

**DRAFT MINUTES FROM THE JULY 7, 2009 SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
MTG:**

**Street Lighting Recommendation for the Hamlin/Livernois Roundabout**

(Reference: Memo prepared by Derek Delacourt, dated July 2, 2009 had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the discussion was Paul Shumejko, City's Transportation Engineer; Marc Match, Traffic Engineer; and Timothy C. Miller, DTE Account Representative.

Chairperson Boswell reminded that the request was very specific to the roundabout. He was not saying that it could not have influence down the road when they did the entire City lighting policy, especially for other roundabouts. They were looking at the Hamlin/Livernois roundabout, and whatever they chose for it, it would have influence on further discussions, but it did not mean that they would choose a particular pole and lighting system for other places.

Mr. Anzek stated that by way of history, Mr. Hooper, as President of Council, had asked the Planning Commission to take up consideration of development of a citywide street lighting policy. Mr. Hooper felt that the Planning Commissioners should weigh in because they dealt with the aesthetics of the community, lights on private property and how things looked in the City. Since the first CIP discussion in May, there had been a hurried request for a decision for the Hamlin/Livernois roundabout, which will soon be under construction. It could not open without the lighting in place. They had to decide the spacing and style of lighting. Staff worked with DTE to get some options and they had a meeting in June. DTE brought samples of the teardrop lighting and black fluted pole, and they talked about the advantages and disadvantages. DTE was asked to bring back some other alternatives for consideration at the Special Meeting. Concerns raised included height, smooth pole versus textured pole, the ability of a textured pole to have banners and street signs, long term maintenance, strength of the pole, number of poles and spray of light with the luminaires.

DTE brought four options, including pricing. Mr. Anzek advised that cost was not the driver for the Planning Commission – it was aesthetics – but price would influence things. One issue discussed was safety and people moving through dark and bright spots in the roundabout, which depended on the spacing of the lights. Mr. Anzek pointed out the options for the lights, which were the teardrop, the two mongoose options and the standard cobrahead. The footcandles were of concern, and they were listed for each option and ranged from 2.2 to 2.8. The Commission was also concerned about the number of poles. With the cobrahead, they would need 26 poles. The ratio was critical, which told of the patterns of going from bright to dark. The higher the ratio, the worse it was. The second option, Mongoose #2, went from 12.0 to 1 ratio, which was not good. The rest were fairly similar, but Staff did not believe the #2 was acceptable.

Mr. Reece asked if there was an industry standard for the ratio. Mr. Miller said that there were 46 different standards, depending on the design. DTE would send the results to OHM, and they gave opinions about them and determined what should be used. DTE tried to keep things under a 3 to 1 ratio.

Mr. Anzek noted the number of poles needed for each option. The Mongoose option 2A would require 18 poles. The group was given a photo of option 2 and 2A (Mongoose) and the standard cobrahead. Mr. Anzek said that he had a chance to see the teardrop lights while on vacation in Ohio. He said they were fine and somewhat ornate. The question was which would be the appropriate fixture for the roundabout.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked why there was such a large difference in the average minimum ratio for something that was very similar looking (mongoose options). Mr. Miller said it was because of the additional three lights between option one and two, which dramatically affected the numbers.

Mr. Delacourt noted that there was not a photometric provided for option two because no one felt OHM would approve that configuration. The group agreed to eliminate option two. Mr. Matich said that it was shown for comparison; they could not get the same lighting out of that Mongoose option.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the cost included finishing, such as painting. Mr. Miller confirmed that the estimates were for everything in the ground. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the pole was painted or powder coated, and Mr. Miller said it was painted at the factory. Mr. Schroeder asked if it included conduit wiring and cables, and Mr. Miller confirmed it would be the finished product as seen in the field.

Mr. Dettloff clarified that the cost was the total cost, not the City's cost. He asked if the City would be responsible for 20% of the total. Mr. Anzek said that had yet to be determined. The City believed the State would pay a certain amount, but they might have to pay for better lighting or 20% of the better lighting. He referred to lighting standards, and said that the Road Commission required lighting, but they would not set standards. MDOT was paying for it, but they would not set standards. Someone had to determine the safety factor, so it fell back to OHM, as the design engineers, to sign off. He noted that photometrics had been included.

Mr. Matich reminded that the height of the poles would be to the top of the fixture. The lower the height, the more poles would be required.

