

Ms. Alaina Campbell, President, Rochester Regional Chamber of Commerce, commended Rochester Hills for its leadership, in particular, over the past year. She wanted to publicly voice the Chamber's support for the Economic Development Strategy that would be presented. Ms. Valentik had reached out to the Chamber, and they were able to participate in the Plan, and they had been excited to be able to provide input. She wished to commend Mayor Barnett, who briefed their members weekly, for his leadership over the past year. She had also welcomed Ms. Valentik, who was serving on the Chamber's Board of Directors, which was very strategic and key for their member businesses. She thanked everyone for their leadership, many of whom were involved in the Chamber. She knew many of them personally, and she thanked them for everything they had done to help support the small business community which, in particular, had been the hardest hit.

Chairperson Brnabic closed Public Comment at 7:15 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS

2021-0021 Transportation Master Plan 2021 Draft

Ms. Roediger thanked everyone and commented that she looked forward to the joint meeting all year. It was a great opportunity for the two boards that really laid the foundation for the regulations and how the City would move forward in the future. She was excited this year to "tie a ribbon" around the Transportation Master Plan, which had been kicked off at last year's joint meeting. No action was being asked, and the Plan would be brought before the Planning Commission and City Council at future meetings for endorsement. The consultants would give a presentation, and then the Plan would be up for public comment for a week or so. She was excited for the members to hear about the Economic Development Strategy that her team had been working on for the past two years. Last February, they were prepared to present round one, but things changed, and they had to revisit the Plan. They spent the past year updating it, based on current trends. She would also present the PED Annual Report for 2020. She felt that all three documents were very important, and she was very proud of the efforts.

Ms. Colleen Hill-Stramsak, Project Manager with Hubbell, Roth and Clark, began the presentation. She said that they were trying to look at the City's transportation system from a holistic standpoint - safety for all users, capacity and emerging trends. They looked at strategies for reducing congestion, and would present information about street design, traffic calming and technology and give some updates on things the City was already doing very well. She noted that the last Transportation Plan had been done in 2008. The City had spent \$480 million in infrastructure

since then and improved a lot of roadways. In 2013, 16% of the roads were in good shape, and in 2018, 29% were. Roads in poor shape went down to 10%. She indicated that it was not the trend seen in most communities, and it was a testament to the City working with its partners RCOC, MDOT and neighboring communities that the money was well spent. There was \$50 million in planned or recently completed improvements scheduled for the next years. If the City was looking at improving a roadway from two to five lanes, it would cost \$6.5 million, for example, and a lot of roadways had been improved with those funds. Regarding funding opportunities, there were BUILD grants available through the Federal Highway for major projects. She advised that RCOC had recently received a grant for Adams Rd. from Hamlin to Walton Blvd. to do an environmental assessment. It had not been included in the Plan, and would take the next year. There was road funding available if new manufacturing was brought in. A good chunk of the major projects came from the Oakland County Federal Aid Committee; RCOC would get \$13 million and the rest was shared by 62 communities. It was highly competitive. The State gave funds to local agencies for safety; CMAQ funds were for reducing congestion and the Transportation Alternatives Program was for pathways and other non-motorized improvements.

Ms. Ann Marie Kerby, MKSK, showed a timeline for the engagement process. They met with the agencies and stakeholders three times. Representatives included members of the Planning Commission and City Council, MDOT, SEMCOG, residents and committee members. They met with the joint meeting group a year ago to talk about existing conditions of the transportation system and talked about best practices that might be explored. They also asked the members about their transportation priorities. There was an online survey and two virtual, public workshops. The comments helped guide the framework for the recommendations in the Plan. They catalogued all of the comments from each meeting, the survey and from emails received into a spreadsheet. They wanted to make sure that they incorporated people's ideas and concerns into the Plan. The most frequent comments related to congestion, road and infrastructure maintenance, intersection redesign, non-motorized connections, safety concerns and transit. They were able to identify priorities for improvements through an analysis and evaluation of existing conditions and congestion, traffic, crashes, gaps in the non-motorized network, practicality options for improvements, potential funding opportunities and a review of the engagement. Based on the feedback they received and their evaluation of the transportation system, a vision and goals were created. The main components emphasized a safer transportation system, easing traffic congestion, enhancing

multi-modal facilities, preparing for new technologies, maintaining infrastructure and roads and exploring public transportation options.

