

**MINUTES of a Special Rochester Hills City Council and Planning Commission Joint Work Session** held at 1700 W. Hamlin Road, Rochester Hills, Michigan, on Wednesday, October 22, 2003 at 7:30 p.m.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

President Dalton called the Special Rochester Hills City Council and Planning Commission Joint Work Session to order at 7:35 p.m. Michigan Time.

**2. ROLL CALL**

**City Council**

Present: President John Dalton; Members Jim Duistermars, Lois Golden, Melinda Hill

Absent: Member Bryan Barnett, Barbara Holder, Gerald Robbins

**Planning Commission**

Present: Vice Chairperson James Rosen; Members William Boswell, Deborah Brnabic, Greg Hooper, Audrey Ruggiero

Absent: Chairperson Eric Kaiser; Members Barbara Holder, Nicholas Kaltsounis, Kristen Myers

**QUORUM PRESENT**

Others Present: Pat Somerville, Mayor  
Jane Leslie, Deputy Clerk  
Ed Anzek, Director of Planning/Development  
Scott Cope, Director of Building Department/Ordinance Enforcement  
Paul Davis, City Engineer/DPS  
John Hines, Deputy Building Director  
Deborah Millhouse, Deputy Director of Planning/Development  
Bob Spaman, Director of Finance  
Dick Young, Supervisor of Inspection Services

President Dalton stated that Council Members Barnett and Holder provided previous notice they would be absent and asked to be excused.

Vice Chairperson Rosen stated that Planning Commission Chairperson Kaiser had intended to attend the meeting.

**3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**Ms. Hill** described a pamphlet she distributed to her fellow Council Members called “A Civic Gift” published by the Michigan Land Use Institute that focuses on “Historic Preservation, Community Reinvestment and Smart Growth in Michigan.”

#### **4. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Lee Zendel**, 1575 Dutton Road, refuted comments made by an unnamed Council candidate who stated that more Sheriff’s Department deputies are not needed because the City’s crime rate is down since last year. Mr. Zendel stressed that deputies do not respond only to criminal incidences, but are also responsible for non-criminal occurrences such as traffic accidents.

#### **5. ADMINISTRATION**

##### **5a. Tienken Road Improvements**

##### **5a.i Traffic Improvements at Tienken and Rochester Road**

**Mr. Ed Anzek**, Director of Planning/Development, explained that, in conjunction with City Engineer Paul Davis, Traffic Consultant Steve Dearing of Orchard, Hiltz McCliment, Inc., and Tetra Tech MPS, an infrastructure and resource management firm, plans have been devised to demonstrate that improvements to the intersection of Rochester Road and Tienken Road in conjunction with the proposed Papa Joe’s and Holiday Village development, will minimize, alleviate or improve the traffic situation there. He then introduced **Mr. John Gaber**, attorney for the Holiday Village development proposed for the southeast corner of the intersection.

**Mr. John Gaber** of Williams, Williams, Ruby & Plunkett, 380 North Old Woodward Avenue, Birmingham, described the traffic presentation tonight as the “maximum proposal we can offer to improve congestion at Tienken and Rochester.” He requested feedback from Council following the evening’s presentation to facilitate forward momentum on the project. He explained that, ideally, they would like final approval by January 2004, thus enabling the developer to complete road construction during the lower traffic congestion summer months when school is not in session.

**Mr. Michael Labadie**, Traffic Engineer from Tetra Tech MPS, 26600 Telegraph Road, Southfield, presented three (3) alternative scenarios for intersection configurations that would facilitate traffic flow. He began his presentation with a projected simulation of the current intersection, noting that, in his opinion, “the volumes forecast that are shown as new traffic is over-estimated,” thus making it a very conservative forecasting of traffic. The simulation was for peak hour traffic movement times between 5:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m., stressing that that is the time during which the amount of cars is greatest. He also noted that their study did not analyze the complete traffic network, but rather, only this specific intersection.

He then displayed the three (3) proposed scenarios for development at the intersection.

