082508 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)  
[090308 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)

**LOCAL STREET FUND:**

**203 - Local Street - Revenue**

**Mr. Rousse** stated that the mission of the Local Street Fund is to facilitate the development, maintenance, and operation of the local street system through accepted engineering standards in order to meet the community's needs for a safe, efficient, and cost-effective local street system. The condition of our local roads contributes to home values as well as to the quality of life in residential neighborhoods. The Local Road Fund is challenged due to the advanced age of the City's roadways. With proper maintenance and overlays, the life-cycle of a road is between 20 and 30 years. Many of the City's local roads that were constructed between the 1970s and the 1980s are now in need of repaving.

Mr. Rousse gave the following information regarding the City's local road system:

- The City has 237 miles of local roads.
- All but approximately 24 miles of these local roads are paved. The gravel roads require an average of eight gradings and five applications of chloride per year.
- Routine maintenance activities include crack sealing, concrete slab replacement, limited asphalt overlays/repairs, and storm sewer/catch basin cleaning.
- Winter activities include snow and ice removal.
- The City maintains 5,700 traffic signs and 150 pavement markings.
- The City is responsible for performing traffic studies, traffic counts, traffic sign fabrication and installation, and bridge inspections.

Mr. Rousse explained that if the City is not expending maintenance activities on the 237 miles of roadway each year, it is not keeping up with the deterioration rates. He further explained that climatic changes, including frost and freeze cycles in winter, and heat producing dust conditions on gravel roads in summer, present challenges that are reflected in the local road performance indicators. He stated that last year was a particularly difficult year for maintenance due to the weather. The rate and volume of the snowfall was excessive last year. Each year, the City does what it can to prolong road life and prepare for the seasons.

**Construction Objectives:**

**Mr. Shumejko** reviewed the following current and upcoming 2009 Local Road projects:

- LS-01, Subdivision Street Rehabilitation Program Construction
  - \* Juengel Orchards Subdivision
  - \* Eysters Avon Gardens
  - \* Glidewell Subdivision
- LS-03, Local Street Concrete Slab Repair Program Construction
- LS-12, Local Street Traffic Calming Program Construction.
- Ongoing Pavement Managing Surveys (Road Matrix).

**Goals:**

- Identify long-term funding sources to implement into the Local Street

*Improvement Plan that will provide for consistent operation, maintenance, reconstruction, and rehabilitation programs for all neighborhood streets.*  
*- Implement the Local Street Improvement Plan as detailed in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).*

*Mr. Shumejko listed the challenges presented to the Local Road Funding program:*

- In 2008, 17 miles (seven percent) of local roads were rated in poor condition. These roads are predominantly concrete in the northern end of the City constructed during the late 70s to early 80s with failing storm structures creating voids underneath the roadway. Fifty-eight miles (25 percent) were rated in fair condition; and 162 miles (65 percent) were rated in good condition.*
- Ongoing challenges with the local road concrete slab replacement program include a perception of inequity amongst many residents as to how areas are selected for reconstruction. He stated that priorities are set based upon intersections, traffic volumes, and areas of catch basin failing. Due to limited funding, there is frequently a stopping point identified where repairs do not continue. He highlighted several subdivision in the northwest part of the City that have concrete roads in need of rehabilitation, and included Cumberland and Heatherwood.*
- "Log" job format for performing road rehabilitation projects, while successful, presents constructability challenges in the field as no formal design plans are developed for many of these repairs. Decisions are made as field conditions are encountered.*

**Public Comment:**

***Melinda Hill***, 1451 Mill Race, questioned whether the subdivision projects mentioned were strictly overlay or if they were new construction projects. She questioned whether the original SAD projects included overlay costs.

***President Hooper*** confirmed that these subdivision projects were an overlay.

***Mr. Shumejko*** responded the road policy in its earlier form, from 1993 or 1994, included a four-inch cross section to keep costs down to the residents. He stated that at the time, it was intended that the City's regular road funding dollars would provide the overlay within that 15-year window that the assessments existed.

***Ms. Hill*** commented that she did not recall a discussion of that aspect of the road policy when she sat on City Council. She reiterated her concerns for future funding, based on economic forecasts and expressed her hopes that residents would be willing to vote some type of millage toward Local Roads in the next two years. She requested that Council reconsider amounts intended for Local Roads, to preserve future funds. She stated she was not generally in favor of the City taking on the expense of traffic calming on local roads.

**Council Discussion:**

***President Hooper*** commented that there was a shortfall between Act 51

revenues, fees and permits of approximately \$3 million dollars, which is transferred from the General Fund to maintain Local Roads. He stated that these shortfalls would not go away, and attempts were made to address them on several failed millages. He noted that \$50 million was in the Capital Improvement Project for the next ten years for local road construction, just to maintain serviceability. He questioned if the repairs were allocated to the construction portion of the budget.

**Bud Leafdale**, General Superintendent, responded that repairs were allocated to the Maintenance portion of the Budget.

**President Hooper** questioned what portion of the \$2 million for local road maintenance was spent by City crews doing spot concrete replacement.

**Mr. Rouse** responded that the City has been supplementing the road repair budget as a stop gap to keep road service going. He outlined the magnitude of the City's work, stating that the 2006-2007 project year included approximately 24,000 square yards of concrete removal and replacement; while this year approximately 29,000 square yards are targeted. He stated that larger projects are bid out to vendors and the City does smaller projects and spot repairs. A good portion of these repairs include catch basin work. He explained that approximately one-quarter of the spot work, including emergency repairs, is done with in-house crews.

**President Hooper** stated he did not disagree with using in-house crews for spot work, but noted that it is more costly to do the work in-house. On a larger project, it could be a significant cost differential to use a vendor. He questioned what portion of the \$2 million budget was spent on in-house forces.

**Mr. Rouse** responded roughly \$50,000 was spent in-house.

**President Hooper** commented that Council would have an upcoming discussion regarding whether asphalt roads should be rehabilitated with asphalt and concrete roads be rehabilitated with concrete.

**Mr. Pixley** asked for an example of a street that might qualify for traffic calming.

**Mr. Shumejko** responded that Kilburn and Tower Hill could qualify. He further explained that the Department receives complaints about speeding and cut-through traffic from many subdivisions that are sandwiched between two main roads, when during times of main road congestion, drivers seek alternate routes. He stated that traffic counters are installed in a study area to evaluate speeds, and calculations are made as to what traffic is internal and what is cut-through. Subdivision speeds are considered exceedingly high if the 85th percentile speed is at 30-31 miles per hour or above. The Traffic Board would then recommend locations for the speed humps. He commented that residents frequently request stop signs; however, the Department follows the strict guidelines of the Michigan Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices when deciding whether a stop sign is warranted. He stated that the speed hump is a physical object in the roadway that forces the driver to slow down. He stated that traffic humps on Powderhorn Ridge have been successful.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** questioned whether the City performed a cost analysis to determine whether using outside vendors were more cost-effective for these projects.

