



Rochester Hills

Minutes

City Council Regular Meeting

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

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

Monday, May 5, 2008

7:30 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

President Hooper called the Regular Rochester Hills City Council Meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Michigan Time.

ROLL CALL

Present 5 - Erik Ambrozaitis, J. Martin Brennan, Greg Hooper, Vern Pixley and Michael Webber
Absent 2 - James Rosen and Ravi Yalamanchi

Others Present:

*Dan Casey, Planning Department/Manager of Economic Development
Ron Crowell, Fire Chief/Emergency Management Director
Paul Davis, Water-Operations/City Engineer
Keith Depp, Public Improvements - Drains/Staff Engineer
Todd Gary, Captain/Fire Marshal
Jane Leslie, City Clerk
Roger Moore, Public Improvements - Drains/Professional Surveyor*

Council Member James Rosen provided previous notice that he would be unable to attend and asked to be excused.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made by Ambrozaitis, seconded by Webber, to Approve the Agenda as Presented. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 5 - Ambrozaitis, Brennan, Hooper, Pixley and Webber

Absent 2 - Rosen and Yalamanchi

(Mr. Yalamanchi entered at 7:33 p.m.)

Present 6 - Erik Ambrozaitis, J. Martin Brennan, Greg Hooper, Vern Pixley, Michael Webber and Ravi Yalamanchi

Absent 1 - James Rosen

PUBLIC COMMENT

Richard Rondeau, 1111 Hall Road, Executive Director of Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) for Southeast Michigan, explained that in November 2006, MADD announced its campaign to eliminate drunk driving. He reminded everyone about four key elements necessary to accomplish this:

- Intense high visibility law enforcement - to deter future drunk drivers.
- Full implementation of current alcohol ignition inter-lock technologies for all convicted drunk drivers.
- Exploration and development of new vehicle based technology.
- Mobilization of grass roots support.

He also stated that MADD has House Bill 4289, 4920 and 4921, commonly known as the Extreme Drunk Driving Bill, pending before the State Senate. It passed almost unanimously through the House of Representatives and has been waiting before the Senate since December. He urged all residents to contact State Senator Michael Bishop to move this to the Senate floor for a vote.

Linda Raschke, 1599 Dutton Road, stated that the single trash hauler is not a simple issue. She expressed her opinion that the Road and Police issues are the most important issues at this time. She referenced New York's Mayor Michael Bloomberg statement of 'do the hard things first'. She informed Council that she will be working closely with Oakland Township on a plan of action to control the deer population.

Lee Zendel, 1575 Dutton, referencing various newspaper articles, compared the higher cost of living, property taxes and the economy of numerous states. Speaking on the Single Trash Hauler issue, he cautioned Council against implementing any changes too quickly without reviewing the economical impact.

Lorraine McGoldrick, 709 Essex Drive, responding to Mayor Barnett's request, brought in her trash bill which is \$39 for 3 months, and talked about the cost of her recycling and trash pick up. She referred to Ms. Jenuwine's March 17, 2008 report on the City's finances, stressing that government spending needs to be reduced. She suggested that Council be alert to the indirect consequences of these billing decisions. She further stated further that the trash, road and police issues will be a burden on government spending, and any

increase in governmental costs to the residents should be put to a vote by the residents.

LEGISLATIVE & ADMINISTRATIVE COMMENTS

Mr. Brennan requested some further discussion with Mr. Rondeau of MADD. He asked Mr. Rondeau why MADD is not moving to zero tolerance.

Mr. Rondeau responded that MADD does support zero tolerance under the age of twenty-one. He noted that MADD is not against individuals drinking responsibly; Their goal is to make the roads safe for families, children and grandchildren.

Mr. Ambrozaitis reminded everyone about the Heritage Festival on Memorial Day Weekend. He stated that it is a terrific event and would like to see a great turnout of residents. He informed residents and Council that RARA and other charitable organizations benefit from the patronage of this event.

Mr. Pixley made the following announcements:

- The Make a Wish Foundation for the Rubber Ducky Race in Rochester Park raised a fair amount of money.
- A reminder about college kids coming home, prom season, spring fever and reminded the residents and Council that everyone is responsible for keeping drunk drivers off the road.
- The Community Foundation will host its annual Scholarship Reception at the Older Persons Commission from 7:00 p.m. until 8:30 p.m. Awards are from Rochester Kiwanis Club, Rochester Rotary Club and Rochester Community Schools. He was happy that his family has sponsored The Pixley Family Scholarship which will be awarded to Jennifer Johnston who will be attending Michigan State University.
- Reminder to residents and Council in a non-partisan way, Senator John McCain will be speaking at the Shotwell Gustafson Pavilion, on May 7, 2008.

Mr. Webber thanked Mr. Rondeau for his presentation and spoke of the importance of speaking with loved ones about these issues. He congratulated the committee that put together the Rochester Area Prayer Breakfast last week.

