



# Notice

## City Commission Special Meeting

7:00 pm

Monday, March 8, 2010

Commission Chambers, Governmental Center

400 Boardman Avenue

Traverse City, Michigan 49684

Posted: 03-05-10

Meeting informational packet is available for public inspection at the Traverse Area District Library, City Police Station, City Manager's Office and City Clerk's Office.

The City of Traverse City does not discriminate on the basis of disability in the admission or access to, or treatment or employment in, its programs or activities. Makayla Vitous, Assistant to City Manager, 400 Boardman Avenue, Traverse City, Michigan, 49684, 922-4440, TDD: 922-4412, has been designated to coordinate compliance with the non-discrimination requirements contained in Section 35.107 of the Department of Justice regulations. Information concerning the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the rights provided thereunder are available from the ADA Coordinator.

If you are planning to attend and you have a disability requiring any special assistance at the meeting and/or if you have any concerns, please immediately notify the ADA Coordinator.

At the request of the City Manager, the City Clerk has called this special meeting.

City Commission  
c/o Debra A. Curtiss, MMC, City Clerk  
400 Boardman Avenue  
Traverse City, MI 49684  
922-4480, <http://www.ci.traverse-city.mi.us>

---

*The mission of the Traverse City City Commission is to guide the preservation and development of the City's infrastructure, services, and planning based on extensive participation by its citizens coupled with the expertise of the city's staff. The Commission will both lead and serve Traverse City in developing a vision for sustainability and the future that is rooted in the hopes and input of its citizens and organizations, as well as cooperation from surrounding units of government.*

**Welcome to the Traverse City Commission meeting!**

Any interested person or group may address the City Commission on any agenda item when recognized by the presiding officer or upon request of any Commissioner. Also, any interested person or group may address the City Commission on any matter of City concern Public Comment. The comment of any member of the public or any special interest group may be limited in time. Such limitation shall not be less than five minutes unless otherwise explained by the presiding officer.

**Agenda**

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call.

Announcements by the Mayor, City Manager, and City Commissioners

1. Consideration of trial and settlement strategy in connection with *City of Traverse City v Michigan Department of Natural Resources*, (Grand Traverse County Circuit Court No. 08-26647-CE) and consideration of attorney-client communication. (Possible closed session) (Karrie Zeits, R. Ben Bifoss)
2. Public Comment.

k:\tcclerk\agenda\agenda20100308spl&ss

(See next page for Study Session agenda)

**Notice  
City Commission  
Study Session**

**Immediately following the Special Meeting**

At the request of the City Manager, the City Clerk has called this study session.

**Agenda**

1. Discussion regarding CH2MHill (OMI) operation, management and maintenance of the Wastewater Treatment Plant and Grand Traverse County Septage Treatment Facility. (R. Ben Bifoss, Robert Cole, Scott Blair)
2. Discussion of Report regarding 2010 Paving and Reconstruction Projects. (R. Ben Bifoss, Russell Soyering, Timothy Lodge)
3. Discussion of Eighth Street Reconstruction Project status and update. (R. Ben Bifoss)
4. Public comment.



The City of Traverse City

## Communication to the City Commission

---

FOR THE CITY COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING OF MARCH 8, 2010

DATE: MARCH 5, 2010

FROM: R. BEN BIFOSS, CITY MANAGER <sup>YDV</sup>

SUBJECT: CLOSED SESSION - *CITY V MDNR*

The City Attorney recommends the City Commission enter into closed session.

A Roll Call vote is required with *five* affirmative votes to enter closed session.

The following recommended motion would be appropriate to do so:

**that the City Commission enter into closed session immediately to consider the trial and settlement strategy in connection with *City of Traverse City v Michigan Department of Natural Resources*, (Grand Traverse County Circuit Court No. 08-26647-CE) and an attorney-client communication relating to it.**

k:\dcurtiss\communications\closedsession\_dnr



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE

MAR 04 2010

**CH2M HILL**

9193 S. Jamaica Street

Suite 400

Englewood, CO 80112

P.O. Box 6607

Englewood, CO 80155

Tel 303.740.0019

Fax 303.740.7061

March 3, 2010

R. Ben Bifoss  
City Manager  
City of Traverse City  
400 Boardman  
Traverse City MI 49684

Subject: Out-of-Scope Letter Agreement  
Project: Recoating of Screw Pump  
Agreement Dated July 1, 2007

Dear Mr. Bifoss:

As discussed and outlined below, CH2M HILL Operations Management International, Inc. ("CH2M HILL") proposes to provide screw pump body recoating services for the City of Traverse City ("City"). If the below out-of-scope services are acceptable, please indicate the City's approval. CH2M HILL will use the City's approval as authorization to proceed with this out-of-scope service.

