



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 5, 2011

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

Absent 1 - Nicholas Kaltsounis

Quorum Present

Also present: Ed Anzek, Director of Planning and Economic Development

Keith Sawdon, Director of Fiscal
Scott Cope, Director of Building
Alan Buckenmeyer, Manager of Parks
Kevin Krajewski, Deputy Director of MIS
Paul Davis, City Engineer
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2011-0137 February 22, 2011 Special Meeting

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

Aye 8 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hetrick, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 1 - Kaltsounis

2011-0139 March 1, 2011 Regular Meeting

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

Aye 8 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hetrick, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 1 - Kaltsounis

COMMUNICATIONS

A) *Planning & Zoning News dated February 2011*

B) *Washington Township Announcement of Master Land Use Plan Update*

NEW BUSINESS

2011-0138 Request for Adoption of the 2012-2017 Capital Improvement Plan (Public Hearing)

(Reference: Memo prepared by Keith Sawdon, Director of Fiscal, dated April 5, 201, and Draft 2012-2017 CIP had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Mr. Anzek stated that Staff would present the new Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) projects submitted to the City for consideration. It was the 15th year of doing the program. The CIP helped the City organize necessary repairs, upgrades and improvements to the City's existing infrastructure, and maintain existing infrastructure, which was a priority of City Council. He noted that the Public Hearing was scheduled in April rather than May, and if the Commission was satisfied with the Plan, they were respectfully requesting an approval, which would enable the Fiscal Department to start with the budgeting process sooner. He referred to the memo provided by Mr. Sawdon, which discussed 55 projects - 12 had been completed, five reclassified and 38 deleted from this year's CIP. He thanked Mr. Schroeder and Mr. Hetrick for their involvement on the Policy Team.

Mr. Sawdon stated that they determined that some projects in the Capital Plan were more operational than capital in nature. In total, the costs indicated that they were capital, but on an individual basis, they were under the \$25,000.00 threshold. A good example was gear bought for the Fire Department. On an individual pursuit basis, it did not meet the \$25,000.00 threshold, but in an aggregate for all the suits being bought, they would exceed that total. In addition, those items were bought through

an operating line item versus a capital line item. They felt it was more appropriate to be handled at the operational budget level than in the CIP. The Policy Team agreed, and that policy was reflected in this year's CIP. They did remove 38 items, but a lot of them were in the pending area. They had the departments take a closer look, to see if it would ever be likely that they would be done within the City's Capital program. At one point they seemed possible, but through the years, that became less likely.

Mr. Anzek advised that they would be working from page 89 in the draft, which listed the new projects. They added page numbers showing where to find specifics about each project. He asked Mr. Cope to begin, noting that he had taken on the new role of Facilities Manager.

Mr. Cope referenced FA-01H, the City Hall: Energy Management System Upgrade. It involved an upgrade to the current system, which monitored the HVAC and lighting systems. The upgrade was needed because it had been on an older computer for which the hard drives tended to fail. The City would have to purchase new software with a new computer. MIS had a concern that if something happened and the computer went down, there would be no energy management system at all. The system had also never been used to its full capacity, because of its complications. Staff was in the process of installing new energy management and HVAC systems at the Fire Station. Through the Energy, Efficiency Conservation Block Grant (EECBG), the City had received Federal funding and would also be installing new energy management systems at the DPS building and the other fire stations. They could be remotely accessed to change and monitor the status of all the equipment.

Mr. Cope's next referenced FA-02D, Fire Station #1: Entryway Roof Repair. It had been on the list for a few years, and since he was new to Facilities, he was not aware of it and put it on again based on some incidences he saw. The City was in the process of re-insulating and re-roofing at Fire Station One. They looked at the slope and how the water and snow ran off onto the entry area and wanted to change the slope.

Mr. Dettloff asked if the roof issue posed potential liability issues for the City. He noted that it was scheduled for 2013, but based on the information, it seemed that the City could be exposed to a liability. He wondered if there was a reason other than funding why it would not be done sooner.

Mr. Cope said that the lack of funding was the reason it was not budgeted

for 2011. He hoped to budget it for 2013, and it could be done in 2012. He was concerned about the safety aspect and the possibility of slip and fall lawsuits.

