



Monroe County

Capital Improvements Program

2013-2017

Monroe County, Michigan

**Monroe County
Capital Improvements Program
2013-2017**

This document prepared and published by the
Monroe County Planning Department & Commission
125 East Second Street
Monroe, MI 48161

(734) 240-7375 • Fax (734) 240-7385
Robert P. Peven, AICP, Director

Report Coordinator:
Lee W. Markham, Planner

Monroe County Planning Commission
Mary K. Webb, Chairman

Monroe County Board of Commissioners
R. LaMar Frederick, Chairman

September 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1:	
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2:	
The Capital Improvements Programming Process	5
Chapter 3:	
Financial Analysis.....	11
Chapter 4:	
Future Capital Improvements Needs (and worksheets).....	29
Chapter 5:	
Bonded Indebtedness	35
Chapter 6:	
Findings and Recommendations.....	39

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Inasmuch as a government's response to today's changing needs must be achieved within the limits of its available resources, choosing priorities among competing needs becomes an important element in what the ultimate response is to be. Each expenditure must be carefully analyzed. Since it is often impossible to meet all the identified needs with the revenues available, requests for expenditures of revenues must also be prioritized to enable decision makers to eliminate all non-essential expenditures.

One way in which a governmental unit can approach this problem is through the development and implementation of a Capital Improvements Program (CIP). Capital improvements are defined for the purposes of this report as major non-recurring expenditures for physical facilities of government or recurring expenditures for physical items which cost over \$12,000, such as equipment or vehicles. Capital improvements are the projects which often require the issuance of bonds or are paid for by loans, and therefore are very important to the budgetary process. Specific examples include sewer lines or sewer plant facilities, new construction or major renovation of governmental buildings, and other public investments

In recent years, the Monroe County Board of Commissioners, like many municipal boards across the nation, and particularly in the State of Michigan, has found itself facing an extremely difficult and ever-mounting financial crisis, reflecting a trend of economic shortfalls that have beset all levels of government, businesses, and individuals. Reduced taxable value has resulted in reduction of property tax revenues, the County's chief source of income. The Board has taken numerous steps, which have included careful examination of costs, significant reduction in County staff, and curtailment of some services. Spending levels have been reduced since 2008. Capital improvements budgeting was halted for a year, but has now been restored on a limited basis. While our economic difficulties have not yet shown any signs of a rapid turnaround, these measures have successfully averted financial collapse. Budgeting for the immediate future must be similarly constrained. Still, County government operations cannot stand still, and capital needs continue to arise. So we offer this Monroe County Capital Improvements Program with the following points in mind:

- The Michigan Planning Enabling Act (PA 33 of 2008) requires local municipalities that have adopted a master plan to annually prepare a capital improvements program. This language is contained in Article IV, Section 65, subparts (1) and (2).
- The Monroe County Planning Ordinance likewise requires that the County Planning Commission prepare an annual Capital Improvements Program (Section 17).
- The annual CIP update is intended to provide background information to the Board of Commissioners in their ongoing decision-making process. This document outlines needs expressed by department heads, and presents an analysis of financial data that may be useful in future planning.
- It is possible that funding may be available for projects from a variety of sources other than the Capital Improvements Fund.

- The annual reporting of data in the Financial Analysis section (Chapter 3) should be updated annually in order to provide ongoing information to the Board of Commissioners and to maintain continuity.

A capital improvements program is, in effect, a yearly evaluation of priorities and provides an appropriate opportunity for review of an area's overall development objectives for the near future. This is especially important in county government because of the autonomy of the many county departments that are increasingly involved in developing capital improvements.

One of the most important purposes of planning is to anticipate the needs of a community for public facility improvements, and to provide a stable base from which to work in achieving these needs. This is a function of the capital improvements plan, which can help the county to develop and implement a long-range policy for physical development, and thus act as an efficient and effective tool in implementing both county and local development needs.

