



Rochester Hills

Minutes

Planning Commission

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

Chairperson William Boswell, Vice Chairperson Deborah Brnabic
Members: Gerard Dettloff, Dale Hetrick, Greg Hooper, Nicholas O. Kaltsounis,
David A. Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Emmet Yukon

Tuesday, April 3, 2012

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson William Boswell called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present 9 - William Boswell, Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Dale Hetrick, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder and Emmet Yukon

Quorum present

Also present: Ed Anzek, Director of Planning and Economic Development
Keith Sawdon, Director of Fiscal
Alan Buckenmeyer, Manager of Parks
Jason Dale, RHTV
Paul Shumejko, Traffic Engineer
James Breuckman, Manager of Planning
Joe Snyder, Fiscal Department
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Correction to Minutes: Page 27, first paragraph, last sentence, change that Mr. Schroeder "passed" the Resolution to "moved."

2012-0085 March 6, 2012 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Reece, that this matter be Approved as Amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 9 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hetrick, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

COMMUNICATIONS

A) Planning & Zoning News dated March 2012

NEW BUSINESS

2012-0084 Request for Adoption of the 2013-2018 Capital Improvement Plan (Public Hearing)

(Reference: 2013-2018 CIP Draft, prepared by the Fiscal Department, and memo prepared by Keith Sawdon, Director, had been placed on file in the Planning and Economic Development Department and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Mr. Anzek welcomed the Planning Commissioners back to the 16th round of reviewing the CIP program for the City. He noted that Mr. Keith Sawdon, Finance Director, had joined him at the presenter's table, and advised that Mr. Sawdon's department spent the majority of the time putting the report together from the projects submitted. Mr. Anzek stated that the City began preparing a CIP back in 1996, and he felt that it had served the City extremely well to get projects identified and properly sequenced to use funding in the most valuable manner. A few years ago, they scaled back primarily due to the City's revenue issues, however, things were starting to turn around, and there might be money to do projects that had been deferred. It was a six-year program, and the first year was intended for budgeting purposes for 2013. The next five years planned for future projects. He said he would review the new projects submitted and discuss some that were completed or rescheduled. Staff members that put new projects forward were present to answer any questions. He noted that it was a Public Hearing, and if the Commissioners were satisfied with the Plan, the Committee was respectfully requesting approval. The meeting date had been moved earlier over time, because it provided a significant benefit for the Fiscal Department to put forward a budget for the Mayor's consideration in June and City Council's consideration in August.

Mr. Sawdon pointed out that they had a successful year with the CIP. He referred to page 80, and said they had moved 18 items from the plan, which had either been included in a budget, been completed in a prior budget year or been deleted from the plan, and 14 new projects were added. He felt that moving projects to the budget and entering new projects was a very successful use of the CIP. Mr. Anzek agreed, and added that the City had also been very successful in obtaining grants to make projects happen.

Mr. Anzek next went over the new projects from page 79 of the draft CIP. He noted the LDFA Street Enhancement Program (FA-59), and observed that it should not be too much of a surprise for the Commissioners. They talked about implementation of projects contained within the district when they reviewed the M-59 Corridor Plan, and they hoped to get them into the CIP. They targeted the Enhancement Program to commence next year, and it included sidewalks and landscaping to try to improve the business parks. They put the rest of the LDFA projects, including the LDFA: Major Road System Upgrades (MR-59), the LDFA: Sanitary Sewer System Upgrades (SS-59) and the LDFA: Water Distribution System Upgrades (WS-59) in the Projects Pending section. They did not want to move forward with them with LDFA money until they had a private partnership involved, and he reminded that they only had LDFA fund capture for another 14 years. Projects totaled about \$30 million, and they might only capture one-third of that over the next 14 years. They would like the Enhancement Program done next year, and they hoped to double the \$50,000.00 cost with private participation. They were getting more requests from business owners to add sidewalks and landscaping. He added that the LDFA currently had a matching 50/50 grant program if someone wished to upgrade entry signs to business parks.

Mr. Anzek referred to the next project, an Auditorium Media Upgrade (IS-19), which would revamp the speakers and sound systems. They had all experienced some problems with them over time. At many Council meetings, it was virtually impossible to hear when sitting at the presenter's table. The money for the project would come from the Public Education and Government access money or PEG monies, which were franchise fees from the cable television companies using the City's right-of-ways. The City generated about \$180,000.00 a year from that.