Ms. Brnabic referred to FA-02I, Fire Station #1: Electrical Panel Replacement. She was very concerned that it was scheduled for 2012. She read from the description: "The report also rated the fire alarm panel and six electrical panels as unacceptable or poor. Four existing electrical panels were noted as having a history of problems that may cause a fire. This project will reduce the risk of fire damage, increase the level of safety and extend the service life of the building. Repairs are planned for 2012." She questioned why they would wait until 2012 for something that could cause a fire at the main fire station. She pointed out that the fundamental principal of the Fire Department was safety. She asked why they would wait another year to clear up that situation, noting that it was \$30,000.00, but it would cost a lot more if something happened. She thought they might be able to transfer funds, such as from the Apparatus Fund. She stated that it was not a "want" - it was a need and a safety issue - and that it should be a priority.

Mr. Cope said that he could not agree more. It was just brought to his attention as he considered projects for the CIP. If there was a possibility, he would like to take care of it. One of his main reasons for wanting to take care of the building was because it was the City's emergency operation center and main fire station.

Mr. Sawdon said that once it was in the CIP, they could look at it for a budget amendment, and bring it before Council. The first step was to get it in the Capital Plan because of the nature of the purchase. They could extract it from the Capital Plan through a budget amendment to the regular operating budget. Ms. Brnabic stated that she would like to see that done.

Mr. Cope advised that a study was done by Partners in Architecture in 2010 that identified all the ADA concerns in the City's facilities. The next project, FA-02H, Fire Station #1: ADA Sidewalk Replacement was to replace the sidewalk because of ADA requirements. It would involve replacement around the entire perimeter of Fire Station #1, and of the guardrails and handrails. The sidewalks at Fire Station #1 were a major concern, because the public often used it. Mr. Schroeder asked how the ADA was missed for a relatively new building. Mr. Cope was not sure if the sidewalks were put in originally in error or not.

Mr. Anzek noted that since the ADA was first signed into law in 1990, the standards had been tightened four times through the years.

Mr. Reece asked if the building met ADA requirements when it was originally designed and constructed. He pointed out that if it was designed and built after ADA was adopted, the City might have justification to go back to the architect or builder. Mr. Anzek was not sure when it was built. Mr. Cope said that there used to be different requirements for building codes and ADA requirements, and he did not know which was used when constructed. The building codes used to require substantially less than ADA, but they were very close now. Mr. Schroeder advised that the station was built in 1985, which would have been before ADA was adopted.

Mr. Cope's discussed FA-02J, Fire Station #1: Exterior Painting, which had been identified in a study in 2008. Last year, the City put a substantial amount of money into a crack on the outside of the building. There were a number of other cracks in the masonry, and it needed to be stained to extend the life of the building. There had been a lot of activity in the last six-eight months related to the EECBG funding the City received and the large HVAC project. The building had not been maintained properly through the years, but they had the opportunity through different funding mechanisms to put some money into it to keep it an asset.

Mr. Cope referred to FA-05, Van Hoosen Farmhouse Boiler Replacement, which was another item noted in the 2008 study. He indicated a 2014 replacement date. They had been doing maintenance, and they believed that they could make it to 2014.

Mr. Cope referred to FA-13K, Fire State #3: Parking Lot Rehabilitation. There were a number of spaces around the catch basins that were damaged and the entire lot needed resurfacing.

The last project Mr. Cope discussed was IS-16, Ordinance Field Laptop Upgrade, which was related to the Building Department's Ordinance Division. The project was approved through the 2011 budget, and when MIS started looking into it at the end of 2010, they found that the software was not going to be supported for that type of application any longer. If they wanted to use field laptop computers, they would need to upgrade the software. They had taken on the duties for Facilities and moved some work from the Clerical Staff to the Ordinance Staff, assuming they would be able to get the computers and do work in the field. The cost went from

\$11,000.00 to \$59,000.00, but they felt that there would be a savings of about \$25,000.00 per year and a three-year payback, based on the ability to shift the work to the Ordinance Staff.

