The Special/Study Meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Hutson at 7:30 p.m. on January 26, 2010 in the Council Board Room of the Troy City Hall.

1. ROLL CALL

Present:
Donald Edmunds
Michael W. Hutson
Mark Maxwell (arrived 7:35 p.m.)
Philip Sanzica
Robert M. Schultz
Thomas Strat
John J. Tagle
Lon M. Ullmann
Mark J. Vleck

Also Present:
R. Brent Savidant, Acting Planning Director
Christopher Forsyth, Assistant City Attorney
Zachary Branigan, Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc.
Kathy L. Czarnecki, Recording Secretary

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Resolution # PC-2010-01-004
Moved by: Schultz
Seconded by: Edmunds

RESOLVED, To approve the Agenda as presented.

Yes: All present (8)
Absent: Maxwell (arrived 7:35 p.m.)

MOTION CARRIED

3. MINUTES – January 12, 2010 Regular Meeting

Resolution # PC-2010-01-005
Moved by: Sanzica
Seconded by: Schultz

RESOLVED, To approve the minutes of the January 12, 2010 Regular meeting as prepared.

Yes: All present (8)
Absent: Maxwell (arrived 7:35 p.m.)

MOTION CARRIED

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one present who wished to speak.

5. BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS (BZA) REPORT

Mr. Ullmann reported that the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) granted variances, as requested, on the following items at their January 19, 2010 meeting.

- 1890 E. Square Lake, AT&T Wireless Facility at Troy Lanes *(Planning Department File Number SP 954)*.
- 6693 Rochester, "Our" Credit Union *(Planning Department File Number SP 956)*.
- 1400 Rochester, Axle Tech *(Planning Department File Number SP 955)*.

[Mr. Maxwell arrived at 7:35 p.m.]

Mr. Ullmann briefly addressed his experience as a BZA representative.

Mr. Savidant noted the three site plan applications that were granted variances will possibly be on the February 9, 2010 Planning Commission Regular meeting agenda.

6. DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (DDA) REPORT

Mr. Savidant reported there was no January meeting.

7. PLANNING AND ZONING REPORT

Mr. Savidant reminded members that a joint meeting with the City of Birmingham is scheduled on January 27 at 6:00 p.m.

Messrs. Savidant and Branigan addressed grants that were applied for funding of the Transit Center.

Mr. Savidant reported the following items received approval by City Council at their January 25, 2010 meeting:

- Oak Forest Site Condominium, Extension of Preliminary Site Condominium Approval, South side of Square Lake Road between Willow Grove and John R, Section 11
- Oak Forest South Site Condominium, Extension of Preliminary Site Condominium Approval, East side of Willow Grove, South of Square Lake Road, Section 11
- Adams Road Site Condominium, Extension of Preliminary Site Condominium Approval, East side of Adams, South of South Boulevard, Section 6

STUDY ITEMS

8. ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT (File Number ZOTA 239) – Amendment to Article 28, Used Automobile Sales Facility, Automobile Auction and Commercial Vehicle Sales Facility in M-1

Chair Hutson asked to recuse himself from discussion on this item.

[Chair Hutson exited meeting. Vice Chair Maxwell chaired the meeting.]

Mr. Savidant reviewed the revisions to the proposed language that addresses the concentration and distance among the similar uses. He noted that a Public Hearing is scheduled on the February 9, 2010 Regular meeting.

Mr. Schultz asked if the 1,500 foot distance would have an effect on new car facilities that sell used cars.

Mr. Forsyth replied the proposed distance limitation would apply only to the three different uses specified in the proposed text, and a new car sales facility could be within the 1,500 foot distance.

[Chair Hutson returned to chair the meeting.]

9. COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE REWRITE (ZOTA 236) – Discussion with Representatives from Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc.

Mr. Savidant introduced (1) the status/schedule of the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite and (2) Article 11, Parking, Circulation and Access Management, prepared by Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc.

Mr. Branigan gave a progress review of the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite. A brief discussion followed on:

- District Regulations; overlay and corridor districts.
- Solar energy (General Provisions or Specific Use Standards).
- Signs; intensity of LED signs.
- Environmental Standards; stormwater management; flexibility, sustainable products, incentives.
- Parking (reduction of).
- Projected adoption of new Zoning Ordinance is 2011.

Mr. Branigan reviewed Article 11, Parking, Circulation and Access Management, section by section.

A general discussion followed.

