



# Rochester Hills Minutes City Council Work Session

1000 Rochester Hills Drive  
Rochester Hills, MI 48309  
(248) 656-4660  
Home Page:  
[www.rochesterhills.org](http://www.rochesterhills.org)

*Erik Ambrozaitis, Jim Duistermars, Barbara Holder, Greg Hooper,  
Linda Raschke, James Rosen, Ravi Yalamanchi*

---

Wednesday, May 24, 2006

7:30 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

---

## CALL TO ORDER

*President Rosen called the Rochester Hills City Council Work Session Meeting to order at 7:41 p.m. Michigan Time.*

## ROLL CALL

**Present:** Erik Ambrozaitis, Greg Hooper, Linda Raschke, James Rosen and Ravi Yalamanchi

**Absent:** Jim Duistermars and Barbara Holder

Others Present:

*Bryan Barnett, Mayor  
Paul Davis, City Engineer  
Jane Leslie, City Clerk  
Roger Rousse, Director of DPS/Engineering  
Paul Shumejko, Transportation Engineer*

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

## PUBLIC COMMENTS

*Mr. Lee Zendel, 1575 Dutton Road, corrected a statement he had made during a previous Council meeting regarding the City purchasing United States treasury bonds, noting that his suggestion would not be sanctioned by the State of Michigan. He then countered a previous claim by a member of Council who compared the building needs of the DPS Facility to the City's auditing firm, noting the distinct difference between the work done and the work space needs of the different employees.*

## COMMENTS & ANNOUNCEMENTS

*Mayor Barnett announced that the Rochester Hills City Council would be joining forces with the Rochester City Council to play a game of 1850s-style baseball against the area's vintage baseball team The Grangers on Saturday, May 20th. He also noted that the Memorial Day Parade would be taking place on Monday, May 29th and encouraged people to attend. He described a recent fundraiser for the Older Persons Commission (OPC) and praised the organization for all that they offer the seniors in the community. Mayor Barnett indicated that a summary of the results from the City's recent arbitration with Wal-Mart would be posted to the City's website. Finally, Mayor Barnett noted the success of his open office hours on Thursday afternoons. He then indicated that he would be moving them to Wednesday evenings to accommodate those residents who work during the day.*

**Mr. Yalamanchi** requested that Mr. Scott Cope, Director of Building/Ordinance Enforcement, make a presentation to the City Council regarding the City's commercial blight ordinance.

**Ms. Raschke** announced that the Stoney Creek School House would be receiving a State Historic Marker to be dedicated on May 31st. She also noted that a retirement dinner would be held to honor former Mayor Pat Somerville on June 14th.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** expressed support for Mr. Yalamanchi's request regarding commercial blight and asked that Mr. Cope also address the issue of residential blight. He noted his disappointment with the results of the Wal-Mart arbitration issue and stated that several of the City's ordinances need to be reevaluated. He then asked that representatives of the Building Department address a possible ordinance violation in a subdivision in his district. He asked the administration to test the water in Riverbend Park and requested that Council consider returning \$5,000 to the budget of the Rochester Avon Youth Association. Finally, Mr. Ambrozaitis praised Board of Education member Michael Reno for his actions in addressing a recent problem at one of the City's elementary schools.

**President Rosen** briefly reviewed the results of the Wal-Mart arbitration, noting that the new Wal-Mart would be permitted to be open twenty-four hours a day and that the illumination level of the outdoor lighting would not be reduced. He noted that the arbitrator did find in favor of the City's request that Wal-Mart officials meet with the City and the Sheriff's Department six and twelve months following the opening of the new store.

## ADMINISTRATION

### (Jim Duistermars Entered at 8:34 p.m.)

**Present:** Erik Ambrozaitis, Jim Duistermars, Greg Hooper, Linda Raschke, James Rosen and Ravi Yalamanchi

**Absent:** Barbara Holder

**2006-0274**

Discussion regarding the John R Road and East Ferry Drain Project

**Attachments:** Agenda Summary Work Session.pdf; John R Council Presentation.pdf; CIP 2006 John R Reconstruction.pdf; 050306 Agenda Summary.pdf; HRC Proposal.pdf; 0274 Resolution.pdf

**President Rosen** explained that the two projects to be discussed were previously brought to Council for approval, however, Council members had a significant amount of questions and concerns that a final decision was postponed and a Work Session was called to gain more clarity. He noted that Council would first discuss the John R Road & East Ferry Drain Project followed by a joint discussion of the Tienken Road Bridge Project and the long-term strategy for Tienken Road between Livernois and Rochester Road.

