

**CITY OF NEWARK  
DELAWARE**

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING**

**October 18, 2016**

**7:00 p.m.**

Present at the 7:00 p.m. meeting were:

**Chairman:** Jeremy Firestone

**Commissioners Present:** Willard Hurd  
Frank McIntosh  
Alan Silverman  
Robert Stozek

**Commissioners Absent:** Bob Cronin  
District 3 (Vacant)

**Staff Present:** David Del Grande, Finance Director  
Maureen Feeny Roser, Planning and Development Director  
Carol Houck, City Manager

Mr. Jeremy Firestone called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:09 p.m.

Mr. Firestone: Good evening, this is the Planning Commission meeting for Tuesday, October 18, 2016. This is a special meeting where we're going to review and consider the 2017-2021 Capital Improvements Program. I'd first like to acknowledge a couple of people who are here with us today, Mayor Polly Sierer and Councilman Mark Morehead from District 1. As well, we've got Carol Houck, City Manager, and Dave Del Grande, Finance Director, who are going to help us through the presentation. So thank you all for coming today, as well as members of the City and residents.

**1. THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2016 PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP.**

Mr. Firestone: Our first order of business is to review and approve the minutes of the September 19, 2016 Planning Commission workshop. I'd like to ask Alan Silverman, our Secretary, to take us through the issue of minutes.

Mr. Alan Silverman: The minutes have been distributed and posted on the City website. Does the [Planning and Development Department] Secretary have any additions or corrections?

Ms. Michelle Vispi: No additions or corrections.

Mr. Silverman: Okay, no additions or corrections have been submitted by the Commissioners. I will entertain a motion that the minutes be approved as distributed.

Mr. Will Hurd: I so move.

Mr. Firestone: Is there a second.

Mr. Bob Stozek: Second.

Mr. Firestone: All in favor? Opposed? The motion carries.

MOTION BY HURD, SECONDED BY STOZEK, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2016 PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP BE APPROVED.

VOTE: 5-0

AYE: FIRESTONE, HURD, MCINTOSH, SILVERMAN, STOZEK

NAY: NONE

ABSENT: CRONIN, DISTRICT 3 (VACANT)

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

**2. REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF THE 2017-2021 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM.**

Mr. Firestone: Okay, that then takes us to Agenda Item 2, our second and last item on the agenda, review and consideration of the Capital Improvements Program, and I turn it over to the City Manager.

[Secretary's note: During the course of their presentation, Ms. Houck and Mr. Del Grande referred to a presentation being displayed for the benefit of the Commission and public.]

Ms. Carol Houck: Thank you. I appreciate it. We're very happy to be here. As you mentioned, Dave Del Grande, Finance Director, and I are here and pleased to present to you our recommended 2017-2021 Capital Improvements Program for the City of Newark. Our departments have worked over the course of several months recently to identify the needs of our community in relationship to the capital program. The Program will serve as our guide, primarily for Year 1, but ultimately for the next five years.

I do want to introduce our staff members that are here so that we can answer any questions efficiently that you may have tonight. From left to right we have Andrew Haines, Deputy City Manager, Tom Coleman, Public Works and Water Resources Director, Jim Smith from our Finance Department, one of our accountants, Joe Spadafino, Parks and Recreation Director, Rick Vitelli, our Electric Director, and Josh Brechbuehl, our IT Manager. And of course you know Maureen Feeney Roser, Planning and Development Director.

We wanted to share a little bit about the general powers and duties of the Planning Commission. The detail here represents the charge of the Commission, with the pertinent sections bolded for your easy viewing. Ultimately, you have the responsibility to review our recommended CIP and report your recommendation to City Council.

In developing the capital program, our departments begin by reviewing projects from earlier programs. We confirm completion levels and discuss modifications to projects that may have become necessary. In addition, of course, our departments identify the needs or readiness for new projects. Likewise, staff has an eye towards the out year projects, confirming continued need and/or Council and community support for such things. As our direction, our priorities sometimes can change for our community. These efforts are completed with a focus on how each project supports the provision of services within our community and also to meet our responsibilities. As for what we hope to accomplish in developing the capital program, many of our projects and initiatives align with the vision elements noted here on this slide. While this is of great interest to you, our Planning Commissioners, it is our belief that a healthy, active, sustainable and inclusive community resonates with all who are committed to Newark's continued success.

I think I have shared in past years that the capital program is sort of the backbone of our work as a local government and, like many others, we're in need of focusing more heavily on our infrastructure. Lastly, I can share that positioning Newark to remain financially stable remains a prime focus when developing and making our budget recommendation.

Mr. David Del Grande: This slide here represents the cycle that we face every year with the CIP program. We have infrastructure that gets older every year. Our department directors propose projects accordingly, however we don't have enough funding to support all the CIP project proposals. To balance the budget, we push capital projects into a future period, which in turn finishes the cycle and leads to infrastructure that is another year older. It's a cycle that gets repeated every year and, unfortunately, this year is no different.

Per Section 806.1 of the City Code, the capital program shall include certain information such as, 1) a clear summary, 2) a list of all capital improvements which are proposed to be undertaken over the next five years, 3) cost estimates, how the project is to be funded and time schedules, and, lastly, 4) estimated annual operating costs. Essentially, we have geared our presentation and our budget formulation of the CIP based upon those premises.

The first sheet here is showing our CIP sheets. The CIP sheets provide a great level of detail to help the reader understand how projects are prioritized. The five priority levels that we use begin with the highest priority level of Level 1 if they're already underway or if they must be completed. A Level 2 project reflects a critical need to remediate a failing service, prevent failure or generate a savings to the City. Level 3 projects are still high priority but could be deferred with some understanding that there may be a risk in doing so. And, lastly, we have Levels 4 and 5, which are needs and not wants, but do not carry any significant risk if deferred to a later date. So on our CIP sheets, as I have them circled on this slide up on the screen, all of our directors go through this exercise when going through their CIP program.

Continuing on, and also on the CIP sheet, all CIPs are tied directly to the City's Comprehensive Plan and are broken further down into three elements which are Healthy and Active Community, where these projects encourage exercise, complete street projects, support our parks and help guide development of the City that support our citizens' well-being. There is Sustainable Community, which supports transportation and encourages the reduction of fossil fuels, protects our watershed and promotes projects to support our environment, such as recycling and water quality. The Comprehensive Plan encourages projects that have a diverse economic base to those who live, work and play in the City of Newark. Inclusive Community projects ensure we are providing access to alternative transportation, providing a broad range of housing choices, including affordable and fair housing for all. An inclusive community defines our City with access to dining, shopping, entertainment, arts, employment, parks and open spaces. The City is proud of its educational opportunities, from our daycares to the University.