Items discussed in detail were:

- Shared parking.
- Excess parking.
- Snow removal (multiple family residential).
- Parking dimensions.
- Sidewalk connectivity.

10. DISCUSSION OF ZONING METHODOLOGY

Chair Hutson asked Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc. to give a brief overview of Form Based Codes versus Traditional Codes.

Mr. Branigan gave a PowerPoint presentation, inclusive of the following:
- Overview of presentation.
- Planning Commission considerations.
- Benefits of the Form Based Code option.
- Typical conventional zoning.
- Regulating mechanisms (Euclidian versus Form Based Codes).
- How is Form Based Code constructed?
  - Application: building uses.
  - Application: building location.
  - Application: building height and mass.
  - Application: architectural design.
  - Application: site design.
- Should Form Based Codes be adopted for an entire city?

A brief question and answer period followed.

11. TROY/BIRMINGHAM MULTI-MODAL TRANSIT CENTER – PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONS

Mr. Savidant said the project engineers will be at the January 27th joint meeting to address questions. He said the intent of the joint meeting is to give an update and status of the project design. Should the City not receive funding of the project, Mr. Savidant indicated the project would be revisited, and most likely a reduction in the scale of the project and appropriate development phasing would be necessary. Mr. Savidant said the Consent Judgment requires funding by June 2010.

There was discussion on:
- Function of Planning Commission attendance at joint meeting.
- Role/responsibility of Planning Commission.
  - Advisory.
  - Preliminary Site Plan approval.
  - Design recommendations.
  - Recommendation to City Council.
- Public viewpoint of spending money on transit center with current fiscal crisis.
- Inform public that project will go forward only with grant funding.
- Uniqueness of public/private venture.
- Working cost estimate.
- Communicate questions and concerns of Planning Commission to City Council.

Mr. Savidant said the Preliminary Site Plan application meets all requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, and all other applicable local and state laws. He emphasized the importance of getting input from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Savidant briefly addressed the project funding with grants. He indicated that an announcement on the Tiger grant is expected no later than February 17.

Resolution # PC-2010-01-006
Moved by: Edmunds
Seconded by: Vleck

RESOLVED, That the Planning Commission "questions and concerns" relating to the Troy/Birmingham Multi-modal Transit Center be communicated to City Council as an attachment to the minutes of this meeting.

Yes: Edmunds, Hutson, Maxwell, Sanzica, Strat, Tagle, Ullmann, Vleck
No: Schultz

MOTION CARRIED

OTHER BUSINESS

12. PUBLIC COMMENT – For Items Not on the Agenda

There was no one present who wished to speak.

13. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT

There were comments from around the table on the following:
- Computer laptops.
- New Chair presiding over meeting.
- Opportunity for City to receive funding from grants for the transit center.

ADJOURN

The Special/Study Meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael W. Hutson, Chair

Kathy L. Czarnecki, Recording Secretary

G:\Planning Commission Minutes\2010 PC Minutes\Final\01-26-10 Special Meeting_Final.doc

Date: January 21, 2010

To: Planning Commission

From: R. Brent Savidant, Acting Planning Director

Subject: TROY/BIRMINGHAM MULTI-MODAL TRANSIT CENTER – PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONS

The following **questions** were submitted by some members of the Troy Planning Commission. Answers were prepared with assistance from representatives of HRC, CWA, the City of Troy and the City of Birmingham, and are shown in *italics*.

Submitted by Don Edmunds

1. **This following question was asked a month ago and never answered. If the cost of the 2400 sq. ft. building as currently designed is reportedly $450/sq.ft. or $1,080,000 total, how much smaller would the building have to be to allow for a HRC estimated $400,000 elevator? If the answer is that the building would have to be about 900 sq. ft smaller or 1500 sq. ft. total to allow for an elevator, why is it not even being considered? It would require less maintenance and provide an essential service to users of the facility.**
The elevator analysis is currently not part of the engineering design scope in the project.

2. If elevators were installed, would the ADA heated ramp systems still be required?
The heated ramps are provided for several reasons: (1) They will be cleared of snow and ice without having to wait for maintenance personnel to get to them in the assigned priority; (2) They eliminate the need for applying snow melting chemicals to the environment in keeping with the sustainability goals of the project; (3) Aid in preventing slip and fall accidents.

