



# Rochester Hills Minutes

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

## Historic Districts Commission

Chairperson Brian R. Dunphy, Vice Chairperson Maria-Teresa L. Cozzolino  
Members: John Dziurman, Nicole Franey, Micheal Kilpatrick, Melissa Luginski,  
Paul Miller, Dr. Richard Stamps, Jason Thompson

---

Thursday, May 14, 2009

7:30 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

---

**MINUTES** of the **REGULAR ROCHESTER HILLS HISTORIC DISTRICTS COMMISSION MEETING** held at the Rochester Hills Municipal Building, 1000 Rochester Hills Drive, Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan.

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Dunphy called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM.

### 2. ROLL CALL

Present 9 - **Maria-Teresa Cozzolino, John Dziurman, Paul Miller, Richard Stamps, Micheal Kilpatrick, Brian Dunphy, Jason Thompson, Nicole Franey and Melissa Luginski**

Also Present: Derek Delacourt, Deputy Director, Planning Department  
Paul Davis, City Engineer, Engineering Department  
Jeff O'Brien, Road Commission for Oakland County  
Judy A. Bialk, Recording Secretary

### 3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Chairperson Dunphy announced a quorum was present.

### 4. STATEMENT OF STANDARDS

Chairperson Dunphy read the following Statement of Standards for the record.

"All decisions made by the Historic Districts Commission follow the guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, MCL Section 399.205, and City Code Section 118-164."

### 5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

#### 5A. 2009-0198 March 12, 2009 Regular Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Dunphy asked for any comments or corrections to the March 12, 2009

Regular Meeting Minutes. Upon hearing none, he called for a motion to approve.

**A motion was made by Kilpatrick, seconded by Cozzolino, that this matter be Approved as Presented.**

**The motion CARRIED by the following vote:**

**Aye 9 - Cozzolino, Dziurman, Miller, Stamps, Kilpatrick, Dunphy, Thompson, Franey and Luginski**

**RESOLVED that the Minutes of the March 12, 2009 Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting be approved as presented.**

## **6. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS**

### **A. Selection Criteria and Procedures (Revised 3/12/09)**

Chairperson Dunphy stated the Selection Criteria and Procedures had been revised by the Commission at the March meeting by clarifying some of the language, and copies would be provided to the Commissioners. He called for any announcements or communications. No other announcements or communications were presented.

## **7. PUBLIC COMMENT (Non-Agenda Items)**

Chairperson Dunphy asked if there were any public comments. He reminded the audience members in attendance that if they wished to speak on any non-Agenda items, they should complete a speaker's card and turn it in to the recording secretary. There were no public comments.

Chairperson Dunphy stated that speaker cards should also be completed by anyone wishing to speak on an Agenda item, and turned in to the recording secretary.

## **8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **8A. 2008-0678 Stoney Creek Village - Discussion with Road Commission for Oakland County**

Chairperson Dunphy stated that the City Engineer was present, along with a representative from the Road Commission for Oakland County. He asked both gentlemen to introduce themselves and begin their presentation.

Paul Davis, City Engineer, City of Rochester Hills, stated he was present to provide assistance to Mr. Jeff O'Brien from the Road Commission for Oakland County, who is the lead for the proposed bridge reconstruction project.

Jeff O'Brien, Design Engineer, Road Commission for Oakland County, thanked the Commission for inviting him to attend this meeting to provide an update regarding some of the projects in the area of Tienken Road. He indicated he would focus on

the bridge replacement project over the Stoney Creek, which is essentially adjacent and within the Stoney Creek Historic District.

Mr. O'Brien stated the purpose of the presentation was to update the Commission about where the project stood and provide an overview of the existing structure, i.e., what it consists of; where it lies along Stoney Creek; the funding source; a brief outline regarding the design process and where that process stands; present an overview of the conceptual bridge project, and obtain the Commission's feedback regarding what the Road Commission should be looking at or what the Commission would like to see incorporated and what other considerations the Road Commission could take a look during this early conceptual phase.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the existing bridge was built in the 1940s and consists of plain, reinforced concrete, abutment railings and wing walls. The abutments essentially support the bridge deck; the concrete railings keep traffic on the bridge, and the wing walls retain soil off the side of the bridge and keep the soil out of the Creek and out of the floodplain that is immediately adjacent to the bridge.

Mr. O'Brien explained that the concrete deck consisted of reinforced concrete deck over steel high beams and is approximately a 40-foot span today. He explained that was the length of the bridge along the road, and noted the width of the bridge today consisted of two (2) ten-foot (10') lanes with reinforced concrete railings. There is no pedestrian accommodation on that existing bridge today, and the existing abutments and footings do not meet the current loading standards for the State of Michigan.

Mr. O'Brien stated the bridge is currently weight restricted and is posted with a 37/46/52 ton rating. Those ratings reflect certain vehicles, i.e., a single unit truck, the tandem truck and the tractor/trailer. These are maximum weights that the bridge is posted for. Trucks that exceed the weight restrictions have to find an alternate route.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the bridge is currently experiencing some deck deterioration and is in need of rehab/replacement.

Local Bridge Program:

Mr. O'Brien posed the question: "How do we replace these local bridges?" He advised that currently the Road Commission applies for Local Bridge Funds. Those funds are administered through the State of Michigan, Department of Transportation (MDOT). MDOT calls for a projects on a yearly basis, and every year the Road Commission submits a multitude of projects, usually in the order of five to seven bridge projects a year that are a priority for replacement. Many have structural deficiencies that the Road Commission would like to correct.

The submissions are ranked based on inspection reports, the ratings of the bridge, the cost of the proposed work, and the work to be performed. There are two types

of bridges - one is classed as an A bridge. An A bridge is a bridge that either has a 20-foot or greater than 20-foot span. Anything less than a 20-foot span is classed as a B bridge. An A bridge is required by law to be inspected and rated every two (2) years. The Road Commission has a consultant who performs that work for them, and all the Road Commission's A bridges are rated every two years and that information is given to MDOT and kept on file.

From those inspections, the Road Commission gets a Federal Sufficiency Rating (FSR), which is a large convoluted equation that based upon what the inspector finds in the field with regards to deck condition, abutment condition, scour analysis, which is erosion around the abutments, and other conditions observed such as the varying conditions of the concrete deck on the abutment, all of which are fed into the equation and provide a rating of between zero and one hundred.

From a FSR perspective, when the Road Commission submits projects, they also have to submit that FSR and inspection reports with their request for funding. If it falls in the range of zero to eighty, it is eligible for rehabilitation; if it falls within the rating of zero to fifty, it is eligible for complete replacement; and capital preventive maintenance work is eligible for all bridges.

The Tienken Road Bridge currently has an FSR of 16.6, per the last inspection. To clarify, an FSR of zero is the worst, and an FSR of one hundred is the best.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the Local Bridge Program consists of both Federal and State Dollars, which cover 95% of the construction costs, and the remaining 5% is locally funded and typically paid by the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC). The monies are generally only for construction or construction engineering and force account work, which is signage during the construction of the project. The Road Commission cannot use the money for either right-of-way acquisition or preliminary engineering or design work. It is purely "construction dollars".

The Tienken Road over Stoney Creek project was originally submitted in 2007, when the call for projects was made, and the Road Commission was awarded the funding in 2008 for 2010 construction. This is a "use it or lose it" type of funding source. The Road Commission has to "obligate" the money to that project, which means submitting final plans, specifications and estimates within the 2010 fiscal year. If the Road Commission fails to do so, they lose the money and would have to start the process all over again.

The application that was submitted back in 2007 outlined a two-lane bridge replacement with twelve-foot lanes and eight-foot shoulders with barrier railings. It should be noted that during the application process, the Road Commission does not

perform any detailed level of design work. When the applications are submitted, the bridges are submitted based on the worst-case scenario or the widest or the biggest bridge that would need to be built in order to replace that structure. That is because when the Road Commission submits, they only get one opportunity to request construction funds. When they get to actual bridge design, there could be other utilities or other conflicts or soil problems or a host of other issues that drive up the actual physical construction costs, even though they may be building a smaller bridge.

Design Process:

Once the Road Commission is awarded the monies, they essentially initiate the project with a design kick-off meeting. The meeting for the subject bridge project was held in August of 2008, which was attended by the City, the Road Commission's consultant engineers, and Pat McKay from the City's Museum. That meeting was to generally give guidance to the Road Commission's consultants, and to ask about pitfalls, concerns, or issues. One of the big issues brought up at that meeting was during the traffic staging perspective, to maintain traffic in the area. The Road Commission has another project in the area as well (the Parkdale Road/Bridge Replacement Project), and heavy coordination is required between the two projects.

After that meeting, a preliminary survey of the area is conducted. All the attributes around the bridge are surveyed including buildings, culverts, storm sewer outfalls, utilities, and the existing bridge itself to gather the existing information. At that same time, they complete their geotechnical investigation, which consists of soil borings around the proposed structure location to identify what the soils are in the area; what kind of bearing capacity is out there; what type of foundation may be able to be designed, and to get a general feel of what currently exists out there.