Mr. Reece asked how close the poles would be to the curb, and Mr. Miller advised that they would be five feet away. Mr. Shumejko said it would be between the pathway and the back of curb. Normally, they tried to maintain a three-foot clearance with the pathways. There would be four located in the splitter islands and three on the boulevard on Hamlin west of Livernois. If they went with option 2A, they would get one additional light on each approach leg. There would be dual lights in the boulevard.

Mr. Reece asked if any of the options would be on concrete bases or if they would be on grade. Mr. Miller said that they would be on concrete foundations but on breakaways also. Mr. Reece asked how far above finished grade the base would be. Mr. Matich said it would be no more than six inches. Mr. Reece considered that the bases would be covered with snow in the winter, and he had mentioned earlier that a benefit of the cobra pole was that the base would be higher and more protected from the elements.

Mr. Matich responded that the cobrahead was a non-breakaway, and it was more for parking lots. Mr. Schroeder asked if there was a standard bolt pattern for all of the lights. Mr. Miller said that each pole had its own. Mr. Schroeder asked if the pole had to be replaced if they would use another pole or if the foundation would have to be replaced. He asked if the bolt pattern would fit other poles. Mr. Miller was not sure. Each manufacturer had a bolt pattern for the foundation that was poured. Mr. Schroeder said that if the pole was not available, they would have to replace the foundation. Mr. Miller said it would not be an issue. He said that DTE had been in business for a long time and their goal was to work with the City. They would own and maintain the lights, and they would not put something up that the City would not be comfortable using.

Mr. Matich referred to a standard agreement he had provided. It showed rates and other items, and he said it was not cast in stone. The contract could be modified. Mr. Miller agreed, and said it was not uncommon for a contract to be run by both legal departments.

Mr. Hooper asked about an option without Edison's maintenance agreement. Mr. Miller said for that option, the City would own and maintain everything and get energy only. The cost would be the same for the product. Mr. Hooper noted that if they took option one, there would be an additional cost. Mr. Miller said he did not look at it from an energy only perspective, because that was not how the City did things. The pole selection was the topic, and if they wanted to get into the lighting business, it would be a different scenario. He would have to come up with other cost estimates.

Mr. Anzek asked what would happen if the City wanted to end the contract in three years. Mr. Matich said the City would be committed for the first three years, and then they could go on a month-by-month payment. Mr. Miller advised that when Edison put something in the field, it was an asset and it had a long cycle cost and depreciation. With three years into a contract, they would not have their "asset" paid. If the City wanted out, it would be costly. Mr. Schroeder asked how long they amortized something, and Mr. Miller said it was about 20 years. He talked about lighting expenses for an individual light.

Mr. Kaltsounis referred to the red finish on the mongoose pole. He felt that if the poles were finished with something other than galvanized steel, that it would go along way, even if they used something basic. He thought that something painted a glossy black

would give something different to the intersection, and it might be all they needed, because there was commercial around it. He did not think they needed something too dressy for that particular intersection. Mr. Miller said that everyone had a different input about lighting. They used black because it looked good and it worked well, and it was easy to stock and inventory. It also did not stick out so much.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the cobrahead came in black, and Mr. Miller said he had not seen any. Mr. Delacourt pointed out that they would have to go from 18 to 26 poles if they went with the cobrahead. Mr. Kaltsounis said it was very standard, and if the City had to paint it, they could. The City could maintain it. Mr. Miller said that with option one DTE would do that – the City would not have to touch them. Mr. Shumejko added that the City did not have the resources to fix them. Mr. Matich said another consideration was that they could not hang banners or signs on the cobra poles.

Chairperson Boswell noted that when someone drove south into Rochester, they could see a hodgepodge of lights, and they had banners hanging from standard poles. Mr. Matich believed those poles were designed for the banners.

Ms. Brnabic asked how long it took for Edison to respond when a pole went down or a light burned out. Mr. Miller stated that their response time this year had dramatically improved because everything was done on line. Mr. Matich advised that they were obligated to respond within 14 days, but it was usually within seven. Ms. Brnabic felt that was a long time. Mr. Matich said that if it were a hazardous condition, and the lights were connected, they would come out right away.