Mr. Anzek mentioned Bloomer Road Paving (LS-06), which was the portion of Bloomer on the west side of John R that was currently gravel. There was a project in Rochester that would pave Bloomer to the City's corporate boundary, and the project would continue the paving the rest of the way. As with all projects, it was the Planning Commission's decision whether to put it in the Plan and City Council's decision whether to fund it.

The fourth project was the Hamlin Blvd. and Irrigation System (MR-02G). It was for the re-built portion of Hamlin from Crooks to Livernois, which was done a few years ago. The next project was the Avon Road Widening from Princeton to Grovecrest (MR-49C). It was east of Rochester Rd., and it would go to a three-lane configuration. MR-49G was the Avon @ Livernois: Intersection Enhancements. The City was recently a recipient

of a \$207,000.00 grant for this project, and there would be matching money added. They would do a grander, more artistic version at the Veteran's Memorial Pointe and at the new bridges at Avon and Livernois. He noted North Fairview Lane Rehabilitation (MR-56), which was a major road project. Paint Creek Trailway: Bridge Rehabilitation (PK-6C) was for one of the bridges that was falling. It was in a dilapidated condition and needed a new top surface. The Velodrome Deck Replacement (PK-12B) was something for which they were seeking a grant, and the labor would be done by private sources. PW-07D was the Adams Road @ Clinton River Trailway Crossing and PW-49C was for an Avon Road Pathway from Rainier to Bembridge.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked Mr. Dale to describe the Auditorium upgrade project and how the \$300,000.00 would break down. Mr. Dale said it was a good question, because \$300,000.00 was a lot for auditorium speakers, but he stated that the project was actually a little bigger than just the auditorium. There would be a few acoustical and technological changes that might or might not have to be made. If something could be solved with technology, then acoustical changes might not have to be made. Some of the changes for the auditorium would also go into the broadcasting section, and there could be broadcast operations upgrades. There was a lot of aging equipment that needed to be upgraded to a file-based media work flow from tape-based. He commented that it was somewhat ironic that the PEG money that would fund the project could not be used to buy tapes, but you could use it to buy a tapeless camera. The \$300,000.00 figure was a ballpark, and a lot of things would have to be figured out before it was narrowed. He hoped it would be significantly less, but he would not want it to be under budgeted.

Mr. Kaltsounis clarified that the estimate was for the auditorium and equipment in the broadcast room. Mr. Dale agreed, and said that one piece of equipment could be \$50,000.00 or \$5,000.00. He would use the higher number for estimation purposes. Mr. Kaltsounis said he could see why the estimate was as high as it was when both areas were included.

Chairperson Boswell mentioned that Mr. Dale said a piece of equipment could be \$50,000.00 or \$5,000.00, so he would use the higher number. Mr. Dale said he was trying to be inclusive, and he would rather give the full range than be at one end and find out that it would not work. That had happened in the past, and it could be a difficult situation. Chairperson Boswell indicated that it just seemed like a rather wide range.

Mr. Dale said that it was frustrating to not be able to go out for bids for

something like this. He could do his best to pressure his vendors, but it was hard to get information. They all liked to talk about the big changes coming, but no one wanted to say what they were unless they were responding to an RFP.

Mr. Sawdon assured that before a project moved into a budget, the numbers would be better refined. They were not at that point; they had an idea of what needed to be done and a feel for the money part, but when they went for proposals, they would get firm numbers.

Mr. Dettloff asked Mr. Dale if he would spec it, and Mr. Dale agreed it would be members of his department, Mr. Sawdon and Facilities. The physical changes would be the responsibility of Facilities. He would also work with the City's MIS department. Mr. Dettloff confirmed that component would all be done in-house. Mr. Sawdon mentioned that there might be a need to use a consultant for certain areas. They wanted to get the best use of their funds, and it might be worthwhile to have a consultant help with certain technical areas. Mr. Dettloff asked if he could put a dollar figure on that component, and Mr. Sawdon thought it would be \$5,000.00-10,000.00.