Scenario 1 proposed to:

- Extend westbound left turn lane on Tienken Road at Rochester Road.
- Construct an eastbound shared through/right turn lane on Tienken Road across Holiday Village's frontage.
- Create a westbound shared through/right turn lane on Tienken Road at Rochester Road.
- Create a northbound exclusive right turn lane on Rochester Road at Tienken Road.
- Extend existing eastbound right turn lane at Tienken Road at Rochester Road and restripe as a shared through/right turn lane.

**Mr. Labadie** noted that this proposed scenario was not an improvement over the current situation.

Scenario 2 proposed to:

- Extend westbound left turn lane on Tienken Road at Rochester Road.
- Construct an eastbound shared through/right turn lane on Tienken Road across Holiday Village's frontage.
- Create a westbound shared through/right turn lane on Tienken Road at Rochester Road.
- Create a northbound exclusive right turn lane on Rochester Road at Tienken Road.
- Extend existing eastbound right turn lane at Tienken Road at Rochester Road and restripe as a shared through/right turn lane.
- Convert the second eastbound through lane on Tienken Road at Rochester Road to a shared through/left turn lane.

Scenario 3 proposed to:

- Extend westbound left turn lane on Tienken Road at Rochester Road.
- Construct an eastbound shared through/right turn lane on Tienken Road across Holiday Village's frontage.
- Create a westbound shared through/right turn lane on Tienken Road at Rochester Road.
- Create a northbound exclusive right turn lane on Rochester Road at Tienken Road.
- Extend existing eastbound right turn lane at Tienken Road at Rochester Road and restripe as a shared through/right turn lane.
- Construct second eastbound left turn lane on Tienken Road at Rochester Road.

**Mr. Labadie** noted this scenario results in a “very significant improvement in stop delays, taking into account future traffic growth and additional traffic from the two (2) developments.”

City Council Members and Planning Commission Members raised questions and concerns regarding:

- Stop delays and how they were determined.
- Safety issues regarding the various driveways.
- The need for a traffic signal at the Papa Joe's site.
- Safety concerns with regards to patrons attempting left turns.
- The need for boulevards and “Michigan” left turnarounds.
- Dual left-turn lanes at the intersection.

- Improvements to Tienken Road on the east side of Rochester Road need to be similar to the west side.

**Mr. Labadie** explained:

- The stop delay for the final scenario is 57.8 seconds: some vehicles will not stop at the intersection, while other vehicles may stop for as long as 120 seconds. The stop delay is an average of all vehicles.
- The roads operate as a network and any bottlenecks in the network will influence the flow throughout the system; the study focused in on this particular intersection.
- The situation does not warrant a traffic signal also noting that the driveways “operate in a balanced way.” If a driveway were removed from the plan, “it gets out of balance and won’t operate as well.”
- The plan is not a “panacea” but does address many of the issues: reduction in stop delay, ability of drivers to exit side streets, etc.
- Stressed that the developers are giving the City the right of ways.
- Current funding does not allow for more complex or extensive enhancements to the intersection.

**President Dalton** noted that this is “not the fix, it is the improvement.” He suggested that this is a short-term solution allowing the City time to examine the situation further and, in the event of future development, negotiate for the remaining rights-of-way.

(Recess 9:26 p.m. – 9:40 p.m.)

**ii. Bridge and Intersection Improvements at Tienken & Kings Cove** (Members received a copy of a City Council Work Session Agenda Summary Sheet dated October 14, 2003 from Paul Davis, City Engineer)

**iii. Tri-Party Funds**

**iv. Thoroughfare Master Plan**

**Mr. Davis** presented an overview of the intersection of Tienken Road and Kings Cove:

- Council has shown reluctance to increase beyond three (3) lanes of traffic, however, even a four (4) lane road would be highly congested.
- The current traffic congestion at the intersection warrants a rating of E, with a rating of D being the minimum acceptable rating.
- Future projections (year 2015) call for the rating to remain E approaching F.
- City does not have the funds for a “massive corridor improvement.”

- Oakland County Road Commission concurs that a five (5) lane road is needed at this intersection.
- Traffic has and will continue to increase rapidly, thus warranting an update to the Master Thoroughfare Plan.
- Any improvements will be expensive and there is no Federal funding available to assist in offsetting the cost to the City.
- The balance in the Tri-Party Fund is not adequate for the current improvement plan.
- It is estimated that accidents on Adams Road and Tienken Road will increase significantly if improvements are not made.