ORGANIZATION OF THIS REPORT

In writing this report, *Monroe County Capital Improvements Program 2013-2017*, the staff of the Monroe County Planning Department was concerned with more fully developing a formal capital improvements process through which all departments in the County would make their physical improvement needs known. The advantages of establishing such a process would assist Monroe County in implementing its policies for long-range physical development. The County's ability to finance short and long term capital investment needs are also mentioned in this report.

The *Monroe County Capital Improvements Program 2013-2017* is comprised of six chapters. This chapter includes the organization of the report and the study methodology. A detailed description of the capital improvements programming process can be found in Chapter Two, along with recommendations and proposed amendments for its implementation. The financial analysis appears in Chapter Three. This chapter will examine the County's fiscal position and will evaluate the County's ability to finance necessary capital expenditures. The financial analysis consists of two steps: 1) a historical summary; and 2) a forecast and estimate of future trends in the financing of public improvements. This information will constitute a basic planning background for the present CIP. Chapter Four will cover the future capital improvements needs, and will serve to identify those capital expenditures which the County of Monroe is expected to incur in the near future, particularly during **2013-2017**. Chapter Five is a summary of the County's present bonded indebtedness, and Chapter Six will conclude the study with a summary of findings and recommendations for the County Board of Commissioners.

STUDY METHODOLOGY

The initial steps of the *Monroe County Capital Improvements Program 2013-2017* included a review of previous year's reports, a search and analysis of existing related literature, discussions with other governmental units having experience in capital improvements programming, interviews with County department heads, and several visits

to a number of departments. Forms and instructions for their preparation were distributed to all County department heads by the Monroe County Planning.

After each department formally submitted its proposals to the Planning Department, the Planning staff reviewed and assembled data from other planning publications for use in their consideration of the project proposals. Additionally, the Planning Department further discussed the proposals with each department and other interested groups in order to clarify and restructure the proposals, as needed.

The financial analysis of the County's ability to finance these project requests was also made by Planning Department staff. Primary sources of the fiscal data used in this study included published information compiled by various local and state agencies, data compiled but not published, and information found in public records. Many dollar amounts have been rounded to the nearest dollar and therefore, might not balance exactly.

Because most County departments do not have projections and estimates of needs for their own use, the Planning Department staff had to prepare its own projections and estimates, relying heavily upon statistical and accepted scientific methods. Comments on the methods can be found in the appropriate chapters.

Chapter 2

THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMMING PROCESS

The process by which the Monroe County Planning Department has developed this study was described briefly in Chapter One. In this chapter, however, a more detailed description of the entire Capital Improvements Programming process will be presented, and further recommendations and amendments to the present process will be proposed.

ADVANTAGES OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMMING

Many advantages are to be derived by formulating a capital improvements programming process for Monroe County. Some of these possible advantages are as follows.

Focuses Attention on Community Goals, Needs & Capabilities:

As mentioned in the previous chapter, capital improvements projects can coincide with community objectives, the financial resources available to the County, and growth patterns anticipated for the area. Additionally, the preparation and review of a capital improvements program can act to ensure that the location of new public facilities reinforces existing community development policies. By planning in advance for these public projects, those that are most needed or desired can be constructed or acquired first.

Achieves Optimum Use of the Taxpayers' Dollars:

Advance programming of public works projects on an orderly basis will help avoid the possibility of costly mistakes. An accepted capital improvements program can guide local officials in making sound budget decisions. In addition, a listing of anticipated future construction projects may encourage the selection of needed land well in advance of actual construction, thus permitting acquisition at a lower cost.

Serves Wider Community Interests:

A capital improvements program, once adopted, can help keep the public informed about future construction plans for the community. In addition, knowledge about the future physical needs of the community and the financial ability of the local governments to fulfill these needs is a valuable aid to private investors.

Encourages a More Efficient Governmental Administration:

Coordination of capital programming by the agencies of the County can reduce scheduling problems, conflicting or duplicative projects, and the over-emphasis of any governmental function.