And the last part of our CIP detail sheet are Code references that are provided for any of the information that is required. As I stated on the previous slides, we have the four criteria and here is an example where I have two of them circled for reference so our department directors can provide the information as demanded through our City charter.

An enhancement we've done this year is another justification, essentially our return on investment. In our financial workshop with Council back on October 3, the question was raised could we provide more information on projects that have a return on investment. So in order to provide that information in a timely manner and with quick turnaround, on the summary sheets on page 7, we added another row called Justification Code where they're labeled A through D. On the screen here is a screen-shot of us providing that information and, essentially, we have coded every project that has a return on investment that generates an overall savings on those sheets. Our plan is for 2018 to include this piece, as well, on the CIP sheets so it's all integrated together.

Ms. Houck: Okay, well the good news is that we have been getting some significant work done within our community, despite funding levels not reaching what projections have suggested they should be. This slide outlines some of the highlights of the capital program implemented this year in 2016. Fifteen streets in our community have or will be improved. We're continuing to address accessibility improvements with our ADA ramp upgrades each year. Our vehicles

and equipment, necessary to perform efficiently on behalf of the community, are well maintained and on a regular replacement schedule, which is reviewed annually. A number of highly visible or recommended water, sewer and electric utility improvements have been accomplished.

Mr. Del Grande: The initial CIP proposed by our department directors, when taking stock of their respective areas of responsibility, totaled \$51.6 million over the next five years, with \$14.2 million funded in 2017. A great deal of time and effort was put forth to review the projects, making reductions where necessary or appropriate in order to meet our budgetary requirements. Tonight we are submitting to the Planning Commission for review, a \$46.2 million five-year CIP with \$11 million budgeted for 2017. The gross 2017 CIP is \$1.8 million above the five-year average of \$9.2 million. The total originally recommended CIP budget was trimmed by \$5.4 million, with \$3.2 million in reductions coming from 2017 alone. When combining the CIP with the operating budget for 2017, we initially were facing a \$7.9 million shortfall between overall expenses and revenues.

Here you can see the top five lines on this donut chart, not unexpectedly making up 78% of the gross capital spending for 2017, or roughly \$8.6 million of the \$11 million that we're proposing. For 2017, stormwater has \$500,000 budgeted within the water fund and \$250,000 in the sewer fund. Again, these areas of our operations form the backbone of our capital program for infrastructure needs. Our utilities and streets remain our priority, as they represent our core services and cannot be deferred as easily as our other priorities.

Funding sources for the CIP . . . \$4.4 million, or 39.6%, of the funding for the CIP comes from current revenues in 2017. Current revenues also support all of the City's operating expenses and debt service. Another \$4.5 million comes directly from our capital reserves for what is called "pay as you go" capital spending, and does not rely on debt or borrowing. It should be noted that Newark is fairly unique in continuing pay-go as its primary form of funding capital programs.

Vehicle and equipment replacement account for another \$1.2 million, or 10.7%, as a planned-for funding source through depreciation funding that we commit to annually, followed up by grants and donations for \$945,000, of which \$515,000 is our annual street aid grant, and another \$200,000 of that \$945,000 is for the bicycle/pedestrian bridge at Curtis Mill and Kershaw.

The City's credit rating is very high at AA+, so our cost of debt and our debt load are both very low. Borrowing rates continue to be favorable but are poised to rise at any time. Last year rating agencies rated the City with the understanding that we could add debt in the short term without any impact to our bond rating. We have made recommendations over the past few weeks, as well as the last few years, to City Council that using long term debt to fund our capital program is a viable option for Newark in order to accelerate our investment in infrastructure, to pass along the expense of infrastructure to those who will be utilizing it, and to keep our tax and utility fees relatively level. That's something we hope to be pursuing in 2017 for consideration and relief in the 2018 budget and beyond.

Ms. Houck: Okay, so now we have some Priority Level 1 projects that we have highlighted. As Dave mentioned earlier, Level 1 projects are simply projects that were authorized for this year, 2016, in our prior year, and are either underway or the funds have been reserved so that the project can be initiated or resumed in 2017. By default, the ongoing equipment replacement projects are our priority, one because they carry over from year to year and, again, we have committed to funding their depreciation over their expected life.

Priority Level 2 projects are those given the highest priority among projects that are new for 2017 or that have not been started in a previous program. This slide shows the top nine new projects. I won't go down each of them but please note that the first two items, the street program and the water main renovation project, are recommended to be funded at \$1.5 million

and \$1.0 million, respectively, for 2017. The streets number is up by \$500,000 from 2016. The Newark Transportation Plan has been approved by City Council, as has the Newark Bike Plan. The funding of \$252,000 will allow for implementation of recommendations from the plans. And \$70,000 has been included in 2017 to address Municipal Building improvements, \$25,000 of which has been identified for work at the Police Station and \$45,000 to address facility issues that arise over the course of the year. The Municipal Building we're in right now is 42 years old and we are experiencing some issues. Unfortunately we have had issues at the Police Department much sooner. It's about 26 years old now.

So, Priority Levels 3 and 4, the balance of the projects is what this makes up, and while they're still very important to our community, there's less risk, as mentioned before, in moving them beyond 2017 for completion.

Okay, this last slide . . . or one of the last slides . . . represents the significant projects that have been included in the out years of our five-year program. Again, our out year projects, as currently identified, are heavily geared towards our streets, parks and utilities.

I think you may be aware that for the last several years, staff has had engagement with Council and the public on the creation of a stormwater utility. Public meetings were held and a great deal of feedback was provided to both staff and Council. The stormwater utility consideration was also merged into our planned water rates study. Last week we participated in another discussion with Council regarding the creation of the utility and we will be bringing back more information in the weeks ahead. One important thing to note is that while we are proposing a stormwater utility as the proper way to address stormwater concerns, we have been making improvements, as shared on this slide. However, we're funding them primarily from water fund revenues. Some people might think 'so what, it's coming from my same pocket' and individually that is absolutely correct, but without a dedicated stormwater utility based on impervious levels . . . which was, by the way, what we heard most when we were doing our outreach, everybody thought that was the way it should be developed . . . or many people did . . . what's being charged is not equitable. Additionally, the stormwater project cost falls squarely within our organization's area of responsibility, as a utility. Industry best practices tell us that we should be assigning specific costs of services to those who are benefiting from them. Since 2014 alone, we have spent nearly \$800,000 in resources on stormwater projects, not including City labor. Likewise, our 2017 stormwater capital program spending is allotted at \$750,000 of the \$11 million budget, and represents \$2.7 million of the total over the next five years. Again, last week, Black & Veatch provided their stormwater utility proposal to City Council, and the projects listed here were included in that proposal. Of the \$750,000 requested for 2017, \$250,000 of it represents start-up costs for the creation of the utility. The \$250,000 includes creation of an appeals process, stormwater inclusion in our billing system so that it goes out with the bills, and continued use of contractual engineering firm services, Black & Veatch likely, until and if the stormwater utility is up and running in 2018. The average annual spending in the out years is about \$500,000, comprised mainly of storm system repairs that directly impact our control of flooding within our community.