**Ms. Hill** expressed her concern that the plan for this intersection changed drastically from what was originally presented and she fears it is not what the community wants.

**Ms. Golden** stated that the Master Thoroughfare Plan was “obsolete instantly.” She stressed that the Council has “to look at reality and look at what the professional says.”

**Mr. Duistermars** acknowledged that the plan is obsolete and that the process to make the appropriate changes must be accelerated.

**Mr. Rosen** stated that “the easiest thing is to do little damage with three lanes” noting that the City can get by with three (3) lanes and minimal expense. He questioned, in the case of five (5) lanes, whether the City is going forward with projects without getting the appropriate community input. He expressed concern that the City is trying to move forward with new plans when previous plans have never been completed.

**Ms. Hill** concurred with Mr. Rosen, and stressed the need to weigh the impact a five (5) lane road through the City’s historic district would have on the community. She called for community input.

**Mr. Davis** stressed that his recommendation as City Engineer is to alleviate the congestion while planning for future growth. He noted that traffic problems resulting from the actions of surrounding communities are the problems of Rochester Hills and must be addressed by the City.

**Mr. Duistermars** suggested that the Master Plan be updated every five (5) years and that, due to the time-consuming nature of the current review process, the City does a disservice to residents by being “reactionary to all these things we don’t anticipate.”

**Mr. Dalton** agreed, “it’s obvious our thoroughfare plan isn’t any good.” He agreed with Ms. Hill that Council needs to be made aware of these situations in a timelier manner. He felt he learned a great deal from this discussion.

**Mr. Rosen** acknowledged that “while it might be the [Master Thoroughfare] Plan is obsolete and not meaningful,” while also stressing that “it’s the only one we have.” He supported updating the plan as soon as possible and stressed the need for a consultant to examine the City as a whole, whereas it is “misleading to look at a chunk.”

There being no further business to discuss before the Planning Commission, Vice Chairperson Rosen adjourned the Planning Commission portion of the meeting at 10:33 p.m.

(Recess 10:33 p.m. – 10:40 p.m.)

**b. Update on City Hall Renovations (A0162) and Oakland County Sheriff Substation**

**Mr. Scott Cope**, Director of Building/Ordinance Enforcement, introduced **Mr. Dick Young** Supervisor of Inspection Services, to update Council regarding the progress of the City Hall renovations as well as **Mr. John Hines**, Deputy Building Director, to update Council regarding the progress of the new Oakland County Sheriff Substation.

**Mr. Young** noted the following:

- City Hall project is approximately \$500,000 under budget.
- Second floor drywall, ceiling, lighting and carpeting is installed at the north end of project.
- First floor drywall has been installed.
- First floor ceiling grid, paint and light fixtures will begin the week of October 27th.
- Proposed completion date is first or second week of December.
- Tentative furniture set-up and move scheduled for October 27 through December 8, 2003.
- Council chambers will be ready for occupancy on December 17th.
- There will be no interruption of service to residents.
- There is a proposed Open House for some time in January 2004.

**Mr. Hines**, offering photographs and a floor plan, noted the following:

- Oakland County Sheriff Substation overhead mechanical and electrical in progress.
- Interior masonry and metal stud walls underway.
- Framing for hard ceilings in progress.
- Substation site grading 85% complete.
- Substation curbs and walks 90% complete.
- Court site grading 75% complete.
- Court site curbs and walks 40% complete.
- Overhead doors, skylight are complete.
- Curtain wall to enclose building 90% complete.
- Substation casework delivered, installation to proceed following ceiling grid.
- Overall project is approximately 66% complete based on construction costs.

**President Dalton** praised all involved for bringing these projects in under budget, noting it demonstrated “significant good planning.”

**c. City Survey Results** (Members received a copy of a City Council Work Session Agenda Summary Sheet dated October 22, 2003 from Susan Galeczka, City Council Liaison)

**Mr. Ed Anzek**, Director of Planning/Development, explained the process by which the surveys were collected using the *Hills Herald* for distribution resulting in a seven percent (7%) return rate. He noted that the purpose of the survey was to, in effect, “take the temperature” of the City and see how Citizens perceive the services of Rochester Hills.