Improves the Basis for Intergovernmental & Regional Cooperation:

Because many public services and facilities do not stop at the city, township or county boundaries, adequate planning and cooperation through a capital improvements program by the various agencies and governments in and surrounding Monroe County could elimi-

nate duplication of effort, which thereby reduces costs, and thus reduces the possibility of public inconvenience.

Maintains a Sound & Stable Fiscal Program:

When there is ample time for planning capital improvements, the most economical means of financing a project can be selected in advance. Keeping planned projects within the financial capacity of the community helps to preserve its credit rating, which makes an area more attractive to incoming businesses and industries.

Enhances Opportunities for Participation in Federal & State Grant-in-Aid Programs:

Many Federal and State funding programs exist which a local government may utilize in the planning, construction and financing of capital projects. Preparation of a capital improvements program can serve as a basis from which a local government may investigate these funding sources, and may improve an agency's chances of securing such aid.

RELATIONSHIP OF A CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM TO A LONG-RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Capital improvements programming provides a systematic basis for programming the planning, financing and construction of public facilities and the acquisition of equipment. Capital improvements budgeting, however, cannot be carried out realistically without the benefit of a comprehensive long-range physical and social plan. Thus, the decision to begin a capital improvements programming process within a governmental unit such as Monroe County ideally requires the related commitment to develop such a comprehensive plan, if one has not already been established.

The development of a long-range plan is not sufficient in and of itself, however. An attempt must also be made to coordinate capital improvements expenditures with the policies advocated by the plan. The preparation and review of the capital improvements program can be employed to assure that the location of new public facilities reinforces the community policies as set forth in the adopted comprehensive plan. These must, therefore, be reviewed in a coordinated effort so as to ensure harmonious development within any area of concern.

The Monroe County Capital Improvements Program is based primarily upon the Monroe County Comprehensive Plan. This plan includes information on population, housing, land use, community facilities and transportation services available to County residents and, along with other publications, has provided the Planning Department staff with an important background for capital improvements programming. *The Capital Improvements Plan* has a set of goals upon which expenditures are to be based in order to coordinate with the desired plan of the County.

GENERAL METHODS OF FINANCE

The purpose of this section is to list some of the most common ways of financing capital improvements. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development again outlines the following methods:

Pay-as-You-Go

Pay-as-you-go is the financing of improvement projects from current revenues. Such revenues may come from general taxation, fees, charges for services, special funds, or special assessments. Advantages of this method include the saving of interest costs on borrowed money and providing for greater future budget flexibility. The major disadvantage is the need to have uncommitted cash available, which often precludes the financing of extensive capital improvements in a small community. Reserve fund financing is a variation of the pay-as-you-go method. Under this procedure, funds are accumulated in advance for the construction of capital projects. The accumulation may result from surplus of “earmarked” operational revenues that are set aside, depreciation accounts, or from the sale of capital assets.

General Obligation Bonds

Projects providing community-wide benefits may be financed by general obligation bonds. Through this method, the taxing power of the jurisdiction is pledged to pay interest upon and retire the debt. General obligation bonds can be sold to finance permanent types of improvements such as schools, municipal buildings, parks and recreation facilities. General obligation bonds may require the approval of the electorate and are issued as either sinking fund, or more commonly, serial bonds.

Revenue Bonds

Revenue Bonds frequently are sold for such projects as storm sewers, stadiums, swimming pools, airports, and other revenue-producing facilities. Such bonds usually are not included in State imposed debt limits, as are general obligation bonds, because they are not backed by the full faith and credit of the local jurisdiction. For this same reason, interest rates are almost always higher than are general obligation bond interest rates and voter approval is seldom required. However, care must be taken to assure that estimated net earnings of new facilities are realistic.

Lease/Purchase

Local governments utilizing the lease-purchase method prepare specifications for a needed public works project and take steps to have it constructed by a private company or authority. The facility is then leased by the municipality at an annual or monthly rental. At the end of the lease period, the title to the facility can be conveyed to the municipality without any future payments. The rental over the years will have paid the total original cost plus interest.