**Mr. Rousse** indicated that City Engineer Paul Davis would be providing Power Point presentations regarding the projects under discussion. Reading from the 2006 Budget Plan book, he noted the mission for the Major Road Fund is "to maintain the major road system and rights-of-way in such a manner as to ensure safety for vehicular and pedestrian traffic." He stated that two of the specific goals are "to improve the overall quality and safety of the major road system by increasing capacity and relieving congestion whenever possible" and "to coordinate all aspects of major road construction, maintenance and permitting practices in order to maximize the resources available." He stressed that these goals are taken seriously by his department and a great deal of data is evaluated in an effort to meet these goals, some of which would be highlighted during the following presentation.

**President Rosen** indicated that the goals of the Engineering Department appear to be in conflict with the City's Transportation Plan. He asked Mr. Rousse, "Where do you believe the right direction should be?"

**Mr. Rousse** stated that the two are integrated. He noted that there are times when outside influences beyond the City's control, such as the actions of bordering communities, have an impact on the projects brought forward to Council. He stressed that his department brings all information forward to Council to assist them in making any final decisions.

**Mr. Paul Davis**, City Engineer, provided a Power Point presentation regarding the John R & East Ferry Drain Construction Project:

#### **Existing John R Road Conditions**

- John R is mostly a three-lane asphalt road between Auburn and Hamlin. About a 1,000 foot section south of Bristol Drive exists that is not wide enough to provide a continuous center turn lane.

- John R is a two-lane asphalt road between South Boulevard and Auburn, wider at the intersections, with a passing lane for southbound traffic by the Spencer Park entrance.

#### **Additional John R Considerations**

- John R between Hamlin and Auburn and Auburn to South Boulevard are both City major roads.

- Both John R sections have existing asphalt pavement thicknesses varying between seven and nine inches.

- City of Troy currently intends to extend a five-lane road section along John R to South Boulevard around 2011 or 2012.

- John R is classified as a minor arterial roadway.

#### **Typical Conditions of a Minor Arterial**

- Right-of-way width between 66 and 150 feet.

- Average daily traffic (ADT) between 5,000 and 30,000 vehicles.

- Speed limit between 30 and 35 miles per hour.

- Parking is generally prohibited along the roadway.

#### **Details of John R South of Auburn**

- Traffic Counts:

\* 2001 ADT: 15,600 vehicles per day

\* 2003 ADT: 14,874 vehicles per day

\* 2005 ADT: 14,564 vehicles per day

- Master planned right-of-way width is 120 feet.

- Posted speed limit is 45 mph.

**Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Inclusion and Work Description**

- John R between Hamlin and Auburn is identified as MR-30 and has been described as a two-inch overlay and gap filling to provide a continuous three-lane road section in every CIP since 2000.

- John R between Auburn and South Boulevard is identified as MR-31 and has been described as a complete pavement removal and replacement of the existing two-lane roadway since the 2000 CIP.

**Coordination and the Economies of Scale**

- Converging schedules, a desire to minimize disruption from multiple projects, and believing that a single bid combining several projects of similar work lead to the following scope of work for one project:

\* East Ferry Drain (SW-06)

\* John R north of Auburn (MR-30)

\* John R south of Auburn (MR-31)

\* Replacement of 1,260 feet of existing 12-inch asbestos cement water main built before 1965 along the east side of the John R pavement.

\* Pathway construction on the westerly side of John R between South Boulevard and 3480 John R.

\* Possible incorporation of relocating the Michelson Pump Station out of the existing flood plain limits but within the existing City-owned parcel (2007 project SS-23B).

\* Spencer Park parking lot paving improvements.

**Project Scope and Driveway Review**

- Total length of reconstruction was originally planned. However, a partial reconstruction with wedging and overlaying the existing remainder to a three-lane section was later supported by the engineering staff.

- Design practices for minor arterials recommend a three-lane roadway for mile sections of road that have more than 45 driveways and less than 24,000 ADT. (John R south of Auburn has 64 driveways with 14,564 ADT.)