Mr. Buckenmeyer came forward to discuss PK-10D, the Clinton River Trail Development. The Friends of the Clinton River Trail had spent over a year doing a master plan to tie five communities together and to identify signage and informational kiosks so everything looked alike up and down the Clinton River. They were fine tuning the designs and materials to keep the costs down, but it would still be well over \$25,000.00. They intended to do it with grants, and the City would add matching funds. They hoped it would begin as early as 2012, but it would depend on grant cycles.

Mr. Anzek advised that he, Mr. Hartner, Director of Parks and Forestry and Ms. Melinda Hill, a resident in attendance, also participated in the project. The Friends of the Clinton River Trail had secured a grant and hired professionals out of Michigan State. They took them through a way finding process and showed them the products, and he felt that it definitely would be a plus.

Mr. Davis was present to talk about the balance of the projects, which were engineering related. He referred to MR-13D, Dequindre Road Rehabilitation (South Blvd. - Auburn Road), and noted that it was a Road Commission project. They thought it would be done many years out but suddenly, funding became available through the American Recovery Act, and there was a potential that it could be done sooner than 2013. During the last Oakland County Funding Committee meeting, the project was even discussed for 2011. There was an upcoming May meeting, and it would be decided at that time whether to move the project ahead. Work could start this summer, and there would be a July letting if approved in May. In case that did not happen, they wanted to get it in the CIP. The work was planned between South Boulevard and Auburn and it was a 3-R project - to resurface, restore and rehabilitate the road, which had a very poor driving surface.

Mr. Schroeder asked if the project was still in for the long term fix. Mr. Davis said it was in the Thoroughfare Plan, but no one had submitted a funding application. He agreed that a 3-R project was more of a temporary fix. A 4-R included a reconstruct and a more permanent, 20-year replacement for the road section.

Ms. Brnabic asked if there were any plans to fix South Boulevard from

Dequindre west to the M-59 exit, noting that the road was terrible. Mr. Davis did not believe that area would be fixed. He said that typically, they would not go that far, but just go into the intersection and taper. He offered to make a request if the project went forward in 2011.

Mr. Schroeder asked if there was any CMAQC (Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Control) funding left for any projects. Mr. Davis did not believe so. Mr. Schroeder said that the City used to be able to take care of those types of projects with that, but Mr. Davis had not heard of too many projects getting that funding.

Mr. Hetrick mentioned budget amendments brought up by Mr. Sawdon, and he asked if the same principal would apply if the Dequindre project came forward in 2011. Mr. Sawdon agreed. Mr. Hetrick asked if something would have to come off the list of things to do to make way for it. Mr. Sawdon said it could also be that if a project came up that had substantial funding from another source, the City would have the ability to leverage money. If it was not in a Capital Plan, it would be up to Council.

Mr. Davis referred to MR-26E, Livernois Road Bridge Replacement @ Clinton River, and advised that it had already commenced. City Council had agreed to participate in the engineering design. It was proposed to be added to the CIP because of the uncertainty of the timing of the funding. It was another project that had the ability to move up quite early, or, in a worst case scenario, it would be in 2014, assuming it was determined in November. He stated that the Livernois bridge was in desperate need of replacement, and they were hopeful that the efforts the Road Commission had undertaken already to try to limit traffic over the bridge would allow it to continue to be used and not have to be closed entirely. The project rated very highly and was in the same boat as Avon - they were extremely limited as to load restrictions, and they were emergencies for the community. Unfortunately, they were grouped in with a funding program that was being utilized through the Local Bridge Program that was very competitive and had limited funding throughout the State. At this point, Livernois had not been approved for funding, but they were hopeful that it would be for this year. Council had already taken the initiative to share the design costs with the Road Commission to move it forward.

Mr. Schroeder asked the status of the engineering and hydraulic study. Mr. Davis said that it had not been started yet. Mr. Schroeder asked about field surveying, and Mr. Davis said that some of that work had started. The consultant would be doing the design for both bridge

projects. It made sense to combine the projects to take advantage of a single consultant, and they would have similar designs with five-lane bridges. It had been addressed with the Pathway Committee, and they made a recommendation to have pathways incorporated with both bridges on both sides. The bridge footprint would be larger than what was there today. The Consultant would pick up the topography and do the soil borings and hydraulic study, and because the bridges were in such close proximity, it was important that they related to each other. The hydraulic study would look at the potential impact for the intersection at Avon and Livernois. If the bridge was raised, it could create a slope to go into further road improvements to the intersection. It would take a while to gather the data and get it approved through the DEQ. Mr. Schroeder asked if a decision had been made about the deck materials, and Mr. Davis said it had not yet.

