



Rochester Hills

Minutes - Draft

Brownfield Redevelopment Authority

1000 Rochester Hills Dr
Rochester Hills, MI
48309
(248) 656-4600
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

Chairperson Thomas Turnbull
Vice-Chairperson Robert Justin
Members: Werner Richard Braun III, James Nachtman,
Mark Sera, Del Stanley
Council Member Ryan Deel

Tuesday, April 10, 2018

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Thomas Turnbull called the Special Brownfield Redevelopment Authority meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. in the Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present 4 - Del Stanley, Thomas Turnbull, Robert Justin and Werner Richard Braun III

Excused 3 - Mark Sera, James Nachtman and Ryan Deel

Quorum present.

Also present: Sara Roediger, Director of Planning & Economic Dev.
Joe Snyder, CFO, Director of Treasury
John Staran, City Attorney
Laurie Taylor, Director of Assessing
Tom Wackerman, President of ASTI Environmental
Maureen Gentry, Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2018-0124](#) March 6, 2018 Special Meeting

A motion was made by Justin, seconded by Stanley, that this matter be Approved as Presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 4 - Stanley, Turnbull, Justin and Braun III

Excused 3 - Sera, Nachtman and Deel

COMMUNICATIONS

There were no Communications presented to the BRA board.

NEW BUSINESS

2018-0130

Request for approval of a Brownfield Plan for Legacy of Rochester Hills, City file No. 17-043, for the remediation of property for a proposed residential apartment development on 28 acres located at the northeast corner of Hamlin and Adams, zoned by Consent Judgment, Parcel Nos. 15-29-101-022 and -023, Goldberg Companies, Applicant

Ms. Roediger stated that the subject request had come before the BRA board on March 6, 2018. It was recommended for approval to City Council. Before it went to the City Council meeting, it was discovered that there was some outdated and missing information. In particular, the City was looking for a five-year Internal Rate of Return (IRR) and justification for the interest being requested. For that reason, the topic was pulled from the March 12th City Council meeting with a request for more information, which the applicant had provided. At the City Council meeting the previous evening (April 9th), a Public Hearing was scheduled for the April 23, 2018 meeting, pending a decision by the BRA about the Plan. Since the packet was sent out a week earlier, staff had continued to work with the applicant in fine tuning and reviewing the information submitted. She introduced Laurie Taylor, the City's Director of Assessing and Joe Snyder, the City's CFO. The whole team, with input from John Staran, City Attorney and Tom Wackerman, the environmental consultant from ASTI reviewed the numbers. As a result, supplemental information was submitted. The new Plan tweaked some of the numbers the City had some concerns with. The updated information resulted in a reduction in the total reimbursement costs, a shortened repayment period and less interest paid in total. She noted that the Plan was the same as from March 6 in terms of the environmental cleanup, but it was better in terms of the fiscal impact to the City. She had also included a draft Act 381 Work Plan. That was included as a reference, and it had been reviewed by Mr. Wackerman. The Work Plan was included so the members could consider the entire environmental cleanup, but it would actually be forwarded on to the DEQ by staff and was not included for any type of approval. It was an ongoing working document. She referenced Mr. Wackerman's memo, in which he had asked questions and raised points. The applicant had responded and submitted an updated Work Plan which was not reviewed yet, but it was something for staff to work out and submit to the DEQ.

Ms. Roediger advised that the BRA's role regarded the funding incentives associated with the cleanup required for the property. Any action taken would be a recommendation to City Council, which ultimately had the final say in how much interest was granted and what the terms of the Plan would entail. There had been questions from the public related to the

cleanup methods, the physical development, impact on traffic and things of that nature. While those were very important questions, they were more appropriate for the Planning Commission and City Council as part of a site plan and Consent Judgment review. The BRA was being asked to evaluate the project and the financial need for the incentives and the requested interest as an eligible expense. The Brownfield Policy stated that interest was not considered by default an eligible expense, however, the BRA could make a recommendation based on circumstances that they believed it was warranted. It was the applicant's job to indicate why interest was needed in this case.

Mr. Seth Mendelsohn, Goldberg Properties, introduced Tony Anthony and Bret Stuntz from AKT Peerless, their environmental consultants. He stated that they had a lot of experience and a tremendous amount of experience with the subject property. He introduced Arthur Siegal, who was an attorney from Jaffe, Raitt, Hever & Weiss who worked specifically in environmental law.