**Tentative Project Schedule Key Dates**

- Complete design - August 2006
- Receive project bids - September 2006
- Construct Spencer Park Improvements - early October to mid-November 2006
- East Ferry Drain construction on Enfield and Michelson - December 2006 to January 2007
- Reconstruct Michelson Pump Station - February to April 2007
- Construct East Ferry Drain, relocate water main and pave John R south of Auburn - April to August 2007
- John R Road overlay north of Auburn - September 2007

**Breakdown of Easement Needs**

- The easement/right-of-way acquisition process is estimated to take nine months to complete.
- Forty-six (46) affected parcels currently estimated and the parcels include the following:
  - \* 15 highway easement acquisitions
  - \* 17 pathway easement acquisitions
  - \* 36 temporary grading easements
  - \* 6 storm drainage easements

**Questions Requiring Council Direction**

- Will the three-lane section along John R south of Auburn be supported?
- Will the incorporation of the Michelson Pump Station relocation into the project be supported?
- Will the Hubbell, Right & Clark (HRC) right-of-way acquisition proposal be passed at the June 7, 2006 regular Council meeting?

**President Rosen** referenced the time line of the various projects and questioned how the paving of Spencer Park could be considered included in the benefits from the economies of scale.

**Mr. Davis** acknowledged that it actually does stand alone, as paving the parking lot along with the other projects would cause too much disruption to parks services during peak usage times.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

**Ms. Melinda Hill**, 1481 Mill Race, stated her opposition to the project, noting it is not in the Master Land Use Plan and does not follow the Master Thoroughfare Plan.

**Mr. John Strzalka**, 2777 Winter Park, expressed his opposition to paving a parking lot when there are many local subdivision roads that need repair or replacement. He also questioned why the City of Troy's plans to widen their roads in 2011 or 2012 would motivate Rochester Hills to make these changes now.

**COUNCIL DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Rousse** and **Mr. Davis** addressed questions from Council:

- The minor reduction in traffic counts on John R Road can be attributed to cut-through traffic in subdivisions as well as people simply avoiding the road.
- Despite the slight reduction in traffic counts, the road still meets the warrants for three lanes.
- Combining multiple projects results in an overall savings as contractors can provide quality discounts on materials and mobilization expenses.
- Raising the Michelson Pump Station would still leave the structure in the flood plain.
- The pump station can be moved out of the flood plain without having to purchase additional property.

- In 2004 the Michelson Pump Station was flooded causing a sanitary sewer overflow into a creek resulting in an investigation by the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ).
- Raising the pump station would be sufficient to meet the MDEQ's standards.
- Act 51 money can only be used for major and some local road projects.
- The East Ferry Drain portion of the project will not improve or eliminate the potential flooding of the pump station, as it would remain in the flood plain.
- When meeting with homeowners to negotiate the purchase of easements it makes the most sense to secure the easements for all projects, rather than returning to negotiate a second time in the future.
- Payment for the easements was included in the 2006 Budget under Land Improvements.
- Easements will need to be acquired regardless of whether the project design changes.
- The designs of the project were based on the decisions of a previous Council, and the City has moved forward based on previous decisions.

**Mr. Davis** noted that the Master Thoroughfare Plan (MTP) should be viewed as a reference tool. While it identifies specific projects, it does not address the cost of those projects and in many cases they would be much costlier than the project under consideration. He further stressed that each project must take into consideration numerous factors, noting that while Dequindre Road may have a higher priority in the MTP than John R, the logistics of coordinating any project with other municipalities makes it a vastly different and likely much more costly project.

**Mr. Yalamanchi** noted that the MTP likely needs to be updated.

**Mr. Ambrozaitis** stated that he only supports improvements to the pump station that will bring the City into compliance with the criteria established by the MDEQ. He suggested lowering the speed limit on John R to 35 mph and reminded his fellow Council members that increasing the number of lanes on John R will increase the cost to maintain the road. He stated he is opposed to paving the parking lot at Spencer Park. Mr. Ambrozaitis stressed that, "I'm not going to make any decision predicated upon what a prior Council did."

**Mr. Duistermars** stated that he supports the expansion of John R to include a center turn lane in the interest of public safety, noting that it will reduce accidents involving drivers trying to make left turns. He agreed with Mr. Davis's opinion that the MTP should serve as a guideline and that all projects should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

**Ms. Raschke** expressed her support for moving the pump station, noting that raising it would merely be a "Band-Aid" solution to the flooding problem. She further indicated her support for the expansion of John R for safety reasons, noting the difficulty of fire apparatus to maneuver in that area.

**Mr. Hooper** and **Mr. Yalamanchi** noted that the primary issue at hand was whether Council would support the purchase of the easements along John R. Both agreed that their purchase would be necessary regardless of the final decision on this project.