Next is the preliminary, very conceptual level design process in which the Road Commission determines some of the structure design parameters including width, shoulders, what the bridge should look like, and investigate what types of bridge. There are several different types of bridges that can be built. Primarily in Oakland County, two types of bridges are utilized, unless there are very long span structures. One is called an adjacent box beam or spread box beam type support structure. That is essentially a reinforced concrete box that is set on the abutment piers and a deck is poured on top of that. The other type is a pre-cast or prefab type structure (trade name Con/Span®), which is an arched-typed structure. Both have their applicability in certain design considerations, such as cost. The Road Commission tries to evaluate some of the potential costs and impacts. While one bridge may cost a little less, another one can be constructed quicker. All the pro's and con's of those choices have to be weighed.

Then a proposed conceptual structure is placed in the right-of-way to see if it lines up with the adjacent approaches, while minimizing impacts to adjacent properties; right-of-way impacts, and utility impacts.

Once there is a good feel for the higher conceptual level design, the Road Commission submits to MDOT a TS&L set of plans (type, size and location). That gives MDOT an opportunity early in the process to take a look at what is being conceptually proposed to be sure the Road Commission is not missing anything; to be sure the public's best interests are being met from a cost-conscience perspective and impact perspective; to be sure they are not negatively impacting hydraulically the streams or river crossings; and is a general level review.

The Road Commission would like to submit the TS&L package to MDOT by the end of May, which is only a couple weeks from this meeting. At that same time, the Road Commission would like to submit the TS&L plans to the City for the City's review in order to receive feedback from stakeholders.

Next the Road Commission identifies the utility relocation efforts that will be necessary so that work can be coordinated; they also assess any right-of-way that is necessary and go through the process of acquiring the right-of-way necessary for the project.

Then the Road Commission completes the preliminary plans, specifications and estimates, and resubmits a more complete plan set to MDOT for a grade inspection (GI) meeting. This is when MDOT, other stakeholders, utility companies and cities are invited to attend and offer comments on the preliminary set of plans and make sure the package is complete so that when they get to final plan specs and estimates they are not forgetting anything; everyone has been notified; and to be sure that all the necessary t's are crossed and i's dotted.

Mr. O'Brien stated after that meeting, the Road Commission completes the plan specifications and estimates and then bids the project through MDOT because State Funds are involved. The Road Commission estimate is for bids to be let in November of this year, with completion of construction in the Summer of 2010. The Road Commission is trying to stage this project with the Parkdale project and not have both roads closed at the same time, and also trying to be sensitive to the area schools. Construction would be during the Summer months, although there are some difficulties with providing detour routes in the area.

Mr. O'Brien stated one important piece of the process he had not discussed yet was public involvement and comment. The Road Commission generally wants public comment and input at any point during the process, but also tries to schedule public information and input at specific key points of the process. One such key point would be subsequent to the TS&L meeting with MDOT. However, the Road Commission does not want to go a public information meeting and provide information to residents or other stakeholders, and then be told by either MDOT or the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) that something had been

inadvertently forgotten and a design condition had to be changed, which could cause increased impacts. When the Road Commission goes to the residents, they want to be sure they are presenting factual, accurate information.

Mr. O'Brien stated from a public information perspective, this project is quite sensitive to the Community. The Road Commission would like to propose a public informational meeting subsequent to the TS&L meeting with MDOT, with a follow-up meeting subsequent to the GI meeting in an effort to keep everyone informed and up to date regarding the process.

Current Design Guidelines:

Mr. O'Brien stated that from a current design guideline perspective, there are many guides they have to follow. Most are American Association of State and Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) publications. Three of the main guides are: the Green Book or the policy on geometric design; the Load Resistance and Factor Design methodologies (LRFD Design Manual) for bridges and structures which are a requirement through the FHWA, and the Roadside Design Guide which dictates some of the clearances for travel lanes to ensure a safe transportation network.

The Road Commission also refers to MDOT Standard Plans and Specifications, as well as other documents such as the MMUTCD, which is the Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices, as well as Michigan Department of Environmental Quality publications and soil erosion sedimentation control publications.

Status of Design:

Mr. O'Brien stated that the Road Commission was currently trying to complete their TS&L setup plans. Currently, the plan proposes two travel lanes with appropriate offsets to barriers. From a design perspective, a Roadside Design Guide for the design speed on Tienken essentially dictates about a six-foot (6') offset from the edge of the travel lane (or the edge of the 12' foot white stripe) to the base of the barrier. He noted the Roadside Design Guide is a guide and the Road Commission does have some flexibility with that. Currently, the Road Commission is proposing through the TS&L a four-foot (4') offset from the lane line to the face of the actual barriers. The bridge is proposed to have a pedestrian facility along the south side only. There is a parcel of property on the northeast quadrant with a house and a garage that is relatively close to the existing structure. If a pedestrian facility was put on the north side, there would be several impacts to that property; therefore, the Road Commission is not proposing one at this time.

Essentially the north side of the existing bridge will be where the north side of the new bridge will be. There may be an offset of the new structure being set a few feet further north than the existing structure, perhaps two to three feet. Mr. O'Brien noted that had not been fully decided at this point, which is why he did not have

plans to bring with him to this meeting. He stated that the Road Commission wanted to be sure when they present plans and documents, they present the most accurate, up-to-date and well thought out information they can.

The Road Commission has received the geotechnical report, and it appears they could support this bridge on what is called a shallow footing. That is essentially a spread footing below the frost line. The other type of foundation system for the bridge would be a deep foundation which consists of pilings or drilled caissons or shafts. Typically, with a deep foundation there are a lot more vibration issues. There is a structure relatively close to the bridge, so right now the Road Commission is hopeful they can use a shallow footing to minimize vibrations to that adjacent property.

Next Step:

Mr. O'Brien explained the Road Commission was currently in the process of completing a State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) review request. They hope to complete the actual request by the end of May, 2009 or early June, 2009, with a submission to the State. At that same time, they are making a request to find out if there are any known archeological issues or resources in the area that the State is aware of. He stated that if the Historic Districts Commission was aware of any, he would be happy to take that information back with him.

Mr. O'Brien stated he was present to hear the Historic Districts Commission's comments and see what could be done to make this a truly successful project.

Chairperson Dunphy thanked Mr. O'Brien for his presentation, noting the Commission appreciated his attending the meeting and sharing information. He stated there had been a tremendous amount of interest in this project, and the Commission wanted to receive the most accurate information available to make decisions from.

Chairperson Dunphy wanted to clarify how the structure design parameters were determined, and if the spread box beam or precast options the only options that were available for construction. His concern was that the bridge was going in a Historic District and should be compatible with the Historic District, which was part of the purview of the Commission.

Mr. O'Brien explained from a structural perspective, those are the two most common, but were not the only types available. He noted there was a fairly long span approaching 40 to 50 feet, and pointed out a "timber-type structure" would not be appropriate in that context. It would be very difficult to support the current loading requirements through the LRFD design function. He explained the "spread box" or "box beam" type structure, there was still an opportunity to put aesthetic treatments around the outside or around the abutment walls that would not observe the actual support structure underneath, unless one was traversing the creek itself.



He stated there were aesthetic treatments for headwalls and other type attributes that could be looked into to make it appear more consistent with the area in which it is located.

Chairperson Dunphy stated that Mr. O'Brien had mentioned there would be an opportunity for public input after the information was presented to MDOT, and asked if there was a timeline available. Mr. O'Brien stated that once the Road Commission submitted to MDOT, it typically takes three to four weeks to schedule a TS&L meeting, which he guessed might be around the end of June. He thought it might be July before the public information meeting was held as it was the Road Commission's practice to direct mail flyers to all abutting property owners and residents in the area, and it requires some time to accomplish that and find a suitable venue for the meeting.

Mr. Thompson stated he had heard proposed width size of possibly up to fifty-four feet (54'); however, Mr. O'Brien had indicated the 2007 application listed twelve foot travel lanes with an eight foot shoulder, which only amounted to forty feet (40'), and asked for some clarification on the accurate number. Mr. O'Brien stated there had been a request from both the City and from DCS (Department of Citizen Service - the department that handles citizen questions and takes citizen input), to include a pedestrian facility with the actual structure. The initial application did not include a pedestrian structure. Two (2) twelve-foot lanes plus sixteen feet is forty feet (40'), along with the barrier railings on either side, which are another three feet (3') totalling forty-three feet (43'). Adding a ten-foot (10') pedestrian crossing, plus another barrier, brings the total to about fifty-four or fifty-five feet (54' or 55') (if 8-foot shoulders were used and the pedestrian facility was included). He noted that was from an uncurbed approach perspective.

Mr. O'Brien explained that when the Road Commission submitted for the funding, they did not do any detailed design, and essentially submitted as a two-lane with eight-foot shoulders at that point in time.

Mr. Thompson asked if the Road Commission intended to construct two lanes with eight-foot shoulders. Mr. O'Brien responded no. The current submission for the TS&L included a two-lane with a curbed approach extended away from the actual bridge itself, which would pull in the shoulders. That meant they did not need eight-feet of shoulder width between the lane line and the face of the barrier.

Mr. Miller inquired about a conceptual meeting with the City held in 2008. Mr. O'Brien explained the Road Commission held a design kickoff meeting then, which was before any design work had started.

Mr. Miller asked when the Section 106 review was requested. Mr. O'Brien stated that whenever the Road Commission uses Federal Funds, they have to prepare a SHPO clearance, or a Section 106 clearance.

Mr. Miller noted the Road Commission was planning to use Federal Funds from the beginning when the application was submitted in 2007, and asked at what point the public informational input was allowed toward the design. He understood that all the engineering work had been done, and everything was ready to go except for putting the project out for bid, before the main public informational meeting had been held.

