



Rochester Hills

Minutes

Planning Commission

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

Chairperson William Boswell, Vice Chairperson Deborah Brnabic
Members: Gerard Dettloff, Dale Hetrick, Greg Hooper, Nicholas O. Kaltsounis,
David A. Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Emmet Yukon

Tuesday, April 16, 2013

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson William Boswell called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present 9 - William Boswell, Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Dale Hetrick, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder and Emmet Yukon

Quorum present.

Also present: Ed Anzek, Director of Planning and Economic Development
Alan Buckenmeyer, Manager of Parks
Scott Cope, Director of Building
Ron Crowell, Chief of the Fire Department
Carl Holder, Captain, Fire Department
Kevin Krajewski, Deputy Director of MIS
Keith Sawdon, Director of Fiscal
Allan Schneck, Director of DPS/Engineering
Joe Snyder, Sr. Financial Analyst, Fiscal
Laurie Taylor, Deputy Director of Assessing
Robert White, Ordinance Supervisor, Building
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2013-0115 March 19, 2013 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Kaltsounis, that this matter be Approved as Presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 9 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hetrick, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

COMMUNICATIONS

- A) *Letter from C. Burckhardt, dated March 26, 2013 re: Oakland Township Rezoning*

NEW BUSINESS

- 2013-0114 Public Hearing and request for Adoption of the 2014-2019 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

(Reference: Memo from Keith Sawdon, dated April 16, 2013 and draft 2014-2019 Capital Improvement Plan presented April 16, 2013, had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Mr. Anzek mentioned that this was the 17th year of reviewing the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). He indicated that it had been a very effective tool for the City and for decision making, and every year they tried to improve it. They had asked all the project sponsors to the meeting, because there were quite a few new projects. Work had been set aside because of financial issues over the last three or four years. The matter had been advertised as a Public Hearing, and it was their hope for a motion of approval. It would be advantageous for the Fiscal Department to be able start working on the budget numbers. He turned it over to Mr. Sawdon.

Mr. Sawdon stated that before the Commissioners was a proposed Capital Improvement Plan for fiscal year 2014 through 2019. There were 22 new projects, and the City's share would be a little over \$15,500,000.00. In total for all projects in the CIP, the City's share would be about \$68,500,000.00. In addition to the new projects, they removed 28 projects; 20 had been completed; four were reclassified to pending; three were combined with existing projects; and one was deleted. They had the need for capital improvement; they had just been very cautious over the last several years. They were beginning to see some termination to that process, and he commented that it was time to get back on board. After approval of the CIP, moving to the budget was the next step, and they would determine which projects would move forward with funding. He said he would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Anzek added that at the last Planning Commission meeting regarding Harvard Place, there was discussion about including School Rd. in the CIP. When it went to Council, there was also a request to add it. As Staff looked into it further, they found it would be a much more detailed

project than they thought. He would like to discuss it further when they talked about the road projects. Paving School Rd. would not affect 2014, and it would trigger issues with water and sewer, and the extent of paving was a question. They did not have time to get it rated by the Policy Team. He asked Mr. Cope to come forward. He explained that Mr. Cope was the Facilities Manager as well as the Building Department Director. He took the lead on all facilities matters, including fire station improvements.

Mr. Cope referred to FA-01G, replacement of the City Hall Uninterruptible Power System (UPS). He explained that it was a back-up emergency system for a number of the emergency systems throughout the City, including the MIS computers, the phone system, building security keyless entry system, fire protection and alarms. The existing system was old and no longer able to be maintained due to the un-availability of parts needed to upgrade. They would like to add a new system and completely replace the existing.

Mr. Cope next pointed out the 52/3 District Courthouse Lighting project (FA-14). It related to the lights at the entrance to the courthouse. The lights projected out flush with the concrete to illuminate the front of the building. They had failed over the last few years due to water infiltration. The proposal was to bring them up higher and put them on a post. An architect had designed it so they looked like the pillars that were already there. If the lights were above ground, there would be no water infiltrating. They were hopeful that this fix would be permanent. It would definitely take care of the water problem, and it was why the cost was significantly more than if they just added lights. Mr. Anzek asked Fire Chief Crowell to the presenter's table.

Chief Crowell related that their first project was Fire Station #1: Entrance Sign (FA-02E). He noted that the signs that were currently there were a number of years old and were continuously being repaired. They were the old style where the letters were slid inside, and the message they could put out to the community was very limited. They were looking at a sign similar to the one in front of City Hall. The Fire Department needed the ability to get fire prevention messages out to motorists and residents. They would use it not only for Fire Prevention Week or Change your Smoke Detector Week, but for City-related functions, such as hiring summer laborers.

Chief Crowell referred to their second project, Fire Station #1: Training Tower (FA-02F), and said that the current tower was built in 1990. They turned it into a burn building, adding panels over the wood rafters to allow

them to burn. He claimed that it probably was not a good decision. There was charring to the rafters, and it had become unsafe. They might use it for ladder practice on the outside, but they had quit using it for the most part. He stated that training was a very important part of fire service, and they were currently using Oakland Community College's Crest Center when they needed some types of training. They were running about 6,000 calls a year, and they could not take all their firefighters to Station #1 to train, so they went over in shifts. Chief Crowell advised that they were looking at a building designed as a burn building with metal rafters and windows. They would build it correctly from the beginning.

The next project was Fire Station #3: Kitchen and Bunkroom Improvements (FA13J). All stations were staffed 24/7 with either firefighter paramedics or EMT's. They were currently doing 12-hour shifts at Fire Station #3, but they still needed to provide them a place to cook meals. The kitchen there now was very small. They wanted to take out some walls and build a kitchen and add a bunkroom for the future. Regarding Fire Station #4 on Walton Blvd. (FA-13K), they had built a bunkroom themselves. It was a 24-hour station manned by paramedics. The kitchen was built in the 1970's, and they wished to upgrade.