Authorities and Special Districts

Authorities and special districts are created in most cases to manage facilities that are supported by user charges. Water and sewage systems are examples of such facilities.

Special districts with power to tax are also created for the purpose of issuing bonds and constructing facilities that may not be self-supporting. Sometimes they are necessary to avoid restrictive debt limits. The authority device may offer a convenient method of financing interjurisdictional facilities; however, its use also creates many problems. Chief among these is the scattering of governmental responsibility. Moreover, it must be remembered that the debt incurred by an authority or special district is still a part of a community's total financial obligation even where it is not counted in the debt limit of a general purpose government.

Special Assessment

Public works programs financed most equitably by special assessments are those that benefit certain properties more than others. Local improvements often financed by this method include street paving, sanitary sewers, and water mains.

Joint Financing

The proposed program might be surveyed to determine whether certain projects are equally beneficial to other governmental agencies, authorities, or special districts and if joint financing can be arranged. Such cooperation may bring about projects that would otherwise have to be deferred for many years, and thus can result in better service and lower costs for the area.

Outside Sources

State and federal grants-in-aid programs are frequently available to plan, construct, and finance capital improvements. The possibility of obtaining private gifts for certain facilities - parks, community centers, or libraries - from individuals, corporations, and foundations should also be explored. Before defining what projects should be provided by the government, an effort should be made to discover if some non-public group can provide a service or parts of a needed program. For example, private groups or business leaders may be persuaded to build off-street parking structures or provide lots if the local government has insufficient funds. Civic associations have provided parks and playgrounds in many communities.

In addition to the above methods, special millage, revenue sharing, building authority, and other resources can also be used to finance capital improvement projects. These methods will be mentioned in the subsequent chapters.

LEGAL BASIS

The legal or statutory basis for county planning commissions to engage in capital improvement programs is the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, Act 33 of 2008. This act of the legislature provides each county planning commission within Michigan the authority to prepare a capital improvements program. Section 65 (1) as revised in 2012, states:

“To further the desirable future development of the County under the master plan, it shall be the duty of the Planning Commission to prepare a capital improvements program of public structures and improvements, in the general

order of their priority, that in the Planning Commission's judgment will be needed or desirable and can be undertaken within the ensuing 6-year period. The capital improvements program shall be based upon the requirements of the County for all types of public structures and improvements. Consequently, each agency or department of the County with authority for public structures or improvements shall upon request furnish the Planning Commission with lists, plans, and estimates of time and cost of those public structures and improvements."

Also, Section 17 of the Monroe County Planning Ordinance which was passed by the Monroe County Board of Commissioners, and became effective January 22, 2012, states in similar language the responsibility of the County Planning Commission to carry out capital improvements programming:

"The Planning Commission shall develop long-range fiscal plans providing for the programming of capital improvements based on a determination of relative urgency, together with definite financing plans for the improvements to be constructed in the early years of the planning program."

SUMMARY OF THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMMING PROCESS

1. Decision to commence a Capital Improvements Programming System.
2. Authorization of a Coordinating Agency. (Planning Commission has been so authorized.*)
3. Basic preparatory work activities:
 - A. Selection of the time period covered by the capital program
 - B. Determination of the staff work calendar for preparation of the capital program
 - C. Definition of a capital project for programming purposes
 - D. Statement of executive policy to guide the programming process
 - E. Preparation of preliminary data forms for departmental requests and information
4. Departmental preparation of the Capital Program requests:
 - A. Departmental organization/designation of a person(s) responsible for departmental submissions
 - B. Identification of capital needs of individual departments
 - C. Evaluation of preliminary departmental requests in relation to the county's adopted comprehensive development program
 - D. Analysis of the costs and benefits of each project
 - E. Analysis of financing sources for the proposed projects
 - F. Departmental selection of projects to be included in the department's requests
5. Review and Evaluation of Departmental Program Requests - to be performed by the responsible coordinating agency (County Planning Commission):
 - A. Review for accuracy and completeness of information