Mr. O'Brien stated that when the Road Commission is preparing for a TS&L meeting with MDOT, it is very high-level conceptual plans. They are not detailed designed, and are there to give a general outline of what the Road Commission feels is the most prudent structure. None of the physical design work has been done. Essentially, the outline of the parameters has been discussed, described, put on paper as a conceptual plan, all of which is vetted out with MDOT to ensure the Road Commission is not forgetting anything. MDOT could tell the Road Commission they could cut portions down, or conversely, MDOT might request an addition. He stated it was very high-level conceptual, and the more "meat and potatoes" design is subsequent to that meeting. It was not even fifty percent (50%) design plans, but perhaps on the order of twenty-five percent (25%) design plans.

Mr. Miller thought the envisioned bridge was more than twenty-five percent (25%) flushed out in the vision at that point, even though there were no working plans. He understood when the Road Commission went before MDOT, they were looking for anything that might have been missed. Mr. O'Brien explained that was more on a global scale. The more detailed design review comes at the Grade Inspection (GI) stage, because they have a much more detailed design of the bridge and a much more detailed design of the approaches, which is subsequent to the initial public informational meeting as to the desires of the Community, so that can be incorporated along with the comments from the TS&L into a preliminary design set of plans.

Mr. Davis explained when the funding was made available and the parties were notified that the bridge qualified to be funded, the funding is only available for a replacement of a two-lane bridge. At that time, it was understood it would be a two-lane bridge. Some of the changes that have occurred were regarding shoulder width based on design standards and guidelines. The existing bridge has curbed approaches on the east side through the historic district. The other side is a gravel shoulder leading up to the bridge. In a worse case scenario, when it was first looked at, when there is a gravel shoulder leaving up to the bridge, it is suggested that eight-foot paved shoulders be used.

Mr. Davis continued that when the bridge was initially looked at, it had to be two lanes because that was what qualified. If they went to three lanes or four lanes, they could not take advantage of the funding to replace the bridge. What could be

changed was closer attention to the paved shoulder width. By making changes as the project evolved, it was decided to use four-foot curbed approach lanes on the bridge. As far as the process to determine the bridge size, that was known early on because as soon as it was funded, it was funded for a two-lane bridge.

Mr. Dziurman asked if the Road Commission had ever built a bridge in a Historic District. Mr. O'Brien responded he had not, but could not speak for the Road Commission as to whether they had or had not.

Mr. Dziurman asked if Mr. O'Brien was aware that the Historic Districts Commission had to approve the plans before the bridge could be built. He stated it was not just input, but approval.

Mr. O'Brien stated he had been made aware there were some on-going discussions regarding that, but noted he was the designer. He understood it was a more recent discussion.

Mr. Dziurman stated there may be changes the Historic Districts Commission wanted in the bridge, and indicated he felt the Road Commission had waited too long to come before the Historic Districts Commission. He thought the Road Commission had to understand that issue. He indicated that a very good visioning session had been held in the Stoney Creek Village on May 7, 2009 with the residents of the Historic Districts, with many good suggestions made. He hoped the Road Commission would be provided with the comments from that meeting. He asked for a copy of Mr. O'Brien's presentation this evening.

Mr. Dziurman explained the Historic Districts Commission (HDC) had to follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, which is Federal requirement for the HDC. He commented that the City has prevailed in legal suits because the HDC had followed those National Standards. The Standards refer to replacement, repair in place instead of replacement, and if replacement is required, the replacement should match what was there before. He stated if the HDC did not uphold that Standard, the HDC had to have a very good, legal reason to go off that Standard.

Mr. Dziurman stated if he wanted the Road Commission to put a five-lane highway through the District, the Standard would not allow the HDC to do that. If he wanted to put in a two-lane with two eight-foot shoulders and something added for the pedestrians, he stated he would have particularly difficult time approving that if he followed the Standards as he had taken an oath to follow the Standards.

Mr. Dziurman stated that some of the feedback from the meeting in the Village was to separate the pedestrian crossing with a separate structure. Also, possibly use the separate structure with a different pathway than following the roadway. He thought

that was an interesting suggestion because it would separate the young people using the trail for walking or bicycling from the traffic coming town Tienken Road.

Mr. Dziurman stated his point was that any bridge designed according to standards, in a historic district, he doubted "would come out of a drawer" and would work, as he did not know of any. He suggested the Road Commission might want to spend more time with the HDC to find out what the real design parameters were. He was afraid the Road Commission had been dealing with their standards, but were now up against the HDC's Standards. He did not think the two would match that well. He commented he was not sure about that yet because he had not seen the drawings.

Mr. Dziurman stated the Stoney Creek Village was a Nationally Registered Historic Site which meant there was a big difference in the Section 106 review. If the project causes harm to the District, it virtually stops the Road Commission from putting that item into the District. He was sure there were people in the Community who wanted the bridge constructed because it was needed from a safety point of view, which the HDC certainly did not want to stop. But, the HDC certainly wants the bridge to be compatible and in the context design to what the Village is. If something is put in there and starts destroying the character of the Village, the Village could lose that designation. In his estimation, that designation is the most important designation the City has. It is not just a nice house somewhere, it is a historic Village where this whole Community started. He hoped that bridge would remain the gateway to the Village, which is why there is so much public awareness of the project. Many questions were being asked, and there was a lot of concern about the project. He was not sure the Road Commission had heard that yet, and he hoped the HDC could work more closely with the Road Commission to avoid the Road Commission wasting their time, and in getting something there that works for both the HDC and the Road Commission, and particularly works for the residents. He reiterated it had to stay within the context of the historic Village.

Mr. Dziurman stated that from what he had heard at this meeting, he did not think any of it would work. He thought if the pedestrian aspect could be separated, the bridge could be narrowed, which would be a safer and nicer solution because then perhaps a timber type bridge could be used strictly for pedestrians.

Ms. Franey noted the presentation referred to the presentation before MDOT as March, and asked if that was correct. Mr. O'Brien stated that was in fact May.

Ms. Franey asked when the last review of the bridge was done that provided the 16.6 rating. Mr. O'Brien thought it was a 2007 rating. Ms. Franey clarified the bridges are reviewed every two years. Mr. O'Brien said it was reviewed in either 2007 or 2008.

Ms. Franey noted that ninety-five (95%) percent of the funding was provided by State and Federal, and asked what the overall cost of the project was, and what cost would be incurred by the City of Rochester Hills.

Mr. O'Brien explained that the five (5%) percent local cost is incurred by the Road Commission for Oakland County. Mr. Davis stated that a cost that may come to the City would be in regards to the pedestrian accommodation if it is included.

Mr. Davis stated he would like to speak to some of Mr. Dziurman's points about separating the pedestrian bridge on this project. He explained it was not a bad suggestion and had been done, noting there was an example on Tienken by the Paint Creek prior to the bridge being rebuilt recently. He explained what was being considered for the Stoney Creek was to have a barrier wall with the pedestrian pathway on the other side of the barrier wall, adjacent and part of the bridge structure.

Mr. Davis explained that if a separate pedestrian bridge was put in offset further from Tienken Road, flood plain issues would be encountered. He stated there was a 100-year flood plain in that area. He displayed an aerial depicting the limits of the flood plain, and pointed out the area encompassed by the green lines which depicted the 100-year flood plain for the Stoney Creek. Any bridge structure built would be elevated above the 100-year flood plain, so it did not impede the floodway area. The further a pedestrian bridge was offset to the south, the larger the impact on the flood plain. He pointed out the 500-year flood plain area, but noted the 100-year flood plain was what the path would be designed above.

Mr. Davis stated if the pedestrian bridge was not attached to the road bridge, the pedestrian bridge would most likely be a steel pedestrian bridge that could span the floodway and be supported through footings and not impede the floodway distance; or possibly a wooden pathway similar to a section of wooden pathway along Butler Road. He noted that the City plowed their pathways. He pointed out that type of pedestrian bridge (wooden) would be a pretty costly item. He indicated he was not saying it could not be done, but that all the factors had to be considered in trying to decide if the pedestrian crossing should be incorporated with the bridge.

2008-0678

Mr. Davis stated that \$1.425 Million Dollars had been made available through this program. He explained if a project came in less than that dollar amount, including the pedestrian accommodation with the bridge, then the Federal Highway Administration would likely agree to fund the pedestrian portion included with the bridge. Otherwise, a separate structure becomes One Hundred (100%) Percent the City's cost. He noted it would be an expensive project and would require some operation and maintenance costs, other than those associated with a wooden structure. He stated that it would have to be supported by posts that would go in the flood plain, which had to be considered.

Mr. Davis stated there was also a 36-inch water main going through that area which was offset from the bridge. However, the further the pedestrian bridge is moved away from the road, it goes within the influence of that 36-inch water main, which no one wanted to occur, and would limit where a pedestrian bridge could be located.

Mr. Davis stated if the pedestrian bridge was moved too far south, with such a long span, it would enter the area where the Museum is located and the pedestrian path would have to be brought up to Tienken Road. Ultimately, it becomes a much broader picture than just crossing the Stoney Creek with the pathway system. He noted that ideally the pathway would go down to the roundabout at Washington Road.

