

**MINUTES OF A BOARD MEETING OF THE  
RECREATIONAL AUTHORITY OF  
ROSEVILLE AND EASTPOINTE  
HELD ON THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 2012**

The meeting was called to order at 5:34 p.m. at the Roseville Recreation Center, 18185 Sycamore, by Chairperson Aiuto with the following Board Members present:

Duchane, Frontera, Klinefelt and Switalski

Administrator present: Director Lipinski

Motion by Switalski, seconded by Frontera, to approve the minutes of the regular meeting dated March 8, 2012, as written.

Yeas: Switalski, Frontera, Duchane, Klinefelt and Aiuto

Nays: None

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Discussion on the Bond Capacity for the Authority:**

Chairperson Aiuto read into the record a portion of the Letter from York Dolan & Tomlinson, P.C. as follows:

"It is my opinion reading this section, that any obligation, note, loan, or bond that exceeds a period of five years requires the approval of the majority of the electors in each of the participating municipalities. Because there is no delineation of which taxes being levied are specified, even if it is within the one mill levied for purposes of the Recreational Authority, if the loan or obligation is greater than five years, it must go to the electorate."

Chairperson Aiuto commented that we asked for a legal opinion and we received one that says even if the expense falls within the one mill, if it takes more than five years to pay for it, we have to ask the voters to approve it.

Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that the legal issue has far reaching ramifications State –wide so she contacted the Attorney General to asked how we get the Attorney General to issues an opinion on the issue because it does have implications for all the authorities; we would need to pose the question to a legislator that would need to pose the questions to the Attorney General and asked the Authority what they thought regarding asking for this opinion. Chairperson Aiuto suggested taking the word bond out of the question because we want to borrow money. Board Member Duchane commented that some of this issue we find in some other statutory structures and from what he has read and researched the intent of the legislature was to make sure these special authorities weren't set up just to bond and borrow money for other purposes; it is not compatible with the DDA or Building Authority statutes; we really have a situation and need to have a little broader review to see how this needs to be changed and it is reasonable to ask a legislator for a further opinion. Board Member Switalski commented that there is no cost in asking for an opinion so he would engage a legislator to ask that opinion. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that she would support that. Board Member Frontera commented that because we are one of the first authorities in the State we need to do these types of things to get clarification.

Chairperson Aiuto asked how the Board wants to handle this; would they like Board Member Switalski to contact a legislator or have a letter on Board letterhead sent to a legislator to ask for the Attorney General opinion.

Motion by Switalski, seconded by Klinefelt, to contact our legislator to ask the Attorney General to further define the spirit of the wording as written.

Yeas: Switalski, Klinefelt, Duchane, Frontera and Aiuto  
Nays: None

**Executive Summary Presentation by Partners in Architecture and AEW on Facility Assessment Report:**

David Gassen or Partners in Architecture and Scott Lockwood of Anderson Eckstein & Westrick were in attendance.

Mr. Gassen gave an overview of the draft summary of the facility assessment report; at next meeting will have detailed matrix which will itemize individual things and prioritize them; today surveyed information we could gather and do field work; looked at the primary issues – safety issues (code compliance, accessibility and program enhancement); addition of seniors has created some demand for space and competition to use space; special events that will need to be off site; there are things that you would like to happen here but don't have the space; specific areas – computer room could be larger; fitness area could be larger with more equipment; pre-school functions – there are no toilet facilities, no wet sink for crafts and activities; administrative area – lacks conference rooms and conducting meetings in the lobby sometimes; garage – utilized for storage of park equipment and maybe an easy way to expand; gymnasium – couple of things that could be done such as a raised walking track.

Mr. Lockwood gave an overview of site conditions; parking lot – plenty of spaces but condition of asphalt is fair to poor condition, 95% of curbs are in good condition, drainage and grading – appears to drain quite well; play equipment is relatively new but visibility is poor because of the building but does have surveillance system; fencing is hodgepodge and generally in fair to poor condition; landscape beds are in decent condition and they have irrigation; fencing – many trees and brush growing in the fencing; sidewalks on the site are in good condition and sidewalks in right-of-way are in good condition; other than ADA sidewalks didn't see any other accessibility problems; should have an enclosure for the garbage; ADA accessibility problem with ramps because of cross slope; the way the ADA spaces are currently striped is incorrect but have plenty of space to stripe under the current standards; lighting no current problems and exterior building lights have been ordered; signage other than ADA parking signs are old but they are functional; railings around the building are in good condition and under miscellaneous a new bike rack was installed and should be located in a different spot

Mr. Gassen reviewed the exterior envelope of the building - in good shape lacking the structural issue; walls for the building on the older section are cavity walls; there are some minor settlement cracks on the old portion of the building; the vents and weeps have been sealed and worried about water problems so there is a need to do sealant project. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked what price range Mr. Gassen was talking about to do the sealant project. Mr. Gassen replied approximately \$5,000 cost every five to six years. Mr. Gassen said there were a couple of problems with the metal panels in the walls; recommendation is to do the sealant and do the transitional work at the metal.