Mr. Davis noted MR-43B, the Rain Tree Roundabout Reconstruction project, which was one of several in that area. The first one, the repaving of Rain Tree between Adams, Firewood and Falcon, was almost completed to be put out for bids. Along with that project, there would be a new pathway constructed on the north side. They did a walk through with some homeowners and there were some spots where there could be crossings at intersections to try and minimize tree removals. They looked at how the pathway would go through the roundabout at Firewood and Rain Tree and the pedestrian accommodation was very poor. The refuge islands were very small. The traffic circle there now was not in conformance with current roundabout design standards. As a result of the poor condition of the roundabout, there were projects in the CIP to repave Firewood and Falcon between Walton and Tienken. The subject project was the missing fourth piece, and was proposed as a separate project this year.

Mr. Davis discussed MR-49E, the Avon Road Rehabilitation (Adams Road - Crooks Road) 3-R project that the Road Commission was moving forward. They were looking for opportunities to take advantage of the same contractor also constructing a pathway in the gaps.

Mr. Davis referred to PW-02F, Hamlin Pathway (John R Road - Dequindre Road). The City submitted the project last year for Federal funding and it just missed the cutoff; this year it made it. Hamlin was a City road with the exception of one piece on the west end of the City, and there would be a 20% City share.

Mr. Davis discussed PW-26E, Livernois Pathway (Avon Road - 850°

Southbound), and said that because of the bridge reconstruction, they looked at the limits of what the bridge project would accommodate and would pay for the pathway construction. He felt that it made sense for the City to participate, to a greater extent, in pathway construction in order to complete a link. The Avon pathway between Castlebar and Wilwood was being included with the work to be done for the Avon Road 3-R project.

Regarding SS-22B, Grant Pump Station Replacement, Mr. Davis stated that they were initially looking at just replacing the pumps. The station was an older design, with an elevator and an above ground building. It was time to replace the pumps, and they found that in order to do that, they had to have a provision for the bypass flow, which they did not have at this station. The City undertook a previous project and constructed a bypass chamber (SS-21A in 2006), which was just under \$34,000.00. After that, they discovered they needed to replace the valves, and the City undertook another project. Both projects were in an effort to replace the pumps. This past year, they were going to replace the pumps, controls and the motors at the station, but when they got bids from the contractors, they were just under \$400,000.00. They felt that was very expensive when compared with what they had spent when they rebuilt the entire Michelson Pump Station for about \$400,000.00. There were larger pumps than needed, a station that was outdated, they had to do work on the roof and elevator, and there were missing components. There was an odor control unit there for a number of years that would eventually need some work. If they had gone to a submersible station such as Michelson, they could avoid a lot of problems and end up with a new facility. They did not, unfortunately, know how expensive the pumps would be until the bids came in, but at \$400,000.00, they decided they should reconstruct the station instead. It would be \$785,000.00 for a new facility, so he felt it was a warranted project. Mr. Schroeder asked if that included the removal of the old one, which Mr. Davis confirmed.

Mr. Yukon asked what steps would be taken when the station was down during construction and how the area would be serviced.

Mr. Davis said that was one of the benefits of having the bypass in place - they could utilize it, rather than having to build a new one. They would build next to it, and they would keep it in service as long as they could, but there would be a point where they would need to cut over the flow and bypass pump until they activated the new station.

Mr. Davis concluded with the last project, WS-49F, Avon Road Bridge Water Main Replacement. The existing watermain on the south side of

the Avon Road Bridge was in near conflict with the wing wall of the existing bridge. It had very little cover, and there were some baskets above it to provide some protection, but it needed to be replaced and relocated as part of the Avon Road Bridge project. The structure would be bigger, and it would definitely encroach into the existing watermain. It would be bid out, but there would not be a participating cost the City would cover. Mr. Reece noted that the work would start in 2012, and he asked if there would be an issue with the existing bridge in its new location and where the watermain would go. Mr. Davis said that the Avon bridge would be done in 2012, and Mr. Reece clarified that it would go hand-in-hand with the watermain schedule.