Mr. Reece thought that in the long run, it might be money well served. He advised that there were acoustical consulting firms that could better hone what was needed. He agreed that technology changed all the time, and getting a good consultant could probably save money in the long run. They might be able to put together a menu of items to pick from within a prescribed dollar amount. Mr. Sawdon thought they would want the system to be expandable into the future, and they would not want to get locked into a certain set of criteria and be back in five years asking for more. Mr. Reece thought a consultant would also take the liability a little off of the Commissioners, as well.

Mr. Schroeder noted that sound was a major problem when the auditorium was originally built. They had a contractor that was not experienced with sound and they finally hired a consultant. It still was not the best. Mr. Reece offered to recommend a couple of consultants.

Mr. Hooper asked how much PEG funding was generated per year, and Mr. Sawdon said it was about \$180,000.00. Mr. Hooper strongly suggested that the budget be limited to the one-year PEG funding of \$180,000.00 and when they went out for bids, there should be a menu of items they could pick from to fit. He would not want the PEG funding to go beyond a one-year expenditure.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the City's cost for the Velodrome project was really zero. Mr. Sawdon said that the intent was that it would not move into a budget unless the material costs were covered with a grant. The City did not own the structure, but it sponsored it to qualify for grant funding, and the labor would be donated by volunteers, so there was no anticipation of City funds to be used. Mr. Kaltsounis surmised it was there in case a shovel ready project came up. Mr. Sawdon said they had an April 1st deadline for a grant application, and a project's inclusion in a CIP gave the application preference.

Mr. Reece asked which bridge needed to be rebuilt on the Trail. Mr. Buckenmeyer said there were three bridges on the Paint Creek Trail in Rochester Hills, and they all needed some maintenance. It was mostly decking and railing, and there were some drainage issues. Mr. Reece asked if one was in more need than the other two. Mr. Buckenmeyer said that two were in pretty rough shape. The estimate for one was about \$90,000.00 in repairs; one was about \$40,000.00 and the remainder was for the third bridge.

Chairperson Boswell clarified that they were pretty well locked into it because of agreements they had made, which was confirmed. He asked if there was a more proactive way they could handle things, for example, whether there was another bridge that would need some money in three years they could offset by doing something now. He wondered why all of a sudden the bridge needed \$90,000.00 or if it needed \$90,000.00 two years ago or \$5,000.00 two years ago. Mr. Buckenmeyer advised that the bridges were inspected on a regular basis, and they had been deteriorating, but they had gotten to a point where they needed replacement repairs. He remarked that they did try to be proactive so the bridges did not fall before being fixed.

Mr. Reece asked if the City owned the Velodrome, noting that the write-up said it was given to the City as a gift. Based on that, he assumed the City owned it, but he did not see it on the City-owned property list. Mr. Sawdon said they had had quite a few legal discussions about that structure. The fact that they did not collect at the gate for people entering the Velodrome made it not considered part of the City's structures. The agreement with them was to do some limited annual maintenance, but not full reconstruction. Mr. Reece wondered who would be liable if one of the volunteer workers were injured. Mr. Sawdon said that the City carried insurance that covered volunteers, and it would be a judge making the decision about who was liable. The coverage should protect the City.

Mr. Buckenmeyer added that the Velodrome Management Group also provided liability insurance.

Mr. Kaltsounis referred to page 70, Service Hoist for Borden Park, and asked what type of service would be done on vehicles and if there would be a central area for servicing vehicles. Mr. Buckenmeyer said it would be a replacement for a small hoist they use for working on riding lawn mowers. Mr. Kaltsounis questioned the price of \$12,000.00. He said he had one, and he did not pay that much. He realized it was an estimate, but it seemed high. Mr. Sawdon said that the numbers were provided by Fleet, and they would go with those numbers until they actually went through the proposal process. Mr. Kaltsounis noted the Fleet Equipment Purchase Breakdown for pick-ups and plow trucks, and said that he owned a stripped Sierra and looked at the price of new vehicles, and they were going for \$35,000.00 just for the truck (no plow). He thought they might want to double check the numbers. He stated that the prices of vehicles had gone up significantly in the last couple of years. Mr. Sawdon said that they were buying in volume in a cooperative agreement, so they might buy two although the actual buy might be 100 trucks, so their price could be lower. He agreed they might be off on the numbers somewhat.

