



Rochester Hills

Minutes

Planning Commission / City Council Joint Meeting

1000 Rochester Hills
Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309
(248) 656-4660
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

Tuesday, April 17, 2007

7:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Boswell called the joint meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present: William Boswell, Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Kathleen Hardenburg, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Emmet Yukon, Erik Ambrozaitis, Barbara Holder, Linda Raschke, James Rosen and Ravi Yalamanchi

Absent: Jim Duistermars

Quorum Present for both boards.

Also present: Mayor Bryan Barnett
Ed Anzek, Director of Planning and Development
Julie Jenuwine, Director of Fiscal
Dan Casey, Manager of Economic Development
Roger Rouse, Director of DPS and Engineering
Ron Crowell, Fire Chief
Jim Bradford, Deputy Fire Chief
Alan Buckenmeyer, Manager of Parks
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

Chairperson Boswell called for a moment of silence for the students at Virginia Tech University who were slain or injured on April 16, 2007.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2007-0257 April 3, 2007 Regular Planning Commission Meeting

This matter was Approved. The motion carried.

Approved

COMMUNICATIONS

There were no Communications presented.

NEW BUSINESS

2007-0249 2008-2013 Capital Improvement Plan Workshop

Mr. Anzek related that the workshop was an opportunity for members to discuss details of specific projects submitted. He recalled that about three weeks ago, the Policy Team, consisting of seven staff members, a Council representative and two members from the Planning Commission, met to discuss final project ratings. In the past, City Council had been invited to a Planning Commission meeting to hear about the new projects, but it was decided that there would be a joint meeting at the dais. He noted that the sponsors of new projects would present them, and that they would take questions after that.

Mr. Rousse started with FA-01E, City Hall - West Storage Area, and explained that it was proposed to address some of the storage issues for equipment and materials. It included enclosing an area that had a ceiling and floor outside of the MIS Department and there would be a minimum amount of lighting and heat. It would store the voting equipment of the Clerk's office, which took up a lot of space. The next item was FA-01F, City Hall - Parking Lot Rehabilitation. They would like to combine several projects - the major road in front of City Hall, the pond in front of City Hall and the pathway that bordered the major road.

Mr. Anzek asked about the West Storage Area by MIS, noting that an area outside the Clerk's had also been scheduled to be enclosed, and he asked if the area outside Clerk's would no longer be needed for storage. Mr. Rousse said he believed it was an alternative. Mr. Schroeder asked if the storage area would hold all the machines, and Mr. Rousse said it would if the volume stayed the same, but if it changed, the storage needs might change.

Ms. Hardenburg understood that the City was going to consider making the City Hall parking lot more environmentally friendly in conjunction with the rehab. Mr. Rousse said it was a consideration, and they discussed sloping the parking lot so the water percolated through the islands. They could put in native plantings and the water would go into a collection system before it was conveyed to the drainage basin. It now flowed directly off the parking lot into the basin. Ms. Hardenburg commented that they were not planning to do the parking lot until 2010, so they had time to find out what would work. Mr. Rousse said they did a similar project at the Van Hoosen Museum and once that proved effective, it would be carried over to the City Hall project. Mr. Schroeder asked if he had looked at pervious concrete, which would allow water to percolate through it. Mr. Rousse said he was not aware of that product, but would

like to know more about it. Mr. Anzek advised that they were considering it in the Nowicki Park concepts.

Mr. Hooper asked if FA-01D (City Hall Election Equipment Storage) would be dropped and replaced with FA-01E (City Hall - West Storage). Ms. Jenuwine said they were separate projects - one was for election equipment and one was for additional storage. Mr. Hooper asked if all of the election equipment could fit in the West Storage area, and Ms. Jenuwine said that it was not proposed there. Mr. Anzek added that they had not measured how much area was needed for storage. Mr. Rousse indicated that they had to look at the projects together to determine if one or both would best meet the City's needs.

Mr. Yalamanchi brought up that a project in the CIP showed an impact on the operating budget if it moved forward, and showed an impact if it did not move forward (for example, minimal or moderate impact). He questioned why the City would move forward with a project of minimal impact. He felt it had to make a difference, noting that the operating costs should go up if a project were done - that is, there should be a moderate increase rather than a moderate impact. He asked for clarification regarding that part of the process.

Mr. Anzek said that was added to help identify a level of importance. When a project was submitted, it was a need or want, and they did not want those projects to fall off the radar screen if there was a way to do it cheaper or faster. The project might get bumped back each year, but the CIP helped Council commit funding during the budget process or decide to keep something budgeted. Mr. Yalamanchi surmised that the professionals knew the importance of projects and whether they should be done. In order for him to decide whether to go ahead with a project, if he got the professional opinion that it was a critical project, and the impact was high and the cost savings were minimal, that might help him decide about the funding. The rating was a system they had followed, and he was trying to understand the system; he was not questioning what the Policy Team was doing.

Ms. Jenuwine said they tried to communicate the priority through the rating system on the Aggregate Schedule, which was prepared from the Needs Assessment Form. The impact on operating budget, as far as minimal or moderate impact, was something the Team was trying to "sharpen their pencils on." That was a point of improvement they recognized. They needed to define it better and to try and get a monetary value for each - whether it was a percentage of the project or something like that - to give the Planning Commission and City Council a better idea of the impact on the operating budget. She agreed it needed to be captured a little better so it was less abstract and more defined.

They tried to encourage the submitters to look at that more closely, and she acknowledged that they could improve upon it.

Mr. Yalamanchi said that most of the projects showed a moderate impact, but he felt that if it did not make more of a difference, there was really no reason to do a project. Ms. Jenuwine clarified that it was an impact to the operating budget. Mr. Yalamanchi acknowledged that, but said that there would have to be some cost savings or some benefit to it, and the document did not tell him that. Ms. Jenuwine explained that the CIP was not trying to capture that measurement. The impact on the operating budget was monetary. For example, if they enclosed the storage area, they might have utility and perhaps custodial costs, so it would be considered a minimal impact. She agreed that it needed to be defined better. She advised that to address a priority relative to the Needs Assessment, that the Aggregate Schedule should be used.