**Mr. Rousse** responded that the Department reviews the priority of these projects as well as performing cost analyses. He stated that the new MS-4 requirements have placed a strict limit on the suspended solids, which impacts the City's 12,000 catch basins, sanitary sewer outlets and manholes. He noted that the age of these structures present a challenge to the Department. He stated that approximately 90 percent of all repairs are by a structure. He further commented that the Department also needs to maintain a level for emergency services.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** questioned whether the Department could use its crews for emergencies, giving the maintenance and the repairs of the multitude of structures to an outside contractor.

**Mr. Rousse** stated that he would further discuss manhole and catch basin repairs during the Drains portion of the Budget discussions. He stated it would still be beneficial for the City to provide the emergency repair services; and there were instances where the Department does provide more economical services than a vendor. He explained that equipment was one of the biggest costs, based on Act 51 rates. He stated his Department provides quality and expeditious work, moving from project to project more flexibly than a larger contractor could.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** responded that he had no issues with the quality of work provided by City crews, but requested Mr. Rousse look further into the efficiencies that using a vendor could provide. He questioned whether the City does the design work for road repairs.

**Mr. Rousse** stated the City does not have an engineer do a formal design for repairs. He stated that there are some rough sketches done, and the vendor is instructed to take everything out, and then put it back in a repaired state. He explained further that the Department does some limited survey, analysis and topographic work, but does not complete a full engineering study as would be common for major road repaving. He stated that the Department has saved approximately five to ten percent of costs by doing this work as "log jobs" rather than engineered studies. He commented that this does come with risk that something unexpected could be encountered.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** questioned how the asset management system was working.

**Mr. Rousse** stated that the Constituent Inquiry System is now up and running. He explained that the system is about 70 to 80 percent up on Water and Sewer, 50 to 60 percent on Roads, and 30 to 40 percent on Drains. The Facilities portion is just beginning. The first portion is a completion of inventory and the second portion is a condition assessment. He explained this portion as assessing what condition is it in, identifying the remaining life cycle, and determining whether the Department intervenes with repair strategies. He estimated that the program would be fully populated and implemented by the end of 2009.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** stated that at some point he would request a report on the benefits the program generated, to gauge whether this investment was worthwhile to the City.

**Mr. Rousse** stated that he could provide some examples during the Drains portion of the budget discussion.

Responding to Mr. Yalamanchi, **Mr. Davis** commented that the City is already doing much of what he suggests, in determining what work should be contracted out and what should be done in-house. He stated that the City does not have the staff available to do all of the concrete repairs necessary, and has limited funding for staff to address all of the concerns. He stated that there are additional costs expended by DPS personnel in coordinating a project, even if done by an outside contractor, as in inspections and construction coordination. He commented that when a DPS crew goes out to make an emergency repair, it is not necessary for engineering to produce a design for the repair, or inspections to be done on the crew's work. He stated that the inspection component is tacked on to work done by contractors. He further stated that emergency repairs cannot wait for contract bids, and explained that a repair on a watermain break had to be accomplished immediately. He also stated that many times work is done in-house because no contractor has bid on the job. He pointed out that DPS does pick and choose what is done in-house and what is contracted out.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** reiterated that he is not questioning the quality of work, but suggested the Department look at the cost analysis in order to best use City resources. He stated that if there was opportunity to contract out the bulk of the work, City resources could be shifted to emergencies.

**President Hooper** agreed with Mr. Yalamanchi, stating that if the City can send the work to a contractor and spend half of what is being spent in-house, in-house forces could be redirected to other priority items. He then questioned whether an overall pavement quality index existed for the Local Road system, to compare the level of the roads in 2008 to those in 2006 or 2007.

**Mr. Shumejko** responded that he could provide that information, but did not have it with him.

**President Hooper** commented that with the money expended in the last couple of years, the local road system could be found to be in a "fair" condition rather than a "poor" condition.

**Mr. Shumejko** stated that once the survey is completed at the end of this month, it will provide a good indication on how the network has improved.

**President Hooper** stated that at a minimum, the survey would give the City an indication how conditions are overall. He commented that the City cannot continue to transfer \$5 million from the General Fund to Local Roads, and could move



downward to the \$3 million level which the City is obligated to spend to provide for the operation. The City would stand to lose the Capital Improvement Program unless another funding sources is identified.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** questioned the MS-4 requirements, and asked about the financial obligations of the City for these requirements.

**Mr. Rousse** responded these costs would be covered in the Drains discussion. He stated that Roger Moore has a spreadsheet detailing these costs as they relate to water quality. He commented that the requirements are very stringent, and suspects that these requirements will be updated again in another five years.

Responding to President Hooper's request for an updated condition index on the roads, **Ms. Jenuwine** stated that the current CIP covering the period 2009 through 2014 contained a local street conditions map which is color-coded by condition. She stated that these roads do show a significant improvement from the prior CIP.

**President Hooper** stated he was aware of that, but was looking for a concrete number to prove the City was making headway. He stated that the City could come to a point where the number would not continue to improve, but could begin to reverse due to lack of funding.

Discussed.

2008-0431 Discussion of the Capital Funds (400's) - 2009 Budget

**Attachments:** [Resolution.pdf](#)  
[081808 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)  
[082508 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)  
[090308 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)

**LOCAL STREET FUND:**

**444 - Transfer Out**

**454 - Construction**

**464 - Routine Maintenance**

**474 - Traffic Service**

**484 - Winter Maintenance**

**494 - Administration**

**See also Legislative File 2008-0427.**

Discussed.

2008-0427 Discussion - Special Revenue Funds (200's) - 2009 Budget

**Attachments:** [Resolution.pdf](#)  
[081808 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)  
[082508 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)  
[090308 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)

### **214 - Pathway Maintenance Fund**

**Roger Rouse**, Director of DPS/Engineering, gave an overview of the Pathway System, stating that the City of Rochester Hills currently maintains approximately 83 miles of pathways that have been constructed through City funding and/or private development. The City also maintains a 4.5 mile stretch of the Clinton River Trail. Pathway maintenance includes mowing, patching, sealing, repairing, plowing, tree trimming, sweeping, and other efforts to keep the Pathway System in a safe condition for public use and enjoyment. On November 7, 2006, the voters of Rochester Hills approved a millage of 0.1858 mill for twenty years through FY 2026 in order to construct, maintain and repair pathways and surfaces for use by bicycles, non-motorized vehicles, and pedestrians along main, arterial and collector roads, the Clinton River Trail, and to create linkages to pathways and schools in the City. He stated that 1.3 miles of pathway would be added for this year, along with 1.4 for next year.

#### **Significant Changes:**

\* 801000 / Professional Services decreased 89% - \$40,550 due to the completion of the ADA Transition Evaluation and the Non-Motorized System Evaluation (PS-03) in FY 2008, also due to a reduction in bridge inspections as they are schedule to occur every other year (2008, 2010, etc.)