Mr. Stuntz said that they had worked with the City and the developer on the Plan. He said that there were activities that would be conducted and revenue would be generated to reimburse those activities. Nothing about what was intended to be done with the site had changed. They worked with the City to coordinate the numbers. When they did the first cut at the reimbursement schedule, it was based on a \$15 million taxable value, which was based on comps for the nearest development. With the proforma and income based analysis done to look at the valuation of the property with an income approach, it yielded about \$20 million taxable value. That meant that the property would generate more taxes, and each year the increment would be higher to reimburse the eligible activities. Instead of being reimbursed over 21 years, the \$9.6 million of eligible activities would now be over 17-18 years. There was a small change in the annual inflation factor from 2.1% to 2%. Because it would be a shorter reimbursement period, the simple interest calculation went down. The overall dollar amount in the Plan was lower, because eligible activities stayed the same, but the interest went down from \$4.5 million to \$3.8 million. That was really all that had changed.

Ms. Taylor said that she was asked to review the income statement and the capitalization of the income in determining what the estimate of taxable value might be in a "crystal ball" type of view. They talked with the applicant and discussed what the potential gross income might be by reflecting the market rents and applying the vacancy and bad debt percentage. In the original application and the income statement, the

real estate taxes were included in the expenses, and it was more appropriate to put an effective tax rate in with the capitalization rate to calculate the net operating income. It took the taxes out of the expense, and the net operating income was then capitalized. They came up with a value of almost \$40 million, and they were very comfortable that they would be able to assess at that value. It could possibly be higher, but she would rather value it as it existed. They were very confident that the \$40 million was obtainable.

Mr. Snyder said that once there was a taxable value assigned, his job became quite easy. He just dumped in the numbers. They worked with the applicant and let him know what the approximate tax bill would be and how they came to that. They all agreed it was reasonable and defensible. They bumped up the taxable value from \$15 million to \$20 million, which would speed up the timeline on the tax capture. In the prior example, they had year one as 2019 as the first time the tax capture would start flowing in, but it would be pushed off one year to 2020. The tax values for 2019 had been established. They had to shift everything out one year until the recapture cycle started flowing in. They had all gone over everything, and they were all on the same page with the financial situation.

Ms. Roediger asked the applicants to talk about their justification for the 5% interest. Mr. Mendelsohn said that it was his understanding that interest was very common throughout the state, especially in projects such as this. In Rochester Hills, they needed to demonstrate a funding gap. They were dealing with a very contaminated site on two parcels that they would clean up. Parcel A was slightly contaminated and for that, there would be a full cleanup to residential standards, and they would acquire a No Further Action (NFA) letter from the MDEQ. Parcel B would never be used for any value but as a commitment they had made, there would still be a pretty extensive cleanup. They would remove some soils and also encapsulate the property, which was very expensive. He pointed out that a while back, the State of Michigan came in and started to clean the site and spent about \$5 million and ran out of funds. When they were dealing with something so expensive and going to use the land for the apartments, it created a very significant funding gap. When they discussed the project with the City, they kept talking about how skinny the deal was and how difficult it was to make a minimum IRR. They used Key Bank as a lender on all their projects, and their company had been around for 65 years. The Bank had been involved in hearing about the cleanup for over a year. They would be extremely comfortable once the NFA was obtained and the cleanup was done. They were not lending on the cleanup activities. That was part of the financing gap. Because the

developer would be spending a lot of extra money without having a loan, the project would fall far below any kind of IRR hurdles that anyone had. They would be lending money for the project, and they needed some sort of interest to be able to clear the IRR hurdles. They were just meeting their threshold at the 5% and with some of the changes the City made and some they had agreed to as well.