Mr. Dettloff asked when the City Hall parking lot was last resurfaced. Mr. Rousse said it had gone through heavy maintenance and was seal coated a few years ago, but he believed it was the original parking lot constructed with the building in 1980. Mr. Dettloff stated that was 27 years ago, and he indicated that they had definitely gotten some life out of it.

Mr. Rousse said they submitted projects because they had to do with increasing the level of services, and the annual impact on the operating budget was what it cost to maintain something or about cost savings. In other cases, there would be a high liability associated, so it would be difficult to put on an exact number regarding the cost benefit ratio. They were collecting the projects and rating them according to levels of importance, but there might be other things that should be taken into consideration that were not spelled out. Mr. Yalamanchi said that whenever they invested in an asset, they looked for those kinds of measurements, so he felt it might be something to look into.

Mr. Schroeder said it was amazing that the parking lot had lasted even five years, because when the building was constructed, the ground conditions were terrible. It was a clay tub and the water was trapped in it. The building was put on the edge of the clay, and there was a high water table. They were planning to put stone base in the parking lot, but they ran out of money, and the parking was put on very wet ground.

Mr. Rousse referred next to the HVAC Improvements at Fire Station #1, and said that the system had outlived its useful life. They were starting to see an increased level of maintenance and repair associated with it. The requirements for the HVAC had changed as the building usage had changed. It was now used 24 hours a day with a locker room, and it was

difficult to maintain the temperature. They recycled about 2/3 of the air and brought in fresh air. For the locker rooms, they needed 100% fresh air, which was difficult to maintain with the existing system. They did not want it to fail completely. He said that the next project, FA-02D, Sloped Roof at Fire Station #1, was submitted because ice and snow accumulated on the roof and slid down into the walkway. THA Architects devised an alternate design for the building, and they also looked at other maintenance items that could be installed on the roof, such as ice dams, that would hold the snow in place or divert it to the side. Mr. Yalamanchi asked if the sloped roof was part of the HVAC project, and was told it was not. He noted that there was not a cost involved for the roof, and Ms. Jenuwine said it was under review and that there had not been a resolution.

Chief Crowell said they had two projects: The AED Replacement Schedule for 2010 and Thermal Imaging Cameras for 2011. He explained that they had a number of each, and as technology changed, they were used more and needed to be replaced. The time for replacement was estimated. If they had a lot of fires, the thermal imaging cameras would not last as long (to 2011). He referred to equipment apparatus replacement, and said that the same thing would apply.

Mr. Hooper asked what year the equipment was bought. Chief Crowell answered that the cameras were purchased over a period of ten years. The first camera was purchased by a resident who did some fundraising, and it cost \$25,000.00. He advised that the cameras had dropped in price to about \$10,000.00. When the Fire Department arrived on a scene, they took a thermal imaging (scan) of a building. They could tell if a roof or wall was hot and know where the fire was. The cameras helped reduce the costs of property loss. He believed the AEDs were about five years old, and he advised that they had been updated this year.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if there was a possibility of leasing the thermal imaging cameras. Chief Crowell said he had never seen leases, advising that those in the safety command vehicles would probably last about 15 years. Those in the first-line engines might only last five, and most companies would not lease items like that.

Ms. Hardenburg questioned whether the AEDs went back to the company when they were replaced. Chief Crowell agreed they would get a trade-in value for them.

Mr. Yalamanchi asked about the ambulances purchased in 2001. He said the Fire Department was recommending replacement next year, and

he wondered if that was because of wear and tear or because of technology changes within the ambulances.

Chief Crowell responded that the replacement dates were estimated. They recently discussed that the four ambulances due to be replaced in 2008 could be moved to 2009. They were putting about 10,000 miles per year on them, and their conditions were not that bad presently. There was not a lot of technology in an ambulance that changed; but he noted that they could not get the same chassis for their vehicles. The next step would be medium-duty, which was an upgrade. Mr. Yalamanchi asked if the projections included all their equipment. Chief Crowell explained that there was a wide variety of equipment, and he noted that there were technology and standard changes to the large items, such as the self-contained breathing apparatus'. They would be sold to a smaller department or traded. Mr. Yalamanchi asked about the 1990 Seagrave Telesquirt. Chief Crowell said it was a 55-foot ladder on top of a truck, also known as a pumper and ladder truck. This truck had been a reserve vehicle for a number of years, and it was due to be replaced. They had another Telesquirt, an in-service vehicle that was scheduled for replacement. They would replace the older vehicle with the new one and put the older one in reserve to extend its life by not running it everyday. Mr. Yalamanchi asked if the cost included the vehicle and equipment, which the Chief confirmed. Chief Crowell indicated that if he thought extending the vehicles a year would put their personnel or a patient in jeopardy, he would not do it.

Mr. Kaltsounis said they previously discussed how to determine when something needed replacement. They talked about a replacement cycle, and that they had to make an evaluation. He asked if they should add something to the CIP that showed a grade for each vehicle, to help City Council determine when it should be replaced. He did not think only using a regular cycle of replacement years was a good point of reference. Ms. Jenuwine asked if he meant some type of report card for each vehicle. Mr. Kaltsounis agreed, noting they could stretch some vehicles out a year or two. Ms. Jenuwine suggested that the replacement cycle was a guide, and the administration reviewed each vehicle specifically, to make sure it was appropriate to replace it, and many times the replacement was delayed.

Mr. Anzek cautioned that they had to be careful, noting that the citizens were constantly evaluating the City's services. If an ambulance was sent to someone's house, and it was graded C- for example, and broke down, he thought there could be questions about the City sending sub-standard equipment in emergencies. The vehicles were monitored for wear and tear when they were scheduled for replacement, and if they were safe to continue, the Chief would make a determination to run with them or

replace them.