Ms. Brnabic referred to page 40, project PW-06C, Auburn Road Pathway Gaps (John R Road - Dequindre Road). She summarized that the Pathway Program was initiated in the mid-1970's, and that there was a new millage in 2006 for 20 years. There were also two ten-year millages in effect before that. She wondered why the project kept getting pushed into the future, observing that it was just to fill the gaps on Auburn. In 2008, the CIP projected the completion time of 2009/10 and by 2010, it was geared for 2011/12; last year it was moved to 2012/13 and this year it showed 2015/16. She stated that it was not a mile; it was just to fill pathway gaps, and she questioned why after all these years it had not been completed. There were gaps on the north side that made it unwalkable in bad weather. She reminded that Rochester Hills wanted to create a walkable community. She used the paths a lot, and there were slabs that were really in disrepair. She felt that they needed to look more closely at the really poor ones to get them repaired. She wondered why it kept getting postponed, because she felt it was long overdue.

Mr. Anzek explained the fundamental reasons why there were gaps. He stated that the City took every opportunity to get developers to build a segment of the pathway across their frontage, but that did not get something built on the east, west, north or south of the development. There was an ongoing effort by Engineering to secure right-of-way to put in pathways. They had gaps because residents and property owners were not cooperative in selling the easement or making it available.

Ms. Brnabic asked why it was constantly being moved into the future. Mr. Davis agreed with Mr. Anzek that they did look for opportunities to fill gaps. When homes were up for sale, they sometimes had an opportunity to get easements from people. They had not done any condemning for pathway easements in order to fill gaps. Sometimes they would wait for developers to construct pathways so they did not hit the City's millage;

other times they would wait for opportunities because homeowners were not always cooperative. Some people did not want others walking in front of their homes. The City would rather spend its money building a new pathway in an area where people wanted it instead of fighting someone legally to try to get access. The City had a ranking system, and the Ad-Hoc Committee for pathways came up with a formula that prioritized projects. Prioritizing points were often given for connectivity to the trails or to a school. They ranked the projects according to a formula, and Auburn was not as high a priority as some of the others. Although 20 years sounded like a long time for a Pathway Millage, and it might seem that the City should be constructing them all over, the fact was that the millage was drawn for three purposes, and constructing new pathways was only one. The other two were overlaying existing pathway stretches - every year there was a Pathway Rehab Program done for crack sealing or overlays - or they spent money on maintenance. There were snowplowing and tree removals charged to the Pathway Millage. There were also regular repairs, and they used the millage money for all three items. It was not a high priority for Auburn because it would not be done in coordination with a road project or it was just that other projects ranked higher.

Ms. Brnabic said that she was not aware of the fact that the City had a problem getting easements. Mr. Anzek stated that most of the gaps were because of that. Mr. Schroeder noted that the Pathway Millage started in 1974 and the administration at the time did not want to spend money on right-of-way, so the City came to a standstill regarding that. Ms. Brnabic said she understood, but as far as waiting for redevelopment for some of the gaps, she did not think it would be very likely. Mr. Anzek assured that Engineering looked at it all the time, but they did use a ranking system.

Mr. Davis indicated that MDOT was always looking to turn over jurisdiction of Auburn Rd because M-59 was its priority, not Auburn. They asked what it would take for the City to take over Auburn, and the City listed 19 conditions and one was that pathways should be built all along Auburn Road. MDOT never answered the letter, but he maintained that they would be back at some point, and the City would ask again.

Mr. Schroeder stressed that the cost of right-of-way was phenomenal. The last Big Beaver project in Troy at Dequindre was \$2,000,000, and the right-of-way was \$3,000,000 plus. Ms. Brnabic said there were circumstances involved she was not totally aware, but she said there could always be other priorities since it had been so many years. Some areas were just an inconvenience, but she felt that there could be a safety

issue with some of the others. She hoped there would not always be a "higher priority."