Mr. Yalamanchi stated his heartfelt condolences to Mr. Rondeau and to many families who have lost loved ones to drunk drivers and voiced his support for their continued work and efforts in prevention. He mentioned that he would like to raise awareness of recycling and make this a better world for the children - planning on what we do now could make the environment better. He stated that he was concerned about adding to the administrative responsibilities and expressed his opposition to the government playing a role in it.

ATTORNEY MATTERS

City Attorney John Staran was absent.

CONSENT AGENDA

All matters under Consent Agenda are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion, without discussion. If any Council Member or Citizen requests discussion of an item, it will be removed from Consent Agenda for separate discussion.

2008-0208 Approval of Minutes - City Council Work Session - October 17, 2007

Attachments: [CC Min 101707.pdf](#)
[Resolution.pdf](#)

This Matter was Adopted by Resolution on the Consent Agenda.

Enactment No: RES0106-2008

Resolved, that the Minutes of a Rochester Hills City Council Work Session held on October 17, 2007 be approved as presented.

2008-0210 Approval of Minutes - City Council Regular Meeting - October 24, 2007

Attachments: [CC Min 102407.pdf](#)
[Resolution.pdf](#)

This Matter was Adopted by Resolution on the Consent Agenda.

Enactment No: RES0107-2008

Resolved, that the Minutes of a Rochester Hills City Council Regular Meeting held on October 24, 2007 be approved as presented.

2008-0046 Approval of Minutes - City Council Work Session Meeting - November 7, 2007

Attachments: [CC Min 110707.pdf](#)
[Resolution.pdf](#)

This Matter was Adopted by Resolution on the Consent Agenda.

Enactment No: RES0108-2008

Resolved, that the Minutes of a Rochester Hills City Council Work Session Meeting held on March 7, 2007 be approved as presented.

2008-0170 Approval of Minutes - City Council Special Meeting - November 14, 2007

Attachments: [CC Spec Min 111407.pdf](#)
[Resolution.pdf](#)

This Matter was Adopted by Resolution on the Consent Agenda.

Enactment No: RES0109-2008

Resolved, that the Minutes of a Rochester Hills City Council Special Meeting held on November 14, 2007 be approved as presented.

2008-0047 Approval of Minutes - City Council Regular Meeting - November 14, 2007

Attachments: [CC Min 111407.pdf](#)
[Resolution.pdf](#)

This Matter was Adopted by Resolution on the Consent Agenda.

Enactment No: RES0110-2008

Resolved, that the Minutes of a Rochester Hills City Council Regular Meeting held on November 14, 2007 be approved as presented.

Passed the Consent Agenda

A motion was made by Pixley, seconded by Webber, including all the preceding items marked as having been adopted on the Consent Agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Ambrozaitis, Brennan, Hooper, Pixley, Webber and Yalamanchi

Absent 1 - Rosen

The following consent Agenda Item was discussed and adopted by separate Motion:

2008-0209 Request for Approval for the Community Foundation of Greater Rochester to accept donations of funds for the purpose of constructing a Chapel at the VanHoosen Jones Stoney Creek Cemetery

Attachments: [Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Resolution.pdf](#)

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Josephine Geraci, 1566 Colony Drive, explained that this would assist the building of a chapel at the VanHoosen Jones Stoney Creek Cemetery. She explained the importance of being able to raise the funds through the Community Foundation to build the chapel and that any perpetual care funds used would be replaced with fundraiser monies through this foundation.

Linda Davis Kirksey, 1337 N. Acre Drive, spoke on behalf of the interested residents being allowed to raise funds to build the Chapel at the Cemetery.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION:

Mr. Ambrozaitis stated his support.

Mr. Pixley expressed that it is an honor being on the Cemetery Board. He complimented Calvin Leach, Cemetery Sexton, for his exemplary work.

Mrs. Geraci mentioned that it is the thirty year anniversary of the Cemetery.

A motion was made by Ambrozaitis, seconded by Pixley, that this matter be Adopted by Resolution. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Ambrozaitis, Brennan, Hooper, Pixley, Webber and Yalamanchi

Absent 1 - Rosen

Enactment No: RES0111-2008

Whereas, the City of Rochester Hills VanHoosen Jones Stoney Creek Cemetery has a Beautification Fund with the Community Foundation of Greater Rochester, and

Whereas, the City of Rochester Hills would like to further accept donations for the construction of a chapel at the VanHoosen Jones Stoney Creek Cemetery.

Be It Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council hereby authorizes the Community Foundation of Greater Rochester to accept donations of funds for the purpose of construction of a chapel at the VanHoosen Jones Stoney Creek Cemetery to be held in conjunction with the Beautification Fund.

NEW BUSINESS

2008-0141 Request to Adopt the Amended Engineering Design Standards and Detail Sheets.

