

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Ayes: Robbins, Golden, Barnett, Dalton, Duisternars, Hill, Holder
Nays: None
Absent: None

MOTION CARRIED

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

15a. Request for Purchase Authorization - MAYOR: Local telephone Service for City Hall, DPS Garage, and Public Safety Building, blanket purchase order in the amount not-to-exceed \$90,000.00; AT&T Local, Louisville, KY (A0074) (Members received a copy of the City Council Agenda Summary Sheet dated March 27, 2001 from Susan Koliba-Galeczka, with attachments).

President Robbins indicated this had been on the Agenda previously. They requested it be rescheduled pending receipt of additional information. The information has been included in the packets.

Resolution A0074-2001-R0138

MOTION by Dalton, seconded by Barnett,

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council authorize a blanket purchase order to AT&T Local for primary local telephone service for City Hall, DPS Garage and the Public Safety Building in the amount not-to-exceed \$90,000.00 through December 31, 2002.

Ayes: Robbins, Goldin, Barnett, Dalton, Duisternars, Hill, Holder
Nays: None
Absent: None

MOTION CARRIED

15b. Discussion on Road Policy (A0070) (Members received a copy of the City Council Agenda Summary Sheet dated March 27, 2001 from Susan Koliba-Galeczka).

President Robbins noted this was discussed during the Regular Work Session on March 7, 2001. Vice President Golden submitted a proposed Resolution and it was brought back on the first available Agenda.

City Council Discussion:

Ms. Hill indicated she was not present for the original discussion. She questioned why the current policy was being changed and what funding had been jeopardized

Mayor Somerville stated it was not intended to refer to a specific road. She indicated a four-lane boulevard costs 2/3rd more to build. The City's road funds are not sufficient for the major roads. If the roads are required to be constructed as boulevards, the cost will prohibit very many roads from receiving attention. She noted a policy was just a policy, and a policy can be changed, particularly if the policy is not in the best interests of the residents of the City or in the best interests of Oakland County. The Michigan Department of Transportation has changed many boulevard plans to four-lane roads, citing the additional costs to build them. She referred to the discussion in the 1996 Minutes where there was great objection to having five-lane roads and four-lane roads with a boulevard. She indicated they would have to move forward on Hamlin Road between Livernois and Crooks soon or the City will lose their funding.

Paul Davis, City Engineer, noted the costs of constructing a four-lane boulevard versus a five-lane road. He referred to the four-lane boulevard on Livernois and indicated there were some problems associated with it. Namely, emergency vehicles trying to access the crossovers, the placement of utilities, and maintenance of the landscaping in the

median. He noted the Engineering Department would like to look at different sections of the roads in the community on a case-by-case basis, not just as four-lane boulevards.

Mr. Ott indicated that was the recommendation to Council. Professional engineering standards based on an assessment and analysis of the road conditions and surrounding circumstances ought to drive the solution to a particular road issue versus a blanket policy that may attempt to force-fit a boulevard where it may not be appropriate in terms of the analysis the engineers apply that result in the recommendation to deal with that particular road issue.

Ms. Hill stated the current policy allows for recommendations to be made for something different, if appropriate. She stated the community wants to keep the residential feel for the City and they do not want wide roads. Although the residents have stated they like the boulevard look, the policy allows for other alternatives. Of the five roads under the City's jurisdiction, only Hamlin, from Livemois to Crooks, is indicated on the Master Thoroughfare Plan to be a boulevard. Hamlin Road was to be Eighty (80%) Percent funded by the Federal Government, and it was not stopped by Council. Ms. Hill referred to the County Roads that were indicated to be a boulevard, and the State Road (Rochester Road) which was to be a six-lane boulevard to match up with what is happening in Troy. She felt public input was required before the policy was changed. She did not feel the change in policy was in the best interest of the community.

President Robbins clarified that a video tape is available from the March 7, 2001 Regular Work Session meeting. He noted the auditorium was filled with residents that night and public input was received. Council discussed the issue in depth.