Mr. Gassen reviewed the wall system – addition – walls that are failing structurally because they are sitting on bad foundation; we are experiencing a water problem in the walls because we are sealing vents and weeps and then water freezing down at the bottom of the walls; masonry is in terrible condition on the addition because of the underlying problem of the foundation.

Mr. Gassen reviewed the roof areas – roof systems are original and are somewhere between 16 and 22 years roof life; nearing its end of life and should put on the priority list; should fix the minor problems to hold the roof over for a while; sealant problem also going on up on the roof also.

Mr. Gassen reviewed the interior conditions – as a whole you can see that it was built in several different vintages; older section as accessibility issues and the newer section doesn't have accessibility issues; the building is accessible, problematically have to make adjustments to make that happen; things that aren't such as display panel in the main lobby and counter heights in the kitchen in the gym; in general the rest of the building has a smattering of things that need to be addressed; main bathrooms off the lobby don't have the appropriate level finishes; look at the ceiling tiles and they are 2x4 and are pretty battered, sagging and had a bout with humidity; doors pretty much hollow metal and some hardware needs to be fixed; doors – couple of the exit doors aren't functioning; the interior can go through freshening up.

Mr. Gassen reviewed the mechanical systems – most of what you have is original equipment; all near its typical life end; air handling system maybe has 8-10 years; things with more moving parts maybe 5 years.

Mr. Gassen reviewed the plumbing systems – in good shape only a few things (drain in the garage connected to the storm system instead of the sewer system) so this would be a priority issue.

Mr. Gassen reviewed the energy consumption – energy audit for gas and electric over last 12 of 13 months – building is performing at what it should be for a building of this vintage.

Mr. Gassen reviewed the electrical system – in good shape for right now but has no expandability in it; would need to address egress lighting, exit lighting not functioning properly and strobe lighting.

Mr. Lockwood reviewed the issue regarding the foundation of the 1992 addition – early deterioration of concrete in the footings; this will accelerate over time; we have indicated that it is getting to a point where you have to consider how far do we let it go before we close the building or do something about it; no choice but to remove the footings and replace them; concluded that you are at a continuous monitoring condition and perhaps the building would be fine for x amount of years but also one day something could happen and need to close the addition until something is fixed. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked could something happen that an individual could be injured. Mr. Lockwood replied that the building is not at the point yet. Mr. Gassen commented that the outside wall has moved 3-1/2 inches over a couple of years and that water is inside the walls. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked could there be a sudden issue. Mr. Gassen replied that there could be but you could go through a period of time where it doesn't move. Board Member Switalski asked is there any way to release that water out of the wall. Mr. Gassen responded that you open up the vents and weeps. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that just this repair was between 600,000 and \$700,000 and asked does that contain fixing the inside walls. Mr. Lockwood replied that it covers restoration of the building. Mr. Gassen commented that another option to replacing the footings would be to put in a new footing on the outside of the other wall for the addition. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt responded that she doesn't see an expansion at this time. Board Member Switalski commented that there is about \$230,000 a year in the budget for capital. Mr. Gassen said a new roof would be \$300,000 to 350,000. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that \$2.1 million didn't include HVAC. Board Member Switalski asked how much for HVAC. Mr. Gassen replied approximately \$500,000. Mr. Gassen suggested staggering all equipment for five to seven years but would want HVAC on the priority list. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that the heating could just one day not be working so we would need to close the building down. Board Member Duchane commented that he is concerned that there are a lot of priority issues to operate this building. Mr. Gassen informed the Board that he would have his next report out in two weeks. Board Member Switalski asked if he would include things to show how to extend things in the priority list. Board Member Duchane commented that this building may not be the long-term solution and thinks that the Board should approach it and look to see what three to five years for maintenance for this building to operate it as a recreation facility and the Board look ahead to alternatives whether this going to be replaced or we are going to find another facility; explained that the building at Eight Mile Road is in much better shape than this building; there are a lot of facility issues and this is going to be a significant turning point when we look at your final report, Vice Chairperson Klinefelt explained to the Board that Eastpointe has replaced everything at the Community Center on Eight Mile Road and we promised a large number of the voters that this building would be

Recreational Authority. Board Member Duchane commented that just because it wouldn't be this facility doesn't mean it can't be a facility geographically located in the heart of the authority. Board Member Switalski commented that if there are alternative sites we should look at them.

**Review and Approve Proposed Land Use Agreement:**

Director Lipinski informed the Board that in the packet there was a revised Land Use Agreement and asked the Board if they had any questions.