In closing, the capital program, as we've said, is a blueprint. It is a living document. If situations, information or research changes, so might the projects to some degree. The major, however, are addressed as detailed in our annual programs. Additionally, as you are likely aware, these projects will be presented to Mayor and Council with refined estimates, where appropriate, at initiation, usually after a bidding process has taken place, and with financial analysis, at a regular Council meeting. Lastly, the capital program presented to you in its entirety in your binders that you received is our outline of the project work we see ahead of us. With that said, my staff and I are here and we welcome questions of the program. Thank you.

Mr. Firestone: Thank you very much for that presentation. I'd first like to acknowledge the presence of Councilmember Marge Hadden, District 4, who has joined us. At this point I would like to open it up to any public comment. Is there any member of the public that would wish to address the Commission?

Ms. Carol McKelvey: I'm the only member and I have no wish.

Mr. Firestone: There is now a second.

Ms. McKelvey: Oh, okay.

Mr. Firestone: Professor Morgan, we would ask that you try to limit your comment to three minutes.

Dr. John Morgan: Of course, yes. Thank you. In fact, I really just have a question because I saw some of this already at a Council meeting. Last week the City received, well the City got again and has now made public, the five responses to that Request for Information about a parking garage. And some allocations have been made in previous CIPs in later years for parking garage expenses. And I was just wondering is any of that folded into anything you're looking at tonight?

Ms. Houck: I can answer that. There is nothing in here for the parking garage. We heard that as a concern last year. We didn't know if we were moving forward and why would we have it in the out years. So it's removed. We did, in fact, receive five, the same five garage proposals that were submitted the first go-round, and they're being reviewed. They've been made public and we just simply need to make a date for them to come back to Council for discussion. But there's no funding.

Dr. Morgan: Okay, great. Thank you very much.

Mr. Firestone: Thank you. Would any of the elected officials care to address the Commission? Councilman Morehead.

Councilman Mark Morehead: Just briefly, I printed the link to not take one of these in case there were more public. Slide 5 . . . you've got a new Slide 5 that isn't on the link on the website.

Mr. Del Grande: That's correct, yes.

Councilman Morehead: If you could add it to website.

Mr. Del Grande: Sure. Just to explain, I added Slide 5 at the last minute tonight, which is just a definition of what the CIP sheets represent. That slide was just added in the last hour before the meeting tonight, so that will be updated on the website first thing in the morning.

Mr. Firestone: Thank you. Before I open it up to the Commission, by the statute it says we're supposed to do this after considering the advice of the Planning Director, and so I'd like to ask Maureen to impart some wisdom on us.

Ms. Maureen Feeney Roser: Thank you, Chairman Firestone. As part of the budget team that prepared the budget that's before you tonight, I would recommend approval.

Mr. Firestone: Okay. Are there any questions from the members of the Commission?

Mr. Stozek: I guess the first question is what is the timetable for getting this approved?

Ms. Houck: By Mayor and Council? The end of the year. Of course we do have a public hearing on the entire budget on November 21. Our goal would be to move forward tonight, if possible, with a recommendation from the Planning Commission to Mayor and Council, with any comments that would certainly be presented to all of Council so that we can fine tune beforehand. Mayor and Council do not have the whole budget at this point in time.

Mr. Stozek: My second question is when did you start the CIP process to put this budget together?

Ms. Houck: Department directors and their staff, I would say, started as early as April. There was an extensive timeline. I don't know if the whole timeline is on Budget Central or not, but there was an extensive timeline of targets for them to make. Personnel things coming in at a certain time, capital programs and the like.

Mr. Stozek: I just ask those questions . . .

Ms. Houck: We can share that information with you. There is a . . .

Mr. Stozek: Well I only ask that from the standpoint of . . . I mean the reality is we have this budget today to look at that, and you said this, it's really a one year firm budget, looking out for other items for the next four years beyond that. And that's the same comment I made last year. That concerns me because I don't believe any way that in 2021 we're only going to have \$6.5 million in capital spending. These numbers are going to expand to fill the amount of money available, and maybe even far more money. I just question the process to some extent in that, even when you started in April, this is the first time we're seeing this. So it's hard to say we're going to come up with any revelations or big changes or recommendations to this budget. It's too late to do that now. I would like to see the process change somewhat so that you can come to the Planning Commission, if indeed our input is important, to talk about where you are during the year, even if it's just mid-year, so we can be prepared for this and maybe give some guidance as to what's important and what's not important. I did hear you mention that the City is looking at getting bonds to fund some of this in the future. I was at the stormwater meeting and I think that's a very important suggestion that came out of the consultants. Especially for these projects that have 50 and 60 year lives. It makes no sense to pay for it in one or two years when it's going to then . . . you know, the residents for the next 40 years don't have to put anything into that system. You need to spread that cost out.

The other thing is, and I'll just . . . again, I did capital budgets from a different standpoint in that I knew, pretty much, the general amount of money that I was going to get, plus or minus 5%. So I would put together . . . I actually did 10 year budgets and looking to level that money out that I was going to get. Now there are things that come along you can't plan for and you have to ask for more money. That's the reason you build reserves. And I see each department, apparently, is putting money aside for reserves, although it doesn't seem to be a consistent program for all the departments. But that's up to you guys. I don't want to get into that too much. But the leveling, I guess, is one of the things that bothers me. If I can find my example . . . well I can't find it now, but anyhow there was a capital requirement for one department and it was like \$1 million this year, \$500,000 next year, \$1 million the following year, and \$500,000 the following year. So it's alternating. To me that makes no sense. That's saying you're really not looking at concrete projects out there. I would rather see you try to level that to \$750,000 a year and work within that kind of figure, rather than jumping up and down like a see-saw from \$1 million to \$500,000.