Attachments: [Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Agg Base Letter 4-08.pdf](#)
[CC Questions.pdf](#)
[Hooper Comments.pdf](#)
[Webber Comments.pdf](#)
[Resolution.pdf](#)
[Eng Stds Cover.pdf](#)
[Table of Contents.pdf](#)
[Eng Stds Chap 1.pdf](#)
[Eng Stds Chap 2.pdf](#)
[Eng Stds Chap 3.pdf](#)
[Eng Stds Chap 4.pdf](#)
[Eng Stds Chap 5.pdf](#)
[Eng Stds Chap 6.pdf](#)
[Eng Stds Chap 7.pdf](#)
[Eng Stds Chap 8.pdf](#)
[Eng Stds Chap 9.pdf](#)
[Eng Stds Chap 10.pdf](#)
[Eng Stds Chap 11.pdf](#)
[Watermain 1.pdf](#)
[Watermain 2.pdf](#)
[Sanitary 1.pdf](#)
[Sanitary 2.pdf](#)
[Storm 1.pdf](#)
[033108 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[033108 Resolution.pdf](#)

Paul Davis, City Engineer introduced Roger Moore, Professional Surveyor and Keith Depp, Staff Engineer, and described their proposed revisions to the City's Storm Water Standards. He explained that this area of the Standards was the most impacted by their proposed changes. Many of the other items that are included in the Engineering Standards were more or less housekeeping issues. The City's current set of Engineering Standards date back to the 1970s. He stated that the Engineering Department they had previously appeared before City Council on March 31, 2008 and ran through a quick summary of some of the changes that were included in the standard sections, and gave a presentation regarding storm water. He then explained that the City holds the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit as well as the Municipal Separated Storm Sewer System and that the City is mandated to submit for renewals as required. He stated that there is emphasis on the City's obligation to pay particular attention to clean up storm water. He responded to a previous inquiry from Council by explaining that currently, when the City has a sanitary sewer that is built by a developer and is going to be turned over for our maintenance, the City requires an initial televising of that sewer to ensure everything appears okay inside of the pipe. The City does provide full time inspection while the pipe goes in and runs a sewer camera through that pipe to show that the joints were all connected properly and that the sewer is good working order before it gets put into place. He stated that it is something the City requires. He continued that the City has preliminary acceptance and final acceptance in the Engineering Department after the initial televising. The City has a two-year period to contact the developer for damages that might occur to that sewer. He cited one example recently, in a development by Crooks and Auburn, once two years and three months passed, the City found a problem. When the initial sewer televising was performed, the City did not have any connections completed to the sewer or flow into it. A second sewer televising would have corrected that. He stated that the approximate cost to repair this particular sewer line will be approximately \$50,000.00. This is one bad example of where a second sewer televising would have greatly benefited the City. He stated that his department is asking Council for some direction whether second sewer televising should be a requirement at the expense of the developer.

President Hooper suggested Chapter 4 and any other chapters that might have many issues, be left until last, if that would be agreeable to Council. He then moved on to Chapter 1, wherein he inquired about the use of mylars.

Mr. Davis responded that mylars are still required.

President Hooper moved on to Chapter 2, Water Standards. He inquired about if they had been able to make his suggested changes; more specifically, the requirement for thrust block and restraining glands.

Mr. Davis responded that they agreed that the thrust box and restraining gland should be used and that the standards will be updated to reflect them.

President Hooper moved on to the Fire Department issues and invited Chief Crowell and Todd Gary, Fire Marshall, to come forward.

Mr. Gary stated that the Fire Department would like to be able to work with the

developer in order to convince them to install a suppression system, which would cut back on the number of fire hydrants. He explained that there are so many variables that may increase or decrease the water flow; the Fire Department likes to look at each site individually.

Mr. Yalamanchi questioned how the City can assist developers in being prepared for what is expected of them.

Mr. Gary responded that probably the best way to do that would be to include the two tables which are right out of the fire prevention code, that gives you the standard of the required water flow based on the size of the building and the construction type. That gives the basics and then the Fire Department can adjust from there; increase or decrease based on the circumstances. Including that table, would probably be the best way to do it, but there needs to be a paragraph that explains that there are other variables. He further stated that the tables could easily be inserted in the standards however, if it changes, with updates to the fire code, then the standards have to be updated as well.

President Hooper questioned if this issue had been brought up at the Mayor's Business Council.

Mr. Gary stated that he is on the Permit and Process Subcommittee and each department is making a development guide so that individuals can obtain the packet from the Fire Department and understand all of their requirements.

President Hooper asked if there was a consensus that Council could have Chapter 2 modified to include these tables with appropriate language in there subject to interpretation of the current fire code or language to that effect.

Mr. Gary stated that he would collaborate with Mr. Davis to accomplish this.