#### **Objectives:**

- Perform a GIS based conditional inventory for the entire pathway system to locate and identify deficiencies in the network that can be repaired via the annual Pathway Rehabilitation Program (PW-01).
- Develop a transition plan for reaching compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
- Continue the planning, design, construction, and if necessary, right-of-way acquisition for improvements based on the following projects listed in the CIP:
  - \* PW-01 Pathway Rehabilitation Program
  - \* PW-02A Hamlin Pathway (Crooks - Livernois)
  - \* PW- 07C Adams Pathway (Powderhorn - Tienken)
  - \* PW - Tienken Pathway (Livernois - Sheldon)
  - \* PW-31B John R Pathway (Auburn - 2,300 Southbound)
  - \* PW-31C John R Pathway (Hamlin @ NW Corner)
  - \* PW-31E John R Pathway (Avon - Bloomer)
  - \* PW-43 Rain Tree Pathway (Adams - Firewood)
  - \* PW-49D Avon Pathway (Old Perch - Stag Ridge)
  - \* Clinton River Trailway - Bank Stabilization

**Paul Shumejko**, Transportation Engineer, gave an overview of the following current projects:

- Annual Rehab Program, involving anything from overlaying to crack sealing, including ramp upgrades at the intersection approaches.

- The new Hamlin Road pathway to fill in the gaps and upgrade the existing pathway to ADA compliance.
- The John R pathway on the east side from Avon to Bloomer Park will carry into the park to meet the parking lot area.
- The Adams Road pathway on the east side from Powderhorn to Tienken.
- The John R pathway, about 300 feet south of Auburn to complete the pathway constructed this year.

Mr. Shumejko stated that challenges facing Pathways relate to upgrading necessary to be compliant with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Requirements. He stated that the City utilizes the "log job" format for these projects as well, which is basically upgrading existing pathways, performing a small amount of schematics, using aerial photos to identify these areas, and then going out and resurfacing it. He stated that the City has unique grades and topography which exceed the five percent slope for handicapped ramps, necessitating the need for retaining walls in order to bring the grades into compliance. He explained that a ramp could cost as much as \$10,000, and an intersection could be as much as \$25,000 to \$50,000 just for ramping. He stated that many of the pathway segments remaining to be constructed have drainage issues, such as crossing creeks and streams, or bridges or drain extensions required. He also stated that challenges exist to obtain easements from property owners, as not all of the pathways can be contained within the full right-of-way.

#### **Council Discussion:**

**Mr. Rosen** asked for clarification of the policy to install pathways on both sides of roads.

**Mr. Shumejko** responded that the Master Thoroughfare Plan calls for pathways on both sides of the road, but it was not explicitly stated in a policy. The City has set up a ranking form to prioritize pathways, consisting of ten to twelve items which are weighted. One of the items weighted is whether a pathway already exists on one side of the roadway. Also factored in are pedestrian crashes, linkages to trailways or parks, and access to schools. If a roadway provides a direct link to an existing school, it would be weighted to earn the project additional points.

**Mr. Rosen** questioned whether Mr. Shumejko knew how many miles of major roadways, or quarter-mile segments, had no pathways on either side.

**Mr. Shumejko** responded that he did not have that information with him, but that the majority of the major roads had pathways on at least one side.

**Mr. Rouse** cited one roadway not having a pathway was John R north of Avon.

**Mr. Rosen** stated that he would like to see a pathway on at least one side of each major road before having a pathway on both sides, unless it was to complete an existing segment or was a heavily traveled area to a school. He cited Adams between Powderhorn and Tienken and noted that there was a pathway on one side with an easy crossing location. He commented that the City should focus its money on completing the network on at least one side of each road.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** questioned whether as a result of the ADA Requirements the City had enough money with the dedicated millage for the Pathway Fund.

**Mr. Rousse** stated that the ADA requirements were greatly increasing the costs due to Rochester Hills' terrain, and commented that it would definitely reduce the number of miles the City would be able to do this year and prolong the ultimate goal of having all the pathways in place. He stated that prioritizing these projects to look at connectivity, schools, and high traffic is critical. He expressed doubts that all the pathways would be in before the millage expires.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** asked Mr. Rousse whether he saw ADA requirements becoming even more stringent for the future.

**Mr. Rousse** responded that the City was required to provide a transition plan to convert all of the existing pathways to ADA-compliance. He stated that the City will need to make decisions on whether to build new pathways or rehabilitate existing ones. These requirements will reduce the volume that the City will be able to do with the limited amount of money available.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** questioned whether the ADA requirements allow a grandfathering in of existing pathways or would the entire system have to be redone at some point.

**Mr. Shumejko** said potentially yes, the City would have to redo the existing pathways to become compliant. He stated that many of the requirements that are now being enforced for public rights-of-way were originally designed for building access. Subsequently, a coalition of communities to review the situation has been formed, a U.S. Access Board, to look at this situation to determine if any relief could be given to communities. One of the guidelines being discussed would allow more leeway in hilly terrain, and allow a community to follow the grade and contour of the road. These guidelines have not been finalized yet, so the City must still follow the existing stringent guidelines. As part of the Act 51 dollars, the City is required to spend one percent of funding toward pedestrian facilities. If milling or overlaying an existing roadway, any ramps adjacent to the roadway must be upgraded. Any work done on pathways other than routine maintenance requires an upgrade to current ADA guidelines.

**Mr. Davis** added that the \$13.6 million raised for pathways over the life of the millage was dedicated as a rule of thumb for one-third maintenance, one-third rehabilitation and one-third new construction. The maintenance component includes plowing pathways in the wintertime, minor repairs including crack sealing or utility cut repairs. Monies beyond maintenance in any given year are rolled into 403 - Pathway Construction Fund, which includes the rehabilitation component, which is overlaying existing pathways. His estimation is that there will not be enough funding to do all the construction projects.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** expressed concern that maintenance costs will keep increasing. He stated that he somewhat agreed with Mr. Rosen regarding ensuring that

pathways are built on one side of roadways. He commented that the John R project heading into Bloomer Park is overdue and he was glad to see that being done.

**Mr. Shumejko** commented that the John R pathway was a good example of how originally a pathway was proposed for both sides. However, based on field issues encountered, it was decided to put the pathway on one side.

**President Hooper** recapped the Pathways budget, stating that the millage brings in \$680,000 per year, and \$340,000 is transferred out to the construction fund, leaving \$340,000 for maintenance activities. He questioned the increase in Interfund Charges over the past couple of years.

**Julie Jenuwine**, Fiscal Director, explained that the administrative fee in the maintenance fund is included in the construction budget. When there are increases in pathway projects for capital costs, there will be an increase in the Interfund Administrative Charge.

**President Hooper** commented that if less dollars are spent, there would be less administrative fees. He stated that only \$100,000 are apportioned to labor costs in the Pathway budget which is primarily for inspection.

