



Leanne Scott <scottl@rochesterhills.org>

Water pipe project

1 message

Theresa Mungiola <mungiolit@rochesterhills.org>

Sun, Sep 7, 2025 at 10:02 PM

To: Bill Fritz <fritzb@rochesterhills.org>, Leanne Scott <scottl@rochesterhills.org>

Bill,

I have so many questions about this agenda topic.

- How did we become aware of this problem? Are we experiencing failures already?
- Do you have a map of the different sections that will be excavated? I would like to understand where these are located,
- What is the impact to the surrounding area when the excavation is done? Will the area be returned to its original state? Will fixes be conducted at the time of excavation?
- What is the communication to the residents/businesses when the excavation is conducted.
- Is there any way to do the assessment without an excavation? A lot of the city was built in the 70's and 80's. How widespread is this issue? Is there any vendor that can be held liable for the pipe failure? Is 14 miles the limit to this issue?

Thanks!

Theresa Mungiola

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.



Leanne Scott <scottl@rochesterhills.org>

City Council Meeting Questions

Bill Fritz <fritz@rochesterhills.org>

Mon, Sep 8, 2025 at 12:31 PM

To: Theresa Mungiolli <mungiolit@rochesterhills.org>

Cc: Leanne Scott <scottl@rochesterhills.org>, Bryan Barnett <barnettb@rochesterhills.org>, Tracey Balint <balintt@rochesterhills.org>, Mike Viazanko <viazankom@rochesterhills.org>

Good afternoon, Theresa.

Attached are the responses to your questions. Mike Viazainko is preparing a response to the questions regarding the high-speed doors at the DPS garage.

Thank you,



Innovative by nature

Bill Fritz, PE

Director

Department of Public Services

p. 248-841-2487

c. 248-897-2532

rochesterhills.org

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

2 attachments

2025-09-08 City Council Member Questions.docx
25K **Pipeline.Condition.Assessment.Location.Map.pdf**
261K

DPS Responses to City Council Agenda Inquiries – September 8, 2025

Question Originator	Agenda Item	Question	Answer
Council Member: Theresa Mungioli	2025-0361 Pipeline Condition Assessment Services	How did we become aware of this problem?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are currently no known issues at these locations. This project is a proactive condition assessment of our transmission mains, not a response to existing failures. ○ Water industry asset management best practices have demonstrated that Prestressed Concrete Cylinder Pipe (PCCP) manufactured in the 1970s have proven to be vulnerable to pipe failure. The GLWA 120-inch water main break from 2022 was of the same type.
		Are we experiencing failures already?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Luckily, we had very few failures on our larger transmission water mains. Failures on this pipe class and material tend to be catastrophic.
		Do you have a map of the different sections that will be excavated?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes. See attached.
		What is the impact to the surrounding area when the excavation is done?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Limited excavation to the main is required for the assessment. The largest test hole would be maximum 30 feet in length (at least one pipe joint is required to be exposed). And only as wide as necessary to expose the pipe.
		Will the area be returned to its original state?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes. Once testing is complete, the area will be backfilled and restored to its original condition.
		Will fixes be conducted at the time of excavation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No repairs are required at this time. Just a condition assessment of the pipe.
		What is the communication to the residents/businesses when the excavation is conducted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The adjacent property owners will be notified prior to excavation. There will be no interruption of service during the assessment.
		Is there any way to do the assessment without an excavation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are ways to conduct condition assessments without excavation, but those are not nearly as reliable and accurate as the method being employed.
		A lot of the city was built in the 70's and 80's. How widespread is this issue?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Only 14 miles of Rochester Hills' 400 miles of water main are of the material that we are investigating. These are the transmission mains and are located along major roads. They are not located inside neighborhoods.

DPS Responses to City Council Agenda Inquiries – September 8, 2025

<p>Council Member: Theresa Mungioli</p>	<p>2025-0361 Pipeline Condition Assessment Services</p>	<p>Is there any vendor that can be held liable for the pipe failure?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We do not have any issues currently. Other utilities around the U.S. have tried, but many of the manufacturers are now out of business.
		<p>Is 14 miles the limit to this issue?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes. The 14 miles refers to the total amount of PCCP within the City's water system. These are large-diameter pipes installed in the 1970s, and due to their age and material, there is a potential for future failures in these locations, which this assessment aims to prevent.
<p>Council Member: Theresa Mungioli</p>	<p>2025-0125 v2 Brewster Road Rehabilitation</p>	<p>Why is this increased contingency so high?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The original approved contingency was \$225,900. The cost for the additional 1 ½-inches of pavement over two miles of roadway is approximately \$275,000, which is an unusual and unexpected additional cost that exceeds the initial contingency. The additional \$250,000 covers a portion of this extra pavement, other unforeseen field conditions on the north mile, and a contingency for the southern mile, where work is just beginning. These are projected quantities, and the final project cost will only be known upon completion. We may find savings in other areas of the project.
		<p>How did we miss the road bed issue when the original samples were done?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The original plans of Brewster Road construction indicated a 5-inch HMA (Hot-Mixed Asphalt) cross-section. Recent pavement cores showed an average thickness just over 5 inches, leading to the assumption that 5 inches of HMA would be sufficient for the two miles of roadway. However, the actual pavement thickness required is approximately 6 ½ inches over the entire two-mile stretch.
		<p>What changes to process are being implemented to ensure this is not happen again?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will implement more conservative measures by adding a factor of safety to the average sample depth. Additionally, we will review all quantities and apply additional quantities to items that are routinely high due to unforeseen field conditions.

DPS Responses to City Council Agenda Inquiries – September 8, 2025

Council Member: Theresa Mungoli	2025-0125 v2 Brewster Road Rehabilitation	Why isn't OHM held accountable for this mistake?	○ This is a highly unusual situation where field conditions differed significantly from our records.
		I would like to understand the lessons learned from this very expensive error and what is being done to prevent this from happening again.	○ See response above