President Hooper moved on to Chapter 3, Sanitary Sewer. He stated he is opposed to dropping the ABS type of pipe and solely using PVC type pipes. He explained that as they keep adding additional requirements and costs, the taxpayer will end up paying. President Hooper stated he would accept double televising if they dropped the initial inspection. The developer can install the pipe and the City can televise it after the fact to verify what they have installed and save the developer the up-front cost of having the inspection. He stated that it was his belief that the City should not always make these requirements at the developer's expense.

Mr. Ambrozaitis questioned how long the City has been televising the sewers explaining that recently his homeowner's association had gone through some similar sewer issues.

Mr. Davis responded that the City has only been performing this for the last four or five years. Prior to that, the City has required the video taping be done by the developers. The developers provided his department with the tapes, which they reviewed for verification.

Mr. Ambrozaitis inquired if there had been any discussion of allowing the

homeowner's associations the use of the camera to inspect sewer lines as this would be a cost savings to the residents.

Mr. Davis stated that they had not had this request come up yet but it could be looked into. He stated that generally, that piece of equipment is used very heavily by his department as they have a lot of miles of sanitary sewer and it is a useful tool in trying to be proactive and eliminate blockages from occurring. He stated that they could look into providing that as a service for the residents.

Mr. Ambrozaitis stated that he is a huge proponent of televising the sewer and stated that they are so proactive in their association that his homeowner's association is going to institute a program that once every five years their sewers would be televised. He stated that he could not agree with them more as to the process and noted that he would like to see the City strengthen that particular standard as he thought it would ultimately do a lot of good for the City.

Mr. Yalamanchi inquired if extending the second televising would be helpful, and if it is permissible from two years to three years.

Mr. Davis expressed that generally the thought is that if there is going to be a problem due to construction, maybe a material defect, the odds are that it might surface within the first couple of years so people try to catch it then. He stated he was not in favor of removing the inspection component and incorporating the sewer televising. The inspection process is very beneficial for the Department because when they are out there looking at this stuff, they are also documenting how it went into place, what the conditions were when the sewer pipe was being installed, soil conditions. He stated that many times doing this has been proven to be very valuable when his department has to go back years later and look at the inspection reports or at least have some information to back up that they were out there. He did not feel that the second sewer televising was as important as continuing inspections.

Mr. Yalamanchi asked if it would be better to move the televising to three years instead of two years.

Mr. Davis responded that he did not know how the developers would feel about that.

President Hooper commented that if the City goes forward with the second televising and finds a problem but the developer is not willing to do anything about it, the City may incur legal fees in excess of what it would cost to fix the problem. He stated they need to strike a balance.

Mr. Davis stated that their department has learned to pay closer attention to the initial televising of the sewers, and to thoroughly review the inspection reports.

Mr. Ambrozaitis stated that at the very least that the inspections need to be left in.

After much discussion, it was the consensus of Council to televise at the time of installation, perform an inspection immediately at the completion of the installation,

and then prior to the end of the two-year reinspection do a second video inspection at the City's expense.

President Hooper moved Council discussion to items covered in Chapters 6 and 7, alternative materials, and requested discussion regarding correspondence received from the City's consultant, Schleede-Hampton Associates, Inc.

Mr. Davis stated that they would obtain more information. He also said that the consultant stated that while limestone is more costly than crushed concrete or other types of materials, it is a more durable material for new construction. He stated that the prices may go in cycles. Approximately five or six years ago, the City was performing reconstructions of subdivisions, the City was told that crushed concrete was pretty much the same price as limestone. Therefore, it seemed cost comparable to go with limestone. It probably was a better product for the same cost so if that is not the case now, certainly look at some of the items that are in the standards. Give the City Engineer the flexibility to make engineering judgments or provide exceptions and this could be an example. When the price of limestone is significantly higher than crushed concrete, the City can accept the crushed concrete.

President Hooper added that with the cost of fuel and having to travel further to transport the limestone, it will do nothing but widen the gap between the cost of crushed limestone versus the cost of crushed concrete or recycled material.

Mr. Davis stated that crushed concrete is good, however, when the prices are similar, he preferred limestone.

Mr. Yalamanchi requested clarification regarding a statement in the letter from Schleede-Hampton Associates Inc., the lacking of bondability by the alternative materials because of the adulterated materials mixed in with the crushed concrete.

President Hooper explained that some individuals who recycle concrete do not have the proper magnets in place to pull the steel out of the concrete when it is being recycled. Because of this, the crushed concrete might have foreign materials mixed in that could affect the bonding. He further expressed that this is important, and as part of the full time inspection process should be accepting or rejecting material that is brought. Limestone that would not have the proper grading should not be accepted and be rejected as well.

