

PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION and
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
***DRAFT ***
May 30, 2018

The May 30, 2018, special joint committee meeting of the Paint Creek Trailways Commission (hereinafter "PCTC") and the Charter Township of Oakland Parks and Recreation Commission (hereinafter "PRC") was called to order at 6:43 p.m. in the main conference room of the Township Hall.

ATTENDANCE

PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

David Becker, Alternate, City of Rochester, Acting Chairperson
Rock Blanchard, City of Rochester Hills
Susan Bowyer, City of Rochester Hills
Frank Ferriolo, Charter Township of Oakland
Martha Olijnyk, Charter Township of Oakland
Donni Steele, Orion Township
Jeff Stout, Orion Township

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:

Linda Gamage, City of Rochester
Kim Russell, City of Rochester
Hank VanAgen, Charter Township of Oakland

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

Robin Buxar, Alternate, Charter Township of Oakland
Lynn Loeb, Alternate, City of Rochester Hills

OTHERS PRESENT:

Kristen Myers, Trail Manager
Chris Gray, Assistant Trail Manager

A quorum was present.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

PRESENT: Colin Choi, Chairperson
Craig Blust, Treasurer (arrived 6:50 p.m.)
Emily Barkham, Secretary
Daniel Bukowski, Commissioner
Cathy Rooney, Commissioner
Daniel Simon, Commissioner

Melinda Milos-Dale, Director

ABSENT: Henry VanAgen, Vice-Chairperson

A quorum was present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Commissioners, staff and those present stated their Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

AMENDMENTS TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Approval of Agenda by Parks and Recreation Commission

PRC Chairman Choi asked that the agenda be amended to include an item to consider the replacement of the climber in the Bear Creek Nature Park play structure.

MOVED BY CHOI, SECONDED BY BUKOWSKI, to approve the agenda as presented with the addition of an item to consider the replacement of the climber in the Bear Creek Nature Park play structure.

MOTION CARRIED.

Approval of Agenda by Paint Creek Trailways Commission

MOVED BY BLANCHARD, SECONDED BY FERRIOLO, to approve the agenda as presented and amended by the PRC.

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one present who wanted to comment on an item not already on this evening's agenda.

DISCUSSION OF BRIDGE 33.7 PROJECT SCOPE AND OPTIONS

Project Manager Matt Mikolajczyk was present to review the bids received and review options for proceeding with this project.

PCTC Commissioner Ferriolo noted that the bids include \$37,918 in resurfacing costs. He questioned if the grants we have received will cover this. Director Milos-Dale explained that the grants only cover \$600,000, and any overage will need to be locally funded. Project Manager Mikolajczyk suggested that it would be best to remove the resurfacing from the quotes and instead bid it out with the Trailways resurfacing project, which will take place

after the bridge is replaced. By including this resurfacing work with the larger resurfacing project, he estimates that the PRC will save approximately half of the \$37,918 bid amount. After significant discussion, the PCTC and PRC Commissioners agreed to remove the resurfacing work from the bidding of this project, but still keep that expense in the PRC budget for the project. Mr. Mikolajczyk pointed out that the bid also includes stump removal and other items that could easily be placed under the resurfacing project instead.

Project Manager Mikolajczyk reviewed four options for the Commissioners to consider, which he outlined in his memorandum of May 24th. The memo indicates a description of each option, an approximate engineering fee, and the engineer's opinion of costs. All options contemplate moving the resurfacing and related costs to the resurfacing project. A first option would be to rebid the project as-is with minor changes. This would be an open (vehicular) construction design in weathering steel. A second option would be to rebid the project using a "standard" MDOT spec galvanized steel truss with minor changes. This would be a closed section (pedestrian), tube-style bridge. A third option would be to rebid the project, changing the 75 foot span to a 60 foot span using the same specifications for the bridge, with minor changes. This would be an open construction design in weathering steel. Finally, a fourth option would be to rebid the project, changing the 75 foot span to a 60 foot span using "standard" MDOT specifications for galvanized steel truss and minor changes. This would again be a closed section, tube-style structure. All options will most likely require finding additional funding for the project.

PRC Commissioner Bukowski asked if the cost of materials (riprap, cobblestone, etc.) would change with a shorter bridge span; Mr. Mikolajczyk responded that it may in fact reduce the cost of materials as there will be less riprap, etc. required from the abutment to the waterline.