- B. Evaluation of the present and anticipated need for the capital expense
 - C. Eligibility of the proposed project for inclusion in the capital improvements program
 - D. Further evaluation of the project in relation to the adopted County comprehensive development plan
 - E. Determination of the effects of the project on the government's operating budget
6. Preparation of the draft Capital Improvements Program by the Planning Commission's CIP Subcommittee:
- A. Compilation and prioritizing of all departmental requests
 - B. Comparison of the proposed requests with the existing capital program, if any
7. Review and optional departmental hearings on the program by the Board of Commissioners
8. County Board action with the capital budget proposal
9. Amendments to the capital program and capital budget, as necessary
10. Revision and annual updating of the capital expenditures planning program.

*Monroe County Planning Ordinance, January 22, 2012

Chapter 3

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

The chief objective of this chapter is to provide a comprehensive assessment of the County's ability to pay for proposed capital expenditures. Secondly, determining the best possible means of financing each project among alternative methods also requires the understanding of the financial capacity of the County.

The financial analysis consists of two steps: A historical summary and a forecast or estimate of future trends. The historical summary is made for the preceding ten-year period to account for recession and booms, and is compiled from a number of fiscal reports. The summary also includes a detailed analysis of the revenue and expenditures of the County, because the capital budget and the operation budget are closely interrelated. The forecast includes estimates of future revenues and expenditures based upon community trends. Monroe County's fiscal year is concurrent with the calendar year, January 1 through December 31.

For the purpose of this analysis, only the General Fund will be considered and examined. By definition, General Fund means "the revenue is primarily derived from property taxes, state and federal aid, and fees for services. Expenditures are primarily for the administration and operation of: 1) general county government departments, boards and commissions, 2) court systems, and 3) law enforcement, health, welfare and medical assistance and appropriations to other general operating funds."

TRENDS IN RECEIPTS

The trends in receipts for the County of Monroe between 2002 and 2011 are shown in Table III-1. Receipts for the County reached a high point in 2008 for both tax revenues and non-tax revenues, and then showed declines through 2011.

A further analysis indicates that taxes continue to be the largest source of General Fund revenue, making up approximately 64.5% of the total General Fund revenues in 2011.

Because property taxes provide the largest amount of General Fund revenue, a more detailed examination is in order. The County's property tax is the total State Equalized Value (S.E.V.) of all the assessing units in the County times the County millage rate. This is the total County levy. There are five basic steps in the property tax process: Assessment, equalization, allocation, apportionment, and collection. Since space and time do not permit lengthy discussion, only the tax base of the County (taxable value) and the tax rate (millage) are examined.

STATE EQUALIZED VALUATION

State Equalized Value or S.E.V. is half of the true cash value of real and personal property. The *total* uncapped S.E.V. for the County rose steadily for decades, peaking at \$7,628,754,408 in 2007. It then began a decline that has continued through 2012, when it reached \$6,040,218,341. S.E.V. is used as the basis to determine taxable value for the collection of property taxes, which support local units of governments. Therefore, it is necessary not only to analyze past trends, but also to make predictions for future S.E.V. and taxable value trends.

**Table III-1
Analysis of General Fund Revenue
2002-2011 Monroe County**

Year	Taxes and Related Revenue	Non-Tax Revenues	Total Revenues
2002	26,359,834	17,360,843	43,720,677
2003	26,622,336	15,324,187	41,946,523
2004	27,792,129	17,610,825	45,402,954
2005	29,472,127	17,860,002	47,332,129
2006	30,453,947	19,691,750	50,145,697
2007	31,926,204	19,336,091	51,262,295
2008	32,186,286	19,444,702	51,630,988
2009	31,135,345	18,829,851	49,965,196
2010	29,714,851	16,143,117	45,857,968
2011	29,188,530	16,072,077	45,260,607

Non-tax revenues include transfers in.