Mr. Davis stated that his department does test them, and that this same company, Schleede-Hampton Associates Inc. tests the City's materials whether it is sand, aggregate for base materials, even the density on asphalt pavements, and concrete cylinder brakes. He recommended allowing both of them with the expectation that the developers will go with the least costly alternative. If the price narrows back down to where limestone is competitive again, then he suggested changing it back. He shared that his personal preference is limestone but does realize the costs for trucking and delivering are going up and will impact the cost of the limestone.

President Hooper concurred with Mr. Davis and then inquired about utilizing crushed asphalt.

Mr. Davis stated that it is his opinion that it has a use, but did not know if he would recommend using it on new construction.

President Hooper inquired about the process performed in Shadowoods.

Mr. Davis responded that the pulverized material was utilized. He suggested that where possible, the recycled asphalt material should be used. He did recommend that if it is a new subdivision, then the crushed concrete or crushed limestone should be used.

President Hooper noting the challenge with local road funding, stated that the City is looking at creative opportunities to save money using recycled concrete for the base to save the taxpayers money and stretch our limited dollars further.

Mr. Davis responded that the Spencer Park parking lot was a great argument for that scenario. The City was looking to use the recycled asphalt for base material and also some limestone as well. He suggested that they could have proposed all of it as recycled.

Mr. Brennan stated that he was reviewing the Standards and that he thought the best way to resolve this is to go to Section B, 1A and change the language to 'concrete roads shall be eight inches, 3,500 PSI concrete over four inches, twenty-one AA crushed limestone or concrete. Extend four inches of twenty-one AA crushed limestone or concrete to one foot etc.

Mr. Pixley stated that he would like Council and the City to keep an eye toward the environmental aspect of recycling in all of this planning but not to the extent that the Standards are compromised.

President Hooper then moved on to Chapter 8, Ditches. He stated he had the same comment, allowing alternative materials, and crushed concrete. He stated that he assumed that Council had no problem adding alternatives here as well for materials. He then stated that the only other question he had was the standards for driveway grades, allowing six percent in the right-of-way, eight percent for any change in grade. He questioned Item C, and asked if ten percent would be acceptable, consisting of two percent from the road, and eight percent for the change in driveway grade. He stated that this would allow a lot more flexibility.

Mr. Davis responded that ten percent would probably be the upper limit that Oakland County uses. A lesser slope prevents low-profile vehicles from scraping.

President Hooper questioned if anyone had questions for Chapter 9, Sidewalks.

Seeing none, **President Hooper** moved on to Chapter 10, Pathways. He questioned if any one else had any comments on pathways other than adding

alternative materials. He saw no additional Council comments on Chapter 11, Soil Erosion. He then moved on to the Standard Sheets. Regarding Watermain 1, he questioned the bored casings, and whether the ends could be bulkheaded and left open and not filled.

Mr. Davis explained in instances where the City may have to bore underneath the road, the installation might be done as a pipe within a pipe, such as a sewer pipe or watermain within a steel casing pipe. Not grouting or filling the pipe would allow ease of maintenance or replacement. However, by sealing the ends of the pipe or having the annular space filled, water infiltration into the pipe is prevented. In addition, when carrier pipes are installed, wood skids are placed at three points along the pipe to keep the pipe stabilized. Over the years, this wood can shift or break. Filling this annular space also keeps this shifting from occurring. However the lower cost alternative is to not fill it, bulkhead the ends on the side of the casing, and hope that problems do not occur later.

President Hooper stated that he would support placing a bulkhead on the ends. He stated that on a watermain pipe, restraining joint gaskets could be installed if there is concern about the watermain coming apart.

Mr. Davis stated there are differences in opinion regarding the need for this fill. He stated that he does not have a problem if the City goes to the option to not fill the space.

President Hooper moved on to the standard sheet on sanitary sewer, stating his only comment was on the bored casing issue, noting the discussion that had just taken place regarding the Watermain bored casings. He then moved the discussion to cover both Chapter 4, Stormwater Management, and the standard storm sheet, which he indicated could be discussed together. He had the following comments:

- Flowable fill traps - he agreed with the recommendations.
- Fence materials - he stated that he would like the material selection and aesthetics to remain with the Planning Commission, and the design to remain with Engineering.

Mr. Davis concurred and stated that the intent of the fencing is to discourage individuals from going into those areas.

President Hooper moved to Underground Detention, and mentioned that this was an area of concern. He stated that as the City moves forward with redevelopment, there is no choice but to have underground detention in many of these cases. He stated that he is a proponent of underground detention, but knows there is an issue of whether it is a proven technology.

Mr. Davis noted that with an open basin, it is easier to tell if the basin is need of maintenance. He stated that with underground detention, it is more challenging for his department to know that it will be functioning twenty years down the line to how the original design was.

Mr. Webber questioned what neighboring communities are doing, and what are

some of their standards.