Mr. Siegal noted that the City's Policy stated that interest was not automatically approved. It was an eligible expense under the Michigan law that authorized the BRA and Brownfield Plans. Every community made its own determination, and the vast majority of communities in southeast Michigan that he had been involved with had approved interest. The State would also approve it at a 5% simple rate. The City's Policy stated that interest might be approved in order to cover a financing gap, and there were a couple of gaps for them. The first was that the lender was not making a loan to fund the cleanup work. That was a very tangible gap. The developer would front the money and take the risk on the return that the project would be completed timely. They would not be able to finance that money, so there was a carrying cost for those funds that would make interest appropriate. They felt that it was exactly the situation that the Policy addressed. The west parcel would be redeveloped with apartments, and the east parcel would be left as a green space and not redeveloped. It would be capped, which meant that there would be digging all the way around it, putting in an impervious layer and covering it on top and putting in systems to make sure there was no methane buildup, and those sorts of things. It was a complex and very expensive system. Out of the \$9.6 million of the remedial expense, which did not include the interest or a number of other expenses, well over 50% would be for the east parcel. Mr. Stuntz added that it was atypical from the normal brownfield project where the brownfield activities that were included actually went toward a development. The east parcel would be an additional lift for the project at a substantial cost that would not generate any sort of cash like a typical brownfield would.

Mr. Siegal maintained that it would safeguard the community and the development and the City's park system, and it would address a situation that had been left unaddressed for over 30 years. It did create an economic hardship, but they felt that the Policy wanted to prevent the problem of a development not happening. Without the interest to support the cost of the work, there was no guarantee that the project could go forward, and he believed that the project would be nonviable due to the economics and the property would sit for another 30 years.

Mr. Mendelsohn did not think it would sit; he thought that it would be developed as the original Brownfield Plan had intended with retail. He noted that when they were last before the BRA, the interest was in the Plan. Nothing had been added, and some of the interest had actually been deducted based on the City's expected valuation. He was grateful that Ms. Taylor helped them with that. It was always a big question mark with a new development. He reiterated that interest was always in the Plan. At the last meeting, there were no questions about the interest, and if there had been, they would have been prepared to discuss it at that time. Mr. Siegal advised that the reduction in the interest number was about \$700,000 from last month.

Mr. Justin asked how long it would take from start to getting people into the apartments. Mr. Mendelsohn said that a lot of it would depend on seasonality to start construction. One fear they had was that the window to start the cleanup was starting, and it involved a lot of dirt work. That would be done in the spring, summer and fall. They hoped to be able to start this summer and over the winter, while they were waiting for the NFA letter, they would not be able to work the regular construction, but they would start again the following year at the same time on the building pads, etc. From that point, it usually took two years to build a community. One year in, they already had residents moving in. Two years in, it would be completely done. Mr. Siegal asked if there would be residents sometime in 2020, and Mr. Mendelsohn agreed, if they were able to start in the spring of 2018.

Mr. Braun asked the applicants if they could describe the capping further on Parcel B. Mr. Anthony said that there would be a petroleum based liner that was used in landfills. It would be rolled out in sheets. The sheets would be seamed together and it would be anchored around the perimeter. Above the liner, there would be sand and top soil, and a grass vegetation would be planted on top of that. Part of the maintenance was to not allow anything but grass to grow there.

Mr. Justin asked the life of a liner. Mr. Anthony said that the manufacturer put it at 50 years. The liners were used in landfills every day. The EPA determined that once a landfill was closed, operations maintenance was required for 30 years. At the 30-year period, they felt that no further work would be needed. That was a regulatory limit by Congress. The guarantees were generally beyond what the regulatory limits were or the expectation of the life of a landfill post closure.

Mr. Justin asked if there were any landfills that had been closed and gone

50 years. He wondered what kind of experiences there were with those. Mr. Anthony said that he used to live in South Lyon, and there was the old BFI landfill in New Hudson. That was covered, and there were city parks and ball diamonds now, and there was residential property nearby. That had been really well incorporated into a useful benefit to the community.

Chairperson Turnbull opened the discussion to the public and called the first speaker.

Ed Baron, 3310 Greenspring Lane, Rochester Hills, MI 48309 Mr. Baron stated that he was a former Planning Commissioner and City Council member. He was the environmental chairman of the Quail Ridge Homeowner's Association. His members asked him to bring some questions. He stated that Mr. Mendelsohn was very fortunate. The land was the gateway to the Oakland Technology Park. It was the gateway to Chrysler Corporation. The philosophy at the time was that they would create the jobs in Auburn Hills and the residential would be in Rochester Hills. He was there in 2006 when Nino Homes was going to build. They had five bulldozers to do the land balancing. They started hitting barrels that were contaminated and rusty. The operators stopped the equipment, jumped off and ran. It had been shut down completely since then. Nino Homes did not see it coming. The Mayor mentioned that there was two types of developments available - one for the apartments and the other for retail/office. He said that he would appreciate it if the applicant could tell him if that was correct and what he favored. He asked if the applicant would use the Oakland County 2017 EPA Site Assessment Grant. He asked if Mr. Staran and Mr. Wackerman could share whether all the t's were crossed and the i's were dotted so when it went to Council it would not return back to the BRA.