Mr. Hetrick referred to the Bloomer Road Paving project and said that when the Policy Team was discussing it, there was a section of a subdivision that was potentially included. He asked if it still was in the estimate. Mr. Shumejko said that the paving limits were from the City limits at the bend of Bloomer Road and it ended before John R. There was a gap of about 700 feet. It would front five properties in Rochester Hills. Mr. Hetrick said there was a little element coming out of a subdivision and he asked if that was not included. Mr. Shumejko said it was not predicated but was open for discussion.

Chairperson Boswell asked if Rochester was planning to go all the way from South St. to the point Rochester Hills would pave. Mr. Shumejko said they created a Special Assessment District. The Goldfish Swim Club was constructed in their industrial park, and the SAD would pay to pave the gravel portions. That project would start in May or June. The City could possibly include paving Bloomer next year. Rochester is also planning a water main replacement, and it was under the roadway, so it would involve a lot of asphalt road removal and replacement. The thought was to try and get economies of scale with their project and tie the paving in with it. If the project were to move forward, the timeline would be in 2013.

Mr. Hooper asked if the City's water main ended at the Heatherwood Village stub street. Mr. Shumejko agreed, and said that it went through Heatherwood Village. Mr. Hooper asked if there was a Rochester Hills water main going down Bloomer. Mr. Shumejko said that it did, but he was not sure about Rochester. Mr. Hooper asked if Rochester Hills owned to the centerline of the road. Mr. Shumejko said that the road was technically divided between the two communities, but Rochester Hills currently collected the Act 51 road dollars for that segment and maintained it. There was an agreement years ago where Rochester would maintain and collect Act 51 for the west half of the Great Oaks Blvd. off of Walton. That road was split between the two communities, so it was a trade-off. He mentioned that one of the benefits of paving Bloomer was that the City was only collecting local road dollars for it. If it were to be paved as a continuous road to Rochester, the City could petition MDOT to switch to Act 51 funding (Major Road status). That would quadruple the money the City would get. Mr. Hooper referred to the 50/50 share, and asked if it would be just for the 700 feet of roadway to be paved. Mr. Shumejko said that the 50% cost share would be for the design phase and the construction phase between the cities of Rochester and Rochester Hills.

Ms. Brnabic referred to Projects Removed, page 80, concerning FA-02I, Fire Station #1: Electrical Service Panel Repairs. Mr. Anzek said that those were done last year. Ms. Brnabic said that they were supposed to be done, but the boiler rooms had not been done. She made some phone calls to the City because she questioned why it was listed as completed in 2011 when the electrical service panels in the boiler room had never been completed. She asked if it was overlooked. She spoke with Kelly Winters of the Building Department, and he talked with an Electrical Inspector, who stated that certain control circuits and software would be involved in the repair, and it had to be scheduled for a Saturday. She was not sure if it involved other areas of the City. Mr. Winters advised that the panel repairs should be done after Easter. Ms. Brnabic's point was that a repair was listed as completed that was, hopefully, going to be completed in the spring.

Mr. Sawdon clarified that when something was marked as completed, it meant that it was pulled out of the CIP and put it into the budget and the budget worked on the project. Some projects that moved into a budget did not necessarily get done the year in which they were budgeted or they might get done in portions and carried over to the next budget. He did not know the exact details of the project Ms. Brnabic brought up, but it was moved into the 2011 budget but could not get completed by Facilities in

2011 and was carried forward to 2012 for completion. Ms. Brnabic said that she was looking at it from the perspective that it said it was complete for the year 2011. Mr. Sawdon agreed that was a little misleading - it was completed out of the CIP and moved in to the budget to be physically completed. He suggested that they could work on the terminology for the next CIP.

Mr. Reece mentioned Hamlin Boulevard: Irrigation System (MR-02G) and asked if it was not part of the original scope of work for the Hamlin Rd. repaving. Mr. Shumejko said that was correct. Mr. Reece asked if there was a reason why. It seemed to him that it would make sense to do it while they were doing the road work. Now they would go back in and put in the irrigation system. He asked if it was because of budgeting. Mr. Shumejko said it might have been that they needed to come up with an overall plan including the landscaping and trees. Sometimes, if they put in the irrigation at the onset, it might not match the future considerations for plantings.