Mr. Davis stated the idea could be explored further, but hoped the HDC also considered the merits of including the pedestrian accommodation as part of the bridge. He referred to the resident fear that the Road Commission would come back later and get rid of the pedestrian accommodation and put a road lane in. It was his understanding that if the HDC had authority now on approving the project, the HDC would also have authority on whether any future changes would be made. He thought that type of a change could be more detrimental to the District, and he thought the HDC would have an opportunity to weigh in should such a change be proposed.

Mr. Dziurman asked if there was a map depicting the area further south. He explained what he had heard from the residents was that the bike path might be better located somewhere other than right along Tienken Road.

Mr. Davis stated he had a couple drawings, and pointed out one other limitation, which was an electrical pole line close to Tienken Road. He explained that might present difficulties if they try to include the pedestrian accommodation with the bridge. He stated the Road Commission had not yet reached the TS&L submission to MDOT, which is typically about a 25% plan completion. So they had not gone into detailed design about how these various impacts would be accounted for.

Mr. Davis pointed out the utility poles, and noted there were also grade issues that had to be dealt with. With the area being a flood plain, the ground dropped off from the road. He stated it was possible they would have to do some filling within in the flood plain, which would have to be looked into for either a separated bridge or one with the pedestrian accommodation attached to the bridge. He displayed a photograph of the southeast direction looking toward the existing bridge, which showed the gravel portion on the west side of the bridge and the curbed portion on the east side.

Mr. Davis again pointed out the location of the water main, the existing vegetation

including trees that might have to be worked around, and stated they still had to find a way to route the future pathway to the roundabout. He stated they had not gotten to that type of design, other than considering the alternatives. He noted that through the Historic District there were about five alternatives, which all had their pluses and minuses. One alternative might be on the north side of Tienken, maybe cross at Van Hoosen, go on the north side and run the north side to the round-about. Another might be to run along the south side of Tienken, but that would place the pathway pretty close to some of the homes along Tienken. Another might be to go through the alley between the homes, but that presents difficulties because residents used the alley for garage access and there would be vehicle traffic. Going further south, there were a lot of trees on the north side and close homes on Runyon and property that belongs to the City of Rochester on the south side of Runyon.

Mr. Davis stated that the various alternatives had been looked into, but no final decisions had been made. He thought this was the time to get the HDC's input to help figure out how the big picture would work, outside of just the bridge project.

Ms. Luginski thought it was a good idea to be discussing the pedestrian path within the Village at the same time they were discussing the bridge because they were linked together. She wanted to go on record as saying she was interested in a separate pedestrian and bike path, separate from the bridge. She was glad to hear the Road Commission was looking at the smaller four-foot shoulder, the offsets from the wall. She thought that was encouraging to the residents.

Ms. Luginski thought that two (2) twelve-foot lanes with two (2) four-foot shoulders and a separate pedestrian bridge was something the residents would be interested in looking at, and the HDC could work with those numbers.

Ms. Luginski stated she was a resident of the Village and she had a lot of experience of the day-to-day in the area. She agreed the residents did have a great visioning session kicked off by the Mayor. She noted the residents spent hours talking about the Village and how they cared for it. Mr. Evancoe and Mr. Blust were both there from the Road Commission to listen to the hours of conversation with the residents.

Ms. Luginski wanted to discuss the weight limits on the bridge today. It was her impression that the weight limits would be increased on the bridge once it was redone.

Mr. O'Brien explained that MDOT would not allow them to build a bridge that would not be able to sustain legal loadings that currently exist in the State of Michigan. The weight restrictions that are currently posted on that structure due to structural deficiencies would be removed. It would be an "unposted" bridge.

Ms. Luginski stated that the highest level of the current weight is 52 tons. She asked what the weight limit would go up to with the new bridge.

Mr. O'Brien believed the standard loading on trucks an 80-ton truck, which is an unposted situation.

Ms. Luginski stated the reason she brought that up was because the bridge had such a huge impact on the Village. It had an impact on the walkability of the Village, not only for the residents, but for the Community to enjoy the history of this original settlement. She stated they wanted to encourage people to come to the Village, which is what the pedestrian bridge and bike path were about. If trucks are running through the Village, it was contradictory to the environment they were trying to establish.

Ms. Luginski stated she was familiar with the Combs home, which was house right at the bridge. She stated it was built in 1910 and was historic and was a fantastic property. She stated those homeowners had quite a bit of movement in the house because of the truck traffic going over the bridge. She was glad to hear the Road Commission would be dealing with the vibrations. She noted they had historic structures along the road that are suffering damage on a day-to-day basis from the existing truck traffic at 52 tons. Increasing that limit to 80 tons would have a negative impact on the historic structures. She stated some of the buildings were from 1836 and 1827. She stated she resided in a reproduction home and did not have the same fragility in her structure that some homeowners did. However, she was an acre off the road and her windows rattled from trucks going down the road, not just on the bridge. If the aim and goal was to preserve the structures, she thought not only the speeds in the Village needed to be dealt with, but also the trucking. She stated that increasing the load would bring more trucks in. It was something the group should address. She noted the stone foundations, stone facades, historic windows with original glass, which were all very valuable to the residents.

Ms. Luginski asked if there was more information on the status of the bridge structure itself. She knew the bridge was from 1940, and believed there was a critical bridge list with a rating of the substructure, the superstructure, the deck and another element. She wanted to know the evaluation of each of the elements of the current bridge.

Mr. O'Brien stated he did not have that information with him, but could get that information for the Commission.

Ms. Luginski commented that the residents of the Stoney Creek Village neighborhood had been addressing the bridge issue for some time. She stated there was some flexibility, even with AASHTO Standards, in bridge design. She had information that discussed situations where there may be excessive costs or environmental constrictions, there was an opportunity to have some "wobble room" with levels of service. For example, if the appropriate level of service for the bridge was "C", because of environmental constrictions or excessive costs, there might be some wobble room as stated in the procedures in the green book.



Mr. O'Brien believed that depended on the type or scope of the project, along with other considerations such as cost and environmental impact. When there is an isolated structure replacement, there was somewhat more "wiggle room" than if an entire corridor was being improved. He noted the green book specifically stated in the introduction that it is a guide and engineering judgment should prevail. Some standards are guidance and some are hard and fast rules.

Ms. Luginski stated that according to the information she had received from the County and from MDOT, she showed the width of the current bridge as 24-feet and the length is 38-feet. She wanted to know if those measurements could be verified. Mr. O'Brien stated he could get that information from the bridge inspection.

Mr. Delacourt asked if a separate pedestrian span was considered, that would become a separate process from the bridge review and approval. It would become a normal City Capital Improvement Project (CIP) and would no longer be connected to the bridge project.

Mr. Davis explained the City had a process for selecting pathways through a ranking system. An Ad Hoc Pathway Committee was formed shortly after the millage was approved. If there was going to be a separate bridge structure that would be 100% City-funded because it could no longer be funded partly or entirely by being attached to the bridge, then the City would follow its normal process for selecting pathway projects. There was an opportunity to tag along with the bridge project and possibly get a section funded, but any other project going forward should compete with all the other projects within the City for pathway funds. It should be submitted into the CIP, rank it in accordance to how other projects are ranked, and then move forward. Cost would be a consideration, but on the plus side, there are points given for connectivity. He stated there had been complaints in the past about residents who wanted their children to be able to get to the high school, and the existing bridge was not friendly for students trying to get to the high school. In order to keep the City's process intact, he would not commit to a pathway project being done in this area and bypass the process for spending the pathway millage above all the other projects already in the works.

Dr. Stamps stated everyone recognized the need for a smoother bridge because the existing one was rather bumpy; and everyone wanted to have a safe bridge and a nice bridge. He appreciated the fact there was a desire for public involvement, which he thought was crucial and important. He also appreciated the comment about "this early conceptual phase", because he saw about twelve steps to get to completion in 2010, with step #6 being to submit a conceptual plan to MDOT in May, and wondered if that was still possible to be done in May. Even though the conceptual was only about 25%, he was a bit surprised there was something going in the Historic District that was changing from about 24-feet wide to about 54-feet wide. He commented the HDC did appreciate the opportunity for input at this early conceptual stage.

Dr. Stamps stated the HDC now had to figure out what input they could make. One suggestion was the footbridge and whether it went alongside the road or dropped the footbridge totally and bring pedestrians in some other way. He guessed the Road Commission could come up with several options, and then present the options to the residents who live in the Village and let them chose. He stated the presentation had been informative and there did need to be more opportunity for input. He clarified that a two-lane was what was proposed. Mr. O'Brien stated a two-lane replacement bridge.

Mr. Thompson asked if there had even been a separate pedestrian pathway along that bridge. Mr. Dziurman responded "no, not that he knew of". Mr. Thompson asked how that would work with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Dziurman explained it would be a new addition to the District, and the HDC would have to judge it for its compatibility with the Village. It would be similar to a property owner adding a garage or an addition, and would be reviewed as another structure in the District. He stated a bike path was certainly not something that was thought about back in the 1800s.

Mr. Dziurman thought the HDC needed another meeting with the Road Commission to get the input the Road Commission should have from the HDC. Perhaps include residents from the Village. He stated he did not want to make this more cumbersome, but wanted to make it meaningful and helpful to the Road Commission. He felt another meeting should be held soon as it was already May.