Mr. Hooper said that he had no problem with the sign. He wished the sign in front of City Hall was higher definition. He asked if that could be done for Fire Station #1. He thought it should be more legible, and if he had known it would look like it did, he would have agreed to pay a little more to get better graphics. Chief Crowell agreed.

Mr. Hooper thought that \$600,000.00 for the training tower was a little high, and he asked if there was a way to work with Auburn Hills and Oakland Township to chip in for one tower. He asked if Chief Crowell thought that would not be practical.

Chief Crowell responded that a lot of cities did not have towers, and other departments used Rochester Hills'. Auburn Hills had Crest, and they had to pay for the usage, but it was much more convenient than coming to Rochester Hills. He thought it would be a little too far for Oakland Township, as well. The City of Rochester had turned an old water plant into a training tower. His department had used that. He had been asked whether the City could rent the tower out. The Chief said that they preferred to do "mutual aid," but he did not think others would use it much.

Mr. Hooper asked how many times the department used it. Chief Crowell said that when it was fully functional, they would use it about 12 times a

month. The new tower would be designed so they could do ventilation training and a number of other things. There would be a fully functional suppression system inside so they could activate the sprinkler system and teach people how to pull a sprinkler head and shut the valves off. Mr. Hooper clarified that a new one would be used a dozen times a month.

Ms. Brnabic had never viewed one being displayed, but she wondered if the message board was set up to receive Amber Alerts. Mr. Anzek said he would check. Ms. Brnabic asked if she could assume the new sign at the fire station would also display that. If the City was not involved, she wished to request it, if possible. Mr. Anzek felt it was an excellent suggestion.

Mr. Schroeder suggested that the City should have similar signs with similar parts so they did not have different maintenance requirements. He asked if they were considering putting them at other stations. Chief Crowell said they would look at that in the future. Mr. Schroeder asked about other City facilities. Mr. Anzek said that they had considered putting them in parks to advertise the Festival of the Hills or soccer tournaments, for example.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked what size the electronic strip of the sign would be. He mentioned the price of \$50,000.00, and he asked if it would be like the one in front of City Hall or a sign with a strip across the bottom.

Chief Crowell said that it would be like the one in front of City Hall, but with better clarity. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if any part of the current training tower could be saved or if they could add on to it versus totally demolishing it.

Chief Crowell replied that it would cost \$508,000.00 to renovate the current one. He stated that it was in very bad shape. Mr. Kaltsounis said that it was good that they had looked at both directions.

Mr. Anzek said that the sign in front of City Hall was part of the branding program, which called for standardizing everything they did. Mr. Kaltsounis lightheartedly suggested that perhaps they could move the one in front of City Hall to Fire Station #1.

Mr. Dettloff asked if the training tower was or could be a shared usage. Mr. Crowell said it was limited. Mr. Dettloff asked if it generated any type of income for the City. Mr. Crowell said that it did not because of the mutual aid system. Any time there was a structure fire, their system automatically called other fire departments and they all worked together.

Oakland Township did not need a ladder truck because Rochester and Rochester Hills had one. The City did not have a lot grass fires like Oakland Township did, so the City did not have equipment for that; they called Oakland Township. He did not think leasing the tower would generate a lot. Mr. Dettloff indicated that the trade-off was that the City might have something that others did not, but other cities might have something Rochester Hills did not.

Mr. Yukon asked about required maintenance for a new tower and what its life expectancy would be.

Mr. Cope responded that the life expectancy would be anywhere from 15-20 years. There would be maintenance with burn panels, which would be \$50-100,000.00. The panels right in the vicinity of the burning might have to be replaced every ten years. Mr. Yukon asked if the tower would be subjected to periodic inspection for safety. Mr. Cope said that the Fire Department would do that as part of their training. He concluded that the Building Department would make sure it had no facility problems.

Mr. Dettloff asked if there were any grants to support a tower. Chief Crowell said there were some grants; unfortunately, because of the City's capital, it would be hard to get one of those. He believed the grants opened in the third part of the year and were awarded a year-and-a-half down the road. They would definitely look for those opportunities.

Mr. Hooper noted that the Fire Dept.'s ladder quint and aerial were scheduled for 2014 and 2015, and were the two biggest ticket items. He asked if the life of those vehicles could be extended or if they had to go.

Chief Crowell said that the one for 2014 really had to go. They were starting to see expensive repairs. The aerial tower for 2015 at Fire Station #1 would be evaluated in 2015. They were seeing a lot more repairs for that, and the technology had changed drastically. That truck was about 50 feet long with a 102-foot tower. They were now designing shorter trucks.

Mr. Hooper asked if the aerial would be sold or placed at another station. Chief Crowell said that it would probably be sold, because the technology was so old. Mr. Hooper asked how much the aerial was used, outside of parades and things. Chief Crowell said that it was used more and more. Since they did not have pumpers in every station, they used the aerial. The 102-foot tower carried 150 gallons of water, which was not a lot, so they would up that.

Mr. Anzek introduced Laurie Taylor and asked Mr. Krajewski to come forward for a discussion about software requests.

Mr. Sawdon referred to fiscal software, and said that they learned earlier this year that the operating system where JD Edwards (JDE) was located would no longer receive security updates starting in July 2015. They needed to replace the platform that JDE ran on. At the time they put the CIP together, they used a worst-case scenario with total replacement of the fiscal software with possibly a different name other than JDE. They since had an opportunity to dig a little deeper and look into different scenarios. It appeared that they would be able to update the current JDE to the next level. They were currently running on version 8.1. If they moved to 9.1, it would eliminate the operating system problem for security updates, and it would be at a substantially lower dollar amount. That process had not been forwarded for City Council's consideration yet, but an upgrade would be about \$1-1.5 million versus \$3.5 million for a full replacement. The number occurring in the CIP was based off of what JDE cost the City 12 years ago. At that time, JDE was using 2.1 software. A total replacement 12 years later would be almost double the original price. He felt that they should keep the system they had, with screens that were similar for current users. He noted that Council would be hearing that presentation in the future.