Ms. Brnabic asked if the Commissioners could receive an update regarding the electrical panel repair and the South Boulevard issue. She would like to know if something changed or there would be a budget amendment and if work would be done. Mr. Anzek said that the first order of business was to get it into an adopted CIP, then get the Fire Chief and Mr. Cope involved to review the severity, make Council aware of it and request the appropriate funds. He said he would be glad to give an update.

Chairperson Boswell opened the Public Hearing at 8:10 p.m.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, Rochester Hills, MI 48306. Ms. Hill said that she was pleasantly surprised and encouraged by the presentation and discussion. She thought it was a first - having some of the Department heads talking about the actual projects. She also heard more conversation from the Planning Commissioners than in the past. She commented that the meeting was poorly noticed and it was not on the City's website. She said that in the future, she hoped the City did a better job of getting it on the City's website so people knew about it. She felt that the CIP was a great tool, and she wanted it to continue to be a great tool for the budgeting process. She mentioned the Van Hoosen boiler, and said it was only \$25,000.00, and she was not really happy to hear that it was scheduled for 2014. She hoped it would be looked at, since it was rated as poor. Regarding the Clinton River Trail project, there was a typo on the description on page 47; it should have read 2012-2015, not 2015-2015. She questioned why FA-10, on page 54, Energy Efficiency Analysis, was not under Professional Services as a PS project. Regarding the overall CIP, over the last couple of years she had proposed adding recurring projects. The CIP policy was for one time, non-recurring projects. There were now ten recurring projects with a proposed projected annual cost of \$4.5 million dollars. If someone looked at that for budgeting purposes, the City should be putting \$4.5 million towards the ten projects. She did not have a problem that they recognized recurring projects; she wished to see them in their own section. She thought that would help point them out and separate them from the non-recurring, one-time capital projects, and it would work better as a budgeting tool. She asked that they look at that again, since they had gone from one originally in 2007 to ten. She brought up the Grant Pump Station, and said that it was interesting that the project was presented as a new project in 2006 for the bypass and the replacement

pumps and that in 2007, the bypass portion was removed and it showed \$117,000.00. She said she would like to see the figures align a little more closely. In 2008, SS-22B was back in the CIP at \$98,000.00 for replacement pumps. In 2009 it was gone, and in 2010 it was back in for \$192,000.00. In 2011 it was out, as it was going to be completed, and now it showed a price of \$400,000.00. It sounded like a government "toilet seat" project to her. She did not want something that was not efficient for the community, but she felt that it was certainly questionable, and she felt that Council needed to take a much closer look at it if it was going to be presented into the 2012 budget. She reminded that just because it was in the CIP did not mean it had to be a budgeted project. She realized that it was more of Council's issue than Planning Commission's. She stated that she was glad to see the review, and reiterated that she wanted to see the CIP remain an effective tool. She concluded that if it was made to be something that functioned well and according to policy, it could be a good working tool.

Chairperson Boswell closed the Public Hearing at 8:17 p.m.

Chairperson Boswell asked Mr. Davis to address the history of the Grant Pump Station. Mr. Davis expressed that the project had evolved. They were able to do the bypass a lot cheaper than originally estimated, but when the bids came in for the pumps, motors and controls, it was a lot higher than they thought. They did not expect, with the economy and the amount of work to be done, that it would be the same cost as reconstructing the whole Michelson Station. If it had come in closer to the original estimate, they probably would not be proposing to rebuild the station.

Mr. Schroeder stated that it was a better way to go in the long term, and there would be reduced maintenance costs. Mr. Davis agreed, and said that the pumps were oversized for the flow, and it was not as efficient an operation. They could continue, but once they got the bids, it opened their eyes to the possibility of doing something different. Mr. Schroeder reminded that the bypass was not there just for that project, and he felt that the Grant project made sense.

Mr. Hetrick said that when the Policy team was discussing it, there was a lot of talk about the maintenance and how there would be a significant savings by doing a new station versus trying to maintain the old pumps. He felt there was a reasonable business case. Also, he thought that Ms. Hill had a good idea about recurring projects. He felt that if there were recurring projects, that they might delineate the recurring capital

expenses.