**Mr. Shumejko** stated he was not sure that included the Forestry Department for tree and brush trimming.

**Ms. Jenuwine** stated that there was an Interfund charge for Forestry for brush clearing.

**President Hooper** stated that if that stays consistent, and pathway construction funding remains at \$340,000 transferred out to construct, the City is obviously spending down Fund Balance, which it should be, on building pathways. After this year, the City will only have \$508,000 left in our Fund Balance. If the City transfers out another \$340,000, with another million dollar construction budget for 2010, the City would be done for construction funding. He stated that basically this year the Budget contains \$300,000 for pathway rehabilitation which goes along with the ADA compliance. Between rehabilitation and maintenance operations, snow plowing, seal coat, etc., that will be the Pathway program after 2010.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** questioned Mr. Shumejko whether there was discussion by the Pathway Committee for construction of a pathway on Firewood.

**Mr. Shumejko** responded that there was, and stated it was PW-19 in the CIP.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** commented that the City was not doing Firewood in this budget year, only Rain Tree.

**Mr. Shumejko** responded that was correct, as the Rain Tree project ranked higher and was scheduled earlier. Firewood would be done in a subsequent year, with 2011 design and 2012 construction.

*Mr. Yalamanchi commented that he was surprised that it ranked lower because of the higher speeds on Firewood.*

*Mr. Shumejko stated that Rain Tree had much open space for the subdivisions and they have preliminarily indicated that they would grant the easements required at no cost. Having no easement costs gave the Rain Tree project a higher points value for consideration.*

*Mr. Yalamanchi commented that he did not believe that right-of-way for Firewood would be difficult.*

*Mr. Davis stated that homes abutting Rain Tree made it easier because the homes are rear-facing and back the common areas. He did not believe any homes would actually face the pathway. He added that Rain Tree also provides a direct link to the Village Mall where Firewood does not, which would also earn additional points for consideration.*

*Mr. Yalamanchi stated he would like to see Firewood done as well due to traffic concerns.*

*Mr. Rosen expressed concern that the subdivisions for Rain Tree and Powderhorn have open space plans as a part of their site plan. He questioned whether the subdivisions could grant easements on their property without site plan approval. He stated that he did not want to put Associations in violation of their own subdivision rules, deed restrictions or open space plans.*

*Mr. Rousse stated that was a concern that he would follow up on.*

**Discussed.**

**(Mr. Rosen exited at 8:04 p.m. and returned at 8:08 p.m.)**

**2008-0431** Discussion of the Capital Funds (400's) - 2009 Budget

**Attachments:** [Resolution.pdf](#)  
[081808 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)  
[082508 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)  
[090308 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)

**403 - Pathway Construction Fund**

**See Legislative File 2008-0427.**

**Discussed.**

**(Recess - 8:16 PM to 8:33 PM)**

2008-0432 Discussion of the Water and Sewer Funds (500's) - 2009 Budget

**Attachments:** [Resolution.pdf](#)  
[081808 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)  
[082508 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)  
[090308 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)

**WATER & SEWER FUND**

**510 - Sewer - Operating**

**530 - Water - Operating**

**593 - W & S Capital**

*Roger Rouse, Director of DPS/Engineering, gave an overview of the Sewer Division, stating that Rochester Hills has an extensive public sanitary sewer system that transports sewage flow to the Detroit Waste Water Treatment Facility. Rochester Hills is served by two main sewer districts, the Clinton Oakland System which was established in 1964 and the Gibson Avon created in 1972. The City is responsible for the upkeep of almost 350 miles of public sewer system. As our sewer system infrastructure ages, greater demands will be placed upon the City's maintenance crews to keep the system performing well. Sewer pipe maintained by public service crews range in size from 8-inch to 36-inch diameter. Sewer pipe televising, sewer line jetting and manhole inspections and spot repairs are routine tasks that the DPS employees undertake to ensure that the public sewer system functions properly. Sewer televising plays an important role and allows the DPS crews to review the integrity of the sewer pipes and also troubleshoot the cause of back-ups. It is planned that DPS crews will televise over 14 miles of sewer pipes in 2009 to assist in our efforts to be proactively involved in monitoring the public system.*

**Sewer Division Objectives:**

*Tracey Balint, Project Engineer, reviewed some the following sanitary sewer projects that are ongoing and proposed:*

- The Sanitary Sewer Evaluation Study is necessary because of recent changes implemented by Oakland County in their billing process. Water records were previously used to generate the City's billing, now they actually meter sanitary sewer flow. A study will be performed in 2009 to determine what improvements need to be made to our system in order to decrease inflow and infiltration. This study will be done in-house and in 2010, improvements recommended in the study will be implemented.*
- SS-14A, Washington Road Sanitary Sewer Main Extension. This coincides with the Washington Road Improvement Project. \$275,000.00 is budgeted for design services in 2008 as well as \$175,000.00 for the water main extension. This will most likely be moved to 2009 because as previously discussed, the Road Commission is going to push that project back to focus on the Tienken Road Corridor project.*
- SCADA improvements, to keep up with new software and hardware, are integral to everyday operations of our sanitary sewer and water systems.*
- Sanitary Sewer Televising is continually performed to assist the City in determining minor repairs and where replacements are needed.*

*Ms. Balint stated that a future challenge the City is faced with is to proactively fight against grease discharge into the sanitary sewer system. One location in an area with several restaurants experienced ongoing problems of grease build-up. To be proactive, the City has met with these restaurants to eliminate discharge into the system. The City is currently in the process of updating its Ordinance to address grease discharges. She stated that another future challenge is the concern with the City's aging infrastructure. Routine maintenance will help determine when a utility needs repairs and/or replacing. The new asset management system also will help track these repairs. She commented that adopting new technology will help with overall system improvements. For example, directional drilling has been done using HV pipe for water mains, and lightweight manhole adjustment rings have been utilized. Projects are also being accomplished with sanitary sewer lining instead of the replacement of the sanitary sewer.*

**Council Discussion:**

***President Hooper** commented that he only saw the Water Storage Facility, the Washington Road Sanitary Sewer and Washington Road Water Main in the budget as Capital Projects.*

***Ms. Balint** responded that those three are just ongoing projects that are continually being worked on. She commented that several projects would now be done in-house, including the Sanitary Sewer Evaluation Study which was budgeted at \$300,000 in the 2009 CIP.*

***President Hooper** commented that from his perspective the Water Storage project was totally dependent upon the City's negotiations with Detroit on water rates. He stated that a prior study builds the case for a Water Storage Facility, and asked if all Council members had a copy of it.*

***Mr. Rousse** stated he had a copy of that study if anyone needed to review it.*

***Mr. Davis** stated there are not many Capital Projects moving forward on the Sewer Fund; however, there were a number of ongoing internal projects moving forward. He stated that these in-house projects do not necessarily show up in the Capital, but do take time for the crews and engineers.*

***Mr. Rousse** pointed out that there were a number of different styles of water reservoirs, and the City was not talking about the bulb-shape steel tank type. He stated that consideration was for an above-ground reservoir, initially proposed at 45 feet tall and 80 feet across; and a number of creative designs could be done to enhance appearance should Council decide to pursue this.*

***Mr. Brennan** mentioned that the Water and Sewer Technical Review Committee had discussion about water storage. He asked Mr. Rousse to expand a bit on what the potential costs, savings to the taxpayers, and payback would be.*

***Mr. Rousse** stated that the original study that was done in 2004 estimated an*



annual savings of approximately \$1.4 million dollars and a cost of approximately \$8 million dollars, allowing for a five to six year payback. Current rate negotiations will update those figures.