Mr. Hooper remarked that he was glad to hear that, because his jaw hit the ground when he read the price of \$3.5 million for software. Mr. Sawdon recalled that 12 years ago, it was almost \$2.5 million. Mr. Hooper said that even so, with technology improvements, he felt that there had to be a better system. He suggested that there was a cloud-based system or something better.

Mr. Krejewski said that part of the costs were for implementation. It was not really the software cost. It was a highly customized system. Mr. Hooper asked if it was based on the number of users. Mr. Krajewski explained that it included licensing, but the majority was for consulting, implementation and upgrades. Mr. Hooper thought there was one server to which everyone connected. Mr. Sawdon said that the software looked for certain data fields in certain tables. If they were named differently, they would have to be migrated over to a new version. It was that migration with the use of a third party that cost the most. When JDE was installed 12 years ago, most of the \$2.5 million went to implementation and moving data from an older system to a new system and for the conversion of the data tables. If they used a completely new system, it would cost more,

because they would be moving away from the JDE platform to a different platform.

Mr. Hooper acknowledged that he was not an expert, but coming from a private business enterprise, he felt that there was absolutely no way an owner would pay an outrageous fee like that for financial services. At his company, everything ran off one server, and everyone got their information from one place.

Mr. Krejewski advised that the City's system currently ran on five servers. He noted that at Mr. Hooper's company, they were only running one business. The City had ten different departments that all did unique and different things. It was kind of like running ten businesses. It was more complicated than having a single purpose office like a dentist's office or a construction firm. Mr. Hooper indicated that he would rely on the experts, but he did not think that the numbers could be right.

Mr. Sawdon assured that they would go through an RFP process and get different proposals from reputable firms bidding on the work, and it would be a competitive process.

Mr. Dettloff agreed with Mr. Hooper that it was somewhat of a jaw dropping number. He clarified that the 8.1 version would go until 2015. Mr. Sawdon said they would not get security updates, which was a Microsoft decision, not a JDE decision, after 2015. Mr. Dettloff asked if they had any indication of how long version 9.1 would be in effect. He asked if something new would come in two years, such as a 10.1 with another exorbitant cost.

Mr. Krajewski said that the older version of an application such as this would not be supported through another version. When they held back on upgrades of the application, they could not upgrade the operating systems. Then the operating system would become obsolete and be exposed to security risks. The 9.1 version would be supported for as long as the operating system was certified. They needed to either hold back or upgrade when they released a new version of the software. It was a catch-22. Mr. Dettloff agreed, and said it was like a "gun to the head." Mr. Krajewski said that there was no easy answer for it. No matter what software system they used, it would be constrained by the same problems. They could not NOT upgrade forever. They could skip one cycle and save, but eventually they would have to do something.

Mr. Sawdon mentioned that about three years ago, the City made a

conscious decision to move away from Oracle and go with a third party. They liked what they had and did not need to upgrade and moved to a third party. That movement saved the City over \$600,000.00 in upgrade costs. They saved that over the last three years, but now they would have to use those savings to upgrade the system and get an operating system that would probably be supported for many years to come. If Microsoft would continue to support the operating system, they would not even be discussing anything. They could not let the system be exposed, however.

Mr. Kaltsounis determined that Oracle owned JDE. He asked how they got away from Oracle to support the JDE program. Mr. Krajewski said that they paid for vendor support and used a third party to support. They did not do major upgrades to an application; the third party was used if a new law was passed, for example. Mr. Kaltsounis said that his company used Oracle for their software. Mr. Krajewski clarified that it was not the Oracle database - it ran on a Microsoft server. They had Peoplesoft, and Oracle bought that, and they were fusing it with JDE to get the best parts of each application. Mr. Kaltsounis noted that at his company, they just migrated the operating system to their server. Mr. Krajewski said that was something totally different than the Oracle Fusion financial application. It was owned by Oracle, but it was not the Oracle database application. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he personally had upgraded Microsoft Windows to Version 8, but maintained that he could still run his old programs on it. He asked why that could not be the same with the City's program. Mr. Krajewski said that he could not explain it, but Microsoft would not support the old version application. Mr. Kaltsounis thought they would have to do the same thing in ten years.

Mr. Kaltsounis questioned whether JDE could run on the new Microsoft database for Windows 8. Mr. Krajewski said it could not run on a new Microsoft database nor on a new Microsoft server operating system. Mr. Kaltsounis asked what Windows version they would go to. Mr. Krajewski said it would be whatever current version they had at the time of installation, and it would be the most current version. Mr. Kaltsounis said that there was the Vista-based and old Windows-based, and they were night and day. He wondered if they could get something in between to try to save money. It might not support 03, but maybe they could push things off a couple of years. Mr. Krajewski said that they were running on server 08. 2012 was out now, but they would not necessarily upgrade to that. They would usually wait for the bugs to be worked out. By the time they implemented the new application, in a year from now, they would make a decision at that time about what version to use. Whether they picked server 2012 or 2008, the cost would be the same. The licensing

for the operating system was peanuts compared to the rest of the cost. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if they paid per station or for one unit. Mr. Krajewski replied that the licensing used to be based on current user licensing, and then it was changed to the main users, and the City was given a credit for the number of licenses they had. He was not sure exactly what the license model was. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he was not against updating things, but there was a big number in front of them. He thought that Council would have a lot of questions, and he wanted to be sure the Planning Commission had looked over everything carefully. If the Windows 2012 server was Vista or XP-based, they could probably still use it. He acknowledged that Windows software had changed significantly, but regarding Windows support for security, he had been using OS3 at home, which had been obsolete for a while and was nothing they really supported. He thought there were different avenues they could take.