PCTC Commissioner Olijnyk noted that the existing bridge has a 62' span, and questioned how we can have a shorter span. Mr. Mikolajczyk explained that by removing four 14" piers from the waterway, he believes we will be able to show improved hydraulic capacity. Commissioner Ferriolo recalled that at the December joint meeting, Project Manager Mikolajczyk had explained why a longer span bridge would resolve many issues, while a shorter span bridge was not as favorable. He said he liked the bridge originally proposed, and questioned why Mr. Mikolajczyk is now suggesting a shorter span. Mr. Ferriolo said he is in favor of constructing a bridge that will be the best long-term solution for the Township. Project Manager Mikolajczyk responded that the shorter span (from a 75 foot span down to a 65 or 60 foot span) would save money, but agreed that, hydraulically, the longer bridge would be better.

PRC Commissioner Blust said cost is a big factor for the PRC. The PRC does not have the monies to cover the additional cost of this project. He noted that the PRC may need to address replacement of other bridges along the Trailways.

Commissioner Blust asked Mr. Mikolajczyk if there is big difference in longevity between a galvanized and a weathered steel bridge. Mr. Mikolajczyk responded that the galvanized structure may rust over a 75 year period, and would need to be maintained.

PCTC Commissioner Buxar cautioned that we need to look at how much we would save overall if we make certain changes. For example, if we go with a shorter bridge or different material, this may result in additional engineering and/or materials costs. PCTC Commissioner Ferriolo added that we also need to take into consideration costs that we may encounter in the future (for example, to resolve problems, maintenance, even early replacement of the bridge). He wants to make sure we construct an appropriate bridge, not necessarily a scaled down “bridge that fits the budget.”

PRC Chairman Choi explained that, as the bids currently stand, we are over budget by \$168,157. The PCTC has a reserve fund of \$20,000, which could be put towards the project. This means that the PRC would need to cover the remaining \$148,157. The Commissioners next reviewed the large spreadsheet prepared by Director Milos-Dale showing the various bridge options and projected costs. Even if we selected to go with the 60’, closed section style, galvanized H10 bridge, it would still be an estimated \$111,513 over the budgeted amount. Director Milos-Dale noted that this figure includes a projected \$50,000 savings for scheduling the work for next construction season. Project Manager Mikolajczyk commented that there are potential additional savings with going with a shorter, lighter weight bridge (easier to transport, easier to locate, smaller crane required to place, etc.).

Commissioner Choi said there is a somewhat minimal difference in cost between some of these options, and he agreed with Commissioner Ferriolo that we need to make sure we construct a quality bridge. However, if Commissioners feel we need to look at an entirely different price range, then we need to reexamine this project from a different approach.

The Commissioners agreed that we not need to consider H10 construction as there are restrictions as to which vehicles may cross the bridge (e.g., maintenance or emergency vehicles may not be able to cross). The H20 construction allows for many more vehicles to cross.

Commissioner Ferriolo said he would be in agreement with a shorter bridge span as long as we keep certain of the other specifications. He wants to make sure the bridge will have a useful lifespan of at least 75 years, not just 35 years because it fits the budget. Possibly there are other ways to obtain funds to cover the extra costs of this project. Various Commissioners suggest various combinations of design elements.

The Commissioners considered different criteria. They again discussed H20 versus H10 loading. Mr. Mikolajczyk recommended that the Township go with an H20 construction if possible, as there will be fewer restrictions on which vehicles may use the bridge. Commissioner Simon reiterated that he understood the longer bridge span would resolve many issues regarding water flow

PRC Chairman Choi acknowledged that everyone wants to “do right” for our residents. However, the PRC has other financial obligations. He asked Mr. Mikolajczyk if there is any way to construct a bridge within our budget. Mr. Mikolajczyk shared information on the GRS abutment system. This is a prefabricated (geosynthetic reinforced soil) abutment system. He explained that with a GRS abutment, dry sheeting is placed at the toe, precast concrete precast block units are placed for the walls. A pad is placed on top, and the trusses sit on that pad. Since the units are precast, temporary cofferdams do not have to be in place for as long a period of time as they would need to be in place for a conventional steel and poured concrete system. Consequently, this allows the abutments to be constructed quickly, and they can be installed by the bridge manufacturer instead of the contractor, potentially saving costs. There would be permanent cofferdams installed as necessary. Mr. Mikolajczyk continued that this is a fairly new construction system for abutments, but said MDOT is promoting it as it offers significant (up to 60 percent) cost savings over the traditional method. The GRS system has a 75 year design life, although it does not have a 75 year history (i.e., the system has not been used for 75 years for engineers to have studied the system’s longevity). Mr. Mikolajczyk said the GRS system should be suitable for a 60 to 75 foot span bridge. He has only used it on one project to date; MDOT has been promoting the method for approximately five years.