**Mr. Brennan** questioned whether there would be a benefit to the City regarding water flow or uniformity of pressure.

**Mr. Rousse** explained that the project began a number of years ago with an ISO evaluation, which is a factor on which residents pay their house insurance. The factor included for water supply identified some areas of the City that had low water pressure. That, coupled with a number of complaints up in the northwestern sections of the City of low water pressure, spurred this analysis. The original intent was to provide improvement to the water pressure; a secondary byproduct is the fact that it has a very short return on investment and seems like a good investment. This return should be even better now, because the City's water costs have gone up substantially since 2004.

**Mr. Brennan** commended the Department for following up on discharge of grease by restaurants. He stated that if the City needed to shore up its Ordinance in this regard, it should. He asked if the City pursues reimbursement when addressing grease discharge.

**Mr. Rousse** responded that the City does seek reimbursement but has not been as successful to date in getting this reimbursement. He stated that compliance is the first priority. The City does not want to penalize anyone and expends most of its efforts in education, providing instructional videos about techniques inside of a restaurant in order to minimize the grease. He stated that the problem continues, however, and the City will look at its Ordinance, in addition to appealing to Detroit Water and Sewerage Department (DWSD) for assistance. The Ordinance currently cites DWSD as the control authority, with the City as the enforcer.

**Mr. Rosen** questioned where the problem restaurants are located, and asked if they were located along Rochester Road.

**Mr. Rousse** stated there are some problems occurring in that location, but the largest problem occurs at Walton and Adams. He stated that one problem location is a restaurant that was formerly a clothing store. He stated that it does not have the interior facilities such as a grease interceptor or grease trap. He stated that the first avenue is education. If that fails, there is a sliding scale which the City uses to intervene.

**Mr. Rosen** commented regarding the need for a reservoir, stating his opinion that water issues could be solved by action, not by building. He stated that he strongly encouraged Council to look at the lawn watering regulations as a solution rather than considering a reservoir.

**Mr. Rousse** stated these regulations would not change the volume of water that the City purchases. He stated that a reservoir offers a greater return on investment and asked Council to consider the \$9 million expended every year to purchase water quality. He stated that the biggest way to reduce this amount is by water

storage. He stated that an analysis would be presented for best case/worse case scenarios; and further commented that conservation actions could take a couple of years to obtain full effects.

**Mr. Rosen** commented that he did not expect full compliance with the Ordinance. He stated that he would be happy if two-thirds or even one-third complied, particularly if the large user-establishments performed their watering at night. He commented that approximately ten years ago during the summer, the water pressure was so low that some second-story showers had difficulties, and the system was almost depressurized. He stated that these problems have disappeared in the last four to five years.

**Mr. Rousse** commented that the biggest risk was from a fire prevention standpoint. While the City might have enough water for domestic use, there is no assurance that if a fire would occur in certain areas of the City there would be enough volume to fight it during peak hours.

**Mr. Rosen** commented that before the City makes the appropriations to spend the money toward water storage, he would like to see some hard data that proves these concerns. He stated that using modifications to public use and timing could make all the difference in the world, and that would be at no cost to the City.

**President Hooper** commented that the City's water rates are based on the City's peak hours. He stated that last year, the City spent \$12 million on purchasing the water from DWSD. He stated that the proposed contract, which is still subject to negotiation, includes eight factors used to determine the City's rate; four of them are directly related to peak time and make up 64 percent of the cost of the water. He commented that if the City could make a five to ten percent difference in this peak usage, it would be significant.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** questioned whether there was anything the City could do from an Ordinance standpoint to control grease problems in situations where restaurants move in where a retail store once stood. He commented that he was surprised the City allowed that type of a business change without requiring the drains to be changed.

**Mr. Rousse** explained that there is a Plumbing Code that governs these changes, but the Code requires a minimal amount of improvements. He stated that variables include the volume of people proposed to be served. He commented that if business is good for a small restaurant, they could still experience problems.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** questioned if the Plumbing Code was dictated by the State or the County and questioned whether the City could amend it.

**Mr. Rousse** responded that it was the State Code. He explained that the only thing the City could do is strengthen its Ordinance to minimize impacts. He gave an example of specifying that nothing could be discharged into the sanitary sewer that would interfere with the natural flow. He stated that the City could describe some devices within the Ordinance up and above what the Plumbing Code specifies.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** commented that he would support that sort of an Ordinance change.

**Mr. Rousse** stated that they will be reviewing the Michigan Municipal Risk Management Authority's recommendations for language to include regarding grease interceptors and would decide on a methodology of how to best implement that language.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** stated that he wanted to see this move forward quickly.

**Mr. Rousse** concurred.

**Mr. Rousse** stated that the Water Division is responsible for providing municipal water supply services to approximately 22,570 residential and business customers. Water revenues are collected exclusively through fees and user charges. The water supply system consists of over 425 miles of water main, over 4,200 isolation valves, four master meter facilities, and approximately 31,000 water meters. The water is purchased wholesale from the Detroit Water and Sewer Department (DWSD) and is then distributed throughout the City's water supply network to customers. He explained that DWSD is owned by the City of Detroit and is not only the largest water system in the State of Michigan, but also the third-largest municipal system in the United States. DWSD supplies potable water to approximately four-million people including Rochester Hills, and its earliest distribution system dates back to 1927. Fortunately, Rochester Hills' distribution system is newer, but it still places great demands on the City to ensure that our users can rely on this necessary resource. Rochester Hills crews provide a variety of maintenance activities to keep the City's system in good working order. The water system provides several aspects to enhance the quality of life including fire protection, drinking and cooking water, bathing, and irrigation for lawns and gardens. To ensure that these benefits are available, DPS crews maintain items such as water isolation valves, fire hydrants, service leads, water quality testing and metering facilities.