Mr. Krajewski said they could, but not safely. Mr. Kaltsounis just wanted it looked into because there would be a lot of questions. Mr. Krajewski said that the operating system cost was minimal. They had to upgrade in order to get security updates, which was very important. It was a browser-based application, so desktop users went through browsers for software. When Microsoft released Internet Explorer Version 8, the application would not run. It seemed like a benign upgrade; however, the application would not run through that browser. They had to wait for their third party support company to write a patch to allow it to run on Version 8. Then Version 9 came out and they had the same problem. Every time they did that, they ran the risk of the support company telling them there was nothing they could do. They were in a pickle, and it was kind of like a stack of dominos. If one thing fell over, it would knock everything else down, and pretty soon they could not use an application. That was what they were faced with when they held back on upgrades. Mr. Kaltsounis agreed there were a lot of stones to turn over. Mr. Krajewski reminded that the longer they waited, the more expensive the upgrade would be. They could save money on support but spend the money on the upgrade. For every upgrade, it was stressful on the users but eventually, it had to be done.

Mr. Hetrick indicated that it was good news that they were finding ways to reduce costs. He asked if they took the upgrade path versus a new system whether the maintenance cost would go up. Mr. Krajewski confirmed that it would on Oracle support. Mr. Hetrick asked if the \$40,000.00 per year would go up "somewhat." Mr. Krajewski agreed. Mr. Hetrick said it would be offset somewhat by reducing implementation

costs from \$3.1 million to \$1.5 million. Mr. Krajewski said that an upgrade was less expensive, certainly, and the implementation time would be less - four to five months. Mr. Hetrick added that reducing the implementation time would be more efficient for productivity and from users' perspectives.

Ms. Taylor stated that their project was for software for Assessing and Treasury. It included upgrades for the BS&A Assessing, Tax, Miscellaneous Receivable, Receipting and Special Assessment Software and training for the new applications. The current software was BS&A, and it was going to be phased out over the next few years. She noted that the Building Department had upgraded to the new Equalizer.net program. Oakland County Treasury and Equalization, with which the City shared data, would be upgrading this year to the Equalizer.net program. The implementation of the new program for Assessing and Treasury would help with the integration with the Building Department's .net program. The Receipting Software that Treasury was requesting would improve efficiency by eliminating double entry, which they currently had. It was her understanding, however, that the Receipting Software might be impacted by the financial package. Ms. Taylor asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Hetrick asked if it would change their costs if they took the upgrade path. Ms. Taylor thought not, because an upgrade would not include receipting. Mr. Sawdon added that the only impact the financial software might have would be on the receipting side. If they were approved to move forward, they would look at a receipting package as a module within the upgrade process. It would remove that item from Assessing's project. They would work together to make sure it was compatible. Mr. Hetrick asked if the two projects would be let together to perhaps further reduce the implementation expenses. Mr. Sawdon did not think so, because the financial conversion would be much different. The third party for each would not be the same.

Mr. Krajewski advised that MIS would be the third party and the software vendor. The financial system would take about six months to convert. Building's application took a couple of hours, and Treasury's would be the same. Mr. Hetrick asked if the RFP would be primarily for the software purchase, which was confirmed.

Mr. Reece asked why the maintenance costs would increase from \$10k to \$20k per year. Mr. Krajewski said that was what the vendor was charging, and the applications were different. It would be written in a different

program language. The vendor would consider it a new application, and they had set support costs. He did not know if they expected to have more support issues on a conversion. Mr. Reece asked if the maintenance costs were based on a lump sum figure per year so that if they were not needed, the City would still pay \$20k a year.

Mr. Krajewski related that the maintenance costs included updates which were released almost every day. They were constantly fixing bugs or enabling features. If the City did not have issues, they would still pay for maintenance - that was how the support was structured.

Ms. Taylor noted that the City did not get charged when the legislature decided to change the tax laws. The program would have to be re-written to accommodate the laws. That was another thing with the old Equalizer system. They were not writing any new enhancements except what was required by the State.

Mr. Krajewski addressed the Large Format Copier/Scanner/Plotter (I2-17) being requested by DPS/Engineering. He explained that it was designed for large plans and there would be a large format plotter. They said they needed to replace both, and the copier was on its last legs, and it was difficult to even get a copy. The large format plotter would be replaced with a faster one. They planned to see if there was a unit that would serve both purposes. There might not be an acceptable unit that did both, but he reminded that a lot could happen in a year. It was not his project, but he thought they were being conservative about the cost.

Mr. Dettloff asked if it would be more effective to purchase or lease or if leasing was even an option. Mr. Krajewski said they would definitely look at that. He said they had not leased in the past, but recently, the City replaced all the copiers and were leasing them.

Mr. Kaltsounis commented that he wished he had a 2009 plotter at his Tier 1 engineering center. His company had a nine-year old plotter. It was an ink jet, and it still worked, and they had no issues. Mr. Krajewski said that MIS had a seven-year old plotter. He said he could not answer why Engineering wanted to replace a 2009 unit with one for \$30k. Mr. Kaltsounis reiterated that theirs was almost ten years old, and it ran every day. He questioned the annual maintenance cost of \$10k. The City could lease a machine for about \$6k a year. His church leased one for that, and it was very high-end. Mr. Krajewski thought Engineering was erring on the side of caution, and it could be cheaper than what was in the CIP. Mr. Kaltsounis asked that leasing be looked into. He did not think

there was a good reason to own something. He highly recommended a high resolution color copier with a color scanner. He thought \$10k could replace the \$30k.