3. Most transit stations only have restrooms and kiosks to purchase tickets. Having a large building on the Troy side is inappropriate and not needed. Most train stations have the kiosks located outside and convenient to users. If the platform and bus pick up areas are to be covered, why do we need this large expensive building?
One of the initial design decisions was to provide a facility commensurate with Transit Centers in other communities in the region. The building has been reduced in size by what the design team felt was appropriate for the usage number for Amtrak and much of this was based on Amtrak design criteria.

4. Do we really need a clock tower to display an analog clock in this digital age? Wouldn't it be better if an elevator was installed instead in the NW corner of the building in conjunction with the tunnel excavation?
The clock tower is an architectural feature to make the main entrance to the building more prominent and leave no question in the user/travelers mind where to enter the building. This feature was suggested by the Joint Planning Commission/Board at a previous meeting, and added in response to that suggestion.

5. While we all would like to have a LEED certified building, why have we chosen the most expensive options, such as the curved 5-inch soil w/sedum roof and a separate rain water storage and pump system for flushing toilets? Could many of the LEED credits be achieved with a less costly roof that includes solar energy collectors and skylights?
Each of the Cities indicated that they wanted a LEED Project with demonstration items that were visible and could easily be used as an educational tool going forward.

6. Will the Troy City Manager please be requested to clarify his position in writing regarding incorporation of elevators at the transit center?
If the Planning Commission seeks a formal statement from a member of City Administration on an issue, they could request such statement or response via a formal resolution.

7. With the many budget challenges the City is facing, wouldn't it be more prudent to consider a much smaller conventional building of sufficient size for elevators, restrooms, ticket kiosks and lockers? Riders will not wait in a building on the Troy side of the tracks. If ramps are not required with the incorporation of elevators in the building, as currently reported at a transit station in Scarborough near Toronto, why should we pursue the very expensive heated ramp system?
The ramps provide for the constant connectivity of the two communities for all non-motorized users, at all times, and will not break down and be out of service nor require regular maintenance.

8. If the PC only speaks with one voice through its resolutions, I recommend we consider the following at our next discussion meeting of the transit center:

Be it therefore resolved that the Planning Commission requests staff and administration to seek cost reduction measures including a much smaller conventional building, elimination of heated ramp systems and LEED options currently designed. In lieu of the savings over the current design, include installation of essential elevators that would access the tunnel entrances.

Submitted by Mark Maxwell

Whether or not elevators are included, does the basic layout for the ramps remain the same?
The layout of the ramps are proposed to remain as designed (see response to Question 7, above).

What are the forecasts for daily average passenger use of the transit center per mode of transportation (train, bus, taxi) in the first three years of operation?
The Amtrak ridership was studied and estimated to be 72 daily passengers in 2007 growing to 92 daily in 2012 and 118 daily in 2017. These numbers are from the Fitzgerald & Halliday study in February 2008. SMART is looking at approximately 167 buses per day using this regional hub. In addition they will also run a hub connector to take passengers from this hub to other hubs in the region. If each of these buses had an estimated average of 10 passengers there would be 1,670 bus passengers visiting the facility daily.

Submitted by Lon Ullmann

My concerns were, and still are the following: Why were the elevators removed from discussion so early? Why are they not being considered now? What are all of the costs of the sidewalks and ramps? What is the cost of the heating system for the ramps? What is the life expectancy of that system? What are the potential problems of these systems in places like Michigan which are so destructive to concrete? What about the potential environmental problems when not if the system fails and or leaks? What are the maintenance costs associated with these ramps and their heating systems?
The cost of the sidewalk heating system would be approximately $12 per square foot. The actual square footage has not been determined as of yet but it is approximately 15,000 to 20,000 square foot range. The tubing should last indefinitely; the boilers will probably need to be replaced every 15 to 20 years. The concrete for the sidewalks should last decades. HRC's design is for winter conditions and the service is light duty without motorized vehicle traffic. The fluid used for heat transfer is environmentally friendly and poses no risk if there is a leak. It is projected that the yearly maintenance cost for this system will be less than purchasing ice melting chemicals, spreading them and providing labor to shovel the snow.

I am concerned that this project appears to have been designed with little concern for cost. The LEED certification is commendable but do we need to go as far as this design to get some sort of LEED certification? Why is there a $10,000 fee for a "feasibility" study for elevators? As Tom Strat or anyone else in the building industry knows the potential elevators would be in the station and another shaft and accompanying covering would be in order. We certainly don't

need a fesibility study to determine that. This seem to be more stonewaling to not site elevators on this project.
The study was to identify how the elevators could be integrated into the existing design plan, what changes would be necessary and what the associated costs for the elevators and infrastructure would be. In short, to assess the overall impact on a project that is already into the design refinement phase.