The other thing I have a question about is you're spending a lot of money on vehicle replacement. What is the process by which you determine vehicles need to be replaced?

Ms. Houck: Would you like me to answer that now?

Mr. Firestone: Sure.

Ms. Houck: Okay. Yes, every year there are vehicles that are up for replacement during that year and they go through a review from our Maintenance team, the mechanics, and a recommendation is made for which vehicles will be replaced. We do keep them much past their life expectancy. All of our vehicles go through a monthly or quarterly maintenance schedule so that they're taken in and can have oil changed and things like that checked. With

that said, the funding is there for them. One of the things we've done in the past is we have passed on years because of funding levels. And then we have catch-up years. You'll recall last year we had postponed the refuse trucks for 2015 so we had to catch up when we didn't outsource. So last year was a big year, or actually this year was a big year for that. Does that answer your question?

Mr. Stozek: Are you mostly replacing vehicles because of their condition? Because on the charts you talked about the age of the vehicle and the normal replacement year, which I assume is based on age, or maybe its mileage.

Ms. Houck: It's typically originally age, but then it is the condition of the vehicle, primarily, that makes us replace it. And whether or not we think it's going to be successful to make it through another calendar year.

Mr. Stozek: Do you move vehicles from department to department?

Ms. Houck: We have. We have done that. It's a nightmare in record-keeping. Finance doesn't like it, but we have done it. Yes, we have done that quite a bit.

Mr. Stozek: I would really recommend doing that. I would recommend looking at the vehicles as a fleet, not as individual department fleets. Because then if you see a vehicle that's getting a lot of mileage, maybe you move it to another department where it won't get as much mileage and you try to extend its life.

Ms. Houck: Exactly.

Mr. Firestone: On the issue of vehicles, I was surprised that this was deemed a Priority 1 and it was always then said the project is underway and must be completed. I look at that . . . project is underway and must be completed . . . as something where we start digging in the ground and now we've got to finish it. But it doesn't seem to me a sort of routine vehicle replacement constitutes something that's underway and that has to be completed. And I think we'd be better off if we distinguish between the projects that we really have to do and the things that are important so that we don't have deferred maintenance and breakdowns. And I would agree with the Commissioner that I was sort of surprised by how much vehicle replacement there was. But maybe we have a lot of vehicles.

Mr. Del Grande: If I could add, the one critical need is what goes on in Public Works and Water Resources and the Police Department. We have roughly 70 police officers and about 25 vehicles. So those vehicles are running on a 24/7 basis, for the most part. So we're pretty . . . we adhere to the replacement policy very strictly with the police because it's very important that we don't have any vehicles down or out of commission because, ultimately, that impacts our service we provide for public safety.

The larger items such as refuse, dump trucks and those types of things, are very expensive. They're close to \$200,000 apiece and we do whatever we can, and thank goodness for our Maintenance Department that can maintain these vehicles and keep them going the way they do. But there comes a balancing point where if we hold them too long, they become more expensive to maintain than they do to purchase new ones. So we try to make sure that we're hitting that line as we get close to the end of the useful life for these vehicles.

The ones that used by administration are absolutely shuffled around and the ones that aren't being utilized heavily get tossed to ones who have heavier needs for them, and so forth. We're using every avenue we can to make sure we're stretching our vehicles as far as we can.

Ms. Houck: I can also add that if we are at a decision point where we have to put in a transmission or something like that, it also extends the life, and that is part of the decision making. And our hybrids . . . we have three hybrids in the City . . . and they are routinely used

for when anybody is going to Dover or wherever. We try to push any long rides for them to get more mileage. Just to share that.

Mr. Firestone: Do we have any electric vehicles in our fleet?

Ms. Houck: No, not yet. We've been looking into that and some grants, and charging stations and all that for the Municipal Building, but we haven't been able to make just the right fit yet for that.

Mr. Frank McIntosh: As long as we're on the subject of vehicles, how long to you keep them? I pretty much trust that you're not putting people in vehicles that are dangerous for them to be in . . .

Mr. Del Grande: Absolutely.

Mr. McIntosh: And also that if you have a 1995 vehicle and it needs a new transmission, it's probably not a good idea to replace it, etc.

Mr. Del Grande: Correct.

Mr. McIntosh: So what is your general policy about vehicles?

Mr. Del Grande: It essentially comes down to the type of vehicle. Our police vehicles have a useful life of about five years, and the ones we're looking to replace this year are actually 2010 Crown Victorias. We like them to be at over 75,000 miles for replacement for the police vehicles, and all of the vehicles have between 85,000 and 110,000 miles on them. So they're well-loved and well-used police cars at this point in their life. We have some Jeep Cherokees, two of them, that are about 15-16 years old. They're well past their useful life so we can say without any hesitation that we've gotten our use out of those two vehicles. The other two items are dump trucks. They're about \$100,000 apiece. Those vehicles are also being exposed as plows, they're exposed to the elements and salt, those types of things. So we do our part with making sure they're kept clean and maintained, but they can only go so long.

Mr. McIntosh: Thank you. With regards to the budget itself and five year projections, I do agree that Years 4 and 5 are . . . well I don't think the term was used . . . but in my opinion, they're useless to project out that far. At least in my world, we don't do that anymore and haven't done it for a long, long time. We can barely get three years out that's of any value. So I can understand why you might say Year 4 and 5 is whatever, but they don't really amount to a lot because so much can happen between today and 2021 . . . is that five years from now? An enormous amount of things can happen. Think about what happened in the last five years. You just cannot possibly look at those number as being meaningful. The only numbers that are really meaningful are the ones in the next year and that's only if you pray well. So a budget is a budget and I would prefer to see you having less years projected out, and project those two or three years with more accuracy. The other years are just not meaningful. No one would accept them as being . . . if you happen to hit one on the money, that would be a tremendous surprise, I think, to most people.

Mr. Del Grande: Understood. And I think part of our issue is, essentially, the financing of capital, along with our operating. Since we're a pay-go system here, it's very hard for us to plan out five years based upon availability of funding. If we had a consistent source of funds, say a State revolving loan to help with our water/sewer/stormwater expenses, or go to the bond market for our general obligation expenses, those types of funding we know are there and they're entrenched in our budget for that period. That helps us with our planning. In the budget we put together in front of you for the CIP, these are projects that we feel are attainable and reachable with what we have, with the resources that we have today. And, as you said, when we move out into the Years 3, 4 and 5, things start to fall off a little bit. Ultimately they're continuations of projects that we've already started, projects that are on the

horizon that we'd like to do but we need to push out a year or two in order to get to the ones that are more important first. So I feel that if we had some funding that was consistent with our needs, that would help us with our CIP program.