Mr. Moore stated that regarding underground detention, his department has not prohibited it and just is not their first choice and encourage them to look at other methods to do this. He stated that this does not give the City an advantage or disadvantage, or other communities for that aspect.

Mr. Davis inquired if the wording was revised to state 'the City would prefer to have an open basin but if the conditions are met, then an underground system would be accepted.'

President Hooper stated that he was fine with that.

President Hooper stated that having an operation maintenance plan would be a huge positive step for the City, but inquired how it would be funded.

Mr. Moore stated that the operation maintenance plan will be prepared by the engineer for the developer and submitted. The association and the owner are going to have that maintenance plan for operations in managing their system.

President Hooper moved on to televising the storm pipe. He stated that is was his understanding that there are other communities that are performing this, however, he does not want to create additional costs.

Mr. Moore stated if the language was revised to show that an association owned it as opposed to a single private commercial developer or operator, they would not need to post-construct video inspect a private development. However when an association of the City will end up being the owner and maintaining it, those would be the ones to be inspected. If the builder of a private development builds a substandard system then he has to live with it but if the builder builds a substandard system that an association is responsible for, then we all have to deal with it. He added that concrete pipe typically is what is used for storm sewer and is not as likely to be damaged as PVC truss pipe.

Mr. Yalamanchi commented on the channel protection, bank flow and the flooding protection, and questioned if the ten-year, twenty-five-year, fifty-year and one hundred-year storms, would be a better standard, or is every situation different.

Mr. Moore stated that Oakland and Macomb Counties are proposing to adopt the one hundred-year design, for their standard for flow attenuation or detention. He stated that he does not know that adopting the one-hundred-year design provides any better protection than the twenty-five-year will provide. The bank flow event is something new that Engineering has not really addressed, that is a relatively minor storm event, that causes all of the serious erosion and bank cutting in the rivers and the tributaries, that they are now addressing. To go from a ten to a twenty-five-year, he thought that should satisfy the needs for flow attenuation without unduly burdening development.

Mr. Davis confirmed this and stated that in a ten-year and a twenty-five-year design, those years mean a percent that in any given year there will be a design

event and in a ten year, there will be a ten percent chance of any year of having a storm of that magnitude, in a one hundred-year - there would be a one percent chance in any given year of having a storm of that magnitude. He stated that he knows there have been back-to-back one hundred-years, pretty unexpected, but it does happen. Going from a ten to a twenty-five-year, it is reducing our chance for having a catastrophic event, but these will still happen.

President Hooper suggested that the Mayor's Business Council weigh in on this to obtain a different perspective as well as to see what other developers have done in different communities.

Mr. Davis stated that the Engineering Department is proposing twenty-five to update the standards for their recommendation for what is necessary for the stormwater storage.

Mr. Dan Casey commented on the suggestion that the Mayor's Business Council weigh in on this, and he indicated that the Mayor's Business Council has not taken up this issue, however, they do have their permit and process subcommittee and has had one discussion that included this item. It was his suggestion that if this was thought to be an important step that a special meeting could be convened with the permit and process subcommittee to discuss it further.

Mr. Yalamanchi commended Mr. Davis, Mr. Moore and the rest of the staff for bringing this to Council.

Mr. Davis mentioned that he wanted to make one more comment on the storm sewer televising, stating that there is a period of time after the inspection is done but before it has been completed and the erosion is not a problem any longer, that the City could have sediment in the pipe. He noted that this is not absolutely necessary but wanted to bring it forward to Council and see if they had an opinion one way or another.

President Hooper stated that from the examples that were presented, that clearly there is an erosion problem that engulfs the storm sewer system and that becomes an automatic requirement to go out and videotape it, but just to make a universal statement that the City will videotape everything storm sewer wise, he would not agree with that. He felt that it should be on a case-by-case basis where there are obvious problems that erosion controls were not properly installed and maintained and that would cause the storm sewer system to be engulfed with the sediment.

Mr. Davis stated that they could add that language and state it as 'at the discretion of the City Engineer, some sites may be required to provide that if the erosion appears to be in construction during the construction'.

President Hooper requested that Mr. Davis recompile the standards and bring it back one last time for adoption. He also stated that they will give the Mayor's Business Council time to weigh in on fire flow and detention.

Mr. Webber commended Engineering for all the work being done, and stated

that it was great that the standards are being updated.