Mr. Reece asked if the department looked at outsourcing. Mr. Krajewski did not know, because it was not his project. He noted that people came to the counter and wanted copies that day, so he was not sure sending something out would work. Mr. Reece said they could get things within a day. Mr. Schroeder did not think it would be practical. Mr. Reece said that his company did it. They printed hundreds of construction documents a day. Mr. Krajewski said that he would pass that information along.

Hooper asked which department it was for and was told Engineering. Mr. Krajewski said that other departments, such as Planning, also used the machines.

Mr. Buckenmeyer came to the presenter's table. He advised that there were three new Parks projects. The first was the Calf Barn Adaptive Reuse at the Museum (PK-03E). They had already stabilized the structure and added a roof, doors and windows. The project would add a second floor, HVAC and other utilities and an elevator, and it would become a useful space for climate controlled archival storage, display and programmable spaces. The second project at the Museum was to replace the Equipment Barn (PK-03F). The Equipment Barn fell apart a few years ago, and the project would build a reproduction of the Barn. It would be useful for Staff for equipment storage, because it was stored outside currently. It would also provide a workshop to build displays and do restoration projects. The third project was Storage Building Addition at Spencer Park (PK-04E). There was a block building for storing equipment, and it was necessary to create some more storage space. They were currently storing equipment at the DPS Garage in the old salt building, but the City was going to demolish it. It would also give them the advantage of bringing all their Forestry equipment under one roof.

Mr. Buckenmeyer brought up the Rivebend Park Development. That project would re-create some wetland area. It was a very interesting parcel with interesting environmental features. Initially, they would create some restoration facilities, parking and pathways on the property to make it usable. Future possibilities would include restroom and educational facilities and fitness stations along the pathways. It was hoped that the project would begin this year and continue on next year.

Mr. Anzek recalled that last summer, students from Lawrence Technical University came to the City and presented concepts for the Park. The plans had been sitting at the back of the Planning Department since then, and they sparked the interest of a local resident, Steve Stolaruk. It was announced at the State of the City that his trust had verbally committed to a significant donation for the development of the Park. Based on that pledge, Council recently budgeted some money for design services and to get the necessary permits from the MDEQ for the wetland restoration. It was moving fairly quickly.

Mr. Yukon asked the anticipated size of the building at Spencer and whether it would be for cold storage. Mr. Buckenmeyer said it would be, and the only utility would be electricity for lighting. It would be about 30 x 50 feet. Mr. Yukon asked how many phases there would be to the project and how many years it would take. Mr. Buckenmeyer thought there would be two phases at the most, and Mr. Anzek thought that it would take about a year-and-a-half. Mr. Yukon asked if there was grant money available. Mr. Buckenmeyer said there could be grant money available, but phase one was being funded privately. Mr. Hooper advised that the City funded \$100,000.00 towards the project.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if there were potential environmental issues. Mr. Anzek did not believe so. When the City bought the land, it also bought a 100-foot strip between the contaminated property to the west and the Park as a buffer. In that buffer were four or five MDEQ monitoring wells, and they had picked up nothing in ten years. They believed that all migration was done. Based on recent testing at the Hamlin/Adams dump site, it was determined that the contaminant that remained were pcbs, which attached to dirt and did not migrate with ground water. They were encapsulated. He stated that he did not believe there was a problem, but cautioned that there were no guarantees. They received reports on the monitoring well steadily, and they had been good.

Mr. Schroeder asked when the shovels would hit the dirt on the project. Mr. Anzek said it could be in a matter of weeks. They had to go in and stabilize areas and cut the paths, which could happen in the spring. Mr. Schroeder asked if there had been any public notices about the project construction. Mr. Buckenmeyer said that they were not that far along yet, and they were still in the design process. Mr. Schroeder remarked that knowing Mr. Stolaruk, he would want to get going as soon as possible. Mr. Schroeder thought they should get the public involved. Mr. Anzek noted that the neighborhood associations were invited to the LTU presentation, and three people showed up. He stated that he would

anticipate a public hearing for public input. Once they knew more, they could present it to the citizens. They did not want to present something too open-ended, and they wanted to know what the MDEQ would permit.

Mr. Yukon recalled that about six years ago, Madison Park was before the Planning Commission. He believed they were going to try to tie Riverbend Park into the development. He asked how it would impact the project.

Mr. Anzek responded that they had discussed that because Madison Park was a landfill, they had no possibility of digging into the landfill to create a retention area. Riverbend Park needed water and they thought it would allow a good cooling system to allow it to get into the Clinton River. They worked out an agreement with the developers of Madison Park that would enable them to bring water and put it into Riverbend Park. Part of the design still incorporated that retention system. In exchange for allowing them to do that, they would make a contribution to the City. That development was rather dormant, however.

Chairperson Boswell asked if there were any further questions for Mr. Buckenmeyer. Hearing none, Mr. Anzek invited Mr. Schneck of DPS/Engineering Services to the table. In the meantime, Mr. Anzek mentioned the Master Thoroughfare Plan Update (MTP), which had been included in the CIP. It followed the Master Land Use Plan updates, which were scheduled for the next Planning Commission meeting. The MTP was due for an update, and a lot of the projects identified in 2009 were done or in the process of being done. It was a State mandate. He said he would be happy to answer any questions about that.

Mr. Hetrick commented that he fully supported the need to update the MTP, but he stated that the CIP was a capital document and the MTP update was an expense. That was why he suggested that it not be in the CIP.

Mr. Anzek said that they had discussed it. The CIP was used to identify costs and expenditures for the future, and sometimes, they were not always capital. He said that Mr. Hetrick's point was well taken; they just wanted to get it on the radar screen to help with budgeting.

Mr. Anzek mentioned the Sheldon Road paving project. As the Planning Commission was aware, at the approval of Clear Creek No. 5, the Commission requested that the developer pave further along Sheldon than they were proposing. They paved another 1,000 feet to the

cul-de-sac. The remainder of Sheldon to Mead was gravel, and the City decided to add it to the CIP and see if they could collect Act 51 money for it.