Board Member Duchane commented that he worked with both attorneys on this and addressed general questions; need to finalize the parks and facilities covered and need to finalize insurance coverage.

Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that she viewed the Recreational Authority as easing the burden on the cities by taking over the scheduling of the parks, etc. and found it interesting that the cities want us to pay them for the right to ease the burden and thinks it is each City's responsibility to take care of their parks. Board Member Switalski commented that he thought of it that we will schedule and you and make sure the City lines the field. Director Lipinski commented that the Authority staff does not line the fields; the City staff drags and lines the fields; general maintenance and rental fees should cover the cost of paying the City for dragging and lining the field. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that this Agreement is to be voted on by the City Councils of each City and this Authority so how do you vote on this Agreement as an Authority member and Council member. Board Member Duchane commented that both arguments are solid; it is a question of we know what we are and we are negotiating price. Chairperson Aiuto asked if her concern was the money was too much; doesn't want to tack on fees that we begin shooing people away won't use our fields; don't want to discourage people to use our land. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that she feels the \$2,500 number is too big; raising it that the parks belong to the City and we are paying a fairly substantial sum to the City; doesn't have a number yet and maintenance of the parks is a City responsibility. Chairperson Aiuto asked if there is vandalism at the park, who is responsible for clean up. Director Lipinski replied it is the City's responsibility. Board Member Switalski asked that Mr. Lipinski look at the \$2,500 number and Vice Chairperson Klinefelt can come up with a number.

Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented on No. 11 – Parks Commission – believes that if you create a Parks Commission with staff representatives from each party then they would be subject to the Open Meetings Act whereas if you just have an agreement that members of the staff of each will meet to review this once a year, they are administrators that can meet in an office. Board Duchane explained that you have a couple of layers of how to administer; agrees with Vice Chairperson Klinefelt that the establishment of a Commission will be necessary; administrations can meet and discuss. Board Member Switalski asked would the Director of Authority, finance people from each city meet and review this. Board Duchane commented that he would submit that we don't need this structure in here.

Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented on – Section 3 – Parks Covered – asked are these all the parks in the City of Roseville. Director Lipinski replied no, these are the parks which could potentially have an athletic event. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that there may be a need to add some Eastpointe parks – Belleview, Roxana and Shamrock.

Board Member Frontera had a question about Lion's park because it is school property leased to the City and would we need to look at that down the road. Director Lipinski replied it is something we look at every five or six years to use for soccer. Board Member Frontera commented that as a Board couldn't we do this instead of the City doing this. Director Lipinski responded that the City does mow and maintain Lion's park. Chairperson Aiuto commented that then the City would say you have to maintain it. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that the tennis courts and Kelly School need to be looked into. Board Member Duchane told Board Members to send comments to Director Lipinski and we will discuss it from there.

**Review and Approve Proposed Transition Plan:**

Director Lipinski explained that in a meeting with staff in Eastpointe and Roseville and thinking long-term, we talked about the spring/summer programs that would be coordinated as is through the cities but we did want to try to combine the youth softball and baseball but Eastpointe had begun their registration and their leagues have a large age span but would like to pursue combining with our leagues in 2013; working with seasonal park attendant staff in both cities and they do basically the same thing; if we don't have an event at a park, we don't have a park attendant present but Eastpointe does have a park attendant at Spindler and Kennedy even if an event wasn't scheduled; pavilion rental policy will be on the next agenda and consistent for both cities; single brochure for the Authority with a kick-off on August 13, 2012 with a movie in the park and have the brochure ready for this event; asked the Board to think about a logo for the Authority; planning on closing the Community Center on Eight Mile Road on September 30, 2012.

Chairperson Aiuto asked do you need the Board approval on this Transition Plan. Director Lipinski replied that he would like the Board to approve the date of closing the Community Center on Eight Mile Road and his thought process is that he will work around the construction at the Roseville facility.

Board Member Duchane suggested that within the next month of so pass a resolution to collect the one mill by directing the cities to collect it and would suggest it be a summer tax. Chairperson Aiuto replied that this bears some conversation because we just did the one mill in December and now if we ask again in July residents may have a problem with that. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that the budget is predicated that we will do this so the fund we are starting with really isn't there. Jane Lamb replied that the one mill is on the winter. Board Member Switalski asked if it is in the ballot language. Ms. Lamb replied she doesn't believe so. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented on the scheduling of the closing of the facility in September; since we are not approving this would like to see his matrix on how much interruption the residents are going to have here. Board Member Switalski commented that it was a good question about disruption and commented on the efficiency of staying in one building and saving costs. Board Member Frontera commented that it is much more cost effective to close it sooner than later but understands Vice Chairperson Klinefelt's commented of waiting to hear what the architects have to say.

Board Member Duchane excused himself from the meeting.