Mr. McIntosh: I don't have any objection to you saying in, you know, 2020 . . . that was a song, wasn't it? . . . in the year 2020 . . . I've been wanting to say that for a long time . . . you would do whatever it might be, rebuild the reservoir for instance. Bring back the contractor, I don't know. But to put a price tag on it makes no sense to me. It's something that you need to do when the times comes that it gets into your horizon, then you price it. You say, okay it's coming up on 2020 and now we've got to get serious about what we're going to do with this and where does it fit into the scheme of things. So for people that are looking at your budgeting process, or your thinking process . . . and that's all it is . . . you've got these things we know that we need to do and they're prioritized in such a way but to actually put a dollar value on it, you know, I think that's an exercise in futility. And it doesn't do anybody any good other than to look at it and say, geez, I wonder what that means.

Ms. Houck: We appreciate that feedback and certainly it has been the way our community has done it for as long as I've known. We understand it is difficult, often, to plug that number in there. I would say there are sometimes electric distribution, for instance, where we do know something is going to happen probably down the road, such as STAR Campus, when Rick is going to have to do something there, and the number is probably going to be the best he can come up with with some inflationary figures in it. But I think we can have that conversation with Mayor and Council and see if they would entertain less years in the capital program. It would be probably something that would be easier for staff to be able to work on, as well.

Mr. McIntosh: Whether it's easier or not is immaterial. It's whether it's beneficial and an effective use of your time and energy. So I doubt very much that you're spending a lot of time thinking about how much money we're going to spend in 2021. You're just throwing numbers on there. And if you're doing more than that, it's a waste of time. So because it's been done that way is probably a really good reason not to do it that way in the future.

Ms. Houck: I think that's something we can bring up to Mayor and Council in the beginning of the year, prior to starting any efforts.

Mr. Firestone: Any other questions or comments?

Mr. Silverman: Mr. Chairman? To steal and paraphrase from Mr. Del Grande, the CIP is the skeleton on which the capital program is overlaid to give it some shape and form. The City, over the last several years, in working with Council, has developed another resource I think parallels the CIP, and that's the IT Department, bringing the City of Newark from the carbon paper and typewriter age into the modern age of the Cloud. There are references to IT improvements within the capital program. There are references to master plans scattered throughout the program, and I think the capital budget needs to have a dedicated IT section, and perhaps the task dedicated to the IT section or division to bring together a total GIS/GPS master plan. There is a very good base plan that exists within the Electric Department. They can almost tell you down to the pole what is on that utility pole. We don't have that existing for sewer. As was pointed out in the documents, we aren't even sure what our sewer flows are through all the lines. What the sewer was originally designed for. What their peak capacity is. The Water Department, I think, there's been work on identifying valves and sections of pipe and sizing. That information is hanging in cyberspace at the moment. We're talking about a stormwater management system, or stormwater management plan. There are apparently monies within that to start a GIS plan within that operation, yet work has already been done, from what I read in the paper and from what I read in the Council minutes and reports, on things like identifying and scoping corrugated iron piping to get an idea of what kind of condition it's in. That information, right now, lives within various departments. It needs to be brought together in a comprehensive GPS-related GIS system. I'm a very visual person. I like maps with overlays. And there are several things that naturally lend themselves to that overlay

kind of thing. Aerial photographs. Base maps. Topo maps defining drainage basins in neighborhoods. The electric service, which I understand exists very well within a GIS/GPS system. The sewer system. I've worked in several small towns where areas, like the older areas of Newark, in order to find out which side of the street the sewer line was really laid on, you had to bring somebody out of retirement to meet you and tell you it's over there. And water valves that get covered over when a street gets repaved. You bring somebody from the field into the office to tell you where the valve is.

The information exists out there and it needs to be brought together. Sewer overlays, water overlays, electric overlays, stormwater and even street maintenance, so Council has at its fingertips, when it's looking at a capital program, and someone says we need to replace all sewer lines or all water lines that are older than 75 years, the Council and even public can click on that map and see where those lines are. And I see that as being almost its own capital item.

Ms. Houck: Thank you. Josh, yes, you can add to that. I do want to mention that we just hired a GIS coordinator and Josh can expand on that. And then, Tom, maybe you can talk about the path forward for GIS with water and sewer.

Mr. Silverman: I'd like to see that as a capital item. It's a major expenditure to get started and its major replacement and operation and bringing all those survey type pieces together, may be capital type expenditures, and it ought to be part of this package.

Mr. Firestone: Please go ahead.

Mr. Josh Brechbuehl: Yes, Josh Brechbuehl, IT Manager. I can speak to a few of these items. The City started their GIS efforts a little over two years ago. Prior to that, we had kind of an ad-hoc, some people had some apps, and some people had GIS data. The City, itself, has dedicated a good amount of resources to getting this off the ground. Two years ago, we didn't have anyone dedicated to GIS. Today, right now, we have three. We are adding a fourth, possibly, next year, which is in our operating budget for the following year, and we are dedicating a lot of time to gathering this data that has been on paper scattered throughout this building and in people's brains, of course, and putting it into the system. I know the Electric utility has spent a good amount of time prior to that developing in their system and they're porting it over to the GIS infrastructure. And now Tom Coleman is working on having that data from his departments brought into the GIS system. From an IT perspective, we oversee all the resources that work with all the other departments, Parks included, to bring that data into there. So the amount of data that we have put into our GIS system in just two years is enormous compared to where we were before. So we are working towards it.

Mr. Silverman: And I appreciate that and I've been following that in the City's records. But maybe it's time to really bring all that to the surface, consolidate it and make it part of the capital budget and a capital item, itself.

Mr. Brechbuehl: Okay.

Mr. Firestone: Tom?