Source: Monroe County Finance Department

Proposal A, which resulted in Public Act 415 of 1994, put a cap on the annual increase in taxable S.E.V. Beginning with the 1995 S.E.V., the increases in primary residential properties' taxable value has been capped, using a formula based on the inflation rate. Increases are limited to the rate of inflation, based on the consumer price index, or 5%, whichever is less. This was only a temporary tax relief measure. Now, the taxable value of any individual primary residential property transferred in the previous year will return to being based on its full, uncapped S.E.V. Properties may be taxed at their full uncapped value once they are sold. The actual Monroe County S.E.V. for applicable years is shown in Table III-2a.

**Table III-2
Trends in State Equalized Valuation & Taxable Value
Monroe County 1975-2012**

Year	Taxable Value	Increase	Percent Change	Year	Taxable Value	Increase	Percent Change
1975	988,318,727	96,826,418	10.9%	1994	3,574,945,246	29,656,767	0.8%
1976	1,076,137,243	87,818,516	8.9%	1995	3,685,441,790	110,496,544	3.1%
1977	1,112,354,184	36,216,941	3.4%	1996	3,830,989,362	145,547,572	4.0%
1978	1,240,420,814	128,066,630	11.5%	1997	4,006,948,110	175,958,588	4.6%
1979	1,391,185,902	150,765,088	12.2%	1998	4,161,611,626	154,663,516	3.9%
1980	1,538,058,323	146,872,421	10.5%	1999	4,364,330,601	202,718,975	4.9%
1981	1,771,412,668	233,354,345	15.1%	2000	4,516,473,282	152,142,681	3.5%
1982	1,900,328,852	128,916,184	7.2%	2001	4,709,403,459	192,930,177	4.3%
1983	1,987,975,871	87,647,019	4.6%	2002	4,926,510,403	217,106,944	4.6%
1984	2,092,506,691	104,530,820	5.3%	2003	5,100,911,871	174,401,468	3.5%
1985	2,189,906,398	97,399,707	4.7%	2004	5,334,377,371	233,466,500	4.6%
1986	2,439,324,806	249,418,408	11.4%	2005	5,586,497,737	252,120,366	4.7%
1987	2,611,146,455	171,821,649	7.0%	2006	5,887,176,406	300,678,669	5.4%
1988	2,725,308,204	114,161,749	4.4%	2007	6,218,440,561	331,264,155	5.6%
1989	2,858,157,174	132,848,970	4.6%	2008	6,283,959,923	65,519,362	1.0%
1990	3,060,834,880	202,677,706	6.6%	2009	6,155,641,319	-128,318,605	-2.0%
1991	3,249,431,349	188,506,469	6.2%	2010	5,785,534,274	-370,107,045	-6.01
1992	3,339,805,681	90,464,332	2.8%	2011	5,695,081,546	-90,452,728	-1.56
1993	3,545,298,479	205,492,798	6.2%	2012	5,604,486,636	-90,594,910	-1.59

Capped Taxable Value is shown for 1995-2012 (Resulting from requirements of Proposition A)

Source: Monroe County Equalization Department

**Table III-2a
Comparison of Taxable Value and SEV 2003-2012**

Year	Taxable Value	Full SEV	Percent
2003	5,100,911,871	6,167,024,077	82.71
2004	5,334,377,371	6,518,266,172	81.84
2005	5,586,497,737	6,918,045,765	80.75
2006	5,887,176,406	7,297,680,821	80.67
2007	6,218,440,561	7,628,754,408	81.51
2008	6,283,959,923	7,419,400,378	84.70
2009	6,155,641,319	6,918,507,251	88.97
2010	5,785,534,274	6,431,283,303	89.96
2011	5,695,081,546	6,210,299,964	91.71
2012	5,604,486,636	6,040,218,341	92.78

Source: Monroe County Equalization Department

Table III-2a shows a comparison of taxable value and full SEV 2003-2012. Before 1995, the SEV *was* the taxable value, State law imposed a cap in 1995. The taxable value, as a percentage of the full SEV, showed a steady decline during the first part of the past decade, until bottoming out in 2006 at 80.67%, but it has increased in the years since. Both Monroe County's SEV and taxable value, however, have seen reductions in 2009 for the first time in modern history, and the upward trend has continued through 2012.