Mr. Anzek said that it was his understanding that there were underground conduits put in. Mr. Reece said he was not sure if it had to do with timing or the budget. It just seemed that from a competitive bidding standpoint for all the roadwork, it would have made more sense to do it at that time rather than coming back a year later. Mr. Anzek said that a lot of times on road projects, the Federal and State agencies would not pay for "frills" and leave the burden to the local community to fund.

Mr. Schroeder asked if the older section of Hamlin to the west where the trees were older was irrigated. Mr. Shumejko replied that it was not, and he said that a lot of the median was inverted so it could better retain water. Mr. Schroeder mentioned that the irrigation contractors in Troy were non-participating items. When they put them in contracts, they got losers, and they ended up using their own people and straightening it out so they left that out of contracts and had a separate contract with a maintenance contractor. They had problems with the low bidders that went with the State contracts.

Mr. Hooper asked how much money the City got from the Metro Act per year. Mr. Sawdon said it was \$188,000.00 for 2011/12. Mr. Hooper commented that it was about the same as the PEG funds. Mr. Hooper wondered why Adams Rd. Blvd. Irrigation was \$190,000.00. Mr. Anzek thought it was partly higher than Hamlin's because the western third of Hamlin Rd. was not a boulevard, it was five-lanes. The boulevard began on the east side of the Trail crossing. Mr. Shumejko added that Adams

did not have all the conduits in place, and there would be a lot more boring done under the roads from median to median.

Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Shumejko if he used a pavement management system when rating road projects. Mr. Shumejko advised that they did, and they were currently using the Stantec software. They had been in discussions about migrating over to the PASER Rating System, which was what MDOT and the Road Commission used. It was a common pavement management system that was used in a lot of the grant funding applications the City submitted. There were also issues with Stantec, and they were not as responsive as they used to be. Staff was doing more work that could be done in-house. Mr. Schroeder asked if that was the company from Canada, which Mr. Shumejko confirmed, and he added that it was a worldwide company now. They had gone to some seminars for the PASER System to learn how to rate the roads.

Mr. Hooper observed that the lighting associated with the boulevards was put in Projects Pending. He asked where he would find the estimated costs for that section. Mr. Shumejko said that the cost and background data was in the original CIP submittal. Mr. Hooper said he would have to look at last year's CIP, but he thought they had estimated costs in the Projects Pending section. Mr. Sawdon did not recall. He said that typically, when something was moved to Pending, they were getting close to removing it from the Plan. He did not know about the disconnect of the values. Mr. Shumejko believed that the lighting projects might go back to 2008 when they were identified with a cost, and subsequent to that they were put in Pending. Mr. Hooper said he was not saying they should do the lighting projects, but he was curious about the estimated cost. Mr. Sawdon thought that a lot of the projects moved to Pending were so old that the estimated cost was unreliable. He recalled that a splash park had been in the Plan for a number of years with an estimate that was not pertinent to what the true costs would be any longer. Mr. Shumejko believed that the plan was to light the road up and down the corridor with uniform spacing (150 feet), and he thought it was about \$200,000.00-250,000.00. An alternate plan to illuminate the side street intersections could bring it down to \$125,000.00-150,000.00 per mile.

Mr. Hooper brought up Meadowfield Drive @ Yorktowne Drive: Traffic Signal Installation (MR-23C on page 59), and said that he was under the impression that warrants were met for a signal. Mr. Shumejko advised that after the road was realigned, MDOT did a warrant study, and it still failed to meet the hourly warrants. Mr. Hooper asked about Eddington Blvd. and Drexelgate. Mr. Shumejko said that was in discussion with

MDOT, but there was no official word. Mr. Hooper asked if that meant there was a 50/50 chance, and Mr. Shumejko said it was closer to 80/20. Mr. Hooper asked why that would not be listed as a Pending Project. He stated that he would definitely want a signal there, because it was a major public safety issue on Rochester Rd. He said he would wholeheartedly support that moving forward, and he strongly felt that it should be in the CIP.