This matter was Discussed

2008-0118 Request for Adoption of City Council's Vision and Mission Statement

Attachments: [Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Resolution.pdf](#)
[Vision and Mission Statement.pdf](#)
[031708 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[2008 Council Mission Statement..pdf](#)

Public Comment:

Lee Zendel, 1575 Dutton Road, urged the Council, Mayor and Department directors to purchase and read the book 'Price of Government' - Getting the Results We Need in an Age of Permanent Fiscal Crisis. He suggested that perhaps the City of Detroit is practicing a few of these items. He suggested the first thing to be done is to get answers to five key questions: Is the real problem short or long term; How much are the citizens willing to spend; What results do the citizens want for their money; How much will a city spend to produce each of these results; and How best can the money be spent to achieve each of these core results. He stated that the price and value of government are up against the price and value of housing, food, health care, and all the other things that meet people's needs. He cautioned City Council that new budgeting practices must be implemented. He then went on to comment on portions of Council's Goals and Objectives stating that he did not care for the statement under Economic Tax Base, Objective 31: Implement current systems and processes and develop a seamless system that minimizes time for approvals and eliminates redundancies. Under Fiscal Management, 2.4, he stated that he did not feel oversight from investment professionals would be necessary. Under Effective Governance, 8.4, Promote cooperative purchases with other communities as a means to obtain the best price possible, he was very complimentary of the City's Purchasing Department and its current practices.

Gary Jaracz, 582 West Hamlin Road, apologized for missing the earlier Public Comments portion of the meeting. He stated that he would like to comment on the single trash hauler and requested a meeting with President Hooper to discuss this. He also stated that he would like to participate in a committee on this subject, when and if it is created. He stated he had some background when this issue came up in years past.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION:

Mr. Webber stated his opinion of it being a great document. He did note that there are two vision statements and City Council must decide on one statement. He stated his support for President Hooper's proposed vision statement.

Mr. Ambrozaitis thanked Mr. Zendel for his comments and stated his optimism that something good will result from the City Council's Goals and Objectives.

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Yalamanchi, that this matter be Adopted by Resolution. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Ambrozaitis, Brennan, Hooper, Pixley, Webber and Yalamanchi

Absent 1 - Rosen

Enactment No: RES0112-2008

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council hereby adopts its Mission Statement as follows:

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

and their Vision Statement as follows:

The Community of Choice for Families and Business.

Mr. Yalamanchi recommended that the Vision and Mission Statement be placed at the top of City Council's Agenda every week as a weekly reminder for Council, the City's staff and the residents.

President Hooper stated his support.

Mr. Webber concurred as well.

Mr. Ambrozaitis agreed.

President Hooper requested Clerk Leslie to see that this is made so.

2008-0119 Adoption of the Fiscal Year 2009 City Council Goals and Objectives

Attachments: [Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[ZBA & AT&S Comments.pdf](#)
[GSAB Comments.pdf](#)
[2009 City Council Goals & Objectives w Revisions.pdf](#)
[Resolution.pdf](#)
[2009 Goals and Objectives.pdf](#)
[Public Hearing Notice.pdf](#)
[2008 Council Goals & Objectives.pdf](#)
[041408 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[031708 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)

President Hooper referring stated that Mr. Zendel's comments under Economic/Tax Base, asked if Council was in agreement with the first item.

Mr. Yalamanchi explained the idea behind that particular item was to keep the Mayor's Business Council in mind. He stated that when City Council approves something, it takes about two years to implement the action. This would be to streamline the process.

Mr. Brennan suggested that the objective to read as: To develop a seamless system that minimizes time for approvals. He also suggested: Implements

systems and processes that would promote the development of a seamless system that minimizes time for approvals. He stated that eliminating redundancies is not necessary.

A motion was made by Ambrozaitis, seconded by Yalamanchi, that this matter be Adopted by Resolution. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Ambrozaitis, Brennan, Hooper, Pixley, Webber and Yalamanchi

Absent 1 - Rosen

Enactment No: RES0113-2008

Resolved, that the City Council establishes the following as its Fiscal Year 2009 Goals and Objectives:

GOAL: PUBLIC SAFETY

To protect the residents, businesses, and visitors of Rochester Hills by providing high quality public safety.

Objective: Identify a community-wide level of public safety service; and the associated costs to deliver such service.

Objective: Review any strategies possible for delivering the current level of service more effectively/efficiently.

Objective: Develop strategies to secure a long-term funding source for Police Services.

Objective: Maintain our focus on providing safe buildings for our community.

GOAL: FISCAL MANAGEMENT

To establish policies for fiscal responsibility that ensures short and long-term prosperity thru effective fiscal planning and efficient management of the taxpayers' assets.

Objective: Evaluate non-tax, tax, and structural issues in the City Charter for possible amendment.

Objective: Request that the administration establish a list of identifiable cuts to reduce the operating or non-capital budget by two-percent and provide contingency plans for reduction in revenue.

Objective: Continue the policy of forecasting revenue and budgets for the next five years on a rolling basis.

Objective: Establish an Investment Committee, made up of local investment professionals, to provide guidance, support and oversight of the City's investment process.

Objective: Review depreciation formulas and confirm or modify.

GOAL: ECONOMIC / TAX BASE

To retain investment, maintain the tax and employment base, support redevelopment, and uphold high property values in the City.

Objective: Implement current systems and processes and develop a seamless system that minimizes time for approvals and eliminates redundancies.