Ms. Hill-Stramsak talked next about recommendations. They encouraged investment in technology along the Adams and Walton corridors and to continue participating with RCOC and MDOT in autonomous vehicle and future vehicle investments. The City had already been onboard with the highly adaptive, controlled traffic system, and they encouraged working with partner agencies. They also recommended studying the potential for electrical charging stations in City-owned parking lots.

Ms. Kerby stated that one of the goals of the Master Plan was prioritizing pathway gaps. The Plan looked at recommended improvements suggested by the school district. There was a recommendation to implement a pathway crossing along the north side of Auburn at M-59, which appeared to be the most feasible. After surveying the public and stakeholders, there was some support for permitting lower speed e-bikes and scooters on pathways, and a recommendation was to consider revising the Ordinance to accommodate that. She turned it over to Ms. Roediger to put up a survey question to be answered anonymously at the meeting.

Ms. Roediger put the question on the screen, which asked for support for e-bikes and scooters on pathways. When done, she said that there was pretty good support by both boards to look into modifying the regulations to allow those on the pathway system.

Ms. Kerby said that another goal was to explore transit options. They evaluated what was currently available, but they wanted to have discussion about future options. The recommendations included working with the OPC and Oakland County agencies to establish transit connections, explore park and ride options and establish mobility hub demonstration projects near multi-family developments. The goal was to increase access to destinations and jobs and help reduce transportation costs for residents. She again turned it over to Ms. Roediger to launch another poll.

Ms. Roediger explained that they were looking for opinions about whether the City should look into some of the transit options. When done, she said that the results were pretty split, and it would be something that they would continue to look at.

Ms. Kerby advised that also as part of the recommendations, they looked at regulatory improvements or changes that could be made to the Zoning Ordinance. They recommended requiring multi-modal impact assessments, and not just traffic impact studies for developments that met certain square-footage thresholds, trip generation thresholds or projects that could be rezoned. The main goal was to help City officials and the public understand the potential implications of a development on the greater transportation system and improvements and mitigation that might be needed. They were looking at all modes of transportation, including pedestrian, bicycle, transit and vehicles. They encouraged bicycle parking when there was a significant change in use or new development. It could be incentivized through regulatory measures. For example, if bicycle spaces were included, then required parking spaces could be reduced. Electric vehicle charging stations could be incentivized, and required parking could be reduced if a developer installed those onsite.

Ms. Roediger launched another poll, which asked if electric vehicle charging stations should be pursued at City Hall, and there appeared to be a majority in support.

Ms. Kerby noted that they had put together some road diet alternatives for certain locations where it was feasible and in denser residential areas where walking gaps were prevalent. She explained that a road diet was a design solution that reconfigured a street where travel lanes were repurposed into other modes of travel. Benefits included safer traffic speeds, reduction of pedestrian crossing lengths and safety for all users. Drexelgate had been named as a missing pathway gap street. They were proposing three additional crosswalks. The travel lanes were currently 16 feet wide, so there was a lot of room to shift the north side curb and construct an eight-foot wide pathway. They would also add bike shares in the road. The other two roads they looked at for road diets were Barclay and Hampton Circles. They were noted as top priorities by the stakeholders and the public. They analyzed their existing crosswalks. It was recommended to add a few more crosswalks for Barclay Circle and to complete the connections at both ends of the Barclay and Hampton intersections. There were a few mid-block crossings currently existing on Hampton, but only two for the entire stretch. They were recommending adding nine additional mid-block crossings. Barclay Circle was currently five lanes, and they were recommending narrowing it to three lanes with bike lanes on either sides with buffers. For Hampton Circle, they were recommending going from three to two lanes and adding bike lanes.