Metering installation and calibrations are important to the City Budget since the meters represent the City's cash registers for collecting user fees. He gave the following performance indicators for meter installations:

Performance Indicators:

**Meter Installations**

<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>June 2008</b>	<b>Projected 2008</b>	<b>Projected 2009</b>
1,660	1,703	613	1,200	1,700

**Meter Transceiver Units (MXUs) Installed**

<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>June 2008</b>	<b>Projected 2008</b>	<b>Projected 2009</b>
7,461	7,688	2,714	6,000	1,650

**Water Distribution Objectives:**

**Tracey Balint**, Project Engineer, reviewed some of the proposed and ongoing Water Distribution Projects, including:

- WS-22, Water Storage Facility.
- WS-14A, Washington Road - Water Main Extension

*Ms. Balint explained that the City has an existing water CAD model of its system which has been updated over the years with current data. The City has taken fire-flow tests within the last year as well, and these will be incorporated into the system model to determine whether there is a need for a reservoir, and how a reservoir would improve the functionality and cost-effectiveness of the City's system.*

*She also explained that the Washington Road Water Main Extension project coincided with SS-14A, the Washington Road Sanitary Sewer Main Extension project as well as the road improvements.*

*Ms. Balint also noted that DPS was undertaking a Water System Pressure District Overview, explaining that all the major drains and ridges within the City create unique pressure districts throughout Rochester Hills. She stated that the City has eight pressure districts and four feeds around the City from DWSD. She noted that since the City has grown over the last thirty years, the needs of the water system has changed; therefore, it is imperative that a comprehensive review of the water system is undertaken to determine whether or not the City can eliminate some of the pressure reducing valves (PRVs) that were installed. Some of these PRVs are now inactive and the City might be able to remove these from the system.*

*She stated that the Water Division performs routine maintenance projects, giving the example of water main breaks that are repaired and small water main design projects currently in-house that will soon be going out for bids.*

*She outlined an Initial Distribution System Evaluation (IDSE) project, the purpose of which is to test the levels of two byproducts from chlorine disinfection, used by DWSD to disinfect the water. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has mandated sampling from November 2007 through September 2008. She stated that every two months crews are going out to 16 points within the system and running tests on these samples and then turning them in to the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) Laboratory for further testing. She explained that this is an example of a non-funded mandate that the City is required to do. Once all of the information is returned, a report is required to be sent to the EPA. Thus far, the results have come in low. She commented that these levels will most likely be routinely sampled for in the future, possibly in 2010/2011.*

**Goals:**

- Limit water purchase costs to the community; and determine whether or not installing a water reservoir would improve the overall system and its reliability, and possibly reduce costs.

- Maintain an aging infrastructure.
- Review and adopt new technology.

**Council Discussion:**

**Mr. Yalamanchi** questioned when the smaller water main projects would go out for bids.

**Ms. Balint** responded that a Brewster Road water main project as well as a small Rochester College project replacing approximately 2,000 feet of water main would both go out for bids within a couple of weeks.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** expressed that he was skeptical about supporting a water reservoir project. He questioned whether a reservoir project would be done with a bond issue.

**Mr. Rousse** responded that Ms. Jenuwine would best answer the bonding question. He gave an overview of the history of the Water Capital Fund, stating that at one time in the 1990s the fund contained \$58 million as the result of a large development, and additional Capital and lateral fees paid to the City. Now that the fund has been paid down, City residents are hesitant to support supplementing to build this fund for the future. He explained that the alternative is a pay-as-you-go methodology, which is the preferred method by residents not just in Rochester Hills, but in most communities. He stated that public policy has been formalized to not raise fees to supplement the Fund Balance when residents could benefit from reduced rates. He stated that the rationale for bonding out the project would be that residents who would benefit from the project would then pay for it.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** commented that he opposes this public policy. He expressed his wish that if the fund balance was there, it would have benefitted the community at-large. He stated there was a cost of bonding, the replacement fund was low, and the City was looking toward the challenges of infrastructure replacement. He stated he was willing to look at a reservoir, but it was his recommendation that the City wait and not include funding for a reservoir in the Budget at this time.

**Mr. Rousse** stated that they wanted to look at the benefits of a water reservoir project from a business standpoint. He commented that if the City spends \$12 million each year and we could save \$1.4 million, including the bond debt, it could be a worthwhile project with a return on investment of six to eight years. He commented that DWSD wants to negotiate a 30-year contract; and if the City wanted to consider using reservoirs, now would be the time to make that consideration. He stated that the reservoirs would not be done unless there was a compelling business argument for long-term savings.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** responded that does not wish to see this reservoir in the Budget Document. He stated that at a later time, it could be added as a Budget Amendment.

**President Hooper** responded that if the project is excluded, both bond revenue and capital expenditures would be reduced in the Budget.

**Ms. Jenuwine** agreed, stating the overall Budget would be reduced.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** stated that he would find it acceptable to bring the reservoir back later if it is decided to move the project forward.

**President Hooper** stated a water reservoir would be a part of a survey to determine what everyone wants.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** questioned the IDSE requirements and asked what costs were entailed to run that program and fulfill the unfunded mandate.

**Ms. Balint** replied that the amount budgeted was for MDEQ laboratory services only. These monies did not include the City's in-house costs to take the samples.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** questioned what the rough additional cost would be for the City to administer this testing.

**Ms. Balint** responded that an estimate would be in terms of hours. She stated that every two months, 16 samples were taken. She estimated that three employees were going out to take these samples over a period of approximately four hours. Along with the coordination of sending samples to MDEQ and tracking them, she estimated four employees spend a day's work every two months.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** questioned whether she saw the mandate increasing in the future.

**Ms. Balint** replied that could be the case if the numbers were found to be high. To date, the City's numbers were coming in low. Copper and lead are being sampled for at this time. She stated that she did not see this mandate going down in the future.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** questioned the MS-4 requirements, and asked about their potential costs.

**Roger Moore**, Professional Surveyor, stated that this would be further explained during the Drains discussion. He stated that the MS-4 requirements mandate a good deal of administrative tracking that do not add to water quality. The permit, in its present form, requires a great deal of prescriptive-type actions, which require tracking whether improving water quality or not.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** commented that these requirements added a substantial amount of additional bureaucracy.

**Mr. Moore** commented that these requirements are well-intended, but were drafted by individuals who have never worked in municipal government and do not know how it works. He stated that the City was contesting the requirements

to draft a permit which was not as costly to the City as the current draft language.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** questioned whether the City would be forced to rewrite its Ordinances and Building Codes as they relate to sewer and roads.

**Mr. Moore** responded that the City's design standards do address much of what MDEQ is looking for, and are to a level that is nationally and locally reasonable.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** commented that Judge Feikens would most likely strengthen the EPA requirements and make them even more difficult to administer.

**Mr. Moore** stated that Judge Feikens has Mr. Bulkey on staff, who works with him closely, and Mr. Bulkey is going to help facilitate the negotiations and offer some assistance in negotiations to try and come up with a permit that is affordable to the communities, yet meets the goals and objectives of the NPDES, EPA and the Clean Water Act. He commented that Judge Feikens is neutral toward water quality and does not want to see people waste money on bureaucratic tracking. Judge Feikens wants to see results, and this is the way the permit should be written.