Chief Crowell said that the American LaFrance Pumpers were combined fire trucks and ambulances. They were bought in 2003, and they needed to be replaced. One had 50,000 miles, and one had 60,000. They had one in service for three weeks. The engines were still under warranty, and they had some warranty work done recently. They were not unsafe, but the Department had to feel comfortable that if a house was burning, that the truck would pump water. They did not realize the vehicles would be running so much, and they were down for repairs more often. They were going to try to downsize and buy smaller pumpers.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if it was a brand issue. Chief Crowell said that was to be determined. He wanted a truck that would pump water and one that would go down the road when it was needed. They talked to other departments who had problems with other brands. Every fire truck was built individually, not on an assembly line, so there were some issues. He noted that the company had been decent with service, but they would look at other companies and at costs. They did not need to design the trucks anymore and would buy a standard truck. They had tried hard to stick with a scheduled replacement, but if they could go another year or two, they would, and if not, he would ask for new trucks.

Ms. Hardenburg also wondered about regular replacement, but she noted that the Fire Department also had a 1992 pickup truck, which was still working. She commented that they did not replace something just because the time was up.

Mr. Rosen asked if the two pumpers for 2008 would be replaced in 2013, which was confirmed. He noted that the two the department had were at about the same level of service (miles). He questioned buying two at the same time, and about buying all four ambulances at once. That would leave them with four great vehicles in the first year, four slightly used vehicles in the second, and at the end, four very used vehicles. He questioned if it would be smarter to buy two at the same time, then stagger the purchase of the other two.

Chief Crowell said that had been considered. They discussed that perhaps there were two ambulances that could be replaced in 2008 and two in 2009. He felt it made sense. He said it might be possible to extend the two scheduled in 2009 until 2010. They were not in that bad of shape, and they did not have many maintenance problems.

President Rosen said that from a strategic prospective it might make sense to stagger them slightly so they never had all of them in the shop.

With respect to the pumpers and the Ford Rescues, he thought it could be the same thing. Chief Crowell said that the Ford Rescues were fairly old and that they carried the cargo and air system. When those were replaced, one would be replaced with a pickup or Suburban, which would be a much lower price, and one might be more upgraded. A lot of the vehicles were from the nineties. He said he agreed 100% with President Rosen. He knew there were other cities that needed to replace pumpers next year, and they could jointly purchase vehicles.

Mr. Ambrozaitis clarified with the Chief that he drove with him on a LaFrance Pumper, and said he applauded him regarding sharing services, and about the idea of going to smaller trucks. He understood the concept about having a pumper at a scene, but he had been a little afraid about drivers not yielding. The idea of smaller pumpers was something he wholeheartedly supported. He asked if they would let City Council know when they planned to purchase different vehicles so the members could stop by and look at the vehicles before they voted. He stated that it would be fairer to the taxpayer.

Mr. Casey came forward to discuss an IT infrastructure capacity project, which he said related to the City's LDFA and SmartZone. One of the intents was to provide public infrastructure to support the technology parks or eligible uses - manufacturing or IT related companies. He explained that IT infrastructure was something specific called out in the LDFA Act as it related to SmartZones. The LDFA board had been very concerned about the IT capacity within the Technology Parks and the district. They had a couple of projects in the past year where the IT capacity was called into question. The project fund would be a floating fund to be used on a case-by-case basis, primarily to retain a company or to attract a company to vacant buildings where the capacity was not sufficient. In 2006 it could have come into play with Tesla Motors. They needed T3 capacity in a building they were looking at, but the building only had T1 availability. They could upgrade that T1 in the SmartZone to T3: AT&T would lay the lines and the City could fund it. He stated that ordinarily, AT&T would either pay for it themselves, by virtue of getting a long-term, signed contract with a company, or the company would have to pay to upgrade the infrastructure. It would give the City the ability to fund projects as needed. Mr. Casey advised that the LDFA was currently in the process of amending their Plan to provide for this, and it was expected to go to City Council this year for review and approval.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the City would be paying for AT&T's capital improvements so they could make money off of the City's money. Mr. Casey said that was correct in a sense. It would be in a public right-of-way, and the purpose was so the SmartZone could make

technology available to companies. Mr. Kaltsounis said it did not make sense, because the City would not get much from its investment. Mr. Anzek said they would get business, jobs, taxes - it was an incentive program. Mr. Kaltsounis said that it seemed something was fundamentally wrong with that. He understood they would be investing in the City, and would be trying to make an improvement, but he wondered why AT&T could not pay to get business. Mr. Casey said they could, but they typically charged a lot of money, and some companies would consider going to a different community because they did not want to cover that expense. He mentioned Commerce Park, and said they received a complaint from one of the tenants that the IT capacity was poor, and that it was extremely expensive to put broadband into the Park. The landowner was unwilling to cover the AT&T costs because there were not enough users in the Park to warrant the expense. There were companies (e-commerce, life science) with large-file size transfers they were unable to make. This would have given the community an opportunity to provide the infrastructure only along the public roadway. They would still have had to pay to extend it to the buildings.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the City was under contract with AT&T or Comcast to be in the City, and said that it sounded to him as if the City was fighting a monopoly. If it were his property, he would not want to spend the money, either, if the City would. He wondered if there was a different way they could look at it for the future to save money. Mr. Casey said that AT&T did own a significant portion of the fiber capacity in the ground. There were other companies that leased lines from them, but in a general sense, AT&T owned the majority. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if it would behoove them to bring in someone else to invest in the City. Mr. Casey indicated that AT&T had been willing to do some things for the City. For Tesla, they were willing to increase the capacity to T3, but Tesla would have had to sign a ten-year lease. Tesla was only signing a five-year lease for the building, so that did not make sense.

Mr. Ambrozaitis said that Mr. Kaltsounis brought forward a very valid point from the issue of competition. Mr. Ambrozaitis said he understood retention of businesses and jobs, but as they saw with Google in Birmingham, there were no tax abatements. He was concerned that it was part of a strategy to put a deal together on a case-by-case basis, and if the City did the tech, it would be a policy of open season, and he would not want the City to go that way or to have that reputation in the community. He felt it was very important to convey the message to the business community that the City was friendly, and that they wanted to do business, but that they were not going to give them everything they wanted. He knew there were strategies being discussed, but he was not in favor of a strategy that kept giving abatements in every case. He reiterated that he did not want the City to have that reputation. He

understood how brutal the economy was, and it would make him feel better if the State was involved, but he did not want it to be "open season."