Mr. Sawdon responded that they were large enough to be in the Capital Plan. In his opinion, if they were in a separate section, it would not be as efficient. The Fiscal team felt it was more efficient to have everything in one spot. He felt it would be easier, for example, for a citizen who picked up the Plan and wanted to know what the City was doing in Local Roads. They would not have to look at one section that was non-recurring and another that was recurring and try to put it together as a total plan. If someone looked at a roadway, there were some items that would be done every year and some that would be done once, but there would be one spot for everything. For Fiscal planning, they could pick up everything by year by a certain fund type, and it worked better for them. He acknowledged that there were many more recurring projects than in the past. He indicated that if the Commissioners wanted it split, it would not be a problem. Mr. Hetrick asked if the recurring projects were mainly in road construction, and Mr. Sawdon noted that there were also some in other places.

Mr. Anzek mentioned that Mr. Hartner pointed out a need to update page 45 because it was written as though the City would be doing a Parks and Recreation Master Plan, but it had already been completed and was in the DNR's hands.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Schroeder moved the following motion:

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Hetrick, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission Approves the Capital Improvement Plan, with revisions documented in the minutes by staff, that has been proposed for the years 2012-2017. 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 on 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 hearings, public review, and committee reviews over the course of several years and a duly noticed full Public Hearing on April 5, 2011; 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 5, 2011, is adopted by the Rochester Hills Planning Commission on April 5, 2011; and

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

Mr. Hooper referred to the vector truck under 2012 fleet, and said that it was approved for purchase in 2011, but it was shown for 2012. Mr. Sawdon said that would be updated and moved from 2012.

Mr. Hooper pointed out that there were six tandem axle dump trucks (snowplow vehicles) to be replaced in 2013, and he asked Mr. Davis if some of them could be moved up into 2012. Mr. Schroeder asked if the

City had the funds to do that, and Mr. Hooper agreed. He thought that rather than doing all six in 2013, they could do two or three in 2012. He explained that the prices they received last year were very competitive. Mr. Halliday of the DPS garage had informed that there were some issues with the diesel exhaust requirements for some of the older vehicles. The maintenance was getting to be prohibitive, and they needed to be replaced.

A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Hetrick, that this matter be Adopted. The motion carried by the following vote.

Aye 8 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hetrick, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 1 - Kaltsounis

Chairperson Boswell stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

2011-0140 Election of Officers for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2012 (Chairperson, Vice Chairperson and Secretary)

Chairperson Boswell and Vice Chairperson Brnabic accepted nominations to be re-elected, and the following motions were made:

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Reece, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby elects William Boswell as its Chairperson for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2012.

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Reece, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby elects Deborah Brnabic as its Vice Chairperson for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2012.

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Yukon, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby elects Planning Staff as its Secretary for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2012.

Voice Vote:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Absent: Kaltsounis

Any Further Business

Mr. Anzek passed out a draft version of the Complete Streets Policy, and said that Staff would bring forward a motion at the May meeting. Mr. Jim Breuckman of McKenna Associates and Planning Staff assisted with the Policy.

Mr. Hooper asked if McDonald's would be coming back May 3. Mr. Anzek advised that the Site Plans went through one technical review. There were quite a few snags with Engineering and Fire, but they were making changes and would try to be ready for May. Crittenton Hospital also submitted and received some questions from Staff, and they hoped to be on the May agenda also.

Mr. Anzek mentioned that some concept plans came in for a ten-acre parcel on Livernois north of M-59. It had recently been delisted as a Historic District by City Council. He related that someone wanted to build a subdivision with a connection to Livernois from Cumberland Hills. He noted that plats and housing were picking up, and investors were buying developments that had been approved but not built. He also mentioned that the developer for Lorna Stone at Adams and South Boulevard did not control most of those parcels any longer. There had been a lot of interest, and the ten-acre historic piece had been recently purchased. They wanted to build a church and school and would have to get in front of the Historic Districts Commission soon.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairperson Boswell reminded the Commissioners that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for May 3, 2011.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Commissioners, Chairperson Boswell adjourned the Regular Meeting at 8:35 p.m.

William F. Boswell, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

