

Mall evokes mixed reviews before DNR

By Pat Murphy
staff writer

Developers of the proposed Auburn Mills megamall ignored other, more feasible sites before deciding to build the super shopping center at I-75 and Baldwin Road in Auburn Hills, according to a consultant for one of the Oakland cities trying to block the development.

Thus the Western Development Corp. of Washington, D.C., should be required to evaluate — and possibly select — another site before destroying wetlands and accelerating urban sprawl by building the 1.9 million square foot mall, according to Brandon M. Rogers, a consultant to the city of Lake Angeles which borders the proposed development.

Rogers was one of about 40 people who spoke at a public hearing called by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Tuesday night at Avondale High School. About 250 people attended.

The DNR is gathering information to determine if the proposed megamall complies with requirements of state wetlands laws. It also is gathering information on other "feasible and prudent" sites be evaluated before developers are allowed to disrupt wetlands.

TUESDAY'S HEARING was called to gather information that will be evaluated before the DNR grants, denies or modifies the permit requested by Western Development, said Steve G. Sadewasser, a resource specialist. The DNR decision is expected within 90 days.

The Auburn Hills site contains about 39 acres of wetlands, 18 of which would be destroyed or affected by the development.

Western Development said it will create 25 acres of new wetlands — to replace those wetlands — and devote more than 100 acres to high quality wetland habitat and storm water management.

Opponents, however, argue that wetlands can not be adequately "created" because they involve wildlife and vegetation. They also argue that traffic generated by the megamall would contribute to air pollution and congestion.

Some speakers, including County Commissioner Hubert Price, D-Fenton, argued for the megamall, saying it would create much-needed jobs for displaced autoworkers and would generate an estimated \$5 million in tax revenue for the financially-strapped Pontiac School District.

"We need Auburn Mills to provide

Will commission support center?

By Pat Murphy
staff writer

Oakland's fledgling Open Housing Center still has an outside chance of winning support from the Oakland County Board of Commissioners, an endorsement the center has sought, but been unable to get.

An amendment supporting the concept of fair and open housing in general and the Open Housing Center specifically — was approved by the board's General Government Committee Monday afternoon.

By a 4-3 vote, committee members approved the amendment that now goes to the entire Board of Commissioners at its April 26 meeting beginning at 7:30 p.m.

The Open Housing Center opened March 13 in Farmington Hills to promote integrated housing in Oakland County. It is funded by an \$80,000 grant from the City of Southfield and the Southfield Board of Education, but will solicit support from the private and public sectors in subsequent years, according to directors.

It is seeking an endorsement from the Board of Commissioners to help with that solicitation as well as a symbolic vote of confidence.

SO FAR, however, commissioners have refused to endorse the center, sending it back to committee twice.

Commissioner John Pappageorge, for example, voted against endorsing the Open Housing Center when it appeared before another committee, saying he wasn't sure what the endorsement would require, or how it might affect future board action.

Pappageorge, a Troy Republican, said he supports fair and open housing, but not an endorsement that would subsequently obligate the county for money or would preclude the board's endorsing other agencies that promote integrated housing.

Supporters of the Open Housing Center, like commissioner Lillian Jaffe Oaks, D-Southfield, insist endorsing the center would not necessarily obligate the board, or tie its hands.

"(It endorsement) would put the board on record as supporting the

'The proposed megamall in Auburn Hills simply doesn't make sense. It would destroy the rural character of northern Oakland County.'

— Brandon M. Rogers,
land use consultant

job opportunities for the younger generation," said Debra Strickland, a Pontiac businessperson who argued on behalf of the mall.

ANOTHER PROPOSER, Dennis Griffin, chairman of the Auburn Hills Planning Commission, said Western Development has been cooperative and forthright in its dealings and, presumably, could be trusted to live up to its guarantees to protect the environment.

Rogers, however, said the megamall is the wrong development in the wrong place.