**Table III-3
UNCAPPED S.E.V. BY LAND USE CATEGORY
Monroe County 2002-2012**

Category	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Agricultural	342,155,453	373,418,518	437,947,734	468,961,778	476,656,813
Commercial	638,975,155	695,883,009	731,115,107	784,389,681	827,866,223
Industrial	1,113,416,407	1,081,071,159	1,042,462,771	1,018,368,809	1,017,641,719
Residential	3,591,071,882	3,868,050,728	4,171,394,039	4,480,795,902	4,695,250,326
Developmental	16,428,886	23,928,451	45,988,525	48,597,403	48,516,833
TOTAL REAL PROPERTY	5,702,047,783	6,042,351,865	6,428,908,176	6,801,113,573	7,065,931,914
TOTAL PERSONAL PROPERTY	464,976,294	475,914,307	489,137,589	496,567,248	562,822,494
GRAND TOTALS	6,167,024,077	6,518,266,172	6,918,045,765	7,297,680,821	7,628,754,408

Category	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Agricultural	476,286,771	480,294,556	477,120,794	460,314,979	446,476,781
Commercial	857,244,793	856,587,613	857,734,721	807,657,466	772,824,646
Industrial	1,054,430,386	1,042,302,338	1,062,863,630	1,039,416,773	1,051,177,594
Residential	4,482,849,346	3,998,867,886	3,474,192,511	3,321,573,084	3,254,305,029
Developmental	47,840,711	48,091,288	43,267,812	32,540,512	21,252,625
TOTAL REAL PROPERTY	6,918,652,007	6,426,143,681	5,915,179,468	5,661,502,814	5,496,036,675
TOTAL PERSONAL PROPERTY	500,748,371	492,363,570	516,103,835	548,797,150	544,181,666
GRAND TOTALS	7,419,400,378	6,918,507,251	6,431,283,303	6,210,299,964	60,40,218,341

These figures represent actual S.E.V., only a portion of which is taxable under Public Act 415 of 1994. See Table III-2 for taxable value figures.

Source: 2012 Monroe County Equalization Report

Table III-3 shows the breakdown of S.E.V. by use category (Agricultural, Commercial, Industrial, Residential and Developmental) for 2003-2012. Table III-4 shows the top ten taxpayers in Monroe County as compiled by the Monroe County Equalization Department. The ten companies alone accounted for 20.88% of Monroe County’s taxable value.

**Table III-4
Top Ten Taxpayers—Monroe County 2012 Tax Levy**

<u>Company</u>	<u>Taxable Value</u>
Detroit Edison	\$912,111,040
Consumers Energy/Consumers Power	79,251,246
International Transmission Co.	40,056,468
Good Will (Meijer)	23,867,825
Gerdau MacSteel	23,805,070
Frenchtown Square Partnership	18,734,927
Inergy Automotive Systems	18,590,437
Monroe Bank and Trust	18,523,967
Michigan Gas	16,390,878
Spartan Steel Coating	15,899,800
TOTAL	\$1,167,231,658

Source: Monroe County Equalization Department

Detroit Edison (DTE Energy) has, for many years, been Monroe County’s largest taxpayer. In the late 1980s, the proportion of the tax base represented by this company reached its peak at 45% of the total County value. Increases in all other County tax base, combined with gradual depreciation of Edison’s electrical generating facilities, lowered the percentage beginning in 1987 and bottoming out 2007-2009 at 13%. Small increases have been seen again since 2010, as DTE’s value rose while the overall County value declined. Table III-5 shows the relationship between increases in Monroe County’s overall S.E.V./Taxable Value and that portion of it attributable to Detroit Edison.