Mr. Klomp clarified that the Commissioner's goal was to talk about the kind of lights they liked and it had nothing to do with the arrangement between the City and DTE. Mr. Anzek agreed, and said that City Council would be looking for a recommendation from the Commission about the appearance of the lights. Mr. Delacourt said that if the City wanted to evaluate its lighting for the entire City, it should be done when the citywide policy was being investigated.

Chairperson Boswell reiterated that the topic they were discussing was only about what they would like to see on the roundabout. Council had to make a decision in order for it to open. Mr. Matich said that because the project was Federally funded, when they took the application, Detroit Edison was approved under the "force" account. The force account work was something approved through MDOT when they did not directly bid an item. It was a sole source, and all the other lighting had been the same avenue with Detroit Edison. MDOT signed off on it as part of the release of the entire Federal grant money, so they were locked in with Detroit Edison.

Mr. Dettloff asked if the galvanized pole (cobrahead) was a standard stock item, which Mr. Miller confirmed. Mr. Dettloff asked if the black pole was becoming a standard stock item. He recalled that at the meeting a few weeks ago, Mr. Schroeder had a concern that the black pole would not be a stock item. Mr. Miller said that there were many standards in poles. If someone went to ten cities, there would be ten different

standards. He tried to come in with a pole that was stronger, sensible and more flexible. They were putting the pole in at 26 Mile and M-53, because MDOT saw the idea behind it and how they were doing things in terms of a standard. A traditional cobrahead came in fiberglass, which was the cheapest way to go, but he did not feel that was what the City wanted. Over time the paint might fail. He said he could come back with any solution they wanted. He indicated that he was not trying to be evasive; there were a lot of different poles and ways to do things. They tried to come up with something that would give uniformity and flexibility, with the break away option, because it was for a roundabout. He felt it was a great alternative. He said he could research options for the cobrahead.

Mr. Reece asked if the cobrahead pole was available with two lights, noting that they could reduce the number of poles. Mr. Miller said that they looked at it, but the light patterns were different. The group looked at the lighting patterns for the two options. Mr. Reece asked if option 3 did not allow the banners, and Mr. Miller said he would look into it.

Mr. Hooper asked if the 120 volt power was typical on all the poles and if they could plug into the light, which Mr. Miller confirmed. He asked if that was part of the price, which Mr. Miller also confirmed. Mr. Hooper clarified that it would apply to the teardrop, the mongoose and the cobrahead. Mr. Miller said he had never seen a gfi on a cobrahead, but he said it did not mean they could not engineer one.

Mr. Kaltsounis referred to paint finishes failing, and he asked what would happen if he got the extruded aluminum pole and the paint finish failed. Mr. Miller said they would come out and paint it. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if that would be the same for galvanized. Mr. Miller said it would not cost the City anything and they would take care of it. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if they used a regular cobrahead with a painted finish if that would fall under the same thing. Mr. Miller was not sure he could find a cobra head in black.

Mr. Anzek asked how the pole held up to salt. Mr. Miller said that the pole had been out about two years, and salt had not been an issue. He said they would not want to maintain things and spend a lot of money. Their goal was to put things up and not have to come back and fix them all the time. He noted that every issue they have had, their supplier Halophane had handled. They only used premier manufacturers.

Mr. Schroeder asked if there was a manufacturer's warranty on all the poles, and Mr. Miller said there was. Mr. Schroeder suggested that the City would be paying maintenance when there was a warranty. Mr. Miller said DTE would handle the maintenance.

Mr. Klomp asked if fewer lights meant less energy. Mr. Miller agreed more lights would be more energy. They further discussed the pros and cons of sodium lighting, mercury and LED lighting. LED lighting was still problematic and had not evolved and did not work well in colder states.

Mr. Anzek thought the next step was to choose between the light heads. It boiled down to whether the Commissioners wanted the cobrahead, with more poles and energy use, versus the teardrop or the mongoose.

Chairperson Boswell stated that there were several Commissioners that were concerned the fluted pole would not be around. The standard galvanized had been around forever. Mr. Delacourt commented that it was a new pole at one time, too. Chairperson Boswell agreed, but he said that some were worried DTE would not be able to get the proposed pole because the manufacturer would have stopped making it. Mr. Miller suggested that they could stop making the cobrahead. Chairperson Boswell said that would have to be the Commission's consideration if chosen. He said that he liked the fluted pole because it cut down on signage. They would not have to have a sign next to it on a pole. If they wanted to decorate circles, they would be able with that pole.