I do not intend to place any blame on anyone but rather point out that the criticism of this plan was almost brutal from it's first presentation. The suceeding presentations weren't much better because there was little change from the first iteration. This project seems like a juggernaut that once launched had a life and identity of it's own that is not to be changed in spite of criticism from both the Troy and Birmingham side. We should recognize that at some point we are going to be required to justify both our project and the costs. We are supposed to be good stewards of the taxpayers' money and judging from the doubt and criticism of the members of the two boards our collective good judgement is likely to be under close scrutiny. Grants may pay for most of this project but there is always a match required.

We are well into this project and I have the expectation that the figures I have requested should be known at this point in time. If they are not there should be a very good explanation why not and just saying they don't know is unjustifiable at this juncture. I support a transit station and believe it is the way of the future and now is the time to do it. The timing is awful but if we qualify for some grants it may well be the time is right. Let's get some question answered honestly and prepare a good, workable plan that we can all be proud of.

Lon Ullmann

<u>Submitted by Tom Strat</u>

What is the added cost of the curved roof over a straight roof?
The cost to roll the roof purlins is approximately $2,800.

What is the structural cost for the added weight of the 5" special moisture retained soil?
Structural steel and reinforced concrete foundation cost?
The added cost to the building steel is estimated at a 30% increase or about $22,000.

How long will it take for the green roof to be established?
8 to 12 weeks.

What maintenance will be required until established and after established.
Watering during the establishment period will be required by the contractor and replacement of any plant material that does not survive the first year. After the establishment period the roof will not require any more maintenance than a normal roof with possibly semi-annual inspections and removal of any windblown debris.

How will it be watered and fertilized? Who will responsible, the City?
No fertilizing required. Watering by the installing contractor until established and then by precipitation.

What is the method of heating and air-conditioning systems proposed? (Heat pump)
The building will be heated, ventilated and air conditioned with two nominal 5 ton ground water source geo-thermal, reverse cycle heat pumps.

What is the cost of the system?
The geo-thermal system is estimated to cost approximately $68,000.

Who will be responsible for the maintenance of system? (Pumps, electronic controls etc).
The Cities of Troy and Birmingham will be responsible.

How does the cost compare to a conventional system. Is there a difference in the maintenance requirements and or cost?
The initial investment is more expensive than a conventional commercial system. The maintenance costs of a heat pump is comparable to the maintenance of a conventional commercial system.

What is the cost of the proposed system to use rain water for flushing the toilet fixtures? Storage tanks, added piping, pumps etc.?
The current estimate is $65,000.

What are the maintenance requirements going to be?
There will be pumps for the rainwater harvesting that will require some periodic maintenance. The use is a low volume but fairly consistent. There is secondary filtration of the water and the filter will need periodic maintenance.

How often will the fixtures be used?
As needed to meet the demand of the transit ridership.

What are all the energy items proposed for the Leed Certification? Please provide a list.
What is the added cost of <u>each</u> energy savings item proposed?
What is the projected energy cost savings per year for <u>each</u> item?
<u>How many years would it take in energy savings to pay back the added cost of each energy saving item?</u> <u>(A return for the investment)</u>
Each and every item has not been individually analyzed and priced out at this stage of the design. The LEED target is a 14% reduction of energy use when benchmarked according to ASHRAE 2004.

How was the building size determined?
Building was sized based on ridership projections and based on observation of other similar transit facilities that the design team has been in the U.S. and Canada. It should be noted that the City of Pontiac is going to have a new Transit Center installed on Wide Track at Orchard Lake Road. This facility is programmed by the Michigan Department of Management and Budget to be a 4,400 square foot facility, approximately 181% the size of the Troy Birmingham Facility.

Why is there not storage for bikes or space for bike racks inside the building? *It was determined by the design team to provide bike racks outside the entrance to the building. Interior or covered bike storage can be provided in the future if a need arises.*

Why are there not lockers provided in the building? *Lockers could be provided in the future if a need arises. The Police Departments for the Cities of Troy and Birmingham should be consulted to determine if lockers within a public facility pose and safety or security risk.*

What is the estimated cost per square foot of the building?
The current estimate is approximately $395 per square foot including contractor markup and contingencies.