Mr. Tom Coleman: Tom Coleman, Public Works Director. To expand on what Josh has said, it actually has been a capital item going back to 2014. So the water system master plan and the sewer system master plan are that GIS exercise. So, similarly, we received grant funding for all three, believe it or not. But in 2014 we received a \$100,000 grant and put up \$150,000 in capital money of City funding for a stormwater master plan. So we actually performed a field survey of every catch basin in the City, built a geodatabase that's on one of Josh's servers, along with all of our other geodatabases, and then we similarly surveyed the GPS accuracy of every valve in the City and digitized over all the water lines from our hand-drawn mylar maps and then we did a similar exercise for our sanitary sewer system, also with grant funding, the same as the water system and stormwater system last year. Part of the sewer system master plan

includes flow monitoring and capacity modeling. And, similarly, the water system we have built a water GEMS capacity model that sits on top of the GIS and have performed calibrations by doing flow tests and roughness coefficient factoring for all the lines in the City. So we can now, through that model, tell if we open that fire hydrant, how much water is going to come out of it from our GIS system. And on the sewer side, our goal is, through the capacity modeling that we're doing, to be able to take over . . . right now during the development process, a developer has to tell us whether or not we have capacity in our system. It's not the best method to use. So instead we built the model our self, the development plan comes in . . . it's not done yet, but we did receive a second grant for that one, bringing us up to \$100,000 in grant funding . . . and when a development project comes in, we'll be able to set up a fee for capital cost recovery for sewer capacity analysis. We'll run the analysis, it will help pay for our model, and then they'll get a more detailed analysis as to whether or not there is capacity in the system. It's pretty far along.

Mr. Silverman: My one comment is going to be wow and, secondly, why isn't it the introduction to your capital program? This where we are, this is whose responsible for it, this is what we've done and the stuff you see behind this, if you want to visual it, here it is on our model.

Mr. Coleman: Yes, we wanted to get the geodatabase built for each of our systems because otherwise we didn't have a system of record for our knowledge. So we built the database and now, as one of the slides mentioned, we're doing a survey of all of the corrugated metal pipe in the system. This will be, technically, the second survey. The first one we went out and [inaudible] every pipe. I physically sent one of my employees out to confirm the location of every single corrugated metal pipe in the system and we found a couple thousand more feet of metal pipe. And now we have our engineering consultant out doing visual inspection along with a condition summary for every pipe in the system. That data will get input into our GIS database and then we can start projecting out, once the survey is done by the end of the year, the out years for that kind of levelized capital expenditure for rehab.

Mr. Silverman: Okay, so there is true capital planning going on, it's just that you haven't bragged about it.

Mr. Coleman: Correct. No.

Mr. Silverman: And the other issue I have is that you have what sounds like a very cooperative group of managers at the moment. But, based on my own experience, if a manager is pressed and we have to replace a major pumping station, guess what soft thing gets dropped out of the budget? The my-piece of the big effort. So somehow it needs to be brought in to be an ongoing high priority program. You can't tell your true life cycle costing, for example, unless [inaudible] is constantly there.

Mr. Coleman: I agree.

Mr. Silverman: So maybe that's something we can look forward to in future years. To have not only your slides showing up, but the GIS showing where all these projects are, what they involve, the streets that are going to have new curbing and all that good kind of stuff.

Mr. Coleman: Absolutely.

Mr. Silverman: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Firestone: Thank you. Commissioner Hurd, do you have any questions or comments?

Mr. Hurd: Thank you. I think I have more, sort of, general questions on specific items. On the reservoir mixing project, my only sort of first question is whether that's going to have any visual

effect on the reservoir for the people walking around. Is it going to make it all turbulent? Or is it kind of subtle?

Mr. Coleman: It will be very subtle. And actually one correction for the slides. That was a 2016 project and we've actually already ordered all of the parts. We're doing the installation in-house. It should be complete by the fall. But it's fine bubble aeration and most of the oxygen should be absorbed in the water calm before it gets to the surface. So you might see some light rippling, maybe some small bubbles, but it shouldn't be very noticeable.

Mr. Hurd: Okay. One I have here is just sort of piggybacking on the GIS system issue and this is more for Maureen, I guess, in the future. It would be lovely once we have this integrated GIS system, if that information can be part of what we see when we're reviewing a development. Unless that can be part of the . . .

Ms. Feeney Roser: The Subdivision Advisory Committee comments?

Mr. Hurd: Thank you. If that could be a piece of it to say sewer capacity is blah blah and, you know, the project addition is modeled at this and so we have some confidence in the current state and the projected state.

Ms. Feeney Roser: So you're looking for more detail from the Subdivision Advisory Committee based . . .

Mr. Hurd: Well I think once we have the GIS stuff in place, I think we can do that. I think now it would be hard to say, oh sure it's . . .

Ms. Feeney Roser: Now you're getting that there is capacity or that . . .

Mr. Hurd: Yeah, well it comes up as a question often about is the capacity truly there for some developments. I had sort of a, and I don't know whether the item for the stormwater utility, where that's going to fit in, given that there's still conversations and stuff ongoing on that. One concern for me that came up when I was researching stormwater utilities is institutions like the University of Delaware are often exempt from these kind of programs in other jurisdictions. So, considering how much square footage they control, would we run that risk of another large hole taken out of a possible funding thing, just like property tax is?

Ms. Houck: Delaware has a code provision that they would not be exempt.

Mr. Hurd: Okay, that was one of my first concerns, just reading through it and going okay, if they're exempt, we're screwed.

Mr. Silverman: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Firestone: Will, are you done?

Mr. Hurd: The Council Chamber renovations, how much of this is, sort of, still to be worked out and how much of this is already set to go? I'm looking specifically at an additional entrance/exit and I'm not sure what the justification for that is. But I was . . . the paneling for the front of the dais, \$5,000 for architectural design for that feels a little high, just as a number.

Ms. Houck: It's not finalized.

Mr. Hurd: Okay.

Ms. Houck: The work would need to be done to determine the costs and also involve Mayor and Council on what exactly they want to see done.

Mr. Hurd: So this is more, sort of, a placeholder of things you've heard people say, like wouldn't it be great if we had another way of getting in and out.

Mr. Stozek: As I read it, it sounded to me like it's how to get from the floor out that door.

Mr. Hurd: No, that's a separate piece.

Ms. Houck: There's been some concern about how to exit if there was some type of an incident. That is a concern that's been brought up. Also, the layout, to some extent, although we're a little bit difficult here with what we can do. And just improving the sound. Updating the look of the chambers. And there's also been talk about whether or not we're going to move towards where things are videotaped so that things are picked up better with a different background and things like that.

Mr. Stozek: But you're talking about another complete entrance and exit, or emergency exit, through that wall or something.

Ms. Houck: Yes, that is one of the things that has been brought up.

Mr. Firestone: I've got a question about the difference, as you see it, between needs and wants. Every time that phrase is used, it seems it's used in conjunction with this item could be deferred. And so I'm trying to understand what a need is and what a want is.

Ms. Houck: Essentially the needs are things that, if we did not move forward, we're either going to have to make some decisions about changing service provision or that there's other risks that will become involved. Other things that will be impacted if we don't move forward. Sometimes it may be things that we have already spent money on previously, so that if we don't continue and finish it, that may be money that would have been wasted, so to speak. If you have a specific area that we can . . .