"I've been a land use consultant for many communities," he said, and the proposed megamall in Auburn Hills simply doesn't make sense. It would destroy the rural character of northern Oakland County.

"I personally inspected many of the sites" Western Development said it considered before deciding on the Auburn Hills location, said Rogers. He charged that the company overlooked other sites on which the megamall could be built without destroying wetlands or disrupting traffic.

Sites along I-275 in Van Buren and Canton townships are just as suited and "make good economic sense," said Rogers.

The consultant warned the giant mall would have a much greater impact on northern Oakland County than developers or planners envision, and cited the Twelve Oaks Mall in Novi as an example.

TWELVE OAKS was expected to generate 1.2 million square feet of business development when it was planned more than a decade ago, Rogers said.

What was not expected, he said, was the 1.9 million in additional business development that occurred as other businesses moved into the hot shopping area.

"We can expect the impact of this megamall to be much greater than we recently anticipated," Rogers cautioned.

So far commissioners have refused to endorse the Open Housing Center, sending it back to committee twice.

Open Housing Center and the work it's doing to promote integrated housing," said Oaks.

The committee resolution approved Monday states the Board of Commissioners "supports the concept of the Oakland County Center for Open Housing to build community understanding and support fair and open housing, and to achieve a stable and integrated housing process in Oakland County, and urges other communities within Oakland County to adopt resolutions of support for the Oakland County Center for Open Housing."

APPROVING THE measure were Ruel E. McPherson, D-Hazel Park, Donald E. Blahop, R-Rochester, Richard M. Aaron, D-Oak Park and Richard G. Skarritt, R-Milford. Opposing it were Donald W. Jensen, R-Birmingham, Donna R. Huntoon, R-Clarkston, and Don L. Wolf, R-Farmington Hills.

Jensen said he opposes the measure for philosophical reasons. The center is a new organization with no track record, he said. "I think they should accomplish something before we (commissioners) endorse it."

"Furthermore, I don't think we should single out any organization for endorsement when there are many others with the same goals."

Commissioner Oaks is not a member of the committee, but attended Monday's meeting because of her support for the center.

"This was a hollow victory," she said, "but a victory nonetheless."

Oaks predicted an uphill struggle for the measure before the Board of Commissioners, which has already declined to endorse the Open Housing Center specifically.

By Pat Murphy
staff writer

Hoping to make its proceedings more open accessible to county residents, the Oakland County Board of Commissioners has scheduled an evening meeting for later this month.

The board's annual night meeting will be at 7:30 p.m. Thursday, April 26, in the county auditorium at 1200 Telegraph Road in Pontiac.

Regular board meetings are usually held at 9:30 a.m. twice each month. The annual night meeting is a means of confirming the board's contention that attendance is not affected by the time for which meetings are scheduled.

The board generally has about 50 to 75 people at meetings, including those representing companies doing business with the county as well as county staff personnel who may be needed to provide information about a specific issue.

Prosecutor Richard Thompson, for example, attended the April 5 meeting when commissioners approved his request for \$75,000 to fund Oakland County's grand juries.

Commission meetings also attract critics — like John King of Bloomfield Township, who is critical of the grand jury among other things, and Susan Mysliwiec, of Highland, an opponent of the county's solid waste plan, particularly the incinerator proposed for Auburn Hills.

Generally, attendance at night meetings has been at the same level or slightly less than, morning sessions.

This month's night meeting may be an exception, however, because commissioners are expected to vote on the proposed \$470 million solid waste program that includes a controversial waste-to-energy incinerator in Auburn Hills.

Turnout could be substantial — and vocal — because it is one of the last times commissioners will deal with the program that includes recycling, composting, incineration and the use of existing landfills, including private facilities as well as the expanded SOCRRA landfill in Rochester Hills.

Generally, attendance at night meetings has been at the same level or slightly less than, morning sessions.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

Prime time

Trash plan vote due at evening session

ings are scheduled.