Along that same thinking, Staff added Crestline, north of Hamlin to Parkland, which was also gravel. About ten years ago, there was a proposal for a six-lot development on the east side of Crestline. The City was working with the applicant to get the road paved then, but the sub was never developed. He thought that both of the projects were logical connections.

Mr. Schneck agreed that regarding Crestline, there was a very sizeable project coming up for Hamlin Rd., which made paving Crestline very logical. The City would not have to maintain this gravel road any longer.

Mr. Schneck referred to SS-24, Sanitary Sewer Televising Camera. He explained that it was a device that DPS used to inspect the sanitary sewers. They had over 390 miles of sanitary sewers within the City. They looked at them to see in what kind of condition they were, not only from a maintenance standpoint, but from a capital improvement standpoint. It provided great insight to find out which pipes were in poor condition in a non-destructive manner. The current camera was 11 years old and took a lot of maintenance, and they would like to purchase a new one.

Mr. Schroeder suggested that Mr. Schneck mentioned the lead. Mr. Schneck said that oftentimes, as a customer service, as a by-product of inspecting the main lines, they would try to look at the leads coming into the main to see if there was root intrusion and/or blockages. Many times, customers would ask if the City had the ability to look up their lead to further assist. The camera did provide that ability.

Mr. Kaltsounis remembered that about five years ago, there was a request for another camera. He asked if the proposed request was for replacement of an older one and whether the City had four or five cameras. Mr. Schneck said that there was only one sanitary sewer camera. Mr. Kaltsounis wondered if they did not fulfill the request five years ago.

Mr. Anzek said that the camera was used almost daily. Mr. Kaltsounis said that Mr. Schneck mentioned that the camera was 11 years old, but he had been on the Commission for 11 years. Mr. Schroeder said that technology had really improved, and Mr. Kaltsounis said he understood, but that was what they were told five years ago. Mr. Schneck reiterated

that the camera he was aware of was 11 years old. Mr. Kaltsounis thought they never purchased another one, but Chairperson Boswell recalled that a request was in the CIP several years ago. Mr. Schneck said that as with the fleet vehicles, they evaluated the equipment every year and did a score card. They looked at depreciation and costs and made a decision.

Mr. Schroeder brought up the lead program, and said that as a City got older, such as Birmingham, it had failing leads, and they had no way of checking them. It was a lot of grief. He had been involved in lawsuits in Troy. Leads were private, but a City still had to work with the people. If they could have had a camera when he was in Troy, it would have saved a lot of time and money. It was worth it just for potential lawsuits. Mr. Schneck agreed. Mr. Schroeder said they could find where leads broke or whether there was a crack filled with dirt. They got answers, and it saved a great deal of Staff time.

Mr. Schneck talked next about the PRV Vault Installation: Dutton Road @ Acorn Glen (WS-12). He stated that PRV was a pressure reducing valve, and it was to be installed in the northern part of the City. A new development had gone in, with approximately seven houses, and there was one house experiencing water pressure issues. They were delivering the pressure appropriately and according to the Waterworks Association. It was not a desirable pressure, but it was within what pressures they were required to provide. The PRV would mitigate those pressure concerns for the seven-unit development, as well as provide some assistance for other property owners along the Dutton corridor.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked how they reduced pressure but increased it to the homes. He asked if it was a calming throughout the development - for example, he asked if they would cut someone else off so the seven units got more. Mr. Schneck said that it was a little bit of a misnomer. Oftentimes, the PRVs could reduce pressure and send it out at less, or they had the ability to balance those pressures. There was a certain amount of topography in the City. There was about 100 feet of elevation change from the northwest to the southeast part of the City. They had over 50 PRVs in the City that helped regulate the pressure. Along Dutton, there were also topography changes, and the PRV would help provide better pressure. Mr. Schroeder maintained that the problem had existed in Tienken Manor since the late 1950's. He lived on top of that.

Mr. Schneck stated that the next four projects were related. They were water replacement programs, essentially replacing old cast iron mains with a ductile iron or a high density polyethylene pipe. The decision for

which to use would be made at the time of installation. They could do pipe bursting with HDP pipe, and traditional construction installation would usually use a ductile iron pipe. He noted that they were monitoring watermain breaks in particular areas, and they were programmed for consecutive years.

Mr. Hooper mentioned pipe bursting, and said that his company just did a project in Van Buren Township. The problem with pipe bursting was that if there was a sanitary sewer lead or gas main that was within a foot of the watermain, it would cause problems. Four homes got backed up by sewage during the project. The contractor did not know where the lead was compared to the watermain. That was the flaw of using pipe bursting. They did not want to dig up everyone's yard, but they almost had to do it to find where the sewer leads were. He recommended that Mr. Schneck made sure that money was allocated to pay to locate each sanitary service or gas lead that might cross the main to be burst if there was a question about the depth relative to the watermain.

Mr. Schroeder suggested with the camera going up to the sanitary lead, that they could possibly get a rough elevation that way.

Mr. Schneck pointed out that with water replacements, they exercised the watermain valves in case there was a watermain break. They would have the ability to isolate a section of the main and fix it. They were finding that some of the valves could be broken open, or they could not open and close them, which would be another part of the project.

Mr. Schroeder asked if they would replace the hydrants, too. Mr. Schneck agreed that would be part of it.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that speaking as a plastics engineer, underground utilities and water scared him because of the effect on the ground. He heard a lot of things about underground electrical wires, which did not last very long with all the water and dirt. He did not like the use of plastic pipes. He referred to "plastic fatigue," and said he would rather see steel used for the lead.

Mr. Schneck said that they did take precaution against aggressive soils. Mr. Kaltsounis said that when plastic was put under pressure full time, there would be fatigue cracking. That was why he did not like plastic for pipes.