Chairperson Dunphy stated as point of clarification that the responsibility of the HDC not be abdicated. He reminded the Commissioners that any decision made by the HDC had to be made by the full Commission and he wanted to be sure the Commission followed the proper process.

Mr. Delacourt suggested if there was input for the Road Commission, the Commissioners provide that at this meeting. If there was more information needed to provide the input, the Commissioners should let the Road Commission know what was needed.

Mr. Dziurman stated he would like to have more information about the flood plain and the issue of a crossing for pedestrians. He asked if there were other options or other locations. He guessed the bottom line from his viewpoint was that the pedestrian crossing should be separate, although he understood it was something that would cost the City more money, which he did not have the authority to do. He thought the residents, particularly those in the Village, would also prefer that.

Mr. Dziurman stated other issues dealt with what the bridge would look like. He noted Mr. O'Brien had mentioned some aesthetic treatments, which he would not sure he would like to see. Mr. O'Brien stated the aesthetic treatments were concrete faces, abutment walls or wing walls. He noted it was also mentioned by the Commission that the current structure was a plain concrete structure and there should not be any alterations to the District that would detract. He asked if it would be more appropriate to have a plain concrete structure put back, as he did not know the answer to that question.

Mr. Dziurman stated that according to the Secretary of Interior Standards, that was what should go back. He pointed out he did not know if the entire Commission would agree with that, but that was his interpretation of the Standards.

Mr. O'Brien stated there were treatments that could be done if poured concrete were used, which were called form liners. It is a textured form liner that goes on the inside of the concrete form that is peeled away and leaves a texture. The Road Commission has done several structures with that type of treatment depending on the area or the locale in which they were placed. That was a change from what existed today, and he did not know where the balance was with that option. He was seeking assistance from the Commission regarding that option.

Mr. Davis agreed that was something the Commission could provide because early on in the process, there might have been some good intentions. Such as, at first, Paul Shumejko, the City's Transportation Engineer, and he had thought they should propose a cobblestone façade on the bridge. He noted that as soon as they mentioned that to Mr. Delacourt, Mr. Delacourt informed them the HDC might not like that at all or could be opposed to it. With all good intentions, Mr. Davis and Mr. Shumejko thought it might be something to dress up the bridge and make it appear more historic, but were unaware of the HDC's expectations to make sure it was consistent with the Historic Village. That was the type of input they needed to be consistent with the expectation with the period.

Mr. Kilpatrick asked about the comment about not being able to receive funding unless it meets present day standards, or that funding would be difficult. Mr. O'Brien agreed it would be difficult to convince MDOT or FHWA to build a bridge that did not meet current standards.

Mr. Kilpatrick asked if there was any type of restrictions that could be placed on the weight limits. In other words, construct the bridge up to standards, but limit the type of vehicles that could travel through the Village. Mr. O'Brien stated he was not aware of any. He noted it was a public road and for use by the public, whether the public is on foot or driving a large vehicle making a delivery in the area, they had the right to use that facility. He was not aware of any rules or statutes that prevented that, particularly since it was a public road.

Mr. Kilpatrick stated there were restrictions placed on highways all the time, such as speed limits, no right turn, etc. Mr. O'Brien stated those were traffic control orders. Mr. Kilpatrick asked if there was some type of traffic control that could divert traffic from the Village to other roads. Mr. O'Brien pointed out that unfortunately in that area there were not a lot of good alternate routes. He stated that both Parkdale and Letica in the City of Rochester were highly residential as well as Tienken. He noted the next mile road to the south was Avon Road which was a large, circuitous route. He commented Tienken was really the main road through that area. He stated he could ask the Road Commission's Traffic Safety personnel to look into that.

Mr. Kilpatrick stated since there were the two islands for the roundabouts, and it seemed to him the purpose of those roundabouts was to control the traffic through the area and to slow traffic down going through, and that would be another logical extension. He thought that was done for sensitivity of that area, and then perhaps they could get what they wanted for the bridge and still get the funding. Mr. O'Brien stated he would ask the question.

Mr. Miller referred to the Section 106 review. He was concerned that in dealing with alterations or road widening or road projects that would be changing was existed, that the Section 106 review should be done earlier in the process, rather than later or as an afterthought.

Mr. Miller stated he heard the bridge being called a two-lane bridge and asked what the bridge on Tienken Road over the Paint Creek was called.

Mr. O'Brien stated that bridge facilitated four lanes of travel. He noted there was a center left turn lane on the bridge, and one lane in each direction, and a painted right-turn lane. He stated that bridge was built sufficiently wide to perhaps facilitate more through lanes in the future. At this point in time, the Paint Creek Bridge and the Stoney Creek Bridge were different widths. He stated that what was seen from a travel-way perspective over the Paint Creek, was not what was proposed for Stoney Creek.

Mr. Miller clarified that the width would be significantly different. He noted when he looked at 54-feet, he thought that would be four lanes with several feet on either side for a shoulder. Mr. O'Brien stated the 54-feet was a scenario with two through lanes; the eight-foot shoulders, and the ten-foot pedestrian walkway. He stated that currently from the TS&L level of plans, two through lanes with four-foot offsets to the barrier walls and the ten-foot pathway being proposed would constitute a rough 47-foot bridge width. That was substantially less than the Paint Creek. He pointed out he could not commit to a deck width until the TS&L was complete to be sure there has not been an oversight or other things of that nature.

Mr. Delacourt asked if the Section 106 is normally submitted before the TS&L. Mr. O'Brien stated they typically submitted the SHPO 106 reviews once they have a conceptual plan. He noted the environmental personnel normally complete the review request, but the review does ask for impacts. If they did not have a conceptual plan, it was hard to determine what the impacts might be.

Mr. Delacourt stated if he understood correctly, if the 106 submittal had gone in earlier, it would have gone in with two twelve-foot lanes with eight-foot shoulders, which would have been incorrect because it was now being looked at for two twelve-foot lanes with four-foot shoulders. If it had been submitted earlier, it would have to now be resubmitted and reevaluated for impact. He noted even if it had been submitted as recently as a month ago, it would have been incorrect.

Mr. Miller asked if the width would have basically been the same, since the difference appears to be the pedestrian crossing. Mr. Delacourt stated it would be 8-feet less in width.

Mr. Miller stated that the current standards would be an 80-ton and considered an unposted bridge. He asked if there was any information regarding the tonnage of trucks are currently travelling over the existing bridge. He noted that despite the fact it was posted at 52 tons, he did not think that either east or west there was another weight restriction. He questioned if there were not 80-ton trucks currently travelling over the existing bridge.

Mr. O'Brien stated he would have to check with the weigh master to see what activity had been in the area because that is who monitors weight restrictions and overloaded trucks.

Mr. Miller asked if the bridge had been inspected in 2007, it would be scheduled for another inspection that would happen this year. Mr. O'Brien stated it was either inspected in 2007 or 2008. If it was inspected in 2008, it would be inspected again in 2010. He did not believe the A bridges were being inspected as part of the 2009 budget, which would lead him to believe it was inspected in 2008 and would be inspected again in 2010. He pointed out that 2010 was the year the bridge was scheduled to be reconstructed or rebuilt, so the inspection would be done subsequent to the construction.

Mr. Miller was concerned that the bridge had deteriorated visibly over the last couple of years. If it had a 16.6 rating in 2007 or 2008 when the last inspection was done, it might be much worse than that now. He clarified the proposal was a ten-foot pedestrian plus barrier widths if the pedestrian crossing was built as part of the bridge, which would also be built to an 80-ton load standard like the rest of the bridge. Mr. O'Brien concurred noting that they would not change the design of the deck.

Mr. Miller pointed out that the entire bridge would be built to carry 80-tons. He commented it had been said it could be more expensive if not built, but he did not think there was a pedestrian bridge that had been to that 80-ton standard, and asked if it really needed to be that size. He understood it was nice to be able to plow the pathways.

Mr. Davis pointed out there was such a pedestrian bridge over the Paint Creek further west down Tienken Road as it was constructed the same way. He noted the pedestrian bridge was attached to the rest of the road.

Mr. Miller stated when he looked at the Paint Creek Bridge, he did not see a two-lane, but rather a bridge built for a much larger road to follow along. That was why he asked if that was the definition of a two-lane bridge because if it was, he was concerned. He commented it had already been said it was not a two-lane bridge.

Mr. Davis stated that the Stoney Creek Bridge was initially built around 1940 and is almost 60 years old and was an old bridge. When built, bridges are expected to last longer than the design life of the road. Normally, roads are designed for a twenty-year life, although the City's roads probably exceed that in many cases. When the roads approach thirty years, they look pretty lousy and are in need of replacement. He thought it was an important consideration to get the bridge right.

Mr. Davis stated there were different daily traffic amounts for the two bridges, and he did not think it was fair to compare the Stoney Creek Bridge to the Paint Creek Bridge. There was not a Historic District by the Paint Creek Bridge, and whole set of different circumstances that drove the decision on that bridge that would not necessarily come into play with the Stoney Creek Bridge.

Mr. Davis stated that even if a three-lane road bridge was proposed for the Stoney Creek Bridge, he did not know what the point of that would be. Normally, a center turn lane was not put in unless it was needed. On the east side of the bridge there were some homes that might benefit from a three-lane road section. West of the bridge there are a couple developments that have deceleration lanes and he did not know if a center turn lane was necessarily needed there.