Mr. Dettloff agreed with Mr. Casey that the SmartZone was a good program and a direction the State needed to take. He asked if the City could use block grant dollars for job retention or creation. Mr. Casey said it would be an option, but the block grant dollars were being used for funding housing projects. Mr. Dettloff noted that the City got money through the County, and asked if there was a chance to increase that amount. Mr. Casey agreed there was a formula used based on population.

Mr. Buckenmeyer next discussed the Parks Department's three new projects. He went over the Utility Tractor Replacement, and he explained that the reason it did not come through fleet was because they purchased it before the fleet fund was developed. As they replaced equipment, it went into fleet, and this was the last big piece of equipment they had. They developed the fleet fund so they could maintain and assess equipment. The tractor was due, but it was a guesstimate, and by budget time, they would have fleet take a look at it and see if it should be replaced or not. It needed to be in the CIP because sometime soon it would need to be.

Mr. Ambrozaitis asked if the dollar amount of \$42,500.00 was from a preliminary, informal process. Mr. Buckenmeyer said it was a quote - they called the manufacturer and asked the cost of a new one. Mr. Ambrozaitis clarified that there would be a formal bidding process.

Mr. Buckenmeyer referred to PK-03J, the Museum Tool Shed, and said that last year they did a Master Plan for the entire museum site. They already had several buildings in the CIP, but the tool shed was not in there previously. They would use it for display purposes. The idea was to raise as much private funding as they could, and that was why it was scheduled in 2012.

Mr. Ambrozaitis asked about the Velodrome Hillside Drainage Repairs and why they were up to \$60,000.00 (PK-01G). Mr. Buckenmeyer said it was an engineer's estimate to rebuild the hillside that was falling away. Mr. Ambrozaitis asked if that was factored in when they decided to build the Velodrome. Mr. Buckenmeyer said they used the dirt from City Hall to build the bowl for the Velodrome, and now it was starting to wash away. They were originally asking for enough money to do some engineering to know what was happening. It could potentially be an in-house fix and cost much less. Mr. Ambrozaitis asked if the \$60,000.00 included the engineer's fees, which was confirmed.

Mr. Schroeder asked if they had the tools to put in the shed. Mr. Buckenmeyer said they had some in the collections, but they were envisioning using the building as larger rooms and instead of hand tools, they would display tractors or similar items. Mr. Schroeder asked what else they envisioned putting in the shed, and Mr. Buckenmeyer said it would house equipment used on the farms in the 1950's.

Ms. Raschke agreed the tool shed was needed for the equipment stored outside currently. Regarding the Velodrome, Ms. Raschke said she would like to see it completely covered so it could be used year round. It would be a "Velo-dome", and cyclists could use it all year.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the Parks Department documented lessons learned, since the falling hillside was an obvious lesson to be learned. He wanted to make sure nothing like that happened at Nowicki Park. He wondered if there was a standard for building sports fields in the parks. He wanted them to be careful to avoid another \$60,000.00 expense because of a mistake made.

Mr. Buckenmeyer indicated that the dirt used was a matter of convenience. He stated that there were ways to build soccer fields and baseball diamonds, and they definitely had that information. Mr. Anzek advised that the dirt was dug out of City Hall when the expansion was done. At the time the Velodrome was completed they decided to add a viewing stand, and it seemed like an opportune time to save money instead of hauling the dirt outside the City. It was compacted and it was steep, and he stated that the City learned from everything, but there was no documentation about mistakes from building soccer fields or anything like that. The City followed guidelines and standard practices to make sure they were right the first time. The Velodrome was something that did not vegetate property and eroded, and they wanted to make sure it became stable. Mr. Buckenmeyer said they did not want to just throw more dirt on it, and the engineer would make sure they made the right fix by perhaps using a stabilizing fabric.

Mr. Ambrozaitis said he knew they all had different wants, but if they looked at the tax structure of the City from an operational standpoint, they had to start taking a look at the costs to maintain what they had. He knew they wanted to give the citizens more and more, but he wondered who would pay the bill. From the Headlee standpoint, where the general fund was and analyzing the Parks budget, he wondered where the money would come from. He stated that they had to start doing a better job of picking their priorities as a City, and to think about the future. There was a day of reckoning coming in the City, and he wanted everyone to consider whether they really needed to do every project.

Chairperson Boswell said he believed that was the purpose of a CIP.

Discussed

Discussed

2007-0249

Public Hearing and Request for Approval of the 2008-2013 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

Mr. Buckenmeyer said they had hoped to be a little further along regarding Nowicki Park, and said they were in the process of master planning it and there was a lot yet to be determined. They were not sure what it would look like, and a lot of decisions still had to be made about the design. They felt they should get it in the CIP, even though they did not have dates, so it was in the process. Mr. Anzek said they intended to seek grant money for the development of the park. They were in the process of identifying citizen wants for the park. He commented that they had a very good conceptual meeting in January, with over 80 people in attendance actively giving opinions.

Mr. Rosen recalled that they had a professional service contract from a few years ago to look at all three of the major parks - Nowicki, Riverbend and the area on Tienken west of Adams High School. He believed that they needed to look at how all three parks fit together. He did not know if they would do all three at the same time, or which one should be done first. He was not sure which one they could get more funding for and for where there was more demand. He understood why they were putting Nowicki in the CIP, but he thought that a lot of people would like to see what they had in mind for all three parks. They would figure out from that which one everyone liked the best and put the most money there, and then figure out which would be second and how to get the money for that. He did not think they should get grant money and spend it, simply because they could, and then determine they could have used it better at another location.

Mr. Buckenmeyer said he agreed, and related that they were finding a lot of excitement and ideas that would not work in Nowicki, so they would take some of those and see if they would fit at Riverbend. They could look at all the parks. It was a placeholder for Nowicki (in the CIP) and they planned to add one for Riverbend next year. He said he believed the idea of the CIP was to let people know what was on the horizon, not just what was in next year's budget.