Mr. Gentjan Heqimi, HRC, talked about the Auburn and M-59 crossing. He explained that they looked at the bridge crossings throughout the City to see where it would be feasible to make them more pedestrian friendly. Of all that they looked at, and with input, the M-59 crossing at Auburn was the most feasible because of its wide right-of-way. The cheaper option was to restripe the pavement to allow two five-foot wide bike lanes with buffers. The other would be to establish a shared use path, 12 feet wide with barriers. They analyzed the road network of the City in terms of congestion, safety, non-motorized uses, stakeholder input and infrastructure conditions to come up with locations for which they could provide recommendations. He mentioned the Action Plan, which was a subset of the overall recommendations. He showed a map that highlighted near term recommendations based on needs. He showed the intersections and corridors which showed the most congestion with the most opportunity for safety improvements. The corridors prioritized included parts of Adams Rd., Tienken Rd., Avon Rd., Rochester Rd., Livernois and Auburn Rds. Recommendations for those corridors included road widenings, which, most of the time was to install left turn lanes. Other improvements included access managements, signal modernization and intersection capacity improvements.

Ms. Hill-Stramsak summarized that the next step would be to leave the Plan up on the City's website for additional comment. They would finalize the Plan based on the input and take it to the Planning Commission and City Council in the next couple of months for endorsement.

Mr. Hetrick stated that the Transportation Plan was outstanding and very well done. He could see how the City could move forward based on the recommendations. He mentioned Adams Rd., which he felt was clearly in need of significant change, and he asked the status of the environmental assessment and the game plan ahead.

Ms. Hill-Stramsak said that RCOC was still waiting for its contract from Federal Highway, and then the assessment would take a year to eighteen months. Mr. Hetrick said that he was glad it was moving forward. He felt that looking at new technology and using electrification as well as autonomous vehicles would put Rochester Hills at the forefront. He said that he was 100% pleased that there was a road diet planned for Drexelgate. His wife walked their dog on Drexelgate, as did a lot of other people. He was happy to see that they wanted to put in a level of safety for people who wanted to walk, bike, run or push strollers. He thought that a road diet was good for other roads to drive multi-modal transportation. He remarked that it was a terrific job.

Mr. Kaltsounis thanked the team for the report, which he felt that it was very thorough. Regarding freeway crossings, he said that he would like to see a recommendation for Livernois. He asked if they could add something to the current Plan so that going forward, the appropriate parties would see that it had been identified.

Mr. Davis agreed that they could add that. In addition to Livernois, he advised that crossing Rochester Rd. through the M-59 interchange had been another area identified. There was not a pathway through the interchange on either side, and he felt that a lot of people could benefit from that as well. He stated that Livernois had been in the works for many years. It would probably require a full rebuilding of that bridge or a separate pedestrian bridge crossing, which would be very expensive. He knew that when M-59 was widened, the Road Commission and the City reached out to MDOT to see if they would incorporate the rebuilding of that bridge, but they would not do it. If it happened, it would be a 100% City cost, and at the time, it was not something the City could move forward with. He did not think that anyone would disagree that it was a primary area where a pedestrian improvement would be very valuable. He thought that one of the drawings identified the area as a concern, but he agreed that it could be emphasized.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the current pathway system was suitable to handle e-bike and scooter traffic. He wondered if there were areas where they could not travel because of the condition of the pathway. Mr. Davis agreed that there were gaps, but the City tried to fill those where they were able to do so. He did not think that the additional traffic from the bikes would be a problem. The pathway cross section had four inches of asphalt, and he claimed that there were parking lots with less than that. The Ordinance did not currently allow e-bikes. Mr. Kaltsounis knew that e-bikes and scooters were becoming more popular, and that the pathways down the main roads were great. He wanted to make sure they documented things to have as guidance down the road.