**Project information:**

There are three screw pumps at the Traverse City Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant. These are 33 feet long, 4.5 feet in diameter, steel Archimedes screws, which raise primary effluent from the elevation of the primary clarifiers to the elevation of the aeration basins. These screw pumps operate in the harshest of environments at the plant. The protective coating is wearing off the pump bodies exposing steel to the corrosion-accelerating effects of wastewater and hydrogen sulfide-containing atmosphere. CH2M HILL recommends recoating of the existing three screw pumps.

In 2004, as part of the Traverse City Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant upgrade, CH2M HILL recoated the pump bodies using a coatings subcontractor working to specifications typical in the industry. For the current proposed out-of-scope services, CH2M HILL's corrosion specialists and engineers have prepared a more robust specification calling for a higher degree of preparation, more rigorous control of atmosphere and application conditions, more extensive testing during preparation and coating, and an additional coat of material.

- What is being provided:** Recoating of screw pump services:
- Provide detailed and stringent specifications for the sandblasting and coating of the three pump bodies.
  - Procure the services of the lowest cost qualified coatings applicier.
  - Mechanically remove the existing pump bodies and reinstall newly coated pump bodies with new bearings.
  - Transport pumps to and from the coatings facility.
  - Provide inspection during preparation and application.
- When it is being provided:** CH2M HILL will complete the project within one year of acceptance of this letter. CH2M HILL will complete the project in three stages as the City can only have one of the three units inoperable at a time.
- Price of services:** In accordance with Agreement Section 2.22, the services shall be performed for actual direct cost plus 13%. Direct cost means actual labor, labor related expenses, parts purchased, and outside services (subcontractor/vendor services) necessary to complete the project.
- Estimate of costs:** We estimate the out-of-scope service will cost approximately \$76,300. However, if this amount is determined to be insufficient, CH2M HIL will promptly inform the City, provide a revised amount, and seek the City's approval prior to proceeding.
- Payment terms:** CH2M HILL will invoice the City \$25,000 upon completion of the first pump and an additional \$25,000 upon completion of the second pump. After completion of the third pump, CH2M HILL will provide a summary of costs for the entire project and invoice for the remaining balance.

All other terms and conditions of the Agreement dated July 1, 2007 between CH2M HILL and the City remain in full force and effect.

If these terms are agreeable to you, please sign both copies of this letter. We will return one fully executed original for your files.

CH2M HILL appreciates the opportunity to provide these additional services to the City.

Sincerely,



Scott Blair  
Project Manager

R. Ben Bifoss  
Page 2  
March 3, 2010

Both parties indicate their approval of the above described services by their signature below.

Authorized:  
Operations Management International, Inc

Authorized:  
City of Traverse City

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Natalie Eldredge*  
*Vice President*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Chris Bisdok*  
*Traverse City Mayor*

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

---

# Memorandum

The City of Traverse City



---

TO: MAYOR & CITY COMMISSIONERS

FROM: R. BEN BIFOSS, CITY MANAGER

DATE: MARCH 5, 2010

SUBJECT: 2010 STREETS

The Planning Commission reviewed the 2010 Street Improvement Projects at its regular meeting of Wednesday, March 3, 2010. There was significant discussion, primarily focused on three of the projects including Hannah Avenue, Airport Access and Barlow Street. The questions related to whether curb and gutter, sidewalks, and bikeways were appropriate for these streets. The other eight projects were endorsed as presented.

The action by the Planning Commission was to recommend that all 11 projects proceed to bid letting and contracting with a provision that the above noted three projects could be deleted/deferred pending additional review and discussion by the Planning Commission at its April 7 meeting. Staff will be preparing additional information on these three projects.

The Planning Commission discussion revealed several disconnects between the Infrastructure Policy and the Master Plan as it relates to infrastructure. For example only, the Barlow Street Project is primarily within a TC-3 Neighborhood. The proposed project is to crush, shape and resurface the existing street at a cost estimated at \$60,000. If storm facilities, curb and gutter, sidewalks, and bikeways were added to the project, the cost of the project would increase by multiples of the current project.

If the project was full reconstruction, it is apparent that under the Infrastructure Policy these enhancements would be considered. However, the proposed project is basically a new asphalt surface; really a maintenance project. Having said that, it is also a longer term (7 – 15 year) fix. If the cost of sidewalk for this area is \$50,000, is this where that expenditure should be made or should the money be spent on a high pedestrian traffic area with deteriorated sidewalks?

The Master Plan suggests formal interconnected streets with curbs. Curbs require a storm sewer system that may or may not be present. Under the Infrastructure Policy, the cost of curb and gutter not required to control street drainage is a special assessment cost to the adjacent property owners. If the Planning Commission was to direct that curb and gutter be included but the adjacent property owners are not willing to participate in the cost, what is the outcome?