PRC Commissioner Blust felt that this is a good solution that we should look into. PCTC Commissioner Ferriolo said he also likes this proposal. He stated that this will give us substantial savings as well as a 75 year longevity potential. PCTC Commissioner Loebis questioned if the installer offers a different pattern other than the block look. Mr. Mikolajczyk said there may be other aesthetic options available. Alternately, we may be able to applique a decorative panel on the precast units to achieve the desired look. The Commissioners had various questions. Mr. Mikolajczyk named a number of line items that would either be eliminated or significantly reduced. He did not have an estimate of how much a GRS system would reduce the cost, and said he would like to speak with several contractors first. Very roughly, he thought it might offer a \$50,000 savings. PRC Chairman Choi said we still need to look at the bridge overall to make sure we can get closer to our budget amount.

The Commissioners discussed the differences between the galvanized steel and weathering steel with corrosion allowance. Project Manager Mikolajczyk said galvanized structure is approximately \$28,000 less costly, but does not have the same “old fashioned” look as the weathering steel structure. PCTC Commissioner Steele said she is in favor of the GRS abutment and galvanized structure, which would bring the project much closer to within budget.

MOVED BY BLANCHARD, SECONDED BY STEELE, to rebid the project as it was before, but to look into the GRS abutment system, and used galvanized instead of the weathering steel construction.

Discussion on Motion:

PRC Commissioner Blust returned to the difference in cost between the galvanized and weathering steel. Project Mikolajczyk explained that there has been a big change in the cost of steel, which now has created even a larger difference in cost between the two bridge materials options. PCTC Commissioner Steele asked for more explanation about the two types of material. Mr. Mikolajczyk explained that weathering steel oxidizes and develops a protective coating of rust. However, if it remains damp, it can rust to the point that it impacts the integrity of the steel. In contrast, the galvanized steel will, over time, change in color from silvery grey to eventually look like bare steel. He stated that his personal preference is for the galvanized steel, although he likes the aesthetics of the weathering steel. A galvanized structure is protected by the galvanized finish.

Commissioner Blust next questioned which length is best. Mr. Mikolajczyk said the creek has already meandered 15 feet, and he expects that it will continue to meander. Therefore, he suggested that we may need additional scour protection, particularly if we go with a shorter bridge. Commissioner Blust suggested that the engineer needs to help make the decision regarding the best bridge length. Commissioner Ferriolo concurred.

Chairperson Becker said that he feels Mr. Mikolajczyk is familiar with which qualities the PCTC and PRC are most concerned about (including a 75 year lifespan, H20 loading, and that the project should come in within budget). He proposed that MSG return with two or three options that the Commissioners can consider.

PRC Chairman Choi continued the he feels we are not ready to go out for bids at this time. Rather, he would like more information on several options so we can make a more informed decision. The options he wants more detail and a recommendation on include length of the bridge (60 or 75 feet), the GRS abutment system, open (vehicular) or closed (pedestrian) construction, galvanized or weathering steel. Other Commissioners concurred that they do not feel we are ready to seek bids at this time.

Disposition on Motion:

Commissioners Blanchard and Steele agreed to withdraw their motion.

Commissioner Ferriolo said he feels we need to have another discussion on the vehicular (open) style as opposed to the pedestrian (closed) style. Project Manager Mikolajczyk said he could not state that one style was any better than the other. He reviewed potential problems with the closed style (if there is not adequate drainage, areas can fill with water, expand and burst). The only way to avoid the potential pooling issue would be to use a gusset plate and keep the joint open so that it can drain, but this would add cost.

The Commissioners next discussed the additional engineering costs for MSG to do this work. After discussion, the Commissioners agreed that the cost should be shared between the PRC and the PCTC. They further agreed that these fees should not exceed \$5,500.

APPROVAL BY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

MOVED BY BLUST, SECONDED BY SIMON, to direct Mannik Smith Group to return with an optimized design per the discussion this evening, keeping the following features: H20 loading, IPE decking, and open section/vehicular style. Mannik Smith Group shall evaluate the following features, based on cost savings, including future costs: bridge length (between 60 and 75 feet), and galvanized (as opposed to weathering steel). Further, MSG will investigate the feasibility of GRS abutment wall construction. It is understood that the Commissions want a 75 year lifespan for this bridge. Finally, it is agreed that the PRC and PCTC will share the \$5,500 cost associated with these engineering services (the PRC and the PCTC will each be responsible for \$2,750), and that MSG will return with a quote for additional services to prepare the plans for bidding. Additionally, MSG will prepare a proposed timeline for the work.