Objective: Implement the new Master Land Use Plan and the new Master Thoroughfare Plan.

Objective: Encourage businesses to take an active role in the local economy.

Objective: Continue to attract businesses that focus on R&D and "High-Tech".

Objective: Continue support and coordination with OU Inc and SmartZone Initiatives as part of City's attraction and retention program.

Objective: To begin development of a policy for future Brownfield redevelopment.

Objective: Encourage the Mayor's Business Council to provide input and feedback to the city.

Objective: Continue development of Ordinances for maintenance of existing residential and commercial buildings.

GOAL: INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT

To provide reliable, safe and effective infrastructure (roadways, utilities, buildings, etc...) throughout the City.

Objective: Implement the new Master Thoroughfare Plan.

Objective: Sustain the local street program specifically through a targeted repair and replacement program. Maintain funding at 3.5 million from the General Fund in addition to State Act 51 revenue.

Objective: Study and establish a Special Assessment District (SAD) Policy for developing and funding gravel roads to asphalt.

Objective: Establish a neighborhood drain maintenance policy (including sump pump discharge) and study solutions for drain maintenance funding.

Objective: Implement asset management program effectively.

Objective: Establish and implement a long-term street lighting policy.

Objective: Review and implement recommendations from Pathway committee.

Objective: Establish a comprehensive local street policy and develop a short and long term funding strategy.

Objective: Maintain our focus on ensuring that existing and new buildings in the city are safe.

Objective: Develop a comprehensive policy for Conservation Easements.

GOAL: RECREATION, PARKS, CULTURAL

To preserve Rochester Hills' natural resources and recreational character.

Objective: Implement the Green Space Millage effectively.

Objective: Develop and implement funding strategy for maintenance of acquired Green Space.

Objective: Review the need and feasibility of a Parks Millage.

GOAL: COMMUNITY / NEIGHBORHOODS

To protect the family-oriented community from adverse events and conditions by strategic planning and proactive management in all aspects of municipal governance.

Objective: Establish a neighborhood drain maintenance policy (including a sump pump discharge policy) and study solutions for drain maintenance funding.

Objective: Implement a comprehensive strategic plan with the administration that is reviewed on an annual basis.

Objective: Study and make recommendation(s) to reduce the adverse impact of the deer population in the City.

Objective: Implement code enforcement/blight ordinance effectively to preserve existing neighborhoods.

Objective: Maintain strong relationships with homeowner associations to further neighborhood stability and to make the community a better place to live.

GOAL: COMMUNITY TRUST & PARTICIPATION

To promote effective communication between City Council, administration residents, businesses, and visitors so that decisions reflect the community's desires and expectations.

Objective: Maintain openness and transparency in conducting City business by way of cable broadcast and web cast of City Council meetings, and accessibility to City documents.

Objective: Engage residents through outreach in the decision making process and encourage community participation and involvement by focusing on committee recruitment.

Objective: Inform residents through various media and personal interaction on the numerous issues that affect quality of life.

Objective: Involve youth in leadership growth and in the development of City's future by way of encouraging their participation on the Rochester Hills Government Youth Council.

Objective: Develop a recognition program for resident service on City boards, commissions, committees and other acts of volunteerism.

Objective: Utilize web and technology to further enhance communication with residents and allow for online delivery of certain services.

Objective: Develop a policy to obtain public input via a community survey.

GOAL: EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE

To provide clear policy direction to the administration for the execution of City programs and services.

Objective: Implement a comprehensive strategic plan with the administration that is reviewed on an annual basis.

Objective: Explore opportunities for new public/private partnerships, and possibilities for consolidation of City services.

Objective: Explore privatization of certain city functions and develop a plan of action for implementation.

Objective: Promote cooperative purchases with other communities as a means to obtain the best price possible.

Objective: Implement records management program to improve institutional memory.

Objective: Continue improvement of communication between Mayor, administration and City Council.

Objective: Communicate the City's vision, mission, goals and objectives effectively to all City staff and link them to organizational culture and individual performance expectations.

GOAL: ENVIRONMENT

Objective: To promote conservation of water, electricity, etc.

Objective: To move towards a more green city - not only city hall and facilities but promotion within the community and businesses and which businesses we attract.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Rochester Avon Recreation Authority:

Mr. Ambrozaitis thanked President Hooper, Mr. Yalamanchi and the Mayor for coming to the Rivercrest for the RARA 50th Anniversary Event.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

NEXT MEETING DATE

Regular Meeting - Monday, May 12, 2008 at 7:30 PM

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before Council, President Hooper adjourned the meeting at 10:06 p.m.

*GREG HOOPER, President
Rochester Hills City Council*

*JANE LESLIE, Clerk
City of Rochester Hills*

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

Approved as presented at the June 23, 2008 Regular City Council Meeting.