**President Rosen** indicated that those who participated in the MTP update noted that the community would have to accept some degree of traffic congestion. He expressed his support for acquiring the rights-of-way but not expanding John R to three lanes, although he did acknowledge the increased safety afforded by a center turn lane. He suggested that the pump station be raised rather than moved and the situation reevaluated if a problem arises. He noted his support for the pathways portion of the project "only if we're keeping the cost down."

**Mayor Barnett** noted that often Council is criticized for not "thinking outside the box." He praised the City departments for bringing forward ideas that recognize the changing times, noting that it is not only appropriate, but essential. He then read a list of projects proposed in the 1999 update of the MTP, noting the likely controversy they would inspire, including a plan to widen Rochester Road to a six-lane boulevard from Avon Road to the City limits, which he estimated would likely cost a quarter of a billion dollars. He further noted that adhering strictly to the MTP would result in many missed opportunities.

#### Discussed

**(Recess 9:22 p.m. - 9:34 p.m.)**

2006-0299

Discussion regarding the Cost Participation Agreement for the Tienken Road Bridge Replacement over Paint Creek between the City of Rochester Hills and Board of Road Commissioners for Oakland County

**Attachments:** Agenda Summary Work Session.pdf; Tienken Road Bridge and Signal Presentation.pdf; CIP 2006 Tienken Rd & Bridge Rehabilitation.pdf; Tienken Rd & Kings Cove Traffic Study 2002 Excerpt.pdf; 050306 Agenda Summary.pdf; Cost Participation Agreement.pdf; 0299 Re

**Mr. Paul Davis**, City Engineer, provided a Power Point presentation regarding the Tienken Road Bridge and Traffic Signal by Kings Cove Drive Project:

#### **Project Location and Objectives**

- Install a traffic signal at a realigned intersection for Kings Cove, Tienken and Oakbrook West
- Rebuild and widen the existing Tienken Road bridge over the Paint Creek
- Redirect Paint Creek Trailway users to cross Tienken at the new traffic signal

#### **Existing Tienken Road Bridge** (pictures)

- The original bridge was constructed in 1947.
- The piling supports are made of wood.
- Some of the decking was replaced in 1971.

#### **Overhead DTE Lines with Temporary Guards Installed and looking east to the Tienken Bridge** (pictures)

- Had to temporarily relocate DTE power lines to accommodate the use of a crane during reconstruction.
- There is some concrete deterioration of the guardrails.

**Existing Intersection Configuration at Kings Cove and Oakbrook West** (pictures)

- Driveways need to be aligned to accommodate a traffic signal.
- The Oakbrook driveway is behind the stop sign.

**Existing Paint Creek Trailway Crossing of Tienken Road** (pictures)

- Some cars are stopping at the trail crossing to allow pedestrians to pass, causing a potential traffic hazard.

**Initiation of the Proposed Project**

- Initial request for a traffic signal by the Kings Cove Association
- City retains Hubbell, Roth & Clark (HRC) to perform a traffic signal warrant study:
  - \* Review of possible traffic signal configurations
  - \* Consideration to rebuild the Tienken Road bridge
  - \* Review of the Tienken Road traffic counts to determine proposed bridge width
- Proceed with HRC recommended project design for a five-lane wide bridge and traffic signal

**Project Approval Dates Given by City Council**

- Initial Traffic Signal Warrant and Bridge Study - August 7, 2002
- Design plan and specification approval - November 5, 2003
- Design plan and specification amendment - April 6, 2005
- Project Cost Participation Agreement with RCOC - Postponed by Council 5/3/06

**Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Recorded for Tienken between Livernois and Rochester Roads**

- Actual 2001 ADT: 19,716
- Actual 2002 ADT: 23,055
- Actual 2003 ADT: 22,681
- Actual 2005 ADT: 20,806
- Estimated 2025 ADT: 30,200

2015 ADT forecasted for Tienken Road between Livernois and Rochester per the 1998 Rochester Hills Master Thoroughfare Plan Update: 21,200

**Capital Improvement Plan and Budget Inclusion**

- Tienken Road bridge (MR-06A) and traffic signal (MR-06B) has been in the Capital Improvement Plan for the years 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006. The bridge has specifically been described as a five-lane bridge for years 2003 - 2006 in the CIP.
- The Rochester Hills budget first included the traffic signal design in the 2002 adopted budget. The bridge design was added into the 2003 adopted budget and both projects have been included in the adopted City budget under major road construction for years 2003 - 2006.