Lawrence Schloss, 2851 Current Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48309 Mr. Schloss asked about the history of the applicant and or the owner. He wondered if they had a history with the type of project they were discussing. He asked if there would be insurance involved to protect against human liability should there be an occurrence. He asked the most current environmental evaluation. He said that he could not find a thorough evaluation of the property. He knew what the intentions were for Parcel B. He said that he did not think the Plan was adequate. He said that he was a lawyer and he went over things carefully. He wondered what methodology was used to make such huge, enormous decisions. He said that when a jury was instructed, they were given instructions on how to decide a case. He was not an expert, but he was about 200 yards north of the hot zones, and he was not impressed with the information to make

such a weighty decision.

Christine Weglarz, 3136 Greenspring Lane, Rochester Hills, MI 48309

Ms. Weglarz said that she had two issues. She was really disappointed in the City for how they let the homeowners in the area know about what was going on and it being cancelled from the last Council agenda. She had been told that it was pretty much a done deal. She had emailed and left messages for her representative, with no return call. She was very worried about the cleanup of the area. She felt that it was being pushed through. There was already a start date. She had not seen any paperwork for how it would be done or evaluations of the soil. She asked how it would be contained especially in the summer months with homeowners so close. Kids with asthma was an issue at Freedom Hill. When they tried to remove dirt years and years ago, it was capped and they were able to use it. That was put in a subdivision, and there were a lot of issues when she and her parents lived in Sterling Heights. People had tried to clean the area before with people not knowing what was going on when they went in there. The State and other builders tried, and the funding was not there. She was worried about what would happen if they started, and it was more than they expected, and it was left for the City again. She was worried about health and who would be maintaining air quality. She was worried about the traffic flow. They were talking about three years of construction at that corner, and the traffic could not handle it. She would like to see what the plan was. As a resident of Rochester Hills for 15 years, she could not get any information, and she said that she would like to see it. She said that she was very disappointed in how fast it was going through without enough of the details not being done. She said that people said the project had to be four-story apartments or there would be a 24-hour CVS on the corner, and she thought that was railroading the residents. She knew the area would be developed, and she knew it was contaminated, but being threatened that if the City did not say yes to the project there would be a 24-hour CVS was not the best way for the City to handle it with the residents. She believed that it was not the best thing for Rochester - building a four-story apartment complex on the corner. She felt that it would set a precedent for other residential areas. She stated that she was against the project, and she was not thrilled with the soil remediation. She had seen capping before to be used for retail only, and she thought that maybe it should be looked at.

Deanna Hilbert, 3234 Quail Ridge Circle, Rochester Hills, MI 48309

Ms. Hilbert echoed the concern with the notification. The City had been talking about the project for a year, but a lot of the residents just found out about it a month or two ago. There was little chance for them to

understand what was going on and to have input. It was a done deal, but that was the way things had been done in the past, so it did not surprise her. Years ago, she talked to the MDEQ about the landfill to the south. She was told that every load of dirt removed would be tested. If it tested at a toxic level or if it had to go to a different landfill, the price could go up. She wondered if there was a limit on what could be spent for the cleanup and removing the soil. She wondered if they still tested every load removed.

Chairman Turnbull closed the public comments at 7:45 p.m. He asked Mr. Mendelsohn if he would like to respond.

Mr. Mendelsohn said that they definitely appreciated the site. It was a great gateway. They appreciated the entire community as well. That was why they were very excited about the project. Someone asked about apartments versus retail. He said that there was currently a Brownfield Plan that had been approved for retail ten years ago. There was a lot more interest for residential and maintaining the character of the neighborhoods, and that was why they worked very hard to try to figure out how to make that cost effective. With retail, there would be significantly less cleanup, and it would bring a lot more traffic. There was a question about grant money, and that was something they would definitely look into. As far as having the skills for the project, he felt that they had the best possible team they could imagine. Not only did they have AKT and Mr. Siegal, they have had a tremendous amount of input from ASTI. Between those two environmental firms, he felt that it would be hard to find a better team. It had been very important for them, because some of the later questions got into the cost. There had been extensive testing, and that would be some of the first work they would do. They wanted to make sure they were getting the right areas and to make sure that the costs could not get out of hand. They were comfortable with the two teams of experts and with the testing they did to make sure that the costs would not get out of hand, and that they would be able to complete the project. There would be insurance. Their goal for Parcel B was to keep it as an open space. Per the Consent Judgment, they would want to keep it as a conservation easement. Had the retail plan gone through, there would have been parking and buildings. They thought it would be much nicer for the community. There were some questions about the cleanup, and a lot of those were addressed in the Plan. He stated that it was a very thorough Plan. Regarding the timeframe and moving fast, they met with the neighbors adjacent to the site about three months ago. They had taken significant input from the City. There was nothing being done rashly. It was one of the most thought out and deliberate projects he had