Mr. Rosen reminded that there was a Master Parks and Recreation Plan, which did let people know what was on the horizon. He thought that if there was a project in the CIP and they came up with money for it, they would do it, but it might not be the highest priority. The parks were going

to have a rough time with City funding because the budget was tight. They said they would go for grants, but he was concerned they would forge ahead outside of the Master Plan, even if the intent was to stay in it. He would like to see all three parks scoped and considered at once so they were looking at the next ten or 15-year development of parks in the City. He guessed that those would be the end - he did not think there would be much more park land after those three, noting they could not use the open space.

Mr. Ambrozaitis said he agreed with President Rosen's approach for the parks. He thought it was important to look at it in its entirety.

Mr. Anzek said that during the discussion about major and local roads, the City's engineers identified pathway installation dates and times, and they discussed trying to accomplish those in the best and easiest manner. He stated that building pathways was fine, but that the one of the biggest hurdles was obtaining the easement rights across someone's property. They discussed whether obtaining easements should determine the priority of the pathway development, and he noted that there were a lot of new pathway projects in the CIP.

President Rosen indicated that if there was a path on one side and it was going to be tough to get the right-of-way on the other side, that they did not need to worry about it so much, but should look where they could get right-of-way, and consider where there was no pathway at all. He thought they should focus on places where they could get right-of-way more easily. For example the City owned Nowicki Park between Powderhorn and Tienken so they probably owned 60% of the right-of-way, and they had a perfectly good pathway on the west side of Adams. They had to determine where to spend the money.

Mr. Anzek referred to local roads and turned the discussion over to Mr. Rousse. Ms. Jenuwine advised that there was a road condition map and PQI rating for local streets in fair condition included.

Mr. Rousse advised that the local road replacement program resulted in efforts to salvage as much as they could of existing concrete road and costs. In some of their previous proposals, they had looked at replacing the entire concrete section, and the local road program was an alternate plan. They realized some costs were prohibitive, and they found they could do partial road replacements. They were proposing it for the local and major streets, and would rank them and annually contract services for replacement of the concrete slabs. It would include drainage improvements also, to minimize failure in those areas. They would make the best use of limited funding for road rehabilitation.

Mr. Rousse continued that the program was ongoing and involved multiple years. He recalled a workshop on the local road system last January, and at that time, there were 42 miles of roads rated poor. Of those, 12 miles were asphalt and the other 30 miles were concrete. They would do Shadow Woods this year, which was 4.7 miles of the 12 miles of asphalt. They prioritized the rest, based upon whether: a) it bordered a major road; b) whether it was an intersection in a subdivision; or c) whether there were drainage problems. He noted there were cul-de-sacs, but he added that typically, there was less traffic on them, and they did not deteriorate as rapidly as other streets.

Mr. Yalamanchi said that in the 2006 budget, they planned \$1.7 million for local roads maintenance. Mr. Rousse said it did not all get constructed so it was carried over to this year. Mr. Yalamanchi asked how much was budgeted for 2007. Ms. Jenuwine said they were carrying over \$700,000.00 from 2006 to 2007, which was in addition to Shadow Woods, which was \$2.5 million. Mr. Yalamanchi clarified that nothing additionally was budgeted for preventative maintenance. Ms. Jenuwine said it was for the operating budget, but not for the construction portion. The only construction would be Shadow Woods, and the completion of the concrete work not done in 2006. She said that it was later determined that the local road program would be a concrete slab program and that was why it was on the new projects list. She explained that the local road concrete slab replacement program did not go through the CIP process last year. It was already started, but it was new because it did not go through the rating process. Mr. Yalamanchi asked if they had a similar program for asphalt. Mr. Rousse said they would do that maintenance with the in-house crews.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked the last time the City looked at specs for new roads and what standards developers had to use. He thought it was better to have a thick base, and asked how many feet were required for the base. Mr. Schroeder said they used the County standards, and they could not afford them for local roads. Mr. Kaltsounis agreed, but asked why they expected second best when they had to repair them later. Mr. Rousse said that the City had engineering standards for local roads and they had changed over the years. The cross sections of the roads they were doing now did not, in many cases, have below the pavement drainage. The new standards included collection systems, enclosed drains below the road and catch basins. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if developers were required to follow those standards, and Mr. Rousse confirmed they were, but Mr. Kaltsounis wondered if they needed to look at them again. Mr. Rousse said that the City was constantly revising them, and in light of the financial crisis in the local road program, they tried to make the best choices for everything. He indicated that most of the roads had a design life of 20 years. Even if the roads seemed substandard by today's

standards, they had met their life cycle. Shadow Woods' roads were 30 years old, and lasted that long because there had been regular maintenance. They had nine-inch asphalt on a clay grade, and the new standards required six-inches of 22 AA stone which provided drainage. Drainage was the biggest problem for roads. If possible, they installed a sump pump collection system to keep water from the roadway. Mr. Anzek recalled that two years ago, the Engineering Department and its consultant did a complete rewrite of the standards.

Mr. Kaltsounis referred to pathways, and said he thought they needed to look at them for corporate drives, in addition to the main roads. He noted that he used to work on Waterview Drive, and said that many people walked it during lunchtime in the summer. He cautioned that it was not safe to walk there without pathways.

Mr. Anzek agreed it was a timely suggestion, and reminded that the City was beginning to update the Master Thoroughfare Plan and that it would have a pathways component. They discussed linking pathways and job centers. He thought that the members on the Council and Planning Commission who were on that Tech Committee could take the suggestion back for discussion. Mr. Kaltsounis said he thought they needed pathways on the corporate drives even more than on major arterials.