Discussion on Motion:

The Commissioners and Mr. Mikolajczyk continued their discussion on cost. Mr. Mikolajczyk said there will be an additional engineering fee to incorporate the GRS abutment system. He estimated the additional fee would be approximately \$9,000 (including the \$5,500). He suggested that the Commissions can approve the \$5,500 to do preliminary work on this and develop a cost estimate. However, the full \$9,000 would be the cost of documents to bring the plans to the point where they would be ready to take to bid with the GRS abutment.

PCTC Commissioner Ferriolo said he feels the PCTC should not pay for engineering fees; additional fees should be paid by the PRC. Commissioner Blust recalled that the PCTC has \$20,000 set aside for this project. He is proposing that \$2,750 should come from this amount, with a similar amount from the PRC.

PRC Commissioner Rooney noted that MSG's estimate of costs was significantly lower than the bids received. She asked if MSG could show some good faith and absorb some of the additional engineering costs that will be incurred because of modifications that will be necessary to try to get the project within our budget. Mr. Mikolajczyk responded that the figures that MSG provided were their opinion of cost based on their history of bidding similar work. MSG could not predict the market or the fluctuation of steel prices. He said they did their best, and noted that there is work he is not charging for.

Commissioner Blust had questions about when the work might be bid and then when it might be accomplished. Trail Manager Myers reiterated that we can solicit bids in October with a

view to starting the work in March. Commissioner Blust proposed that the motion be amended to direct the engineers to include a proposed timeline for the work.

Neighbor Martin McClure was present. He stated that his home is the only one that overlooks the bridge. He said the aesthetics of the bridge are not terribly important to him, although he did say that he prefers the look of the weathering steel. He commented about the fact that a galvanized structure is much more difficult to repair/maintain than the weathering steel because it is his understanding that you cannot drill, weld, etc. the galvanized material. Mr. McClure had some questions about the engineering of the bridge, but said the key in his mind is controlling the river flow and scour, noting that this was accomplished in years past with wing walls. He wondered if the Township might withhold a percentage of the construction cost (like a performance bond) for a given amount of time to make sure that the bridge functions well.

Resident Joe Peruzzi, who was a PRC Commissioner for 16 years, recalled that all projects seem to cost something different than originally believed. He said it is very important for a community to maintain its infrastructure, and he urged the PRC and PCTC to not whittle away at the quality of the bridge they had originally specified.

Vote on Motion:

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL BY PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION

MOVED BY BLANCHARD, SECONDED BY STEELE, to direct Mannik Smith Group to return with an optimized design per the discussion this evening, keeping the following features: H20 loading, IPE decking, open section/vehicular style. Mannik Smith Group shall evaluate the following features, based on cost savings, including future costs: bridge length (between 60 and 75 feet), galvanized (as opposed to weathering steel). Further, MSG will investigate the feasibility of GRS abutment wall construction. It is understood that the Commissions want a 75 year lifespan for this bridge. Finally, it is agreed that the PRC and PCTC will share the \$5,500 cost associated with these engineering services (the PRC and the PCTC will each be responsible for \$2,750), and that MSG will return with a quote for additional services to prepare the plans for bidding. Additionally, MSG will prepare a proposed timeline for the work.

Discussion on Motion:

Commissioner Olijnyk questioned when Mr. Mikolajczyk anticipates he will have the engineering work completed. He responded that he plans to return to the Commissions next month.

Vote on Motion:

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT BY PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION

MOVED BY BLANCHARD, SECONDED BY FERRIOLO, there being no further business before the Paint Creek Trailways Commission, to adjourn their meeting at 9:06 p.m.

MOTION CARRIED.

The PRC took a brief recess. The PCTC Commissioners and Mr. Mikolajczyk left at this time. The meeting resumed at 9:22 p.m.

**FOR REVIEW AND DISCUSSION BY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION:
INFORMATION FOR LAND PRESERVATION MILLAGE BALLOT PROPOSAL**

Director Milos-Dale and the Commissioners reviewed the proposed language for the Land Preservation millage ballot proposal. They agreed, at the recommendation of Dr. VanderWeide and Director Milos-Dale, that in the first paragraph, sixth line, it should be revised to read, "...(~~including maintenance~~ natural areas management, and public access...)..."

MOVED BY BUKOWSKI, SECONDED BY BARKHAM, to approve the ballot language as presented with the revision that in the first paragraph, sixth line, it should be revised to read, "...(~~including maintenance~~ natural areas management, and public access...)..."

MOTION CARRIED.

The Commissioners next considered the draft letter to be shared with the Board of Trustees regarding the proposed placement of the renewal of the Land Preservation millage on the 2018 ballot. Chairman Choi said he feels it is a good idea to do both this letter as well as a "Frequently Asked Questions" sheet to inform residents regarding this millage.