Mr. Firestone: It's just sort of a repeated phrase that this is a need and not a want, but we can defer it. And to a certain extent when you say you can defer it, it sort of sounds like, for this year, it's a want, not a need. It may be a long term need, but for this particular year, it sounds to me like more of a want.

Ms. Houck: Sometimes it's that we think whatever it is that is going to be improved can last, you know, through another year. Maybe it's a vehicle. Maybe other things. I'm trying to think of some of the water projects that we've pushed into out years because of funding availability. But we had to make decisions about what we could include in the program because of what funding levels we thought we would be able to achieve.

Mr. Firestone: And I've got a couple of specific questions and they both have to do with legal compliance. So the first one is on page 101 related to Iron Glen Park Master Plan. It says the purchase was partially funded by the Delaware Land and Water Conservation Trust and we're required as a stipulation of the grant that we got to keep it as open space, but we're using it for leaf and yard waste. But then it got a relatively low priority of 4 – Medium and it says there's no significant risk in the deferral of this item. It seems to me that legal compliance should be a higher priority and not something that we should be deferring.

Ms. Houck: Do you mean from using it for the location where we store our leaves and things?

Mr. Firestone: Well, yes. If we got a grant that we were required to keep this as open space and we've been in violation of that . . .

Ms. Houck: We have not been in violation. They are aware of the usage of it and it cannot be developed for something else without . . . I'm trying to think of a for-instance. There have been other people who've said they were interested in that property for other purposes and we

cannot sell that. But the funding mechanism, Land and Water Trust, I think, are aware and have been out there and they know what we're using it for. So they're not seeing us as not following regulations.

Mr. Firestone: It said a stipulation when using the funding is that the property must be utilized for public outdoor recreation. And it doesn't seem to me that utilizing it for leaf and yard waste is consistent with that grant. Now maybe the State is looking the other way. But it still seems that we were supposed to keep it as outdoor recreation and it would seem to me there should be a higher priority to bring that into conformance with the initial grant maker's intention.

Ms. Houck: And, Joe, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but there are areas of it that are still open for recreation.

Mr. Joe Spadafino: Yes, it is open for passive recreation and the Delaware Land and Water Conservation Trust does know that we do have the master plan on schedule to develop that into a park in the future, whether it be passive or active.

Ms. Houck: Correct me if I'm wrong, because it's been awhile since I've hiked out there but there are opportunities for the public to go and there are areas of it on the outskirts that can be utilized. Is that still correct?

Mr. Spadafino: Yes.

Mr. Firestone: Okay, thank you. My other question on legal compliance relates to the Americans with Disabilities Act, and I see we're making progress with coming into compliance. What's the reason for not immediately coming into compliance as far as the curb cuts, etc. If you could please explain.

Mr. Coleman: Tom Coleman, Public Works Director. Technically we are in compliance so long as we have a plan and we're following the plan to address all ramps in accordance with the plan. So we have a plan and we're in compliance with the plan, so technically we are in compliance with the ADA. You can be in compliance with non-compliant ramps as long as you have a plan and you're enacting it.

Mr. Firestone: It might be useful for both that section and the one that I just mentioned that you just sort of clarify that although we're technically in non-compliance, we are considered to be in compliance, just so that it's clear in the record and as people are reviewing this. Are there other comments from the Commission?

Mr. Hurd: I had one question, actually, on the George Wilson Center before Joe walks away. I saw that you're looking to replace the individual units with a centralized system. Can I ask how you came to the determination that a central system was the best choice for that building, as opposed to, like, through wall units or other . . .

Mr. Spadafino: Are you talking about the George Wilson Center kitchen?

Mr. Hurd: No, the HVAC system replacement.

Mr. Spadafino: Yes, on that one David Greenplate did a study to see what would be the most effective system to use for that. So he might be able to answer that a little bit better but David talked to some different groups and put some numbers together and thought that would be the most effective and efficient way for us to take care of the air-conditioning unit.

Mr. Hurd: Okay.

Mr. Firestone: Thank you. Commissioner Silverman?

Mr. Silverman: Two points of clarification. There is a reference to Kirkwood Highway with respect to water lines. That's Capitol Trail. Kirkwood Highway begins at the old engineering building at All Saints Cemetery. And secondly, I have this in my notes and it was also brought to my attention, on page 100, Project K1601, with respect to the bicycle/pedestrian bridge project, in the narrative there is a mention of \$1.75 million total cost. Coming down to the table, there is a total project cost by category of \$950,000. I can't reconcile those two numbers. It's under Description and Justification. I may be misreading it. It's page 100, Project K1601, Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge.

Ms. Houck: The balance to be funded . . .

Mr. Firestone: Can you please speak into the microphone?

Mr. Spadafino: For the bicycle/pedestrian bridge, right now we've got, for doing the engineering and the permitting for the project, originally the estimate was \$1 million, and we have \$200,000 right now from the Land and Water Conservation Fund that has not been used and we pushed that to the 2017 budget. And then the project now is going to cost \$1.75 million, so that's where that \$950,000 total is. Because right now we have \$1 million in funding for the project, so the shortfall right now is going to be \$750,000 because the \$200,000 represents the Land and Water money that we already have. And we still are going to be doing more grant applications hopefully to close that gap between now and 2018, when construction starts. We expect construction to be completed in 2019.

Mr. Firestone: Thank you. Commissioner Stozek? Oh, excuse me. . .

Ms. Houck: I was just going to add that I think . . . I don't know that you're looking at the sheet . . . but I think this is one of the ones that changed during the process and I don't think this was updated. That's why I think you're seeing a balance funding issue.

Mr. Silverman: That's where I asked for clarification. So the table on the bottom was not updated to match what was in the narrative.

Ms. Houck: To not match the changes.

Mr. Hurd: I'll just note that the narrative says that you're getting \$300,000 from the Kershaw Park but the Kershaw Park project has \$200,000 sitting on it. So it can't . . .

Mr. Silverman: I was very confused when I read through that.

Mr. Spadafino: Yes, there was a Kershaw Park parking lot that was proposed for the 2017 budget but with the addition of the bridge, we felt that another parking lot, the parking lot from the Curtis Paper Mill to get to the Kershaw Park would be about 100 yards that they would have to walk to get to Kershaw Park. The Kershaw Park parking lot was originally proposed before the bridge project became a reality. So that \$200,000 for that Kershaw Park parking lot, we want to put that funding towards the bicycle/pedestrian bridge.