Mr. Dettloff agreed, and said that the proposed pole, long term, had more flexibility for the City to do different things. They could put various lighting heads on the pole. Mr. Miller said that once they got the pole established, the arm on the teardrop and the mongoose were the same. They might want the teardrop in another section of the City.

Chairperson Boswell said that if the pole were chosen and the cobrahead was the lamp people wanted, he wondered if that combination would work. Mr. Miller said he would have to check to make sure the fitting and pole were the same. Mr. Yukon remembered asking that question previously, and Mr. Miller did not believe it was possible.

Mr. Delacourt said that the cobrahead fixture was similar to the mongoose fixture. It appeared that the cobrahead would be much less efficient, however, because they would need many more light fixtures. Chairperson Boswell agreed and said if people wanted the cobrahead, there would still be 26 poles. Mr. Matich added that the annual maintenance costs would be higher.

Mr. Klomp said that he liked the teardrop, and he knew they were not supposed to factor in the cost that much, but he felt that the mongoose was not viable if they wanted to save money. His decision would be one or two.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if there would be any ramifications about what they told developers they could do with parking lots if they chose the teardrop. He wondered if a developer could force the City to allow that if they chose the teardrop for Livernois. Mr. Delacourt said that going with the lower, more efficient poles would be much more in keeping with what they did require of applicants. He would be concerned that choosing the other options, which would be the opposite of what they now requested from developers.

Mr. Reece asked if they could get the black pole with the mongoose, which was confirmed, and he asked if they could get the cobrahead with the black pole. Mr. Miller said he had to get that answer.

Mr. Yukon asked why they were not eliminating option 2A, and Mr. Delacourt said it was because the average to minimum ratio was approvable by OHM. Mr. Klomp said he was talking about 2A to option one; less poles with option one; less lights, better light ratio. For the little more you would get, he would say option one was a more attractive light. Option 2A did not seem sensible.

Ms. Brnabic said she was more comfortable that they were just deciding about the roundabout, and that they would continue with the rest of the circumstances later. With all of the conversation, she would agree that for the roundabout, she would lean more towards the teardrop. She still thought there were open ended questions, because they had been put in a situation. Chairperson Boswell agreed, but said that it had to be decided. Ms. Brnabic said she was comfortable because of the way Chairperson Boswell started the meeting and he said that the discussion would be about the roundabout only, and that there would be further discussion about citywide later. Chairperson Boswell said he was not saying there could not be ramifications, especially in other circles. They could be very similar, but their decision did not have any influence on anything other than roundabouts. He could think of many places in Rochester Hills where the pole and teardrop would not look very good. Ms. Brnabic agreed because it would present a historical presence for Rochester Hills, which was not how it had looked everywhere.

Mr. Hooper asked if the lights would provide adequate lighting for pedestrian crossings in all places. He asked if it would take care of the proposed hawk lighting. Mr. Mattich said they could not implement the hawk signal into the lighting design, and they did not know how the two would be accommodated at the same time. They did not anticipate the pole locations for hawk signals. Mr. Shumejko showed locations for the hawk signals if they went into effect. He pointed out the photometrics. Mr. Hooper asked if they would have to move the poles a little bit to accommodate the system. Mr. Mattich asked if he was wondering if they could use the street light poles for the hawk signals, which Mr. Hooper had, and Mr. Shumejko believed the answer was yes.

Mr. Hooper said that the City's motto was "historic, distinctive, progressive," and comments were made that the pole was historic and the mongoose was progressive.

Chairperson Boswell asked if any Commissioners had an objection to recommending the black, fluted pole. Mr. Reece said he could not support it, and Mr. Schroeder felt it was "overkill." He said there was a big difference between street lighting and walkway lighting, and they were lighting a roadway. It was his opinion that the pole was too decorative for lighting roadways. Mr. Reece asked them to think about the Livernois/Hamlin intersection. It was not a walking path and there were not a lot of people walking west of Livernois – it was more of an industrial area. If they wanted to portray that type of image for Rochester Hills in a downtown area, he felt that would be fine. However, he did not like it and he did not think it was the style the City was trying to portray. He felt it would be great in an historic in the future, but he did not think it was progressive. He thought they should be careful. It was an extruded pole with a lamp on

the end, and the reason the photometrics were so different was because the centerline from the cobra pole to the light was dramatically different from the centerline of the other head. It cast a brighter spot. He stated that they were comparing apples to oranges from a photometric standpoint.