Regarding the Smart transportation system, Mr. Kaltsounis stated that he had initially been for it. But he wondered if there was some type of alternate system with smaller vehicles that could pick people up and take them where they needed. He questioned whether it should be Smart or another autonomous company they should invest into, as they might get a few more votes for that.

Dr. Bowyer thanked everyone for all the work. She noted that she sat on

City Council and the Planning Commission, and she was one of the stakeholders for the Transportation Plan. She thought that the evolution of the Plan, incorporating the comments and feedback from everyone, was great. She recalled that five years ago, the Mayor's Business Council was at the auto show, and she and Ms. Morita were looking at the electric cars. They both thought that it would be an awesome idea to have charging stations at City Hall and the DPS facility and to get some electric cars for the City workers. She thought that it was great to see that after five years, it might happen. She noted that the Paint Creek Trailways Commission approved electric bikes about two years ago. She noted that it was extremely crowded on the weekends. She did not see how they would be able to stop people from using scooters and e-bikes, so she felt that they should just be allowed. She considered that the cost to make some of the improvements would be very expensive, but she felt that in the short term, where there was a very wide roadway, people felt like they could speed, and striping would narrow the road and reduce speeds and not be too expensive. With the bridge by Auburn, it would be nice to have a striped pathway on the side so people could feel safer without it being extremely costly. She indicated that she would be all for mass transportation, but she maintained that it would be cost prohibitive. Instead of having Smart stop once in Rochester Hills and increase everyone's taxes by \$200 per year, they could look at some other format, such as Uber. Or she suggested that the City could have its own internal system where someone could be picked up and taken to a destination. She claimed that it would be a lot cheaper than using Smart, which would have one bus line and would not connect the City. She believed that the City needed to look at its own bussing system with regards to mass transit. She thanked everyone for their work and efforts and felt that it all came together as a nice Plan.

Ms. Morita said that she had had the pleasure of serving with everyone either as a Planning Commissioner or on City Council. She mentioned that there was a little more history with the Smart issue, and she was a little disappointed to see it being presented. It had been made clear over and over again that Council had no appetite to look at a millage situation with Smart where they would suck \$3.5 million a year out of the community for something that would not get people where they needed to go. Council looked at it, and she and Mr. Tisdell (former Council President) met with people from Smart. It was not something they supported at the time, and she would not support it now. She cautioned both boards against talking with Smart. To be polite, the City allowed them to come in for a 45-minute presentation. They took the fact that they had presented to Rochester Hills to other communities, and said that

Rochester Hills was talking with them so those cities should, too. It was not that the City was talking to them or considering Smart; they just let them present, because they were trying to be polite. Her experience with Smart was that they had been less than forthright with the City about their intentions. She felt that they had misused their conversations, and she cautioned again against talking with them. She and Mr. Tisdell had done some other research in terms of entering into an Uber contract that could potentially supply City-wide, last mile, discounted rides for people, which seemed to be a better fit for the community. Generally speaking, most people had cars, and if they did not, it was because they could not drive. Even if someone was at home, without a car, they could not get to a bus stop. Regarding the scooter issue, she was on the Paint Creek Trailways Commission when the motorized bikes were authorized, and there was a speed limit placed. She would be concerned about having scooters on pathways. Hypothetically speaking, someone could take a regulator off a scooter, and it could go pretty fast. She would not like to see those on the pathways - she felt that it would be asking for trouble. She thought that motorized bikes would be fine, but they would have to look at speed limits for them. There were a lot of people walking. Where she lived, in the Hamlin/Adams area, people walked to Innovation Hills, and the pathways were full of people. It was dangerous for her to get in and out of her street because she had to look for pedestrians coming both ways.