What is the cost estimate of the tunnel?
The cost to construct the 15' wide x 11' high, 144' long tunnel is estimated at $1,283,000, which includes excavation, temporary earth support for the railroad tracks, precast concrete tunnel sections, reinforced concrete headwalls and retaining walls, tunnel lighting, estimated railroad review & inspection fees, necessary storm drainage piping for depressed area, and the resulting storm water pump station. This estimated cost does not include costs for the decorative finish on the retaining walls, the ramps and stairways that would be installed to access the tunnel, or any landscaping.

What is the distance in the current design, that a person would walk from the Troy parking lot to the entrance of the station and then to the platform?
The distances are approximately 340' to the building and approximately 860' from the building to the platform utilizing the ramps.

In several earlier schemes, the building was located adjacent to tunnel and adjacent to the train tracks. This resulted with a much shorter walking distance from the Troy parking to the building and to the platform. Why were these schemes abandoned and the building moved?
The building was moved further from the tracks to accommodate the ramp system.

Why were the elevators taken out which were in the earlier schemes?
The design team chose a stairs/ramp system over a stairs/elevator system due to less maintenance associated with the ramp system.

What is the cost of a hydraulic elevator? *Please see the response to Don Edmunds.*

Why would anyone want to go in to the station, as it is currently design, when it is so remote from the path of the Troy Parking to the platform?
Riders would use the building to wait in a heated/cooled environment, use the restrooms or the future kiosks once they are leased.

What is the cost of the excavation and the additional concrete ramps compared to an elevators? Also what is the cost of hauling excavation away.
Excavation is priced at approximately $14.00 per cubic yard and that includes hauling and disposal. Excavation includes hauling and disposal, assuming that the excavated soils are not contaminated. An additional disposal cost of $30-$40 per cubic yard for contaminated soils that require disposal at a Type III or Type II landfill. This question appears to indicate that the ramps are an alternate to an elevator and could be eliminated if there was an elevator. The design team believes that the ramps are necessary because they will always be available and cannot break down and require service.

How much less excavation and cost would it be if the ramps were at a steeper 1/12 slope, meeting the ADA requirements, rather than current design of less than 1/20. (If elevator is provided, a ramp is not required for ADA)
Technically the sidewalks shown are not ramps because they are less than 5% slope. If they were ramps they would require handrails and curb protection on both sides to meet the accessibility standards. The design purposefully had these less than 5% slope to save the cost of the additional accessibility requirements.

What is the sq. ft. area and the cost of the concrete ramps?
The estimate has not currently broken the "ramp" concrete out as a separate item. There is approximately 16,700 sf of 4" sidewalk that is estimated at $3.50 per square foot for an approximate cost of $60,000.

What is the proposed method to heat the concrete ramps?
The system will be a boiler with a closed loop heat distribution system that is a system design with unit responsibility from the manufacturer. This system has been used at the Partridge Creek Shopping Mall, downtown Northville, Cranbrook Educational

Community, Ford Field in Detroit, River Place in Frankenmuth, East Grand Rapids Gas Light District, etc.

What is the cost of the concrete ramp heating system?
The cost of the sidewalk heating system would be approximately $12 per square foot. The actual square footage has not been determined as of yet but it is approximately 15,000 to 20,000 square foot range for an approximate cost of $180,000 to $240,000.

What maintenance requirements are there for the concrete heating system? (pumps, electronic controls etc.) *The system will need to be turned on in the late fall and off in the early spring. The controls will be in the building and should not require any maintenance. The boiler which will be located outdoors would have a regular checkup to make sure it will operate properly when needed.*

Will the city also be responsible for the maintenance?
The Cities of Troy and Birmingham will be responsible for maintenance.

Is the loading and unloading of busses more important than the safety of the pedestrian walking to and from the Troy parking lot?
Both of these items are equally important and both were considered in the design. The site plan, as currently configured, was recently reviewed by an independent Traffic Consultant.

When was the last estimate prepared?
A working cost estimate was prepared in October 2009.

Was it a break down of unit prices?
Yes.

Do we have a copy of the latest estimate?
No. The cost estimate continues to be modified and has not been provided to the Planning Commission at this time.

Brent, since you asked all the commissioners to submit questions in writing, and since there have been discrepancies in the verbal answers we received in the past, I think it would be also proper that all the answers to all the commissioners questions be responded to in writing as well. As you indicated, you need time to respond to the questions, likewise, we also need time to review the response to the questions before the meeting.