Mr. Hurd: I'm just saying that the narrative for the pedestrian bridge says its \$300,000 that you're getting.

Mr. Spadafino: Okay. That should be \$200,000. Thank you.

Ms. Houck: We'll make adjustments to that and you'll get new sheets.

Mr. Firestone: Thank you. Commissioner Stozek?

Mr. Stozek: Just a couple of final comments and questions. We talked before about reserves and there's money going into reserves and coming out of reserves. What is your goal, steady state number, that you want to have your reserve fund built to?

Mr. Del Grande: Our policy is to have a 51-day reserve. And actually Black & Veatch was in doing the stormwater, water and sewer rate reviews with Council last week and their proposal is for us to move the 51-day up to 60-day reserves for all of our water, stormwater and sewer funds.

Mr. Stozek: That's just water.

Mr. Del Grande: Correct.

Mr. Stozek: You have other departments putting money into reserves too.

Mr. Del Grande: Yes, correct, I was moving on there. So moving on to the other funds, we look to have the same type of reserves, as well, to mirror the 51-day to 60-day policy for those, so that we're consistent across the board.

Mr. Stozek: But 51 days . . . what does that mean? Fifty-one days of what?

Mr. Del Grande: Essentially the 51 days is 51 days of our revenue should be in reserves for operations. So you essentially take roughly a \$10 million sewer budget, divide it by 365, times 51 days, and that's what we're looking at for a sewer reserve for operations.

Mr. Stozek: I know you probably don't have it but I would love to know what that gross number is. How many dollars all those things add up rather than just saying 51 days.

Mr. Del Grande: Sure, understood.

Mr. Stozek: Question, I'm curious, you're going to be doing a lot of parking lot resurfacing and tennis court resurfacing and various other things. Does the City have its own inspectors or does it contract inspectors when that work is being done?

Ms. Houck: It's typically our own inspectors who do it. If there were some . . . I'm trying to think if there was a time in the past when we did contract out and it's not coming to me . . . but it is our own inspectors from Public Works.

Mr. Stozek: This is ancient history but with your predecessor I used to be on the phone with him all the time talking about the shoddy work that was being done on paving streets. I don't see that now, so you're probably doing a good job.

One other question about Parks and Rec. In reference to everybody else, you're kind of like the poor stepchild with how much money you get, but in 2018 and 2019 your budget jumps up to over \$2 million because you're doing a whole bunch of expensive projects in those two years. Why do they have to be done in those two years and not spread out?

Mr. Spadafino: One of those projects is the old Paper Mill Park improvements that is going to represent \$600,000 in 2018 and \$1.2 million in 2019. That project has been pushed for the last several years and we believe with the addition of the reservoir, Preston's Playground, and the development on that side of town that it might be time to develop that park. And then we also have, as you said, the bicycle/pedestrian bridge project coming up.

Mr. Stozek: I just worry that you've got a whole bunch of things going on in those two years. And it's not just the money, it's also just keeping track of all that work and getting it done in a timely manner.

Mr. Spadafino: Yes.

Mr. Stozek: I think you ought to at least look at if some of those things can be deferred a year or two and spread that cost out. That's just a comment.

Ms. Houck: Joe, if I can also add that the bicycle/pedestrian bridge design for 2017 is what DelDOT is considering?

Mr. Spadafino: Yes.

Ms. Houck: So that's why it ended up in 2018. We're assuming that they would get that done during that time period.

Mr. Stozek: And my last comment is I was very happy to see that the distribution system at the STAR Campus was pushed back. I assume that's because we don't have any kind of goal or date or forecast from the University. So this is not the time to discuss it, but when Council is talking about that I want to have a lively discussion about how that gets paid for. That's all I have.

Mr. Firestone: Any other Commissioner have any comment? Does anyone else from the public have anything else they would like to add? Mr. Gifford?

Mr. Rob Gifford: Thank you. Rob Gifford, District 3. I hadn't planned on making any comments tonight but I did look through the CIP and I think there's a lot of good discussion about leveling the budgets. Looking at how we fund things, we have years where we have a tremendous amount to do and years where we don't. I think looking more deeply into that and trying to smooth that out, predict how much funding you're going to need and actually plan for the funding that you know you have would make it easier for paying for these projects over the timeframe that is more appropriate. You know, not just paying for them all up-front. Especially the parks. That's one that's been, I think, difficult. I think if you look through the narrative, it talks about the grant funding. I'm not sure that we got that grant funding for those parks. And I'd like to have more discussions about how do we finance the longer term projects. I know that referendum is tough for the City but I think it's part of our process here in the City and if we're going to put an 80-year pipe in the ground or a big project for water, I think we should consider that, essentially, mortgage a part of it and then plan that funding. So thanks for some of your comments around that and I look forward to Council's comments. Thank you.

Mr. Firestone: Thank you. Does staff have anything they would like to add before we consider the question?

Ms. Houck: Thank you for your time and your effort looking through the program.

Mr. Firestone: The Chair will now entertain a motion.

Mr. Hurd: Oh, okay, no one else is going.

Mr. Stozek: Can I ask a question? When the recommendation goes forward to Council, are our comments going to be distilled down as well?

Ms. Houck: We can do that. I can work with Maureen and Dave to take all your comments and share that. Council, of course, does get the minutes, but we can consolidate and make sure that it's highlighted.

Mr. Hurd: Okay, so I move that we approve the Capital Improvements Program as noted and commented and amended.

Mr. Firestone: Is there a second?

Mr. McIntosh: Second.

Mr. Firestone: Any discussion? Okay. All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying Aye. Opposed? The motion carries.

MOTION BY HURD, SECONDED BY MCINTOSH, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAKE THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL:

**THAT CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE 2017 - 2021 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM WITH THE COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS PROPOSED BY THE COMMISSION.**

VOTE: 5-0

AYE: FIRESTONE, HURD, MCINTOSH, SILVERMAN, STOZEK

NAY: NONE

ABSENT: CRONIN, DISTRICT 3 (VACANT)

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Firestone: Do we have a motion to adjourn?

Mr. McIntosh: So moved.

Mr. Firestone: Second?

Mr. Hurd: Second.

Mr. Firestone: Any objections?

Mr. McIntosh: None. Oh, excuse me.

Mr. Firestone: This meeting is adjourned.

Ms. Feeney Roser: Thank you all.

There being no further business, the Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan Silverman  
Planning Commission Secretary

As transcribed by Michelle Vispi  
Planning and Development Department Secretary