Ms. Raschke said that Dutton Road was scheduled for an improvement with 2,550 feet of paving from Tall Oaks Blvd. to east of Livernois to match the existing pavement. The improvements would include replacing curb and gutter on both sides of Dutton to eliminate erosion. The plan was that paving that section of Dutton would improve safety by providing a uniformed, paved surface for the steep road grade and to improve intersection safety. The major intersection was for Tall Oaks Blvd., which was engineered poorly years ago and there was a 12-15% grade. They had vehicles descending east and the inertia tipped them over. She asked if tri-party funds would be used to improve Tall Oaks Blvd. She stated that Dutton was unique because part of it was great, but when someone descended the hill, it was a nightmare. She felt that paving it would add to the nightmare. They always had problems with the ditches, but she felt that the City's money could be better spent somewhere else. There was also a bike path proposed, but she reminded that Dutton was exempt from a bike path in the Ordinance because of liability. She concluded that if people went down a steep path like that and something happened, the City could be sued.

Mr. Rousse responded that there was excessive erosion on Dutton. He mentioned that School road had a similar problem. The gravel road changed each time it was graded. Gravel roads contributed to erosion,

and a vast majority of the gravel ended up in the River because of the steep slopes and the runoff. Paving would be a benefit, and many people used the Clinton River Trail off of Livernois, and they could provide a pathway from Tall Oaks to the Trail. Ms. Raschke said they had to be cautious, and that encouraging people to use a pathway to the Trail from Tall Oaks would be asking for trouble. Mr. Anzek said they would research the matter.

Mr. Dettloff noted that the CIP would be adopted before the Thoroughfare Plan was completed, and he asked if that study would cause a reprioritization of items in the CIP and if so, if there would be amendments or items brought back the following year. Mr. Anzek said that when the Thoroughfare Plan was done, if there was something identified as a top priority that needed to be funded, they would bring the matter back to City Council. He noted that some items were not scheduled for 2008.

Mr. Yalamanchi referred to MR-01E, Crooks Road (M-59 to Hamlin Road) and MR-01A, Interchange improvements, and he was concerned they would not happen. Mr. Rousse said it was in the State's five-year program. The Governor's program, Preserve First, showed these improvements in the State's master plan, but they were not funded. Mr. Yalamanchi said he did not think the interchange was as bad as the traffic to Hamlin. Mr. Rousse said that was the last segment, and it would link together both Hamlin Road projects. Mr. Yalamanchi noted that Hamlin east was scheduled this year, and he suggested contacting the State representatives to help get the road improvements needed to improve the intersection. Mr. Yalamanchi asked if that could be kept on the radar screen, so the administration would know about the progress.

Mr. Yalamanchi referred to page 20, the Technology Drive extension, and noted that MDOT was involved. He stated that some of the businesses in that area had expressed that the extension would help them tremendously. Mr. Anzek said they were definitely working on that. They were advised that it would take FHWA approval and three to four years, and they had already started the process. They were also looking at alternatives, in case they were unsuccessful at the Federal level.

Mr. Yalamanchi asked them to look at Firewood, which connected Walton to Tienken. He was concerned about the safety on that road - children biking and people with strollers. He asked if they could put a pathway on one side or the other. Mr. Anzek said they were in the process of identifying appropriate collector streets to feed into the network on the arterial roadways. Staff discussed another road, Rain Tree, where there was a lot of open space, and that it would be a good

opportunity for a pathway.

Mr. Rosen said that Firewood and Rain Tree were the City's ideas. In 1982 or so, they discussed having collector roads that houses did not front, so people would not walk there. It turned out that people did walk there.

Mr. Schroeder pointed out that if a City had a master plan for pathways on major roads, and the County did a major road project, the pathway would be eligible for federal funding and it would get paid for with the road project. If they did not have the pathway plan (on paper) the City would have to pay for it. He commented that Dutton Road did not get designed; it happened. He also noted that regarding the collector roads, the local traffic was supposed to move around internally, rather than be forced onto the major roads. It worked fine with the first development in, but when the other developments came, people objected so the City could not finish them.

Mr. Ambrozaitis said he agreed that Dutton Road was very dangerous, and that he would not want to see a bike path installed on the hill. Mr. Rouse said he would look into it and get back with the members.

Mr. Hooper asked if there was any thought given to having a project specifically for easement acquisition throughout the City. They might have a Staff member work on it. He asked how it was currently funded. Ms. Jenuwine said it was funded out of Pathways. Mr. Anzek said that Staff did mapping, but he was not sure who approached and made offers. Mr. Hooper noted it was in Professional Services, but questioned whether it should be an annual item in the CIP. Ms. Jenuwine said there was an account in the Pathway Fund for land acquisition and easement costs. As they acquired it in the first phases of a project, it was budgeted into a capital line item. If they found that something was more difficult than anticipated, they would do a budget amendment. It would be easier, administratively, to have one larger, lump sum, but they could consider a separate account. Mr. Hooper said it would be nice to know what the Professional Service contract was and what the easement cost was. As a Council member, he should be aware what it cost to obtain easements. Ms. Jenuwine advised that they were separate items.

Mr. Hooper suggested that they did not want to use City funds to add pathways to vacant land because developers should be paying for them. He recommending deferring those areas until a developer was involved to help pay. Mr. Rouse agreed, and advised that much of the pathway system had been paid for by developers.

Mr. Hooper referred to Meadowfield Drive (MR-23B), and said it was

already in the 2007 budget, but he noted that it was back in the CIP for 2009. Mr. Rousse said they did not want to do the road before the Sheffield development was done because they feared it would get damaged from heavy equipment. Mr. Hooper asked if there was a budget amendment to the Fund balance or if there would be a future amendment. Ms. Jenuwine said she was not sure if it was in the first amendment, but if not, it would be in the second. The CIP process was typically started after the first budget amendment, so it was probably not updated yet.

Chairperson Boswell asked for an overview of the two major road projects that were added subsequently (MR-14 and MR-42C). Mr. Rousse explained that Washington was a County Road and they wanted to use tri-party funds for reconstruction. It had been in the Road Commission's plans for some time, and they indicated they wanted to move forward, so it was included in the CIP. The M-59 Rehabilitation was an MDOT project and they were ready to advance the program. Under Act 51, the City was responsible for making a contribution.