**Other Key Project Meeting Dates**

- February 19, 2002 - Resolution from the Paint Creek Trailway Committee (PCTC) supporting the traffic signal installation at Kings Cove.



- Other updates with the PCTC included May 18, 2004 and August 16, 2005 at the City of Rochester and October 28, 2004 and August 10, 2005 in the City of Rochester Hills.
- Kings Cove information meeting participation has included updates on October 28, 2004, August 16, 2005 and condominium association annual meetings in 2004 and 2005.
- Phone calls and easement acquisitions have further involved Kings Cove, Oakbrook Condominiums and the PCTC at additional times.

#### **Project Funding Sources**

- Tri-party program
- Road Commission for Oakland County construction engineering work
- State Funding earmarked appropriation from Congressman Knollenberg
- Rochester Hills Major Road Fund

#### **Project Schedule and Cost Estimate**

Complete traffic signal warrant study - November 2002

Complete bridge and signal design - April 2006

Project bids received - May 5, 2006

Start of construction - July 3, 2006 estimated

Closure of Tienken Road - July thru October 2006

Project Completion - Mid-November 2006

- Initial Traffic Signal & Bridge Study = \$16,037
- Bridge and Signal Design Cost = \$302,840
- Construction Cost = \$2,504,970
- Construction Engineering\* = \$375,750
- DTE Utility Relocation = \$65,139
  
- Total = \$3,264,736

\* Donated soft-match cost estimate for RCOC contribution.

#### **Coming Soon: Revisiting the Tienken Road Corridor Study**

Approximately \$9.7 million is available to the RCOC and Rochester Hills in the new federal highway SAFETEA-LU bill (Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Act - A Legacy of Users) for the Tienken corridor between Livernois and Sheldon.

**President Rosen** noted that in 1998 or 1999 the Planning Commission excluded Tienken Road from any major improvements due to its difficult geographic features such as steep hills. He also noted that the Tienken Road Corridor Study was intended to determine what could be done to improve the area at a reasonable price.

**Mr. Davis** explained that the Federal earmarked money for the Tienken Road corridor is specifically for corridor improvements and is not necessarily intended for traffic congestion

relief. He suggested that the recommendations in the original Tienken Road Corridor Study be revisited as there have been, among other things, changes to the intersection at Rochester Road that are not in keeping with that study.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

**Mr. David Welke**, 673 Oakbrook West, noted that his primary concern regarding this project is safety and that any traffic light added to the area should accommodate traffic going in all directions and especially "straight through."

**Mr. Richard Stinson**, 1363 Autumn Lane, expressed his support of a five-lane bridge on Tienken Road.

**Ms. Melinda Hill**, 1481 Mill Race, provided a great deal of history on the project dating back to 1999 and expressed her opposition to a five-lane bridge on Tienken Road and any subsequent widening of the road to five lanes.

**Mr. Michael Mally**, 1280 Mead Road, noted that considering the traffic congestion on Tienken Road and the recent changes at the Rochester Road/Tienken Road intersection, Tienken Road should be expanded beyond three lanes.

**Mr. Barry Dodson**, 1142 Hickory Hill Drive, noting that the increased lanes at the Rochester Road/Tienken Road intersection have not relieved traffic congestion, expressed his opposition to a five-lane bridge as well as increasing Tienken Road to five lanes.

**Mr. Earl Pace**, 175 West Tienken Road, stated that he does not see the benefit of increasing Tienken Road to five lanes, noting that it is likely to increase traffic congestion elsewhere.

**Ms. Jane Haugen**, 1053 Paint Creek Lane, noted her support for a five-lane bridge for reasons of increased safety and to alleviate traffic congestion.

**COUNCIL DISCUSSION:**

Council members discussed the following issues:

- The road system in Rochester Hills is such that traffic congestion is inevitable.
- Increasing the bridge and Tienken Road to five lanes will encourage more traffic along that roadway.
- A three-lane bridge and road with a traffic light at Kings Cove will keep traffic moving at a reasonable level.
- It would be erroneous to allow the building of a five-lane bridge to influence the expansion of Tienken Road to five lanes.
- A five-lane bridge makes sense, as this is no longer Avon Township.
- The Council should respect the advice of the City's engineering staff.
- Safety issues should take precedence over maintaining the character of the City.
- It was poor planning to allow the development of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) projects at the Rochester Road/Tienken Road intersection prior to addressing traffic issues in that area.
- The City is only paying for one-third of the project through the proposed cost sharing agreement.