Mayor Somerville noted the policy change is saying a road needs to be considered on a road-by-road basis. For the roads to be widened, the City should consider the best use for the road and the best way to widen it. It is not saying every road is going to become five lanes. The only way to salvage Hamlin Road was to provide an alternative. She stated most of the roads in the City do not have the proper right-of-way to construct boulevards without causing a lot of destruction of property.

Mr. Ott noted although Ms. Hill's interpretation of the policy may be accurate, historically, the Engineers' interpretation has been that they did not have the latitude she alluded to. Their input has been consistent with the so-called "boulevard policy". It may have been the wrong interpretation, but that was what was being applied. He referred to the funding issues and noted because boulevards cost more to construct, it leaves less opportunity to reallocate funds to other road projects in the community. He believed that was the intent of that particular "whereas" clause.

Mr. Davis noted Engineering's confusion was with the statement "except as an absolute last resort". It is unclear as to what is needed to prove the "last resort" stage to present anything other than a four-lane boulevard. He felt it was encouraging to hear they could present something else to Council other than a boulevard; however, he needed to know what information needed to be provided to be at the last resort stage.

Vice President Golden stated she had reviewed the previous history on this issue, noting there has been quite a debate since the 1980's on the interpretation. The discussion at the work session was whether there should be a design policy standard at all because it is limiting. She explained she wanted to reword her original resolution. Ms. Golden reworded the second whereas clause as follows: "Whereas, the design concept of a four (4) lane boulevard has resulted in a policy that has seriously *limited road planning due to funding issues*, and has caused delays in road projects beyond the City's control". She also suggested rewording the "Now Therefore" clause as follows: "*Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that Rochester Hills City Council rescinds the previous Council resolutions with respect to preferred road design*". Mr. Duistermars supported the changes to the motion.

Continued City Council Discussion:

Ms. Holder felt the proposed change was broadening the horizon of the policy. It gave the Directors more options to work with.

Mr. Barnett stated the goal was to review the roads on a case-by-case basis, looking at all the options based on the characteristics of a particular road section. He suggested deleting the second "Whereas" clause because it causes confusion.

Motion by Mr. Barnett, supported by Mr. Dalton to amend the motion on the floor by deleting the second Whereas clause.

Continued City Council Discussion:

Mr. Duistermars noted the real action of the Resolution is the "resolved" clause and the "whereas" clauses just support that.

Attorney Staran clarified the resolve is the action they are taking, but the whereas clauses express their intent behind it and they are material.

Mr. Dalton agreed they wanted to look on everything on a case-by-case basis, not that they will never consider anything but a four-lane boulevard.

Mr. Duistermars stated the policy has hindered the City a great deal and because of that, they have not progressed on the major road system.

Mr. Dalton noted it was not the policy but the lack of cash.

Mr. Duistermars felt the change would allow the Engineering Department to obtain financial data, public safety data, construction cost data, and to get the specifications first and then decide what road matches the specifications.

Mayor Somerville felt the Whereas clauses covered it all and were very clear and complete.

Ms. Hill questioned who decided what the Administration decides to propose and when. She agreed the language was strong but it gave the Administration a place to begin. She felt Council would be delaying the process, and they had always looked at everything on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Ott indicated that is why the City had trained professional engineers to do the analysis and evaluation, and look at traffic patterns and traffic flow. They would review those things, combine them with engineering standards, and they would give the best professional judgment as to the solution. He stated with respect to the existing policy, regardless of what may have been the intent at the time, the practical interpretation and the way it was being applied was as if there was no latitude. He did not believe the proposed change would cause Council to lose anything, nor would the public. Ultimately, the recommendation would come to Council and before the public, and they will have the opportunity to react to the Administration's proposal.

Ms. Hill indicated there were a number of other tools that have been developed for the community, including the Thoroughfare Plan and the Master Land Use Plan, which have taken into account the same intent of the policy. She did not want to see a lot of work put into one alternative if Council was ultimately going to change the project to some other type of road.