Mr. Schroeder asked if plastic leads were allowed. Mr. Schneck said they

still used 200 psi. Mr. Schroder said that when he left the City, they only used copper. Mr. Schneck thought that years ago, they found that plastic was easy to work with. They could use it without machinery. Mr. Schroeder agreed it was very light and easy to glue together. Mr. Schneck said that whether it was watermain or storm sewer, it was used. He spoke about the Mandrel test. They used the MDOT 2013 instruction spec book, which talked about depth as a concern of loading, so pipes were not crushed. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he worked with plastic every day. There were issues back in the day with people putting plastic pipes in their homes, and they had issues. Looking at a fatigue curve, and he used nylon six, it would not last. That was one of the best for temperature. He would not trust it under pressure, and he would not put it in his house. He stated that everyone might be using it, but 20 years from now, they would be discussing replacements again.

Mr. Hooper asked about School Rd. Mr. Anzek said that the question became how far should they pave, who were they serving, and what the additional associated costs would be. The developer for Harvard Place had the money for that frontage. They came up with a \$5 million dollar figure for 40 residents. They determined that it was a policy question that would ultimately have to go before the Planning Commission and City Council. They wondered if they would be paving the portion from John R to the eastern side of Harvard Place or to the bridge or from John R to Dequindre. There were three different cut-off points. There were utility costs. He recalled that years ago, there was a \$7-8 million expense to extend watermains and sewers in the northeastern part of the City with no return on investment. If they put water and sewer in the northeast part of the City, it would encourage density, but in this case, there were landfills. They had a planning overlay, but not a demand for water. Staff had a lot of questions regarding paving School, and they did not put it in the CIP to try to force the issue. They wanted to have more discussion with the Commission. The factor was that the element that would trigger the road would be Harvard Place, and the southern entrance was an emergency only access. If it worked out without opening the entrance, he thought that would be fine. Mr. Chirco (developer) would have to post a bond for paving, but it would not be built this year. It would take about three years to build 168 units. He asked if it could wait until next year to be put in the CIP so they could do more research and have more discussions. They had to decide the logical point to terminate the paving.

Mr. Schneck felt that one of the more challenging part was the utilities. They typically did not pave roads unless utilities were in place. He did not believe that sewer could be installed via gravity; he believed there

would have to be a pump station. That was another expense. It was not a traditional "start at the high point and tap the intersection." They needed to do a little more due diligence and see what the options were. They had to decide if they went to the west to John R with the sewer or if there were facilities on Dequindre.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that there had been many capital improvement plans that had to come at the last minute because of opportunity. It would not be the first time it happened, and he said he would rather let Staff do due diligence and make sure everything was laid out instead of doing a hodge-podge plan.

Mr. Anzek suggested that they could add it to pending projects to get it on there. There were citizens at the Harvard Place discussion at Planning Commission and at City Council, and a Council member wished to see School Rd. paving added to the CIP. They could do more research and do it right next year.

Mr. Hetrick thought that sounded like the best choice. He thought the questions that had arisen were fairly significant.

Mr. Anzek advised that the next day after the Planning Commission meeting, he sent an email to Staff, and they had a discussion about all the factors. Mr. Sawdon questioned the numbers and the viability. They would rather do it right than just throw a number out.

Mr. Hooper reminded that he had made a commitment to Mr. Yalimanchi to get it in the CIP. They could add everything about pending utilities, lift station, investigation, etc. Mr. Anzek advised that they would put it in as a bare bones project to have it on the radar screen and enhance it next year. Mr. Hooper suggested that they could make it a 2019 timeframe.

Mr. Schroeder said that another consideration was that when the whole area was landfill, there was no control - it leaked everywhere. He recommended that they take soil borings to make sure the landfill did not extend into the roadway. In the past, no one was watching the store, and they could be surprised at what they found.

Mr. Schroeder asked if all the utilities were in for Sheldon Rd. and if there was sewer and water. At one time years ago, the owner of a property in Oakland Township wanted the City to extend sewer and water for his property. Mr. Schneck believed that there was sewer and water to Mead, but if someone had a well, they could stay on it. He said he would

confirm, but the public utilities were there. Mr. Schroeder thought it probably had been addressed, but he said that there were a lot of drainage problems there, and the road would wash out. Chairperson Boswell pointed out the Water System maps, which showed it had sewer and water.

Chairperson Boswell asked if anyone had further comments about existing or pending projects or anything else in the CIP.

Mr. Yukon asked if an RFP would go out for the Master Thoroughfare Plan.

Mr. Anzek said that they had not really defined the skill set they were looking for to assist them. Mr. Breuckman and he would be coming forward to the Planning Commission with some of the issues they had been dealing with over the last year, including walkability, form based planning and zoning and whether they needed to do anything with the streets. They knew that the Complete Streets and Rochester Road Access Management Plan would be a part of the MTP. As far as any other approaches to street designing, they would have discussions with the Commission over the next several months. They needed to discuss what they would do to entice and excite and attract reinvestment into various areas. He noted that City Council recently approved the office buildings on the Twist Drill site as historically significant. They needed to decide how to work with the owners or new owners on a creative and dynamic plan for that site.

Chairperson Boswell opened the Public Hearing at 8:55 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, he closed the Public Hearing.

Hearing no further discussion, Ms. Brnabic moved the following motion, seconded by Mr. Kaltsounis.