**Discussion and Approve the Updated 2012/2013 Proposed Roseville-Eastpointe Recreational Authority Budget:**

Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked if the Board should review the updated budget first and then go in depth at home. Director Lipinski replied that Ms. Lamb will give a brief summary of the updated budget and then the Board can look at it. Chairperson Aiuto commented that the Board should get the updated budget, review it ourselves and send emails with questions or comments. Ms. Lamb began her explanation that the only changes projected a ten percent reduction in salary for the full-time staff and ten percent reduction for the full-time part-time staff; adjusted the budget if the personal property tax was not available in the coming years; discussed the possibility of closing the Eight Mile facility while renovations are going on at the Roseville facility, but talked with Director Lipinski about closing it when we brought all the programs over on October 1<sup>st</sup>; year 2012-13 did not project the personal property tax loss but did do it for the subsequent years; \$50,000 savings from overall wages and closing the Community Center early it gives you roughly \$75,000 so increased the Authority's revenue by \$125,000. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked are part-time wages for Eastpointe and Roseville in these documents. Ms. Lamb replied no, but Director Lipinski should have those for her. Board Member Switalski asked where the fund balance is. Ms. Lamb showed Board Member Switalski where it was. Director Lipinski commented that there were changes to part-time wages because some were paid higher by Eastpointe and some were paid higher by Roseville. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked what the difference is between lead park attendant and park attendant. Director Lipinski responded that is someone we have utilized in the past couple of years to schedule the park attendants. Director Lipinski mentioned that they adjusted all wages for the year. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt wanted to know what the part-timers are making from each City right now. Director

Lipinski responded that he would get that information to Vice Chairperson Klinefelt. Ms. Lamb explained that when we first sat down there was a different rate of pay for people who have been returning year after year. Director Lipinski thanked Ms. Lamb for all her work on this proposed budget; discussed a ten percent wage reduction, whether it is a direct wage reduction or taking unpaid leave days in August or the holidays when it is slowest and maybe close the building down for maintenance then. Board Member Switalski thanked Ms. Lamb and Director Lipinski for the proposed budget and when we collect in December then you would like to see the fund balance because that would be when it would be at the lowest. Director Lipinski commented that the busiest time of the year is July 1<sup>st</sup> through October 1<sup>st</sup> and that is when most part-time wages are used. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt pointed out that Board Member Switalski requested and she made it very clear that she has not made any assumption that this ten percent is or isn't at this point until she looks at everything. Ms. Lamb explained that this is just a proposal and please feel free to call her regarding any questions. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked if the downgraded position to an hourly rate is still in this budget. Director Lipinski responded that the Youth Sports Coordinator is still in the budget.

**Review/Discuss Program Financial Summaries for 2012 Winter/Spring Programs:**

Director Lipinski reviewed the financial summaries for the 2012 Winter/Spring Programs that ran in Roseville and doesn't have those numbers from Eastpointe yet; elementary cheerleading program came in at a loss of \$400 because the skirts for that program were replaced; adult basketball lost \$200 because referee and scorekeeper costs were greater and will be adjusted for the team fees for the next program. Board Member Switalski commented that the programs are doing great. Board Member Klinefelt asked if the Adult/Youth Sports Coordinator position is still in this budget. Director Lipinski replied yes.

**Hearing of the Public:**

Walter Jakubiec commented that Partners in Architecture didn't come with the numbers he expected so he will hold off his comments and suggestions until next meeting.

**Director Report:**

Director Lipinski informed the Board that he has started meeting with representatives from East Detroit High School, Director Rizzo, his assistant and varsity baseball coach; did agree that they would pay \$40 per game and he is still working on a field rental policy. Board Member Switalski asked if this is what we charge in Roseville. Director Lipinski responded that Roseville charges \$70. Board Member Switalski asked do they pay for practice time. Director Lipinski replied that they don't pay right now. Board Member Switalski asked if Director Lipinski will make Eastpointe consistent with Roseville. Director Lipinski replied that he would. Director Lipinski informed the Board that he will meet with the Eastpointe Youth Baseball League later in the year to discuss 2013 registration; working on an inventory list and hope to have that for the next meeting; Easter egg hunt was very well attended; has decided to hold the food service program even though we didn't receive the grant because of the benefit to the residents with little cost to the Authority and met with Mary Demsich and Greg Verkest from Eastpointe parks maintenance regarding scheduling.

**Board Member Reports:**

Board Member Frontera had no report.

Board Member Switalski had no report.

Board Member Klinefelt had no report.

Chairperson Aiuto had no report.

Motion by Switalski, seconded by Frontera, to adjourn the meeting at 7:42 p.m.

Yeas: Switalski, Frontera, Klinefelt and Aiuto  
Nays: None

**MOTION CARRIED**

---

Linda S. Lince, Acting Secretary