Mr. Kaltsounis questioned what the final product would look like, noting that they could only see the light without the pole. Mr. Delacourt said that the pole would be the same as option one. There was a representation of it which was not exact, but it was close (he referred to the picture of a red pole and light which had been passed out). Mr. Shumejko said that the cobra would be 28 feet, six-inches to the top. The bottom of the teardrop lens would be 23 feet high. Mr. Reece asked if the cobra would be five feet back, and Mr. Delacourt advised that all three options would be five feet from back of curb.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if there was a problem with creep. Mr. Miller said they chose the pole because it was much stronger than those in the past.

Chairperson Boswell stated that the majority of the Commissioners liked the fluted pole. He took a straw vote, which was seven to two for that pole. He again mentioned that their decision would have an influence on other roundabouts in the City. He said he liked the pole because it gave the City a chance to put up fewer poles and no signposts. Mr. Reece said he would like to see the cobra pole, and he could not believe they could not put banners on it for \$66,000.00. Mr. Delacourt said they still needed metal street signage, not just a cloth banner, and he felt that was where the difference occurred.

Chairperson Boswell asked the Commissioners about the light. Mr. Klomp said they were talking about mongoose or teardrop and for another \$1,000, there were less poles with the teardrop, less lights, better coverage, and he thought it was more attractive. Mr. Kaltsounis liked the mongoose head. Mr. Dettloff said that for this particular area, he would support the mongoose. He thought it would like fine for that area, and that the teardrop would be appropriate for other areas.

Chairperson Boswell indicated that his vote would be for the teardrop. Mr. Schroeder noted that there would be more lights, but he felt that the mongoose would look better. Mr. Hooper agreed with having fewer poles, and he went with the teardrop. Ms. Brnabic said that it she would support the teardrop, but that it would not be a major issue if they went for the mongoose. Mr. Reece chose the mongoose.

Chairperson Boswell said the vote was 5-4 for the mongoose. Mr. Reece asked if there were options for the base. They had shown the pole with a clamshell base. Mr. Delacourt thought they could find a base that was less ornate; he realized the Planning Commission wanted to keep the pole as simple as possible while allowing flexibility.

Mr. Anzek suggested that the light looked more ornate when it was two feet away from them, but he reminded that people would be driving by at 20 miles per hour and it would be up high. He thought that the flexibility the pole offered gave the City an advantage in



terms of hanging street signs or decorative banners to promote the City. He thought the pole would not be that noticeable driving by, five feet off the sidewalk. He also reminded that the heads could be changed, but that would affect the spacing of the poles. He thought they could compensate for the spray if they changed lights with lenses and wattage. Mr. Hooper clarified that the cobrahead pole was galvanized.

The members discussed the bases, and it was confirmed that they did not have to go with the clamshell base. Mr. Klomp wanted to make sure they would not be inventing something with the combination they were proposing.

Chairperson Boswell stated that it was the opinion of the Commission that the pole would be black, have little at the base, and a mongoose head, and he chose to take a formal vote. Mr. Kaltsounis moved the following motion:

**Motion** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Dettloff, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby recommends that City Council approve street lighting as presented at the July 7 Special Planning Commission meeting: Mongoose – Option #2A, a flexible use, black, fluted pole with the ability for banners and street signs, with a mongoose luminaire, and elimination of the clamshell base.

Voice Vote:

Ayes:	Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Klomp, Reece, Schroeder, Yukon
Nays:	None
Absent:	None

**MOTION CARRIED**

Chairperson reminded that the task over the next year will be to study the other lighting issues that were discussed. Mr. Schroeder asked if there would be a policy established for where they wanted lights. He stated that they should establish a uniform lighting fixture; otherwise, they would have an eclectic system in the City. Mr. Hooper said they would work on an overall policy of how people would apply for lights, the reimbursement, etc. Mr. Schroeder said he was referring to lighting the main streets, not subdivisions. Mr. Schroeder said they should take advantage of road contracts, and see about where they could get things paid. Mr. Hooper said they should determine if they wanted lighting at major intersections, major crosswalks, schools zones, or safety paths only. Mr. Schroeder said they definitely should have it for major intersections. Chairperson Boswell concluded that those were the topics they would be discussing and Mr. Hooper had asked them to have those discussions because it needed to be done.