These two matters (the substantial cost increase that reduces the number of projects that could be accomplished and the special assessment issue) will require resolution. Fortunately, these questions do not necessarily require answers prior to bidding the 2010 projects.

Staff is currently working to develop a timeline for future projects that will allow adequate time to work through these issues. Some Planning Commission members have expressed a desire that the schedule be adopted as policy, at least in the short term, to allow flexibility to make modifications as we work through these issues.

While there are issues that need to be addressed, it is important to point out that these are good problems associated with expanded efforts to address an aging infrastructure.

---

# Memorandum

The City of Traverse City  
Engineering Department



---

TO: R Ben Bifoss, City Manager  
FROM: Timothy J. Lodge, City Engineer *TJ Lodge*  
DATE: Friday, February 26, 2010  
SUBJECT: 8<sup>th</sup> Street Reconstruction Project  
MDOT Project Number 87896A

This Memorandum is in response to your request to evaluate the current design for 8<sup>th</sup> Street to identify opportunities for refinements that we believe can fall within the current scope without affecting the funding status of the project.

## **Current Design**

First, the following is a brief review of the design elements for the different travel modes; vehicular; bicycles and pedestrians for the current design.

**Vehicular:** Vehicular traffic is served with two travel lanes and a center turn lane between Garfield and Rose Streets. The center turn lane was added to this commercial activity location in 2005 after conducting field observations and analysis to address traffic safety concerns of conflicts with turning vehicles. There are two travel lanes and parking on the south side between Rose and Barlow Streets. The design includes converting the westbound left turn lane between Barlow and Woodmere to a two way left turn lane to facilitate access to the businesses on the north side of the street and to match observed traffic behavior at Barlow Street.

**Bicycles:** Type A bicyclists are served by shared use travel lanes. Type A/B/C bicyclists are served by sidewalks for access to adjacent businesses and residences and alternate corridors within two to three blocks of 8<sup>th</sup> Street including the Crosstown Trail (Washington Street), the recreation trail (TART Trail), and Hannah Avenue.

**Pedestrians:** Pedestrians are served by 6' sidewalks on both sides of the street. Sidewalk repair including ADA compliant ramps will be included as part of the project. Standard 12" wide crosswalk markings are included in 15 locations. The existing 8' wide tree lawn buffer separating pedestrians and vehicular traffic will remain in place. The existing push button signal controls at the Rose and Garfield intersections will remain in place.

We have completed an illustration demonstrating these elements and placed this on the City's website. A plot version is displayed in the Engineering Department.

## **Design Refinements**

Second, in our February 4, 2010 Memorandum we outlined several refinements that we believe can fall within the current project scope without affecting the funding status of the project. These are further refined as follows:

- Add "Share the Street" signage for shared use (\$1,200 City Cost)
- Add "Pedestrian Crossing" signage at Grant Street (\$300 City Cost)
- Provide enhanced crosswalk marking at signal controlled intersections including;
  - Special Emphasis Marking (Add \$3,000 City Cost)
  - Patterned Concrete (Add \$4,000 per each crosswalk, \$48,000 City Cost)
  - Brick (Add \$5,000 per each crosswalk, \$60,000 City Cost)
- Add shoulder lane marking 4' from the north curb line for the portion between Rose and Barlow Streets resulting in a cross section with an 8' parking lane, two 12' travel lanes and the 4' shoulder for a 36' total width. This shoulder marking currently exists and should be part of the project. The omission of this line on the final plans was an oversight on my part.
- Eliminate recessing the pavement marking. Re-evaluate the pavement marking plan for traffic, bicycle and pedestrian safety during the next 18 to 24 months including quantifying non-motorized use of the route.
- Strengthen route signage and public awareness for type B/C bikers to use the Crosstown Trail (Washington Street), the Recreation trail, or Hannah Avenue.
- A "Shared Lane Marking" is identified with the recent release of the National Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), and may be suitable for this location. We have attached the information from the 2009 Manual for your reference. We may not be able to use this within the current project as Michigan has not adopted the new version of the MUTCD yet.

Also, we discussed that additional street trees may be planted through the City's Urban Forestry Program after the project is completed. We have completed an illustration demonstrating these refinements and placed this on the City's website. A plot version is displayed in the Engineering Department. These refinements to the existing design will require approval from MDOT before they can be implemented. Please indicate if we should continue to pursue these enhancements.

## **Other Considerations**

In addition to the above refinements we examined flaring the intersection at Rose Street for 150' in each direction as shown on the TART Concept. The flaring will require relocating the existing traffic signal poles and grading to limits outside of the existing right of way. We understand that refinements that extend beyond the existing right of way will not be allowed at this time.