Resolution A0012-2001-R0139

MOTION by Dalton, seconded by Duistermars,

Resolved, to Call the Question, to Close debate on the Motion to Amend currently on the Floor.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Ayes: Golden, Barnett, Dalton, Duistermars, Hill, Holder, Robbins
Nays: None
Absent: None

MOTION CARRIED

President Robbins indicated Council would immediately move to vote on the motion to amend the motion on the floor, which was a motion by Golden, seconded by Duistermars, by deleting the second "Whereas" clause from the original motion.

Resolution A0070-2001-R0140

MOTION by Barnett, seconded by Dalton,

Resolved, that the following motion on the floor:

MOTION by Golden, seconded by Duistermars,

Whereas, City Council has reviewed Council's action of July 15, 1992, opposing five (5) lane roads in the community, except as an absolute last resort;

Whereas, the design concept of a four (4) lane boulevard has resulted in a policy that has seriously limited road planning due to funding issues and has caused delays in road projects beyond the City's control;

Whereas, it is City Council's intent to consider all road projects on a case-by-case basis and reserves the right to carefully consider safety and costs for individual projects;

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that Rochester Hills City Council rescinds previous Council resolutions with respect to preferred road design.

Be amended as follows:

MOTION by Golden, seconded by Duistermars,

Whereas, City Council has reviewed Council's action of July 15, 1992, opposing five (5) lane roads in the community, except as an absolute last resort;

Whereas, It is City Council's intent to consider all road projects on a case-by-case basis and reserves the right to carefully consider safety and costs for individual projects;

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that Rochester Hills City Council rescinds previous Council resolutions with respect to preferred road design.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Ayes: Barnett, Dalton, Duistermars, Hill, Holder, Robbins, Golden
Nays: None
Absent: None

MOTION CARRIED

Discussion on Original Motion:

Ms. Golden noted when she initially made the motion she had made some changes to the "Therefore" clause and clarified they were part of the amended motion on the floor. President Robbins verified the motion would be read back before any vote was taken.

Resolution A0012-2001-R0141

MOTION by Duistermars, seconded by Golden,

Resolved, to Call the Question, to Close debate on the **Motion on the Floor.**

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Ayes: Dalton, Duistermars, Hill, Holder, Robbins, Golden, Barnett

Nays: None

Absent: None

MOTION CARRIED

President Robbins read a letter into the record from resident **JOHN HORSCH, 821 Castlebar, Rochester Hills, Michigan**, regarding the City's road policy.

Resolution A0070-2001-R0142

MOTION by Golden, seconded by Duistermars,

Whereas, City Council has reviewed Council's action of July 15, 1992, opposing five (5) lane roads in the community, except as an absolute last resort;

Whereas, it is City Council's intent to consider all road projects on a case-by-case basis and reserves the right to carefully consider safety and costs for individual projects;

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that Rochester Hills City Council rescinds previous Council resolutions with respect to preferred road design.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Ayes: Duistermars, Holder, Robbins, Golden, Barnett

Nays: Hill, Dalton

Absent: None

MOTION CARRIED

Ms. Hill requested an update on Hamlin Road. She noted it was put on hold and has never come back with any other plan, suggestion or revision for Council to review and vote on. Mayor Somerville explained it will come back to Council for a vote. President Robbins pointed out engineering and purchase requests have been approved, and it is in the budget. Mr. Dalton explained he supported considering the roads on a case-by-case basis; however, he voted against the motion because he was not comfortable rescinding prior Council Resolutions. President Robbins explained if one resolution is rescinded, it reverts back to the last resolution made by a previous Council.

16 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Hill requested information about the status of the RV Ordinance. After the members discussed the matter, it was brought back before Council.

Ms. Hill referred to the increase in waste hauling costs. She pointed out there was a waste hauler named Disposal Co. that was not a licensed hauler in the community. She noted this hauler is being ticketed and fined at the current time. She explained the matter was being addressed by the Community Development & Viability Committee.