**Discussed.**

**2008-0427** Discussion - Special Revenue Funds (200's) - 2009 Budget

**Attachments:** [Resolution.pdf](#)  
[081808 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)  
[082508 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)  
[090308 Budget Discussion Outline.pdf](#)

#### **244 - Drains Fund**

**Roger Rouse**, Director of DPS/Engineering, gave an overview of the Drain Fund, stating that there are currently twenty-eight Chapter 20 Drains in service within the City. Storm water issues fall within the parameters of the Public Improvement Drain Fund. Large-scale public drainage improvements are constructed and maintained by the Oakland County Drain Commission (OCDC). Construction is funded through this cost center under Chapter 20 of the Drain Code.

Mr. Rouse stated that the City is responsible for complying with the US EPA NPDES Phase II Permit. This Permit will dominate the Drains discussion as a result of the new regulations that come under the Municipal Separated Storm Sewer Systems (MS-4). The intention of these requirements is to monitor storm water, and whenever possible, to minimize discharges of pollutants into the local waterways. The City feels it has the regulations in place in order to accurately control storm water drainage for public systems. Recently adopted design standards focus on redevelopment within the City. One of the weaknesses

arises with addressing discharge from private systems. He stated that the number of Chapter 20 Drains has remained consistent over the past five years. To economize costs associated with construction projects, the City looks to perform work with Rochester Hills employees rather than contracting the work out to Oakland County.

Performance Indicators:

**Illicit Discharges Discovered:**

2006	2007	June 2008	Projected 2008	Projected 2009
4	6	4	8	8

**Number of Detention Basin Inspections:**

2006	2007	June 2008	Projected 2008	Projected 2009
n/a	1	2	5	5

**Drains Objectives:**

**Roger Moore**, Professional Surveyor, highlighted the following projects in the Drain Fund:

- SW-03, Karas Drain Extension
- SW-05D, Rewold Drain (Phase D)
  - \* ROW Acquisition
  - \* Engineering
- SW-090, Water Quality Basin Rehabilitation

Mr. Moore stated that the Karas Drain II project is basically to provide storm sewer for Hamlin Road, and includes water quality pretreatment before discharge into the Clinton and to tributaries.

The Rewold Drain Project (Phase D) is the portion of the Rainier Road section, behind the auto dealerships on Rochester Road south of Avon. This will provide connection to other development in the area. Originally, in the CIP, this project was larger than it is now, but the project size has been reduced.

Project SW-08B, the Clinton River: Channel Restoration (Drain-related portion). Originally in the CIP, it was proposed to analyze and study the whole river channel behind Rochester Hills City Hall to restore the channel to its original flow with and character, and stabilize it. The river's energy is severely eroding the banks. The City proposes analyzing and stabilizing the river to make it a more natural width and depth ratio, concentrating on the area adjacent to the new Clinton River Trail.

Mr. Moore explained that SW-09, the City Hall Water Quality Management and Ecological Improvement project, deals with the pond outside of City Hall. This pond has done a pretty good job at capturing sediment from upstream and from the City Hall property. This project is designed to clean out the pond, restore its depths so it is not deprived of oxygen, and place some natural feature plantings adjacent to it to help stabilize the soil and restore some of the carbon to the ground. This will improve the water quality to the Clinton River.



**Goals:**

- Comply with the conditions of the Municipal Separated Storm Sewer System (MS-4) Permit.

**Mr. Moore** discussed the MS-4 requirements, stating that the permit covers a five-year period. In the opinion of the communities affected, the new permit goes overboard and has become too prescriptive, with too many administrative demands for record-keeping which do not improve water quality. He projected that these demands will cost the City \$5 million to \$6 million in record-keeping costs and additional requirements for street sweeping and catch basin cleaning. He stated that the discharge-point mapping required by MS-4 will cost the City \$330,000. Legislation currently in committee would allow forming a public utility for storm water so that users would be required to pay for the services.

Mr. Moore explained that MS-4 requirements include the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Initiative (SWPPI), with actions that will need to be developed such as street sweeping, catch basin cleaning and parking lot sweeping. These activity levels would have to be met and reported to meet permit requirements or the City would be in violation. They are also establishing a Total Maximum Daily Load for bacteria, e-Coli specifically which would be limited to 130 milliliters. He stated that even though the Clinton River is fairly clean, he was not aware that the Clinton River ever had levels that low; and that the City would as of right now be in violation. He commented that the goose population, among other things, raises that level. MS-4 would also require water monitoring, water sampling, and inspection for illicit discharge.

Mr. Moore discussed that Drains work includes maintaining curb catch basins, rogue catch basins, and repairing deteriorating infrastructure. He related that in 2005 and 2006, City crews cleaned and inspected catch basins in the City; approximately 4,000 were cleaned and about 430 needed prompt repair. Not all of them have been repaired to date. Many are repaired due to failure under roads which were installed in the late 1970s to mid-1980s. Many roads were installed without a sub-base, and concrete was poured on top of clay; and the drainage structure and base was not built as it is now. He commented that the City owns and operates 53 miles of storm sewer, and has 864 manholes and approximately 4,000 catch basins that it owns and maintains, all directly related to the road infrastructure and supply drainage for the road.

He stated that the City also has 441 private miles of storm sewers. In comparison, the City only has 350 miles of sanitary sewer. He also stated that there are additional miles of private storm sewer in the City which has had no proactive maintenance being done by the City, homeowners associations or landowners. These private systems were constructed in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s and are beginning to fail. Homeowners associations do not have the budget and are not equipped to maintain and operate them. Almost 8,000 private manholes exist to be maintained. Sump collections are an issue because of root systems, and this presents a challenge for the future. A storm water committee is now working with SEMCOG, the Michigan Townships Association, and the Michigan Municipal League, to draft language to address these concerns.

**Council Discussion:**

**President Hooper** commented that if a mandate was being handed down on these policies, a revenue source should also be mandated, rather than force the Cities to absorb these costs. He discussed the SW-08B project, the Clinton River Natural Channel Restoration (trail stabilization), and asked why it was not in the Drain Budget, but was in the Pathway Budget.

**Mr. Moore** responded that there is a permitting aspect to that project and a the study portion needed to be done to save the pathway.

**President Hooper** commented that it should come out of the Drain budget, not Pathways. He stated that the drain is the cause, not the pathway.

**Mr. Moore** responded that the river is the cause.

**President Hooper** suggested that this should be switched to the Drain budget. He then questioned public drain expenditures for maintenance and questioned a revolving fund.

**Mr. Moore** explained that when drains are built, the County establishes a revolving fund for operations and maintenance of that drain, much like an escrow account. Expenditures are charged against that escrow account until it is depleted. Once it is depleted and the account goes into arrears, the City is then assessed for bringing the account back up, including five years of future anticipated costs. He stated that the City did not have accounting in place to know the actual status of these funds.

**President Hooper** questioned why the City does not perform these maintenance activities.

**Mr. Moore** responded that these are Chapter 20 Drains, funded out of the Chapter 20 Millage. There are some activities the City funds itself, such as the mowing of detention basins and catch basin cleaning of local road ditches. The County would not necessarily perform these activities unless they were complaint-driven.