**Ms. Hill** stated that, while the survey did not result in a great deal of new information, it did reflect that, overall, residents are pleased with the City.

**Ms. Golden** cautioned that too much weight should not be given to a mail-in survey and that the City should not be guided “too rigidly” by these results.

**Mr. Anzek** acknowledged that City staff needs “to do a little more digging into these numbers.”

## **6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**6a. Interlocal Agreement** for Sanitary Sewer between the City of Rochester Hills, the City of Rochester and Mark Stapels and Sharon Tattrie at 1965 Washington, Rochester Hills, MI (Members received a copy of a City Council Work Session Agenda Summary Sheet dated October 17, 2003 from Susan Galeczka, City Council Liaison)

**Mr. Davis** explained that the forced main goes out to Rochester Hills and does not serve Washington Township, but rather serves Stoney Creek Metro Park. The main, constructed in 1964, travels along Washington Road and ties into an eight (8) inch gravity sewer. The City of Rochester has agreed to accept this resident’s sewage, while Rochester Hills retains the right to claim the customer back at a later date.

**b. Interlocal Agreement** for water between the City of Rochester Hills and Charter Township of Shelby for John Moore at 50988 Dequindre, Shelby Twp., MI (Members received a copy of a City Council Work Session Agenda Summary Sheet dated October 17, 2003 from Susan Galeczka, City Council Liaison)

**Mr. Davis**, in answer to previous questions by Ms. Hill, noted that there are other surrounding residences that have made similar requests. Shelby Township retains the right to claim the customer back from Rochester Hills at a later date. Mr. Davis was unaware of the reason for the request and assured Ms. Hill he would have an answer to that question when the issue came before Council again on November 5, 2003.

**Ms. Golden** asked Mr. Davis if his department is guided by any written policies regarding these matters or if these issues are addressed on a case-by-case basis.

**Mr. Davis** stated he was unaware of a written policy.

**Ms. Hill** indicated that there are “materials existing” that were created “a number of years back” indicating that these situations would be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

**7. COMMENTS & ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**President Dalton** stated that a 6:30 p.m. Closed Session has been requested for the next City Council meeting scheduled for November 5, 2003.

**Ms. Hill** expressed her disappointment that the Mayor will not allow the City cable channel to air the tape of the previous night's League of Women Voters' forum discussion concerning the upcoming election ballot proposals. She stressed that it is the duty of the City Council to inform the public about these issues and that the forum was "not a debate, it did not direct the voter as to how they should vote on either issue." She then requested that the Mayor broadcast the video.

**Mayor Somerville** explained that she had not yet viewed the tape, but had received "many calls" indicating that the forum was not unbiased.

**Ms. Golden** noted that government access television rules are very rigid with regards to preventing such things as advertising, profanity and the promotion of political candidates and issues. She suggested that the public access cable channel (52) would be a more appropriate venue for broadcast.

**Mr. Lee Zendel**, 1575 Dutton Road, stated that, as a representative of the "Committee for More Police" he was unable to speak at the forum because there was no one there representing the opposing point of view.

**Ms. Hill** stressed that the discussion was unbiased and requested that, if the Mayor did not plan to review the tape in a timely manner, she return it to Channel 52 so that it could be broadcast via that outlet.

**Mr. Duistermars** expressed his disappointment with the League of Women Voters' forum, having felt it was biased toward a pro City Manager point of view.

**President Dalton** stated he felt it was improper for the Mayor to make the decision about airing the tape noting that she has publicly opposed opening the City Charter.

**8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

None

**9. NEXT MEETING DATES:**

- i. City Council - Regular Meeting, Wednesday, November 5, 2003 - 7:30 PM
- ii. Planning Commission - Tuesday, November 18, 2003 - 7:30 PM



**10. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to discuss before Council, President Dalton adjourned the meeting at 11:26 p.m.

---

**JOHN L. DALTON, President**  
Rochester Hills City Council

---

**JAMES ROSEN, Vice Chairperson**  
Planning Commission  
City of Rochester Hills

---

**BEVERLY A. JASINSKI, City Clerk**  
City of Rochester Hills

---

**MARGARET A. STRATE**  
Administrative Secretary  
City of Rochester Hills