seen. He was very impressed working with the City and to have the Assessor look at the numbers before a project even started. He concluded that it was difficult and professional.

Mr. Siegal stated that it was not the last step in the process. It was the beginning of the end of the process. The BRA had to make a determination as to whether or not the Plan would be recommended for approval. City Council would have to act on that. There was already in place an existing Consent Judgment with a prior developer that would need to be amended. There would have to be site plan approvals also. The Plan before them was not a full blown plan for remediation of the site. It reflected their best thinking, and there would be additional delineation work to help focus the remediation to make sure the shovels in the ground were in at the right depth and location. They wanted it to be done right the first time. The purpose of the Brownfield Plan was to lay out the anticipated expenses to the best of the developer's and the City's knowledge. It had been a team effort. It had not been a fast process by any means. It had taken over a year, and it had been an exhaustive process. They appreciated the City's expertise in making sure they had all the i's dotted and all the t's crossed. The BRA would decide whether the costs were reasonable, appropriate and eligible for reimbursement. They would be working with the DEQ to get an NFA letter when the west parcel was remediated. They would work with the DEQ and the City on developing a due care plan for the construction and for the maintenance of the capped area long-term. It was a long-term commitment. He stated that it was not a done deal. If the BRA did not approve it, the project could not go forward, because the economics would not work. There was an existing Consent Judgment with the current owner. If the proposed project did not happen, it was likely that the previously proposed project, which was a lesser cleanup, would. It would not be residential; it would be retail and office. Regarding the process for the development, that issue would be dealt with by the DEQ and the City. It was clear in the Plan that they would provide a series of plans including plans relating to soil and dust control to ensure that the residents were not negatively impacted. That would be shared with the City to allow them to comment. He wanted them to know that if the Plan was approved, they could not just put shovels in the ground tomorrow.

Ms. Roediger said that in the past year, the Planning Department had been consciously trying to increase public awareness of projects. There was a State mandate for any public hearing, which included a 300-foot mailing. The City did not stop at that. Staff made an effort to reach beyond that. Any time the topic had come up, staff provided mailings to

the homes within 300 feet and also to the Homeowner's Associations. They met with the 13 property owners that abutted the subject site in early January. They put up a sign on the property. An Ordinance was created to require Rezoning or Conditional Use requests to have signs on those properties. The subject site was neither of those, but staff felt that since it was such a large project, that it would be helpful to make the public driving by aware as well. In addition, there was an interactive development map on the City's website which had all of the proposed and approved projects. People could go in and see plans and elevations at any time. There was a Notify Me email list developed where notifications of meetings were sent to anyone who signed up. Staff was trying to go above and beyond what traditionally had been done in the City. They wanted to be at the forefront in notifying neighbors through technology. The City had been working with Mr. Wackerman for over a year, because the property was unique, and it involved a Brownfield Plan and a Consent Judgment. The existing Consent Judgment had a level of detail relating to brownfield cleanup that was more detailed than normally found in a Consent Judgment.