MOTION *by Brnabic, seconded by Kaltsounis, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission Approves the Capital Improvement Plan that has been proposed for the years 2014-2019. The Rochester Hills Planning Commission has determined the following:*

WHEREAS, *the Municipal Planning Act, Act 285 of Public Acts of 1931, as amended, requires the Rochester Hills Planning Commission to annually accept a Capital Improvement Plan for the benefit of the health, safety and welfare of the community as those criteria relate to the physical development of Rochester Hills; and*

WHEREAS, the Rochester Hills Fiscal Office has consulted with the City's professional staff who carry out the business of planning for and providing for the present and future needs and desires of the citizens of Rochester Hills; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvement Plan is meant to consider the immediate and future needs and goals of Rochester Hills, as identified by the public, City Boards and Commissions, and the Mayor's staff, in light of existing projects and plans and anticipated resources; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvement Plan is a flexible document, necessarily meant to be reevaluated and amended each year, to project into the six (6) succeeding years, and further amended as needed to address practical realities as they relate to policies and philosophies of relevant Boards, the City Council and the Mayor's office; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvement Plan is a guide and forum to aid the Rochester Hills Mayor's Office and the Rochester Hills City Council in making decisions regarding the physical development and infrastructure maintenance of the City and determining what, if any, resources can or should be available to carry out City Council's policies and budgetary decisions; and

WHEREAS, the components of the Capital Improvement Plan have been subject to a Public Hearing, public review, and committee reviews over the course of several years and a duly noticed full Public Hearing on April 16, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the components of the Capital Improvement Plan were arrived at through a point system using variables that included, among other things, whether the project has begun, funds committed, sources of funds, prior City Council decisions, Planning Commission or administrative recommendations and decisions; and

RESOLVED, that the Capital Improvement Plan presented for review on April 16, 2013, is adopted by the Rochester Hills Planning Commission on April 16, 2013; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Plan should be published and attested to according to law.

A motion was made by Brnabic, seconded by Kaltsounis, that this matter be Adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 9 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hetrick, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Chairperson Boswell stated that the motion had passed unanimously. Mr. Anzek thanked the Commissioners, and said that he would look into the comments and questions. He advised that School Rd. would be added as a project, which was a condition of approval.

Ms. Brnabic asked if the City put Amber Alerts on the message board whether it would extend to the new sign at the fire station. Mr. Anzek said that the sign in front of City Hall was controlled by software in the Mayor's office. He thought that he had read one on the sign one evening, but he would check with the Mayor's office and check the capability.

Mr. Dettloff asked if School Rd. should be part of the Resolution. Mr. Anzek felt that the intended statement was clearly in the Minutes.

2013-0143

Review of Oakland Township Rezoning Request for O'Connor Nature Park at the northeast corner of Rochester Rd. and Mead Rd.

(Reference: Memo prepared by Ed Anzek, dated April 16, 2013 and documents from Oakland Township, various dates, had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Mr. Schroeder thought that rezoning the parkland was a great idea and a good thing for the City. His only concern would be the location of the parking lot. They said they would increase the setbacks, so he felt it would aid if they had to have a parking lot at the corner.

Mr. Anzek stated that he offered the matter with a potential motion, because it was relatively new in the State law that adjacent townships were required to go through a rezoning discussion at the County's Zoning Committee. It was done for Blossom Ridge at Dutton and Adams. In the past, when the Commissioners had a position to comment, they had basically taken a hands-off/no comment role. He was not saying which route to take, because if there was something offensive in the future, the Commission would want to have a say. They could either make no comment or make a supporting comment.

Mr. Schroeder moved the following motion, seconded by Mr. Kaltsounis:

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Kaltsounis, that after a review at its April 16, 2013 meeting, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission

hereby supports the proposed Rezoning of O'Connor Nature Park located at the northeast corner of Rochester Rd. and Mead Rd.

Mr. Anzek added that he would never want to second guess another community's Master Plan. He would not want them second guessing Rochester Hills', either.

Mr. Hetrick asked if he could assume that the Rochester Hills neighbors to the south said nothing other than thank you. Mr. Anzek said that they had not spoken up like they did with Blossom Ridge.

Mr. Hooper said that personally, he felt that they should stay out of the matter, and he would prefer to have no comment. They did not know what Oakland Township's Master Plan or zoning was or anything about the history of the property. They did not know what the neighbors felt about it, and they had not heard how the Rochester Hills residents felt. Like the Blossom Ridge issue, his philosophy was that it had nothing to do with Rochester Hills, and that they should stay out of it. If the majority of the Planning Commissioners wanted to move the matter forward, it would be fine, but he would vote no if it did.

Chairperson Boswell agreed with Mr. Hooper. Mr. Anzek thought they could be going down a slippery slope if they started offering opinions. Mr. Yukon agreed.

Mr. Schroeder said that he would formally withdraw the motion. Chairperson Boswell suggested that they could send a note thanking them for sharing it with the City, and saying that they had no comments. Mr. Anzek said that he would be happy to prepare a letter in that regard and send it to the County.

Chairperson Boswell asked if a letter was sent regarding Blossom Ridge. Mr. Anzek advised that Council sent a letter saying they had collected residents' comments and were forwarding, and would forward them, but Council did not offer an opinion one way or the other. Mr. Hooper said that was correct; they just stated the facts and took no position.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

2013-0116 Request for Election of Officers - Chairperson, Vice Chairperson and Secretary for a one year term to expire the first meeting in April 2014

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, that the Rochester Hills

Planning Commission hereby re-appoints Chairperson Boswell to serve as its Chairperson for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2014.

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby re-appoints Deborah Brnabic to serve as its Vice Chairperson for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2014.

MOTION by Brnabic, seconded by Yukon, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby re-appoints Nicholas Kaltsonis to serve as its Secretary for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2014.

Voice Votes were taken after each motion and all passed unanimously.

Approved

NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairperson Boswell reminded the Commissioners that the next Special Meeting was scheduled for April 30, 2013.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission, and upon motion by Hetrick, Chairperson Boswell adjourned the Regular Meeting at 9:14 p.m.

William F. Boswell, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Nicholas Kaltsounis, Secretary
Rochester Hills Planning Commission