Ms. Mungoli said that it was good to see the Planning Commission. She thanked them for coordinating the meeting. She wondered if there was a way to have a bigger font for some of the pages. It was hard to read some things, and if there was a way to make it easier for people to see, she said that she would appreciate it. Regarding safety issues, she mentioned Adams Rd. When developments came through, she asked how many driveways were allowed for a parking lot. At the corner of Adams and Walton, on Adams, she counted approximately nine driveways. A right turn on red was allowed at the intersection. She thought that there was an easy way to address safety in some areas by looking at the number of driveways allowed in and out of shopping centers, and to perhaps restrict right on red at the intersections. She pointed out that there were always a number of accidents at the Adams and Walton intersection. Regarding electric charging stations, she noted that she worked in automotive, and she knew that electric and autonomous vehicles were coming. She thought that it should be left up to a shopping center to decide if there was a demand. They would put them in if there were residents looking for them. She would not want to see the City arbitrarily providing an incentive or reducing the number of parking spaces because of charging stations. Too many times, there was not enough parking, and she would not want to

see it reduced more because they were allowing people to charge when the number of electric or autonomous vehicles were outnumbered by the ICE vehicles. She suggested that they should keep an eye on what was in the community relative to electric vehicles. She said that as someone who ran in the community with a husband who rode a bike all over the community, with regards to how the pathways were shared, if they were going to allow faster vehicles, she thought that they needed to do some education for the people who walked. There were people walking dogs with leashes that expanded and contracted and took up an entire pathway. It was sometimes not safe for someone to run on a path with a dog walker with an expandable leash, let alone a faster vehicle. Last year, she had added something about safety on bike paths to her article in the Hills Herald. She wanted to make sure that they were being consistent in the words - that pathways equaled bicycle paths equaled trailways. She noted that the Paint Creek Trailways Commission looked at e-bikes and scooters that could go faster. She mentioned "road diet," and suggested that education would be needed for that, as well. She stated that having painted stripes did not mean that it would necessarily slow people down. She said that she wholeheartedly supported Ms. Morita's statements about Smart, and until there was a proven need, she did not think that it was something the City should spend money on.

President Deel thanked the Commissioners who came and gave their time and talent towards the project, which he maintained was extremely worthwhile to do. He thanked MKSK and HRC for their presentation and Ms. Roediger and Ms. Valentik for their hard work putting the plans and meeting together. He thought that there was real value in having a wide-angled lens looking at the future. He had been thinking a lot lately about how the nature of work was changing, noting that he had been into his office twice since April of last year. Many of his neighbors had been working at home, and a lot had been told that it would be permanent. He remarked that his car got three weeks to a gallon. Transportation needs had changed, and they had learned a lot about what they could do remotely. Autonomous vehicles were right around the corner, and that would change the way they lived and where they lived. They had to look at what kind of community people wanted to spend more time in as they potentially lived where they worked. In making improvements to safety and walkability, making room for alternate modes of transportation like scooters and e-bikes made a lot of sense to him. He noticed that it had been integrated into the Plan, and he was happy to see those things addressed. Regarding the road diets for Drexelgate and Barclay Circle, as someone who drove them a lot, he felt that it was clearly needed. It would not just be a safety improvement but a quality of life improvement.

It would also have a traffic calming effect. He stated that it was a fantastic Plan, and he thanked everyone for their hard work in putting it together.

Chairperson Brnabic said that she had a bit of a safety concern with the road diet for Barclay Circle. She claimed that the road was extremely busy. She mentioned the Chase Bank at Rochester and Barclay Circle and the difficulties people had exiting. The left turn lane on Rochester Rd. was always backed up to turn on to Barclay Circle, and she noted the east/west traffic from Wabash to Barclay Circle. She had a concern about adding bike lanes in that vicinity because of the traffic and drivers not paying attention. The road would be taken from four lanes to two lanes, which was a concern. She said that she absolutely supported alternate forms of transportation, but she felt that the area she had mentioned deserved a little more discussion because of its situation. She supported something like an Uber contract that offered discounted rides versus something like Smart. She remarked that she also supported having a bigger font. She thanked the presenters, and stated that the Plan was very well put together and appreciated. She opened the discussion to the public.