Mr. Wackerman said that the Brownfield Plan and the 381 Work Plan for the project went way beyond what was typically required. That was primarily because of the City's concern about the site and because of the existing Consent Judgment and all of the things that required additional plans and monitoring and stewardship of the process. He did not think it was the beginning of the end; it was the first step. He felt that the citizens needed to realize that if they had not heard anything about it was because it was at the first step. He explained that the first step was the Brownfield Plan, the next step was the 381 Work Plan, the next step was more sampling, the next step was getting approval for the design, and on and on. He listed about 11 of them in his memo (on file). There would be a lot of opportunity to discuss and make sure the details really would work. He knew they were still looking at design alternatives for the slurry wall and the cap. He said that it would be a better cleanup, but the most important thing was that the process now required DEQ approval. The previous Brownfield Plan and Consent Judgment did not. The applicant would get approval for a NFA letter for Parcel A and a documentation of due care plan for B, and those were critical to the City because that meant that the DEQ, the experts, would be involved from day one. He felt that was a major improvement in terms of improving the environmental quality on the site. Someone mentioned sampling every truck that left a site. He said that was one way to do it, but there was extensive environmental information on the property. They wanted to have enough information to manage the soils and do proper disposal. When it was done, there would

have to be confirmation sampling to prove that they had done what they said. There would be all kinds of checks and balances to make the project significantly better than the previous.

Mr. Staran felt that Mr. Wackerman covered it well. He agreed that there would be a much higher level of cleanup, and there would be an additional, important agency involved. There was much more detail regarding the specifics of the cleanup under the original Consent Judgment. The current Consent Judgment would have the same level of involvement and approval level. They had to spell out some of the particulars because previously, there would have been a commercial level cleanup. What was now proposed was a residential cleanup, the highest standard, with an NFA. The applicant would be required, before they moved forward with occupying the buildings, to have that NFA letter issued by the MDEQ. That was the golden certificate that the property had been cleaned up to the highest level. The things being taken out of the proposed Consent Judgment were not a downgrade - it was quite the opposite.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Justin moved the following, seconded by Mr. Turnbull:

MOTION by Justin, seconded by Turnbull, in the matter of City File No. 17-043, the Brownfield Redevelopment Authority recommends that City Council approves the Brownfield Plan dated February 20, 2018 for Legacy of Rochester Hills, as amended Parcel Nos. 15-29-101-022 and -023 with the following seven (7) findings and subject to the following three (3) conditions:

Findings

- 1. The submitted plan meets the requirements for a Brownfield Plan under State Act 381 and the City of Rochester Hills.*
- 2. The subject parcels qualify as a "facility" under the terms of Act 381.*
- 3. The submitted plan qualifies for the use of tax increment financing based on the policies and goals of the Brownfield Redevelopment Authority.*
- 4. If implemented, the amount, pay-back period and use of tax increment financing is reasonable for the eligible activities proposed.*
- 5. The submitted Internal Rate of Return (IRR) evaluation supports*

the need for the requested incentive.

6. *The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed project requires a 5% interest capture to succeed.*
7. *The extreme circumstances associated with this site's history and the desire of the City to use this site for residential purposes have increased the cost of environmental cleanup. Therefore, the City finds that the requested interest cost is considered an eligible and appropriate activity in this case.*

Conditions

1. *A reimbursement agreement shall be negotiated between the City and the applicant prior to any TIF monies being paid out for eligible activities. The reimbursement agreement and the Brownfield Plan will dictate the total cost of eligible activities subject to payment, provided that the total cost of eligible activities subject to payment or reimbursement under the reimbursement agreement shall not exceed the estimated costs set forth in the Brownfield Plan by more than 15% without requiring an amendment to the Brownfield Plan.*
2. *That if the extent of due care activities related to the subject site is altered or revised due to a change in the proposed development plans or proposed use of the site, the applicant shall submit for an amended Brownfield Plan to the Brownfield Redevelopment Authority.*
3. *Items to be addressed in the memos from ASTI Environmental dated April 2, 2018 and February 27, 2018 as discussed by the Brownfield Redevelopment Authority.*

A motion was made by Justin, seconded by Turnbull that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 4 - Stanley, Turnbull, Justin and Braun III

Excused 3 - Sera, Nachtman and Deel

Chairperson Turnbull stated for the record that the motion had passed. Ms. Roediger reiterated that City Council had set the public hearing for the April 23, 2018 meeting, and that the recommendation would be carried forth at that meeting. It was also anticipated at that time that the amended Consent Judgment would be brought forward, and potentially the Reimbursement Agreement.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no further business to come before the BRA board.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairperson Turnbull reminded the BRA board that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for July 19, 2018.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the BRA board and upon motion by Mr. Justin, Chairperson Turnbull adjourned the Special Meeting at 8:07 p.m.

Thomas Turnbull, Chairperson
Rochester Hills
Brownfield Redevelopment Authority

Maureen Gentry, Secretary