**President Hooper** stated that the City collects the funds for the Chapter 20 Millage. He asked why the City does not perform all the activities.

**Mr. Moore** stated that with minor activities, we do perform this work. Larger detention basins are a large resource and are basically a Drain activity. Even though the City pays for a majority of the work, it is still the County's drain. With the Chapter 20 Drain District, the County can also capture County and State money to perform this work and contribute a certain percentage to the cost of operations and maintenance of that Drain. The majority of our drain activity, however, is Rochester Hills-funded.

**Mr. Rosen** questioned the cycle for cleaning detention basins, asking about how long after a subdivision was completed was basin cleaning done. He

questioned the City standards with respect to maintenance of privately-owned drains.

**Mr. Moore** replied that for private developments, the City still has a program whereby the developer cleans the basins after completing the subdivision. He stated that right now, the City has some developments that are not complete. The developers are still responsible for maintenance, but have not done their final cleanout. He then explained that the City will inspect eight drains in 2008. A program is being set up within the Asset Management program, where these drains will be inspected and rated, and a determination will be made as to what is required. Homeowner's associations will be informed, along with an educational component, and technical assistance will be offered to help them correct any problems. He commented that this is a long, difficult process because there is a lot of denial going on by the associations. Associations also turn over leadership fairly frequently. He also commented that many contractors do not want to work for the homeowner associations as they do not frequently have the funding in their coffers to pay for these services. He stated that although in the past Rochester Hills has set up maintenance agreements to hire contractors and help subdivisions, adding the amounts to their taxes, but the City is not equipped or staffed to do this kind of work. He stated that working toward assistance such as this might be necessary to help the City meet its requirements.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** questioned whether Mr. Moore had a total estimate of what the City could potentially be looking at in MS-4 costs.

**Mr. Moore** commented that he hoped that the \$6 million figure discussed was excessive and would be reduced once a final viable permit was developed. He reiterated that mapping discharge points had a \$320,000 cost associated. He discussed costs involved with developing pollution prevention plans for each municipally-owned and private system, and discussed requirements for biannual reports on plans. He stated that these were mostly administrative costs that do not contribute to water quality.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** questioned whether the number of residential projects being mothballed could spur the City to require developers to maintain installed basins.

**Mr. Moore** responded that as long as a development had a viable developer, it could.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** questioned whether the Ordinance would have to be rewritten.

**Mr. Moore** stated that he did not feel that was necessary. He explained that an agreement obligates the developer and his assigns, and if he does not have any assigns yet because the subdivision has not be turned over to the association, he is still obligated to maintain it. If he does not, the City has the option to put a lien on the property.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** questioned if the City could legally require this maintenance before the developer turns the subdivision over to the association.

**Mr. Moore** responded that it could.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** stated that he wished to publicly commend Mr. Rousse for helping out his subdivision, Heatherwood, with its drains. He commented that he wished to see the Mayor include some of this information in the Hills Herald to be proactive and communicate with the associations.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** thanked Mr. Moore for his presentation. He commented that he did not know what the solution would be, but the problem could become overwhelming.

**Mr. Moore** responded that he brought up these issues tonight as he wanted Council to be aware of these upcoming problems.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** questioned whether four or five communities could be involved to form a public utility.

**Mr. Moore** stated that he would think that could be a possibility, and that this could be a bigger draw for a contractor to want to do the work and also provide a better pool of resources amongst members.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** responded that he would recommend the City consider this.

**Mayor Barnett** commented that just as the the City is pooling resources and working with SEMCOG, it is combining with other agencies to address these unfunded mandates. To respond to Council questions of where to place the funding for the Clinton River Stabilization Project, he stated that Administration tried to identify what part of the project was related to the pathway, and separate it from the drain portion. He stated that the Clinton River Trail project was a part of the pathway millage.

**President Hooper** disagreed, stating that the drain caused the problem and he would prefer seeing the project come out of the Drain Fund.

**Mayor Barnett** commented that this would place the project into the General Fund, versus a funded millage for the next 20 years as well.

**President Hooper** responded that there is a \$3.5 million allocation in Fund Balance for Drains. He stated that he would rather spend that down.

**Paul Davis**, City Engineer, added that this discussion also occurs between Roads and Drains. He stated that the river is migrating, and it is going to damage the pathway. The pathway should be proactive and try to take steps to protect itself and repair the river. He commented that in the same manner, discussion could be held as to whether street sweeping is a Road function or a Drain function.

**Mr. Moore** stated that the original project included stabilizing that whole section of the river. The City applied for a grant to fund the estimated cost of \$850,000.00 and the study grant was denied. The City is proceeding with

*voluntary efforts to do the study so that it can apply for a construction grant to do the work. Part of that project was to stabilize that section of the Trailway. It appears that the City is not going to be able to wait for that project to come forward because that section of trailway is at risk.*

**Public Comment:**

**Melinda Hill**, 1451 Mill Race, commented on the amount remaining in the Drain Fund, stating that several years back the City eliminated the Public Improvement Drain Millage. She expressed concern that money is not being collected toward these future costs. She questioned the Rewold Drain Project (SW-05B), which at the time included the Rainier Drive portion of the project and asked what the total expenditure was for that project.

**Mr. Moore** explained the project further, commenting that the project was adjusted by the Oakland County Road Commission to reduce the scope. He explained that the Rewold Drain work, SW-05D, in this Budget was not a large project.

**Ms. Hill** stated she wished to get a bottom line for the project to ascertain what is being spent on the various phases of the project. She stated that it was similar to the Tienken Road Bridge, with its phases for the roadway. She expressed concern on how to fulfill the upcoming Federal mandates. She questioned whether the City handled cleaning catch basins all throughout the City or did the County take care of their own roads.

**Mr. Rousse** responded that the County does their own roads, and the City is only responsible for City Major and Local Roads. The City is one of the largest land owners, and that is why it takes care of its own. The Road Commission takes care of its own as well.

**Ms. Hill** stated that the Road Commission should be made to handle its own basins.

**Mr. Rousse** concurred.

**President Hooper** stated that he assumed that the City would be working with the Oakland County Road Commission on those activities.

Discussed.

## ANY OTHER BUSINESS

**President Hooper** announced the Public Hearing for the Budget on September 15, 2008, at 7:30 p.m., with a vote on the Budget projected for September 22, 2008.

## NEXT MEETING DATE

*- Regular Meeting - Monday, September 8, 2008 - 7:30 PM*

## ADJOURNMENT

*There being no further business before Council, President Hooper adjourned the meeting at 10:09 p.m.*

---

*GREG HOOPER, President  
Rochester Hills City Council*

---

*JANE LESLIE, Clerk  
City of Rochester Hills*

---

*CHRISTINE A. WISSBRUN  
Administrative Secretary  
City Clerk's Office*

*Approved as presented at the (insert date, or dates) Regular City Council Meeting.*