Tom Yazbeck, 1707 Devonwood Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307. *Mr. Yazbeck stated that he was really glad that the City was embracing non-motorized transportation. He liked the bike lanes planned for a lot of locations and the addition of sidewalks and crosswalks. He was happy to see the progress that had been made to the Auburn Rd. corridor. He did feel that it was regrettable that City Council continued to oppose Smart, and he felt that they should reconsider that opposition. He thought that a lot of the new developments were making public transportation more viable in the community. Currently, the only public transportation Rochester Hills had was the OPC transit service that served people with disabilities and seniors. It was an essential service that had helped his relatives, but it had huge limitations that prevented it from being a reliable commute option. In his opinion, joining Smart would be the best way for Rochester Hills to provide a transit solution for everyone. A lot of similar communities had voted every year to be a part of Smart. He was a Smart rider, and he said that there were others in Rochester Hills who were as well. They had to drive to get to the bus stops. He was not an employee of Smart, but he had been following their plans for improvement for the next five years or so. They were rolling out micro-transit, which he felt would be a much better solution and more affordable than Uber or Lyft contracts. He believed that the Council and Mayor strove to maintain an innovative, inclusive and sustainable City and had a long history of fostering regional cooperation, and he felt that opting into Smart would be*

an excellent way to show how committed the City was to its civic values.

Corey Rowe, 1556 Charter Oak Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48309. *Mr. Rowe noted that he was an OU graduate. He thanked everyone for exploring transportation mobility improvements for the community with the Transportation Plan. He said that he was also a frequent Smart rider between Troy and his graduate courses at Wayne State. He expressed his shared support for bringing Smart service to the City. He realized that there had been some mixed discussion. He stated that micro-mobility was something that Smart had been focusing on heavily. It had been brought to Farmington Hills recently, and they planned to bring it to other communities. In the past four months, they had expanded service around the area, including to Troy Beaumont. He stated that their service had only been getting better, and since the City had been creating walkable places, such as the Brooklands District and with the proposed Hamlin Circle improvements, he felt that it was an important next step. He would like to see all employees, residents and students have equal access to those places the City was building. He also mentioned that the OU shuttle had been discontinued last year, which left students on campus without a car no way of traveling to places around town. He had been one of those students. He lived in a dorm for a year without a car. He did not think that should be an issue for a major university with 20,000 students. He felt that the City should reconsider Smart and allow it to come to a vote.*

Scott Struzik, 2735 Stonebury Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307. *Mr. Struzik said that he greatly appreciated the time and effort that the Planning Commission, City Council and City staff put into guiding the growth of the City and its transportation infrastructure. He complimented staff, HRC and MKSK on their efforts to incorporate public feedback into the document. The draft Plan was crafted on a foundation of metrics and data and refined with feedback from the residents of Rochester Hills. Some of the aspects of the Plan that he was very excited about and supported were the road diets for Drexelgate, Hampton Circle and Barclay Circle. He thought it was great that the Plan was addressing roads that were built too wide. To Chairperson Brnabic's point, he did not think that the intention of the Plan was to remove all of the lanes for Barclay Circle at the intersections. He lived within walking distance of the area, and he maintained that Barclay Circle was too wide. He did not think that there was enough traffic to justify two through lanes in each direction. He agreed with adding bike lanes on Hampton and Barclay Circle. He agreed with the addition of a continuous center turn lane for Auburn Rd. from Barclay Circle to Culbertson and the completion of*