- *In the interest of public safety it would be irresponsible to delay this project further.*
- *This Council should not be bound by the actions of previous Councils.*
- *It is inevitable that long-term projects will require multiple approvals by different Councils; this is not a violation of anyone's rights.*
- *The City administration and staff need to communicate better with City Council.*

**Mr. Davis** responded to Council's discussion by noting the following:

- *It will be very expensive to try to retrofit five lanes onto a three-lane bridge in the future.*
- *Tienken Road can remain a three-lane road, however, a five-lane bridge constructed now will allow flexibility should the community mind set change in the future.*
- *The SCAT system used to control the flow of traffic at intersections can only alleviate so much congestion.*
- *The traffic flow at the Rochester Road/Tienken Road intersection is very unique in that the left turn movement exceeds the through movement.*
- *The proposed five-lane bridge will only be striped for three-lanes.*
- *If the bridge project does not move forward by September of 2006 the City will lose approximately \$750,000 in Federal funding.*

**Mr. Thomas Blust**, Director of the Engineering Department for the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC), made the following comments regarding the Tienken Road Bridge project and the Tienken Road corridor:

- *The RCOC has been acting as directed by the City of Rochester Hills for several years.*
- *When the City requested using Tri-Party Funds for the Tienken Road bridge improvements, the RCOC insisted that it be a five-lane bridge.*
- *According to the RCOC, the five-lane bridge is "absolutely imperative."*
- *The bridge will not be operated as a five-lane bridge, but rather will be striped as a three-lane bridge.*
- *The Tienken Road Corridor Study indicates that within fifty years it is likely there will be a need for more than three lanes on the bridge and the City and the County cannot afford to be short sighted.*
- *The RCOC lobbied on behalf of the City for the Federal Border and Corridor Funds, thus making RCOC the lead agency on the project.*
- *As the lead agency, the RCOC has committed and contracted with the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT).*
- *Based on past practices and faith, MDOT had the project bid as a means to more accurately establish the level of funds to be identified in the cost sharing agreement.*
- *The approximately \$10.0 million in Federal dollars for the Tienken Road corridor was*

based on the original Tienken Road Corridor Study and does come with strings attached, as does all Federal dollars.

- The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) would determine how a change to the Tienken Road Corridor Study would impact the \$10.0 million in Federal dollars.

**Mr. Roger Rouse**, Director of DPS/Engineering, stressed how Rochester Hill's road network is limited by current land uses resulting in a need for east/west corridors, thus driving the need for the Tienken Road improvements. He further noted that the Rochester Road/Tienken Road intersection is "a dynamic and growing area" adding additional weight to the need for corridor improvements. He also stressed that this long-term project has been approved in multiple stages, including through the CIP process, by the Planning Commission and, ultimately, by City Council. He stated that every step has been at the direction of the City Council. Mr. Rouse concluded by noting that, "We're at a threshold right now that will make a big difference on the transportation network for now and many years ahead."

#### Discussed

2006-0391

Discussion regarding the Long-Term Strategy for Tienken Road between Livernois and Rochester Road

**Attachments:** Agenda Summary Work Session.pdf; 0391 Proj Cost Estimate.pdf; 0391 MDOT Funding Info.pdf; 0391 Preliminary Eng Costs.pdf; Tienken Road Corridor Study 2000 Excerpt.pdf; Master Thoroughfare Plan Updated 1999.pdf; 021506 Excerpt Reg Mtg Minutes & Packet Info

The previous discussion item (File 2006-0299) encompassed this discussion item as well.

#### Discussed

## ANY OTHER BUSINESS

**President Rosen** briefly explained the process by which Council members would rank their objectives to be used during the upcoming 2007 Budget discussions. He also noted that he had been working with the Clerk's Department to establish a system to track open items that are in the process of being addressed not just by City Council, but also by Council's communication committees.

## NEXT MEETING DATE

- Special Budget Work Session - Wednesday, May 31, 2006 at 7:30 p.m.
- Regular Meeting - Wednesday, June 7, 2006 at 7:30 p.m.

## ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before Council, President Rosen adjourned the meeting at 11:38 p.m.

---

JAMES ROSEN, President  
Rochester Hills City Council

---

*JANE LESLIE, Clerk  
City of Rochester Hills*

---

*MARGARET A. MANZ  
Administrative Secretary  
City Clerk's Office*

*Approved as presented at the October 18, 2006 Regular City Council Meeting.*