The board generally has about 50 to 75 people at meetings, including those representing companies doing business with the county as well as county staff personnel who may be needed to provide information about a specific issue.

Prosecutor Richard Thompson, for example, attended the April 5 meeting when commissioners approved his request for \$75,000 to fund Oakland County's grand juries.

Commission meetings also attract critics — like John King of Bloomfield Township, who is critical of the grand jury among other things, and Susan Mysliwiec, of Highland, an opponent of the county's solid waste plan, particularly the incinerator proposed for Auburn Hills.

Generally, attendance at night meetings has been at the same level or slightly less than, morning sessions.

This month's night meeting may be an exception, however, because commissioners are expected to vote on the proposed \$470 million solid waste program that includes a controversial waste-to-energy incinerator in Auburn Hills.

Turnout could be substantial — and vocal — because it is one of the last times commissioners will deal with the program that includes recycling, composting, incineration and the use of existing landfills, including private facilities as well as the expanded SOCRRA landfill in Rochester Hills.

Generally, attendance at night meetings has been at the same level or slightly less than, morning sessions.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Having the solid waste program on the agenda has guaranteed large audiences in the past and is expected to attract another near-capacity crowd.

The method of funding has also been challenged by one group, Taxpayers United, which contends the county must go to the voters to get financing approval for the solid waste program.

Thursday, April 12, 1990 O&E

(OJSA)

SOCRRA incinerator costs jump

By Pat Murphy
staff writer

The waste-to-energy that serves 14 communities in southeast part of the county will cost about \$35 million more than anticipated, members of the Southeast Oakland County Resource Recovery Authority (SOCRRA) have been informed.

The additional cost will require the authority to again hold public hearings to discuss the higher cost but will not significantly affect tipping fees, the general manager of SOCRRA told its directors Wednesday.

"We still anticipate tipping fees to be under \$50 per ton," Thomas G. Waffin said Wednesday at a regular meeting of SOCRRA directors.

Waffin said additional costs are admittedly a setback, "but nothing real serious. When you put something like this together, unexpected things happen."

Waffin said he expects the 600-ton-per-day incinerator to be built and operational in 1993-94, or about a year later than anticipated.

THE INCINERATOR — which initially did not generate electricity — is the major component of the

system that since the mid 1950s has been handling solid waste for Berkley, Beverly Hills, Birmingham, Clawson, Hazel Park, Farmdale, Huntington Woods, Lathrup Village, Madison Heights, Oak Park, Pleasant Ridge, Royal Oak, Royal Oak Township and Troy.

It was shut down in July, 1988, however, after state officials ruled emissions did not meet air quality standards. Officials hoped to reopen the facility after upgrading pollution control equipment and converting it to a facility that also generates electricity.

Several factors are responsible

for the incinerator costing \$35 million more than expected, Waffin said.

The biggest two, he said, are tougher emission control requirements and SOCRRA's decision to finance the project by itself rather than through a partnership with engineering consultants Black & Veatch of Ann Arbor and the Detroit Edison Co., which will also buy electricity generated by the incinerator.

SOCRRA's application to operate the incinerator is still pending before the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR).

Samsara, a new and rare fragrance

In Sanskrit, the word Samsara means "eternal rebirth" which sums up your innermost feelings about spring, life and other recurrent renewals. Samsara is a fragrance wrapped in the mystery of the Far East. A rich scent blending jasmine and sandalwood, it will impart to you a sense of serenity, and a timeless appreciation for harmony and beauty. The graceful flacon that contains Samsara was designed by Robert Greni. The collection, from \$40 to \$195. Fine Fragrances.

HUDSON'S

USE YOUR HUDSON'S SHOPPING CARD, VISA® MASTERCARD®, THE AMERICAN EXPRESS® CARD OR DISCOVER® CARD. HUDSON'S OPEN MON.-SAT. 10-6; OPEN SUNDAY 12-6.