Ms. Hardenburg referred to MR-14, noting that the City share was 17% / 7%, and asked for explanation. Ms. Jenuwine said the City's share would be 17% before use of the tri-party funds, but she did not believe there was a contract yet. Ms. Hardenburg clarified that if they could use the tri-party funds, the share would be 7%. Mr. Rousse said he would check on it, because he was not sure DPS would recommend doing the project if the City had to pay 17%. Chairperson Boswell read from the application submitted by Engineering: Major Roads, Tri-party program funding City share equals 33% of preliminary engineering, 10% of remainder for an estimated cost of \$148,500.00. Mr. Anzek said that would be cleared up by the Public Hearing on May 1.

Mr. Schroeder referred to the Livernois bridge over M-59, and pointed out that it did not include the pathway. He reminded that Livernois was a major link between north and south of M-59. They have had many discussions with MDOT and the Road Commission about the bridge, and their position was that the City would have to pay for it. The City would not want it built without a pathway at least on one side.

Mr. Rousse said that when it was first proposed, they gave a cost proposal for putting in the foundation for the entire project. The City agreed to pay for that, but they had not agreed on the final design.

Mr. Ambrozaitis asked Mr. Rousse if he knew the City's potential costs for widening M-59. He had seen an estimate of \$5 million, but he wondered if there was something newer. Mr. Anzek said that the widening of M-59 from Crooks to Van Dyke was a long-standing project

on the State's list and it was deferred in 2003. They heard that MDOT was looking at the project again. In 2000, the cost was estimated at \$32 million and the City's share would be \$4.3 million. If the project went up, the City's share would go up, to a 12% maximum. Mr. Ambrozaitis confirmed that \$5-6 million would be a good, conservative figure to use.

Mr. Hooper asked if MR-42A and MR-42B would be done at the same time (M-59 Widening and M-59 at Livernois Bridge Expansion). Mr. Anzek thought MR-42A and MR-42C, M-59 Rehabilitation from Adams to Crooks, would be within the same project. Mr. Rousse said they had limited discussion with MDOT and if the City needed pathways, they would have to replace the bridge, which would be very expensive. Mr. Anzek thought that all the bridges were part of the M-59 widening. Mr. Rousse said that the requirements for the freeboard underneath the bridge changed and they had to raise the bridge, which would also be a significant cost. Mr. Anzek indicated that he did not think there would be a problem with pathways on the bridges, reminding that when the State found out the City had a pathway plan, they put one on the Adams Road bridge. He stated that they would get a more definitive answer about the M-59 improvements and status.

Mr. Rousse went over the sanitary sewer improvements and new replacements scheduled, which were fairly self-explanatory in the CIP. The last project he mentioned involved a watermain on Avon (by Rochester College), which he noted was not that old, but it appeared there was backfill they tested that was very aggressive, which was responsible for two watermain leaks in the area. They would like to replace two areas where they found "hot" soils.

Mr. Ambrozaitis asked who put the dirt there. Mr. Rousse said it was put in with the development in 1995. Mr. Ambrozaitis asked if the City inspected it, which was confirmed. Mr. Rousse said that the soil was not consistent with the remaining soil around the area. Mr. Ambrozaitis asked if City workers looked for that type of problem during inspections. Mr. Rousse advised that the process was to analyze the soil and measure its reactivity. It looked like soils had been shifted around on the site and that it was added afterward, and it was prematurely corroding the watermain. In most cases it would not be a problem, but the dorm was lower than the watermain and when it leaked, it went right into the dorm. Mr. Schroeder said that it was not necessarily something an inspector would catch. It would be picked up in the soil borings - it was not something that could be seen, but had to be tested. Mr. Ambrozaitis wanted to make sure it was not a problem with a private contractor, and Mr. Rousse said he did not believe it was a pervasive problem.

Mr. Hooper referred to SS-44, Shadow Woods Sanitary Sewer Rehab,

and asked how much of that would be full replacement rather than relining. He thought it would make sense to do those repairs prior to reconstructing the streets.

Mr. Rousse said that a lot of the work would be in easements between the streets, not underneath them, and that 3,500 feet would be replaced. Mr. Hooper asked how many feet would be excavated or if it would all be relined. Mr. Rousse said they proposed all relining, but there could be minimal areas replaced. Mr. Hooper reiterated that they would want to know where before they worked on the roads.

Ms. Raschke said there had been problems in North Fairview Farms with sewer mains and drainage between homes. She asked if homeowners were notified ahead of time if City trucks were going out. Mr. Rousse said he believed they had brought that to a satisfactory conclusion. The sewer had been repaired and crews were working in that area to do the final grading. He advised that normally, the City left a door tag informing them they would be there.

Mr. Yukon asked if the sewer improvements were due to sanitary sewers collapsing. Mr. Rousse did not believe that was the case. It was new installations and/or rehabilitation or replacement, not collapsed sewers. If there were an imminent threat the City would intervene right away. Mr. Yukon asked if the City had a rating system, similar to major and local roads, for what needed to be done with the sewers and where. Mr. Rousse said they used a standardized method of descriptions for cracks and things like that. The employees had been trained to use the same terminology. They were currently implementing an Asset Management Program to allow them to balance the maintenance schedules and rehab costs.

Mr. Ambrozaitis said that on Parsons Lane in his subdivision there was a water problem. He asked Engineering to look at it to determine whether it was the City's fault or the Association's responsibility.

Mr. Yalamanchi asked Mr. Rousse about the Radio Read System (WS-30). Mr. Rousse stated that it was a four-year implementation program to reduce the operational cost associated with reading meters. In 2006 they had four full-time employees reading water meters. The system would convert a touch pad system to a Radio Read System, which would read the entire City in about eight hours. The City was about half way through the implementation and expected to complete it in 2008.

Mr. Yalamanchi asked how the Sanitary Sewer Evaluation Study (SS-02A) related to the Sewer Rehab Program (SS-02B). Mr. Rousse

said they went hand in hand. The Study was the inspection portion, and it would identify what needed to be done - the costs and performance measurements - and then in the following years the rehabilitation would be done. Mr. Yalamanchi asked about expending \$300,000.00 every other year for a study. Ms. Jenuwine said that phase one was the actual study, and \$2,000,000.00 was for correction of the problem.