several pathways throughout the City to provide critical connections for pedestrians and bicyclists. The access management considerations would help increase safety and decrease congestion, especially at the intersections. Regarding the improvements for pedestrian safety over M-59, he greatly preferred Alternative B, which provided a dedicated safe space for non-motorized traffic that would be great. He walked and biked over that road a lot, and he felt very unsafe. He said that the planning process had received a lot of feedback regarding transit. Transit was something that folks in the City, including him, were already using. In order for him to take a Smart bus to his job downtown, he had to first drive to Troy. He said that he would love to see the City explore expanding the bus system to include Rochester Hills and to connect its residents to the rest of the region. He suggested looking at more roundabouts in the future. He would like to see one at John R and Hamlin and John R and Avon. He claimed that roundabouts greatly reduced fatalities and serious injury accidents. He would also like to see more mid-block crossings on some of the major roads. He thanked everyone for their time and review of the Transportation Master Plan. He was very excited about the transportation infrastructure throughout the City, which he was proud to call home.

Kristy Plesscher noted that she did not live in Rochester Hills, but she worked at the **Leader Dogs for the Blind, 1039 S. Rochester Rd., Rochester Hills, MI 48307** as a certified orientation and mobility specialist. She stated that what the City had done so far to make it walkable and accessible for people with disabilities was very impressive. She had worked in other cities and states, and the accessibility features here were among the best. She said that it was really inspiring to see the team working to make that even more robust, and she thanked everyone for their efforts. She also wanted to express her support for fixed route bus services in Rochester Hills. As Mayor Barnett had stated, Rochester Hills strove to be the premier place to live, work and raise a family. She said that it was difficult to underestimate the value of a robust public transportation option for people who were non-drivers, and she felt that equal access to the community was the best way to make Rochester Hills a better place to live, work and raise a family.

Mayor Barnett thanked the residents for their constructive comments. He indicated that one of the hallmarks of a good City was one that was looking forward and planning for its future. That was why they did a Transportation Plan and a five-year Economic Strategy which would be presented shortly in the meeting. He was happy to see the statistics

about roads in good condition going up and in poor going down, and he praised DPS. He said that it took a commitment by the City Council, and it was nice to see the residents recognizing that. He noted that he had been heavily involved in the public transportation issue from several different angles over the last decade. He was generally a fan of public transportation, and he had seen it work in a lot of places in his travels across the country, but the City would always be incredibly protective of its residents. To date, they had not seen a really good proposal for public transportation, although the folks from Smart had come the closest. He knew that they were continuing to refine their plan, and he encouraged continued conversations. However, nothing had come close to service levels where he would feel comfortable in supporting it. He understood the need for moving people around and that mobility had changed dramatically. He mentioned the ride that only took people from OU to Rochester/Rochester Hills. There were about 60,000 users in 2013. Last year, there were 7,000. That was from a commuter school, and there was a dramatic decline in the use of that type of fixed bus route. He felt that a Uber-like approach was the way of the future and the only way it would work in Rochester Hills. They held a survey last year that asked about public transportation, and 38% of people agreed or strongly agreed that public transportation would be helpful. 31% disagreed or strongly disagreed, and the remainder had no opinion. However, only 5% of the public would pay for it at the rate that Smart was proposing. They would have to present a plan that was palatable and valuable. The recognized value would be a public willing to pay for it. They would have to raise the percentage from 5% to more than 50%. To date, there had not been a cohesive plan that addressed the specific needs of the residents of the City. The City was not anti-public transportation and would love to be a regional partner, which Rochester Hills did in every way, but they had to protect the citizens and make sure that what they were getting was worth what they were paying for. The conversation would have to evolve to meet the needs of the residents, and they would continue it moving forward.

Ms. Roediger recapped that the Plan would be up for public comment for the next week and that it would be presented at the next Planning Commission and City Council meetings for endorsement.

2021-0023

Economic Development Strategy - Planning and Economic Development Department

Ms. Roediger introduced Pam Valentik, Manager of Economic Development and the City's new Economic Development Specialist, Michelle Carley, who joined the City several months ago. She noted that Ms. Carley had many years of marketing experience in the private sector