Mr. Davis stated that what was being presented was a two-lane bridge, with the expectation that it would be a two-lane bridge for a long time. He understood things could change, but pointed out the Historic District had been there for a long time, and he thought the HDC would have authority to weigh in on a decision to make a request to change that. He noted there were two single-lane roundabouts on either end of this section, with the Historic District in between.

Mr. Miller understood, but recalled attending some of the Master Thoroughfare Plan updates and visioning processes a couple years ago where it was clear that at some undetermined time in the future, that the Tienken Road traffic corridor would be widened considerably. Mr. Davis stated he did not agree with that statement as it related to the subject area.

Mr. Miller stated in conjunction with the plans for Washington Road. Mr. Davis stated that Washington Road was planned as a two-lane road.

Mr. Miller stated the environmental studies were being done for wider than that. Mr. O'Brien stated not for Washington Road. Mr. Miller stated that was not what they had been told. Mr. O'Brien stated that for Washington Road, the Road Commission's intent or plan at this point was a two-lane gravel road paving project, with potential for intermittent third lanes if there is a high traffic generator such as a subdivision entrance. That was extent of paving and there was no environmental assessment that is currently occurring for Washington Road.

Mr. Miller stated he had been told something different by members of the Road Commission that they had received funding to do some exploratory and it was clear they were looking at that at some point in the future. It was also clear to him that the Road Commission had been considering doing that on Tienken Road as well.

Mr. Davis asked who had given Mr. Miller that information, noting he would like to speak to that person and follow-up on the matter.

Mr. Miller stated the bottom line was that if they were just looking at two-lane, and not ever looking at changing that, then that was fine. If it was matter of only doing two lanes now and did not want to bring anything else up because they did not want people to be upset before they were able to get things in order, then that should be brought out to the light of day. Also, he understood a pedestrian bridge would become a local matter rather than a State or Federal funded project. He pointed out there were Federal grants available for safe routes to schools that might be applicable to this situation given the location of the middle and high schools on Sheldon.

Mr. Davis stated the City had looked into safe routes to school grant program, but the school needed to initiate it. The request had been made, and the Engineering Department had not been taken up on that option.

Dr. Stamps referred to the photograph on display of the Paint Creek Bridge with the two lanes of traffic, the center turn lane in the middle. He clarified that the Stoney Creek Bridge would not need the center turn lane.

Mr. Davis stated that the Paint Creek Bridge was reconstructed at the same time the traffic signal was installed, as they were a combined project. The Paint Creek was so close to the intersection and there was not much room to turn into Oakbrook West on the south side of Tienken for stacking. Perhaps just one car, and even though it was not a big complex, that was the reason for that lane.

Dr. Stamps agreed that made sense. He pointed out where the cars were parked on the right and asked if that represented a twelve-foot lane. Mr. O'Brien agreed he would assume it was twelve feet.

Dr. Stamps referred to the lane on the right-hand side, and asked if that was turn lane to the subdivision. Mr. O'Brien indicated that was correct.

Dr. Stamps referred to the left-hand side between the solid white lane and the cement barrier on the left he assumed what was called an offset. Mr. Davis stated that was decision that was made to provide flexibility. In the event that a future Master Thoroughfare Plan or a need within the Community arose to widen Tienken between Livernois and Rochester to five lanes, the bridge would be able to accommodate that. He stated that was no different than Crooks Road, north of Hamlin Road, which was a five-lane bridge and had been a five-lane bridge for many years. He explained the bridges were built to last a lot longer than the road would last.

Dr. Stamps stated he was trying to put the vocabulary words to a description. He asked if an "offset" could be pointed out. Mr. O'Brien referred to the photograph being displayed and pointed out what would incorporate a twelve-foot lane plus an offset, noting the photograph on display was wider than a "travel lane".

Dr. Stamps clarified the proposal was for two twelve-foot lanes with a white lane down the middle. Mr. O'Brien stated to help visualize, the white line would become the centerline from a Tienken Road over Stoney Creek perspective.

Mr. O'Brien referenced the photograph of the Paint Creek Bridge and attempted to show what portions would reflect the through lanes of the proposed Stoney Creek Bridge.

Dr. Stamps asked if the four-foot offsets could be reduced to three-foot. Mr. O'Brien stated that currently they believed the four-foot was the minimum they could go. Based on the roadside design guide, the requirements are higher, and they were already making an engineering judgment to reduce what is called the shy line offset distance.

Dr. Stamps clarified that four-foot was about a tight as they could get. He stated with respect to the pedestrian, he envisioned two bicycles trying to pass, with a normal bike being about three feet wide, and asked if the pedestrian lane could be



narrowed down to six-feet. Mr. O'Brien stated the City had a Pathway Ordinance that required eight feet.

**2008-0678**

Mr. Davis stated it would depend. If Federal funds were going to be used, they require a ten-foot width. Dr. Stamps asked if the green book would provide some flexibility. Mr. Davis responded, "no, they require a ten-foot width". He stated the City ran into that same situation with the Adams Road Interchange, which had to be a ten-foot width, and in this case it was a ten-foot width. He stated the City's pathway system standard was an eight-foot wide pathway. Having said that, there are areas that were six-feet, if the City wanted to fund the pathway itself, which was an option. He thought if it was going to be covered and reimbursed, it needs to be ten feet. If they wanted to go with the City's standard eight-foot, that could be done. He stated as they went into the broader picture of how the pathway system might go through the Village, they could look at going down to six-feet to try to minimize it. From the City's standpoint, six-feet was the minimum, and if the pathway system was going to be plowed, it could not be less than that.

Mr. O'Brien stated the other concern is the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, especially on a structure. Such as between two barriers there had to be a certain distance for a situation of two wheelchairs trying to pass one another that requires specific distances. He did not know what those passing distances were, but on a fixed structure those requirements came into play and are fairly stringent.

Ms. Luginski stated that the comments she heard about the activity on Washington Road and the funds that were available were for survey work in the Fall. It was not an environmental assessment, but physical survey work. Mr. O'Brien stated that preliminary survey work had been conducted in anticipation of starting design work.

Ms. Luginski wanted to provide an understanding of where the concerns were coming from. They had talked about a wider road running to a single-lane traffic circle, and noted there was a situation where Tienken Road to Sheldon was being planned for widening and dumped into an existing traffic circle. She stated they had an existing situation where the Road Commission is planning on doing a five-lane road through there and ending up at the traffic circle.

Mr. Davis stated that process had started and been looked at, but a final decision had not been made. He did not know if that section would be a five-lane road.

Ms. Luginski stated when they were shown the plans, it was four or five lanes, with that road going into a small traffic circle, which was a concern for the residents. So

when they look at widening the road in the District between the traffic circles, it was not a source of comfort that the traffic circles were single lanes because that was coming up elsewhere in the Community.

Mr. Davis stated there was a study that was initiated because of comments about the Road Commission not looking at the bigger picture and having a corridor plan. He stated the Road Commission would be completing a study to look from Sheldon to Dequindre and up Washington. They are looking at the traffic counts and came about as a result of comments that the bigger picture was not being considered. He stated there were a number of projects going on, one being the Livernois to Sheldon Project, and the Road Commission wanted to look at the other piece east of Sheldon to also provide some supplemental data for what would be done between Livernois and Sheldon. He noted the Road Commission was planning to hold another public information meeting, and the Road Commission was committed to analyzing the three-lane equal in weight to other options. The Road Commission heard the residents, and added on an additional study east of Sheldon Road.

Ms. Luginski agreed that was a good idea as having an overall plan would make the residents feel more confident. She understood the plans for a two-lane road for Washington Road, with a third lane for turning opportunities, which was currently seen along Tienken Road, but there was a concern that Macomb County had a plan to drop off a five-lane road at what today is a two-lane gravel road. She thought people should be aware of that plan.

Ms. Luginski stated that in researching the bridge, it was brought to her attention that the bridge was updated. The sidewalls were redone in the 1970s or early 1980s. She was not positive what the meant, but wondered if additional research could be done to find out what was there before the existing sidewalls were installed.

Mr. O'Brien asked if the railings had been installed. Ms. Luginski stated they were not that old. Mr. O'Brien stated he could research that. Ms. Luginski stated they found in the records that the sidewalls had been reinforced in the last twenty to thirty years. She thought there was an opportunity to do some research and find out what the options really were there.

Ms. Luginski asked when the 106 review begins, how much time does the Road Commission allow for it. Mr. O'Brien stated that was up to the environmental personnel. Many of the reviews that are done are very minor in nature and do not take very long. He anticipated this one would be more involved given the location of the bridge. He did not know how long the review would take, but they tried to get it in as early as possible in the event something had to be addressed early in the design process.

Ms. Luginski asked how much time Mr. O'Brien was allowing for the Section 106 process. Mr. O'Brien stated they were trying to get to a November bid letting, and would probably allow a few months for that process to take place.

Ms. Luginski stated she did not have much experience with the 106 process, and did not know if any of the Commissioners did. She acknowledged that the bridge decking had been allowed to deteriorate quite significantly, which was a concern, and asked if Mr. O'Brien knew why the decking was allowed to deteriorate.