Mr. Schroeder asked if the City would disconnect the sump pumps. Mr. Rousse said that was yet to be decided. He believed it was prudent to reduce sump pump discharges into the sanitary sewer. They would have to offer the residents an alternative, and that was still a question. Mr. Yalamanchi said he was surprised to learn about \$1,000,000.00 in the amended budget for sewer rehab. Ms. Jenuwine said the program had been in effect, and in the CIP, for quite a few years. She discussed the County's billing rates for sewage flow through the meters and that the City could capture that infiltration in the billing process.

Mr. Ambrozaitis asked if the residents would be looking at possible substantial rate increases, which Ms. Jenuwine agreed could occur. Mr. Rousse said that Asset Management was the balancing act between capital improvements and maintenance and it would affect the rates. They discussed sump pump discharge into the sanitary sewers, and that it was a much bigger problem twenty years ago.

Mr. Anzek said that it was the 11th year the City had used the CIP process. He felt that it was an excellent tool to help the City be proactive in terms of identifying fixes, efficiencies and maintenance programs and to put them into the decision making process.

Mr. Anzek announced that there would be a Public Hearing on May 1 before the Planning Commission, to consider adoption of the CIP, after which Fiscal would prepare the budget. He added that after the budget preparation cycle, the CIP projects would be presented to the Mayor.

Mr. Yalamanchi said he appreciated and applauded the process, noting it was his first experience with the CIP. He had suggested last year that Council should be more involved in the CIP process.

Mr. Yukon asked Mr. Rousse if he was aware of any areas in the City that had a combined sanitary and storm system based on age or if any were installed before Avon Township was a City. Mr. Rousse said there might be some that existed that had been modified, but there were none by design. It was his understanding that all the sewers in the City were designed as sanitary - for household waste.

Chairperson Boswell asked if there were further comments regarding the

CIP. Mr. Anzek extended compliments to Ms. Jenuwine and her team, indicating that they had worked closely with Staff, and he thanked her for her efforts.

Chairperson Boswell opened the Public Comments at 10:15 p.m.

Discussed

Discussed

Lee Zendel, 1575 Dutton, Rochester Hills, MI 48306. *Mr. Zendel said it was de-ja vu all over again, explaining that 15 years ago, he got a letter in the mail regarding Council discussing a bike path on Dutton. He discovered at that time that the State of Michigan had guidelines for bikepaths and that there could not be more than a 5% slope. Dutton Road, from Tall Oaks to Livernois had about 12%, and he urged the members to visit it. He said that it would be very dangerous for a kid on a skateboard or rollerblades to go down a bikepath there. He believed that the City had paid out a fair amount of money for lawsuits on the pathways, simply from ordinary cracks, and he commented that the City wanted to add an "attractive nuisance" on Dutton. He stated that the City would get more lawsuits. He next mentioned fleet equipment, and that the City wanted to buy two Vactor trucks. He noted that both trucks had the same expected life, but he did not recall two trucks being bought in the same year, and he indicated that they were very expensive. He read about the life span of ductile iron for water main projects and said that years ago, he discovered that ductile iron water pipes had a life span of 125 years. The City was discussing replacing some at 50 years. He referred to the Grandview Drive at Tienken Traffic Signal (MR-20A), and said it had been in the CIP for quite a number of years. Previously, the area did not meet State standards for a signal, so he wondered how it became "active" again with the State. He recalled that when they exchanged the Meadowfield property for Nowicki Park, several Council people said they had to do it because a park would be needed in that area in the next 15-20 years, but he found that suddenly, it was in the CIP. He referred to the Olde Towne District Redevelopment Study and Infrastructure Improvements (PS-09A and B), and said that the Study was planned for 2008 and the next year, they would implement improvements. He thought that would be a fast study. Regarding the Fire Capital Replacement Schedule, he noted that one of the items for 2011 was the E-One Snorkel, with an estimated cost of \$928,000.00. He believed it initially cost about \$700,000.00, so that gave an idea of escalating prices. The American LaFrance Pumpers were estimated at \$380,000.00 for 2009, but the replacement cost in 2013 was \$460,000.00. He thought the City would be very wise to put money aside for them, because of the expense.*

Discussed

Discussed

Chairperson Boswell closed the Public Comments.

Mr. Anzek, with reference to the Olde Towne Study, said it had been an annual placement on the books, as identified in the 1999 Master Land Use Plan. It was his recommendation to the Mayor that the Study not be initiated until they could organize the business owners and property owners throughout the corridor. He advised that they had made four serious attempts to meet with those folks, noting that other plans had failed in the past, only to find that the ownership could not agree on a course of action. Every two years they sent out letters or tried to talk to the folks to see if there was any interest in getting a cohesive voice together. They did not want to do a study without the cooperation of the owners, so it had been pushed back every year.

Mr. Ambrozaitis asked if they could look at some type of incentive for that area. When he visited the area, he felt there must be some way, perhaps a block grant, to clean it up and make it better. Mr. Anzek said that the State continually revised their programs, and the City looked at programs for that corridor. There should be tax increments for infrastructure improvements, but the people had to want to reinvest in their properties. Mr. Ambrozaitis said that might be an area where the new liquor laws would be helpful.

Mr. Kaltsounis made a motion to adjourn at 10:30 p.m.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Hardenburg mentioned that there was water being pumped into the road drain from the Sheffield development on Meadowfield, and Mr. Rouse said he would look into it.

NEXT MEETING DATE

The Chair reminded the Commissioners that the next regular meeting was scheduled for May 1, 2007.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Commission, the Chair adjourned the special joint meeting at 10:30 p.m., Michigan time.

William F. Boswell, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

James Rosen, President
Rochester Hills City Council

Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

Approved as amended at the May 1, 2007 regular Planning Commission meeting.
Approved as presented/amended at the _____, 2007 City Council Meeting.