Mr. Anzek thought that part of the issues were that the Gilbert and Vennettelli group had conducted a traffic study to determine the trip generation assuming maximum development of the properties. There was a potential to meet warrants, if the site were developed. It was a chicken and egg type of thing, and they did not know what the development would be. There had not been anyone working with Gilbert on the site. Mr. Gilbert felt the City should pay for the signal. Mr. Anzek had received some communications from residents, and there would be a lot of approvals needed. Mr. Hooper wondered why they would not put it in the CIP, especially if there was a good chance of getting warrants approved. He understood it was subject to negotiation with Mr. Gilbert, but he questioned if there was a valid reason not to have it in the Plan. Mr. Anzek said that when they first called for projects, they had not heard from MDOT, and preliminary approval had only occurred three or four weeks ago. Mr. Shumejko said they had not gotten the official word from Lansing either. Mr. Anzek said they would, of course, add it if the Commissioners wanted it. Chairperson Boswell agreed that it most definitely should be in the Plan, and he did not think anyone would object, and Mr. Hetrick stressed that there was safety hazard.

Mr. Reece asked if it would be subject to the development (City Place) going forward. Mr. Anzek was not sure if MDOT would allow it unless there were the trips. Mr. Shumejko said there were two parts to getting the signal approved - the development and also consideration for re-aligning the roadway, which would have to go hand-in-hand.

Mr. Schroeder asked how the work on Avon was going. Mr. Shumejko said that it was a week or two behind because there was an issue with one of the pilings. The original "open to traffic day" was June 15, and it was now around June 30. Mr. Schroeder asked if the Livernois bridge project was moving along. Mr. Shumejko said that the design was moving. The Road Commission was looking for a June letting. If construction was completed on Avon, then Livernois would follow in July. A lot would be dependent on Detroit Edison, because there were a lot of utilities that had to be relocated. Mr. Reece asked if there was a bonus or penalty

payment if they were late. Mr. Shumejko said that outside of liquidated damages, he did not believe there was an incentive or disincentive. Mr. Reece asked if there were liquidated damages on the job, and Mr. Shumejko said there were. Mr. Hooper thought it was the normal Road Commission or MDOT liquidated damages, and it would depend on the conditions whether an extension of time was warranted.

Mr. Hooper referred to page 70, Fleet Replacement Schedule, and he noted that the total equipment costs for 2013 were about \$1 million, but for 2014, it was \$2.2 million. He suggested that the two tandem axle dump trucks for snowplowing and salting be advanced to 2013 to even out the expenditures; a little more in 2013, a little less in 2014. He thought that possibly with a volume purchase, instead of four trucks they would have six, which should renew their entire fleet for snowplowing and salting. He confirmed that the Fire Department had no fleet purchases planned for 2013.

Chairperson Boswell noticed that in addition to what Mr. Hooper pointed out, there was a wide variation in the fleet purchases. He wondered if that was because there were some from 2012 that did not get bought, so they were put into 2013.

Mr. Sawdon said that Fleet tried to better manage all of its vehicles individually. If a vehicle happened to hit the target year in which it should be replaced, yet the mileage and/or hours on the system did not justify replacement, they might postpone it and use the vehicle for another year or two. That was why in some years, there was an accumulation from delayed purchases from prior years that were being moved forward to a more manageable year when it was a good time for replacement. He said that one thing that concerned him about moving the tandem axles was that although it might make sense from the purchasing side, they might be moving ahead of utilization. They might still be able to get another year of utilization out of those trucks before they needed to be replaced. Mr. Hooper said that he understood. Mr. Sawdon said that without having Mr. Halliday from Fleet present, he thought it could be that they were in that year because of utilization. Mr. Hooper just suggested that it was something to look at. He thought it would be a good idea to even the budget by moving \$370,000.00 into 2013. He reminded that Purchasing had been successful in coming in under budget, so \$185,000.00 would really probably be \$160,000.00. If they moved \$370,000.00 into 2013, there would be \$1.4 million for 2013 and \$1.8 million for 2014. Mr. Sawdon said he would ask Mr. Halliday if he could better balance the two years and let him pick the items closer towards the end of their utilization.

It would be based more on the life of the vehicle. Mr. Hooper said he was not opposed to that.