Mr. O'Brien stated the Road Commission typically maintained or tried to maintain these facilities and structures as best a possible. However, they do have a design life and once they reached a certain point in time, they become more difficult to maintain. To his knowledge, there was no threat of collapse or anything of that nature. Recently, a patch was installed in the deck of that bridge in a hole that developed. At that time, the bridge consultant came out and looked at the bridge to ensure public safety. He stated they tried to maintain them as best they could, but they do become more difficult to maintain. The treatments that can be applied, once they start overlaying the structure, it impacted the dynamics of the crash barriers and other items. It was not as easy as just putting an overlay on because it impacted other issues.

Ms. Luginski stated there was a press release put out when the bridge was closed which stated the bridge would get an overlay treatment in May. She stated there were three "bump" signs which were very intense in color and made traffic very aware of them. If the overlay would happen in May as the press release stated, she asked if the bump signs would be removed.

Mr. O'Brien stated he would have to check with the traffic safety personnel. He presumed if there was no longer a bump, the signs would come out. He did not recall when the press release occurred.

Ms. Luginski believed the bridge was closed April 13 through the 19th, and the press release was issued to announce the bridge was opening. She thought it was about April 18th that specified the overlay in May. The residents assumed it was a matter of a frost issue. Mr. O'Brien noted it would have been a matter of the asphalt plants opening. He stated the maintenance department was a large department, and maintenance was not always aware of what the design section was doing and vice versa.

Ms. Luginski stated that perhaps the City could help with that as the signs were unsightly in the Historic District.

Mr. Dziurman referred to the term "context sensitive design" and stated that was what he hoped they would get from the Road Commission. He stated he had mentioned the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and noted Standard #6 stated

in part: "... deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence."

Mr. Dziurman did not think stones or other features should be added because that was not what is there. What was also not there was a pedestrian crossing point. He was looking for the most minimal width bridge they could have. He agreed two twelve-foot lanes was okay with two four-foot shoulders. Mr. O'Brien stated that was four-foot clearance from the edge of the lane to the face of the barriers, which could be called a four-foot shoulder.

Mr. Dziurman thought in his opinion that should be the maximum that should be there. He thought they should have the lower load requirements, because anything more than that would cause the buildings in the Village to collapse. He felt they really needed the lower limits. He thought the two twelve-foot lanes, with the four-foot shoulders, and the lower limits and a separate pedestrian bridge would be a good starting point. He would like the Road Commission to come back to the next HDC meeting to show the Commissioners something like what he described. He stated he did not want to be the roadblock or the bottleneck, but wanted this to move along.

Mr. Davis stated that earlier in the meeting Mr. Dziurman indicated there was a process for changing things in the District, such a building a garage. He asked if incorporating the pedestrian as part of bridge would harm the District, i.e., was it his interpretation that it provided a direct and demonstrated harm to the District. He asked if it could be looked at as a change to the District.

Mr. Dziurman stated in his mind it would not fit with replacing the bridge as he read and interpreted the Standard. Because they were adding on something that was not there before. He did not have a problem with adding a pedestrian surface and walkway because it was a safety requirement. The overriding issue was that the reason they have the Standards and the reason the Commission does what it does, even if they do not agree with what they do, but they are required to follow the Standards. He stated they Standards were there because fifty years from now, when another group of people are facing the same problem about replacing the bridge again, they should know what is really historic. Not what was changed, but they would be able to see that maybe a pedestrian bridge was added. He stated he was pushing himself to agree to twelve, twelve, and four and four because that was maximum they should have. There should be a safe walkway for the children, but personally he thought that had to be a separate structure.

Mr. Davis noted that there was no guarantee that would happen. He stated it appeared that was the number one issue to work out, which was a main design change. He noted they needed to decide if the pedestrian crossing would be included or not.

Mr. O'Brien noted that the Road Commission had received several local citizen concerns with regards to the inclusion of a pedestrian facility with the project because there is not one there today and it would facilitate movement on both sides of Stoney Creek. If the project had to be put in to the City's CIP process, because of the cost of a separate facility, it could be some time before the citizens would actually see a pedestrian facility.

Mr. Dziurman stated he could not make his judgment based on that. He stated he had done a lot of Section 106 reviews, and he felt that one month would be really quick for this area, and would probably take two months because there was a lot of research that had to be done.

Dr. Stamps commented about getting the Section 106 to SHPO regarding an archeology survey done in May or early June. He thought that would also take some time. Mr. O'Brien explained they wanted to complete the actual application and submit it, with a two-month window starting after that point. He thought it would be another week or two before the application was submitted to the State, so the review can begin.

Dr. Stamps referred to the width of the road, noting he could feel comfortable with the two lanes and the two four-foot shoulders. He would be concerned if the bridge was much wider, and with the weight limit. He did not think a road with those weights could be built on Mackinaw Island on the way to the Grand Hotel. He did not think a road like that could be built at Colonial Williamsburg, or any other historic spot. He commented that no historic place would have 80-ton trucks driving through it. He asked what the Community wanted to be remembered for fifty years from now - progressive people who widened the road and destroyed a historic district. He thought most of those at this meeting wanted to protect and preserve a local jewel in the City.

Mr. O'Brien stated he would approach the Traffic Safety personnel to see what other opportunities there were from that issue's perspective.

Mr. Delacourt asked what the original design standard for the weight limits on the bridge where. Mr. O'Brien stated it was probably an H20 design/loading, although that was back in the 1940s and he did not know exactly.

Ms. Franey asked if the Road Commission specified the weight limit, or it was something the City could change to allow only delivery trucks. Mr. Davis stated

the City could only change it on City-owned roads, noting Tienken was not owned by the City. He stated there were sections of Hamlin Road, east of Livernois that had a different weight restriction associated with it than west of Livernois Road. Tienken Road was Road Commission jurisdiction road. Mr. O'Brien stated it was under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission and was classed as a county primary road, which meant there were certain aspects associated with the class. He indicated he would look in to that question.

Ms. Franey suggested that an aerial of the area with overlays would be helpful for the next meeting. Mr. O'Brien asked if a rendering would be helpful. Ms. Franey stated something that would depict what the Road Commission was proposing, and what the HDC had requested, and how that it would fit with what was currently there. That would give the Commissioners a perspective of how far things would be to the south, how the bridge would look, how the pedestrian would fit.

Mr. O'Brien stated he would ask the consultants what it would take to have a rendering put together, such as the option with the pedestrian facility and without the pedestrian facility.

Mr. Dziurman asked if the Museum had photographs of what the bridge might have looked like. Ms. Luginski stated she would look. Mr. Dziurman thought that might be better than the slabs, and he thought the HDC would want a bridge with railings if that was what had been there.

Ms. Luginski stated she had photographs of the bridge that went to Leticia. She referenced the bridge on the old Runyon Road that went up the hill to the graveyard. She thought that might be an example to extrapolate from, or she would try to find the photographs of the original.

Mr. Dziurman said he would like to provide photographs of the original bridge to the Road Commission so they would be aware of what was there and that was what they should be considering.

Mr. O'Brien stated the Road Commission would certainly look at the photographs, but reminded that crash testing and barrier design had come a long way since that point in time, and had come a long way from a safety perspective. He stated while he was not discounting the suggestion, he noted that typically to get a railing on a bridge today it had to be crash tested. Many of the old railings were discontinued because they were unable to sustain a crash.

Mr. Dziurman thought there might be a compromise and suggesting perhaps a portion of a slab with a railing on top, or something that might pick up the features. He commented he could not really discuss it until he knew what the original looked like.

Mr. Dziurman asked about the earliest time the Commission could meet again with the Road Commission or when the Road Commission would have something for the Commission to review.

Mr. O'Brien noted he would have to check with their consultants to see how long it would take to put a rendering together. He stated he would also like to have a TS&L set of plans that had been reviewed by MDOT, to be sure nothing had been missed. He wanted to provide the most accurate information.

Chairperson Dunphy stated that the next regularly scheduled HDC Meeting was June 11, 2009. He thought it would more manageable to accommodate this matter within the existing process.

Chairperson Dunphy stated he had received one speaker card and would like to take public comment at this time. He suggested if anyone else wished to speak on this matter, they turn in a speaker card to the recording secretary.

**James Johnson, 1172 Sparkle Court**, was no longer present.

**Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race**, stated she lived in the Stoney Creek Historic District, although she did not reside in the Village. She expressed concern that nothing was included in the Commissioner's packets to review to give an opinion, making it very difficult to expect truly good comment or input. She hoped it would not be too late by the time of the June HDC meeting. She stated that no one had talked about or asked about the possibility of repair of the bridge. Certain items become part of the historic context over time. The bridge was built in 1940, and she was aware of other bridges in the State of Michigan that are considered to be historic bridges, although those bridges may be older than the Stoney Creek Bridge. She also wanted to know about any crash data available regarding the Stoney Creek Bridge. She stated the deck could be repaired, and pointed out from information she had seen that was available to the public, it appeared the under-structure, the super structure and other portions are in fairly decent shape, and it was just the deck that looked lousy. To say a building looked lousy on the outside and cannot be rehabilitated was a red herring. She would like to see repair considered. She stated there were other historic areas across the country that maintained that history. She thought the historic district was just as important as Greenfield Village, battlefields, Williamsburg, and other historic sites people take vacations to see. We have this in our backyard and want to throw it away. She truly had a difficult time going from 24-feet to 40 plus feet, which would just create a racetrack. She stated there were many traffic-calming devices available, and one was to maintain this narrow bridge to let people know they are entering a historic area and to slow traffic down and to do what is appropriate for the City and for the District. She stated this bridge was not structurally deficit rather it has structural obsolescence. She stated that obsolescence was part of the City's history.