The Commissioners discussed aspects of this millage and the use of revenue derived from it. Director Milos-Dale pointed out that, while the focus has primarily been on acquisition of land, at this time it is important to make changes to how the funds are used in order to be able to maintain these areas. The Commissioners discussed this matter at length. Director Milos-Dale will speak with the Treasurer's Department to learn how we need to handle the logistics of achieving this goal.

After discussion, the Commissioners agreed to make several revisions to the letter as presented. On page 1, the bottom paragraph, first line should be deleted and replaced with the

following, “If this millage is not renewed early, this limits the PRC’s ability to plan for land acquisition beyond 2020.” On page 2 under “Accomplishments Since the 2006 Renewal of the Land Preservation Millage,” the list of percentages under the second paragraph, last figure, should be revised to read, “27% for ~~proposed~~ land acquisitions...”. Finally, on page 5 under “Proposed Use of Land Preservation Millage Funds,” the percentages should be changed as follows: 90 percent (not 75 percent) “...for potential use during the 10-year millage period...,” 40 percent (not 25 percent) “...for acquisition of land, interests in land...,” and 10 percent (not 25 percent) “...for ~~deposit into a Land Preservation Perpetual Care Trust Long-term Natural Areas Management.~~” The description under this section should be replaced with the following, “This will initiate a permanent revenue stream to be used in the event that dedicated revenue is no longer available for management of Land Preservation properties.”

MOVED BY BLUST, SECONDED BY BUKOWSKI, to approve sending the memo entitled, “Request Concerning 2018 Land Preservation Ballot Proposal at June 13, 2018, Board of Trustees Meeting” to the Board of Trustees with the following revisions: on page 1, the bottom paragraph, first line should be deleted and replaced with the following, “If this millage is not renewed early, this limits the PRC’s ability to plan for land acquisition beyond 2020.” On page 2 under “Accomplishments Since the 2006 Renewal of the Land Preservation Millage,” the list of percentages under the second paragraph, last figure, should be revised to read, “27% for ~~proposed~~ land acquisitions...”. Finally, on page 5 under “Proposed Use of Land Preservation Millage Funds,” the percentages should be changed as follows: 90 percent (not 75 percent) “...for potential use during the 10-year millage period...,” 40 percent (not 25 percent) “...for acquisition of land, interests in land...,” and 10 percent (not 25 percent) “...for ~~deposit into a Land Preservation Perpetual Care Trust Long-term Natural Areas Management.~~” The description under this section should be replaced with the following, “This will initiate a permanent revenue stream to be used in the event that dedicated revenue is no longer available for management of Land Preservation properties.”

Discussion on Motion:

The Commissioners discussed how to word their goal of long-term care of land preservation properties and amended the motion as indicated above.

Vote on Motion:

MOTION CARRIED.

The PRC directed Ms. Milos-Dale to ask that this item be placed on the Board of Trustees’ June 12th agenda.

**FOR REVIEW AND DISCUSSION BY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION:
REPLACEMENT OF CLIMBER AT BEAR CREEK NATURE PARK**

Director Milos-Dale stated that the Chimney Climber component of the play structure at Bear Creek Nature Park needs to be replaced. She and the Commissioners reviewed three options for replacement, all available through Great Lakes Recreation. A first option is to purchase the identical component at a cost of \$5,888 (the item and freight only). A second option is to purchase a Chain Ladder Climber at a cost of \$2,696 (\$1,836 for the item and freight, and \$860 for the installation). A third option is available is the Sky Rail component at a cost of \$3,709 (\$2,629 for the item and freight, and \$1,080 for the installation).

Director Milos-Dale said GLR is recommending that we purchase the Sky Rail Climber. She explained that this component is a much lower price point than the Chimney Climber, has a longer useful life than the Chain Ladder, and is a relatively newer item that many children may not have had the opportunity to use. Funds can be taken from the Bear Creek Nature Park – Maintenance account, which has monies for concrete repair that we can use for this repair instead. She noted that, unfortunately, a replacement part does not carry the same warranty as that on a new play structure.

MOVED BY BUKOWSKI, SECONDED BY BARKHAM, to approve \$3,709 for the purchase of the Sky Rail Climber from GLR at a cost of \$3,709 for Bear Creek Nature Park as discussed this evening.

MOTION CARRIED.

The Commissioners will determine which color to select.

ADJOURNMENT BY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

MOVED BY BARKHAM, SECONDED BY BUKOWSKI, there being no further business before the Parks and Recreation Commission, to adjourn the meeting at 10:43 p.m.

MOTION CARRIED.

Respectfully submitted,

Ingrid R. Kliffel
Recording Secretary