Mr. Reece asked if the estimated costs for the vehicles took into consideration the resale value. Mr. Hooper believed that the salvage value flowed differently, and it was not part of the CIP at all. It flowed back into the budget. Mr. Reece thought that if they could squeeze a year or two more, he would rather do that, but he understood where Mr. Hooper was coming from. Mr. Hooper said he was looking down the road. They were going to vote on the 2013 budget in a few months, and the 2014 budget would have a million dollars more they had to find. He thought they should even it out.

Mr. Reece turned to page 74 and asked if the estimated value of the City-owned facilities was an assessed value and how they came up with a value of \$18.7 million for City Hall. Mr. Sawdon said that was actually an historical cost value - building the structures. Mr. Reece asked if the City owned \$55.6 million of buildings. Mr. Sawdon said that was fair, and it was approximately what they were insured for. Mr. Reece complimented the Policy Team on a "good job."

Chairperson Boswell opened the Public Hearing at 8:02 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, he closed the Public Hearing.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Kaltsounis moved the following Resolution, seconded by Mr. Schroeder:

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission Approves the Capital Improvement Plan that has been proposed for the years 2013-2018. After a Public Hearing on April 3, 2012, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission has determined the following:

WHEREAS, the Municipal Planning Act, Act 285 of Public Acts of 1931, as amended, requires the Rochester Hills Planning Commission to annually accept a Capital Improvement Plan for the benefit of the health, safety and welfare of the community as those criteria relate to the physical development of Rochester Hills; and

WHEREAS, the Rochester Hills Fiscal Office has consulted with the City's professional staff who carry out the business of planning for and providing for the present and future needs and desires of the citizens of Rochester Hills; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvement Plan is meant to consider the immediate and future needs and goals of Rochester Hills, as identified by the public, City Boards and Commissions, and the Mayor's staff, in light of existing projects and plans and anticipated resources; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvement Plan is a flexible document, necessarily meant to be reevaluated and amended each year, to project into the six (6) succeeding years, and further amended as needed to address practical realities as they relate to policies and philosophies of relevant Boards, the City Council and the Mayor's office; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvement Plan is a guide and forum to aid the Rochester Hills Mayor's Office and the Rochester Hills City Council in making decisions regarding the physical development and infrastructure maintenance of the City and determining what, if any, resources can or should be available to carry out City Council's policies and budgetary decisions; and

WHEREAS, the components of the Capital Improvement Plan have been subject to a Public Hearing, public review, and committee reviews over the course of several years and a duly noticed full Public Hearing on April 3, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the components of the Capital Improvement Plan were arrived at through a point system using variables that included, among other things, whether the project has begun, funds committed, sources of funds, prior City Council decisions, Planning Commission or administrative recommendations and decisions; and

RESOLVED, that the Capital Improvement Plan presented for review and revised as discussed at the April 3, 2012 meeting, is adopted by the Rochester Hills Planning Commission on April 3, 2012 with the following Condition:

1. That a new project be added for the signalization of the intersection of Drexelgate and the realigned Eddington Blvd.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Plan should be published and attested to according to law.

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, that this matter be Adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 9 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hetrick, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Chairperson Boswell stated for the record that the Resolution had passed unanimously.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 2012-0086** Election of Officers: Chairperson, Vice Chairperson and Secretary for a one-year term ending the first meeting in April 2013.
- Upon nomination by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, William Boswell was re-elected as Chairperson of the Rochester Hills Planning Commission for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2013.*
- Upon nomination by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hetrick, Deborah Brnabic was re-elected as Vice Chairperson of the Rochester Hills Planning Commission for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2013.*
- Upon nomination by Reece, seconded by Yukon, Nicholas Kaltsounis was elected as Secretary of the Rochester Hills Planning Commission for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2013.*
- A Voice Vote was taken after each nomination, and the votes in favor of each were unanimous. Mr. Reece joked that he was not buying Mr. Kaltsounis a card for Secretary's Day.*

NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairperson Boswell reminded the Commissioners that the next Special Meeting was scheduled for April 17, 2012.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission, and upon motion by Kaltsounis, Chairperson Boswell adjourned the Regular Meeting at 8:08 p.m.

William F. Boswell, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Maureen Gentry
Recording Secretary