**Erik Ambrozaitis, 590 Thornridge Drive**, stated he thought it was important to keep the bridge as small as it could be so long as it meets all of the ADA requirements, if a new bridge is built rather than the existing bridge repaired. He referred to the picture of the bridge over the Paint Creek, noting one could see what had been set in place and that it would not be too hard to widen the road to five lanes. He thought it was important that if a new bridge is built, it stays the same and keeps the historical significance. He stated when heading east into the historic district was clearly a concern, but his bigger concern was 26 Mile Road to Washington. He would like to see the width of the bridge kept as small as possible. He asked what was wrong of keeping the bridge the size it is today, noting the traffic flows today. He suggested the width be as small as possible. He reminded the Commissioners their vote on this matter was important because it would leave a legacy to the City. Their decision will set up a chain of events that will happen many years down the road. He thanked the Commission for following the law and the spirit of the law, and noted he appreciated their discussion regarding that. He referred to the complaints received about pedestrian safety, and suggested it be proven those calls had been received and that pedestrians were walking through the area. Show the absolute demand, the percentage of demand, the time of year the demand was there, and the time of the day. He suggested the Commission really look at the bridge over the Paint Creek, and did not want to raise the loads on the Stoney Creek Bridge and wanted to keep it as close to what it was today as that would be their legacy. The checks and balance in the system would have to come from the Commission. He advised the Commission to question why the load had to be higher or if it could be appealed. If the Commission really believes the load limits have to be left alone, they would have to stand up and fight for that. He stated although he did not want to spend taxpayer dollars, in this particular case, he was not against building a separate pedestrian walkway through the area because he did not want to build a flight deck. In looking at the segmentation, ten years from today, there would be a five-lane because the dots would be connected from I-94 to I-75. He stated that it was said in real estate not to trust anyone until it is put in writing.

Chairperson Dunphy asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak. No other speakers came forward. Chairperson Dunphy asked if the Commission had any further comments.

Mr. Dziurman referred to Standard #6 from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and noted the first part of the Standard stated: "Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced...". He asked if the Road Commission could discuss whether or not that could happen at the next meeting. He would like to see if that was possible as that was what really should be done, and he would like to know if it could be done.



Mr. O'Brien stated he would look into that. He explained one of the caveats could be that the funding may not be available for any bridgework at all if certain requirements are not met. He stated the Road Commission would completely vet it out both ways and present the facts.

Ms. Luginski stated that about one hundred people had attended the Visioning Session held in the Village in early May, and everyone agreed that the bridge represented a gateway to two miles of historic districts. It was not just the Village, but also the district down Washington Road. It was a gateway for the Community and the residents to enter, and in essence was the "country in the city". That comment wraps up the Community's perception of the area.

Chairperson Dunphy asked if Mr. Davis wanted to summarize the requests made by the Commission.

Mr. Davis summarized a breakdown of the latest bridge inspection rating for the four components had been requested; if funding is available for repair rather than replacement; floodplain impact of a separate bridge; detail regarding cost of a separate bridge; where a separate bridge could be sited to not be in conflict with the existing water main; something that would work for potential future extension for the larger pathway system; verify the 38 span versus 40 span that had been stated earlier; sidewall construction in the 1970s and 1980s and check with the Road Commission might have to help explain what work was done back then; possibility of having a TCO (traffic control order) limiting truck traffic; find out if an overlay would occur on the bridge this summer as stated in the press release; and provide a rendering of the bridge, before and after, and with a pathway and without, as part of the bridge. He asked if there was anything else that had been requested.

Mr. O'Brien stated a copy of the presentation made at this meeting was requested.

Chairperson Dunphy asked if there were any other items the Commissioners had requested.

Mr. Dziurman asked if the Commission had covered anything about a separate pedestrian bridge. Mr. Davis stated he had written down its impact on the floodplain and what the cost might be, and the location of a good site.

Mr. Dziurman asked if different methods of construction of a separate bridge could be reviewed. For instance, in building an outbuilding, if it is attached to the original building, it is not considered an outbuilding. He asked if there were a method of attaching the pedestrian bridge that would be an extension of the bridge.

Mr. Davis asked what type of pedestrian bridge would be acceptable to the Commission. He suggested a wooden walkway with a steel pedestrian bridge spanning the floodway.

Chairperson Dunphy asked if there were any further comments from the Commissioners. No additional comments were provided. He thanked Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Davis noting the discussion had been very informative and very productive. He stated he was looking forward to continuing the discussion next month.

**This matter was Discussed**

## **9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### **9A. 2009-0199 Discussion regarding Meeting Start Time**

Chairperson Dunphy stated the Commissioners had received a Memorandum in their packet material asking if the meeting start time should be changed to 7:00 PM rather than 7:30 PM. He called for discussion from the Commissioners.

Mr. Dziurman stated the Historic Districts Study Committee had also talked about meeting start times. The Study Committee meets just prior to the Commission, but believed the Study Committee meetings could be completed to allow the Commission to begin at 7:00 PM.

Mr. Miller suggested the following motion, seconded by Dr. Stamps.

Chairperson Dunphy called for discussion on the proposed motion on the floor.

Mr. Kilpatrick inquired about the purpose of changing the meeting start time. Mr. Thompson stated that City Council had changed their meeting start time, and it was felt the other City Boards and Commissions should be offered the same opportunity to change their meeting start time.

Mr. Miller pointed out that City Staff was required to stay for the meetings, and moving the start time would allow for a shorter wait time for the meetings to begin, and hopefully get everyone home earlier in the evening.

Chairperson Dunphy called for any further discussion. Upon hearing none, he called for a voice vote.

**A motion was made by Miller, seconded by Stamps, that this matter be Approved.  
The motion CARRIED by the following vote:**

**Aye 9 - Cozzolino, Dziurman, Miller, Stamps, Kilpatrick, Dunphy, Thompson,  
Franey and Luginiski**

**RESOLVED that the City of Rochester Hills Historic Districts Commission hereby amends its 2009 Regular Meeting Schedule to reflect that the meetings will begin at**

**9B. 2008-0684 2009 Earl Borden Award**

Chairperson Dunphy reminded the Commissioners that the presentation of the 2009 Earl Borden Awards will be at the May 18, 2009 City Council Meeting. He encouraged the Commissioners to be at the presentation.

**This matter was Discussed**

**9C. 2006-0105 1841 Crooks Road  
- Update regarding Demolition by Neglect**

Mr. Thompson stated he had provided a copy of the November 15, 2007 Notice of Demolition by Neglect sent to the property owner at 1841 Crooks Road. He stated he would like to move another motion for Demolition by Neglect for the property. He asked for a brief update from Staff on the status of the resource.

Mr. Delacourt stated that several complaints had been received as the home had fallen into a state of disrepair since the previous motion and clean-up work was done. He had been requested by the City's Building Department Director to ask for a revised motion passed by the Commission. He explained the City's Building Department would prefer to issue any violation notices under Demolition by Neglect as opposed to Property Maintenance because the two procedures had different outcomes and different processes. He stated the property owner did a reasonable job coming into compliance after the prior Demolition by Neglect was issued; but it has since fallen into a state of disrepair again. He noted it was a matter of revising the motion with some new dates so the Building Department could issue violation notices.

Mr. Thompson proposed the motion he provided to the Commissioners, with the remediation date contained in Condition #1 being changed to July 31, 2009. Dr. Stamps seconded the motion as revised.

Chairperson Dunphy called for any discussion on the proposed motion on the floor. Upon hearing none, he called for a vote.

**A motion was made by Thompson, seconded by stamps, that this matter be Approved. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:**

**RESOLVED that the Historic Districts Commission makes a determination of demolition by neglect for the property located at 1841 Crooks Road, Sidwell Number 15-20-428-003, HDC File #99-011, and that the Historic Districts Commission supports and encourages the property owner to move forward with all appropriate action to mothball and secure the structure against damage from the elements, with the following Findings and Conditions:**

**Findings:**

- 1. That the property is a designated Historic District, and is in clear violation of the**

demolition by neglect portion of the City’s Code of Ordinances and it is the Historic Districts Commission’s belief that the structure at 1841 Crooks Road needs to be protected before any irreparable damage occurs.

2. That the property is part of a renovation and construction project approved over a year ago by the Historic Districts Commission.

3. That the photographs provided to the Historic Districts Commission show clear deterioration in the structure of the building.

4. That the inspection by the Building Department dated November 7, 2007 details specific deterioration of the building.

Conditions:

1. That the defects identified by the Building Department’s Field Inspection Report be remediated by July 31, 2009.

2. That the mothballing by done in accordance with U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, Preservation Brief 31 (Mothballing Historic Buildings).

2006-0105

Chairperson Dunphy noted for the record that the motion had carried.

Chairperson Dunphy called for any other business. No other business was presented. He noted the next regular meeting date is June 11, 2009.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, Chairperson Dunphy adjourned the meeting at 10:15 PM.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian Dunphy, Chairperson  
City of Rochester Hills  
Historic Districts Commission

\_\_\_\_\_  
Judy A. Bialk, Recording Secretary

{ Approved as \_\_\_\_\_ at the \_\_\_\_\_, 2009 Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting)

DRAFT      DRAFT      DRAFT      DRAFT      DRAFT