**Table III-5
Percentage of Monroe County SEV/Taxable Value*
Represented by Detroit Edison 1988-2012**

1988	45%	1997.....	28%	2006	14%
1989	42%	1998.....	26%	2007	13%
1990	40%	1999.....	27%	2008	13%
1991	37%	2000.....	25%	2009	13%
1992	36%	2001.....	23%	2010	15%
1993	34%	2002.....	21%	2011	16%
1994	34%	2003.....	19%	2012	16%
1995	31%	2004.....	17%		
1996	29%	2005.....	16%		

*Based on SEV (1988-1998) and Taxable (capped) Value 1999-2012.
Source of base figures: Monroe County Equalization Dept.

PROJECTING FUTURE TAXABLE VALUE

Studying past trends in S.E.V. and taxable value is helpful in predicting future trends, but other known factors must be considered as well. Perhaps the most significant factor affecting the taxable value now and in years to come is legislation mandated by the passage of **Proposal A** in March, 1994, which resulted in Public Act 415 of 1994. Its impact limits local municipalities' ability to collect property taxes. The basic premise of the Act, which uses a complicated formula to cap property taxes, is summed up in the following language from its text:

“For taxes levied in 1995 and each year thereafter, the legislature shall provide that the taxable value of each parcel of property adjusted for additions and losses, shall not increase each year by more than the increase in the immediately preceding year in the general price level, as defined in Section 33 of this article, or 5 percent, whichever is less until ownership of the parcel of property is transferred. When ownership of the property is transferred as defined by law, the parcel shall be assessed at the applicable proportion of current true cash value.”

Ultimately, year-to-year changes in the taxable value are determined by a complicated set of factors that includes inflationary changes in the consumer price index (CPI), new construction, loss of value from demolitions, the uncapping of taxable value of primary residences upon their sale, and depreciation in the value of local electric utility plants.

Poor economic conditions nationally with even greater recessionary trends in southeast Michigan have negatively impacted Monroe County's State Equalized Value (SEV), which showed an unprecedented annual decline beginning in 2009, and continued through 2012 (see Table III-2). Future trends are difficult to predict. No longer can we depend on a fairly consistent growth pattern in County revenues as we did in years past. Most economic forecasts for Michigan indicate that the economy bottomed out in 2009, and is expected to follow a very slow, gradual recovery in the coming years. Recent optimism for recovery has been dampened as the stagnancy of the economy appears to have an increasing grip, prompting us to reign in our growth projections even more. Furthermore, increases in the Taxable Value are likely to follow somewhat behind other economic indicators. These considerations are reflected in our projections.

Historically, local economic development efforts by the Monroe County Business Development Corporation and other agencies have been successful in bringing new companies to Monroe County, adding to taxable value. In most years, a steady growth had been achieved through their successful attraction of new business and retention and expansion of existing companies. These efforts have continued, but are negatively affected by recent economic trends.

The above factors would indicate that Taxable Value and resulting County revenues might follow a relatively flat pattern in the coming years, and any recovery will be much slower than has been seen following previous recessions. Table III-6 assumes that the economy has recently hit the bottom, the tax levy will respond in a delayed manner, and will eventually begin a very slow recovery.

**Table III-6
Projections of Adjusted Tax Levy
Monroe County 2012-2017**

Year	Adjusted Tax Levy	Increase/ Decrease
2011*	29,669,763	-1.91%
2012	29,224,717	-1.50%
2013	28,932,469	-1.00%
2014	28,932,469	0.00%
2015	29,221,794	1.00%
2016	29,660,121	1.50%
2017	30,253,323	2.00%

*Actual Adjusted Tax Levy for 2011 is used as basis for projections

MILLAGE

Millage is the second principal factor normally used to state the rate of property taxation and compute the property tax. The “mill” is 1/10 of a cent per dollar, or \$1.00 per \$1,000.00 of State Equalized Value.

Section 6 of Article IX of the 1963 *Michigan Constitution* sets limits and exceptions on the rates of taxation that may be levied on property. The major provision of Section 6 of Article IX is as follows:

“Except as otherwise provided in this constitution, the total amount of general ad valorem taxes imposed upon real and tangible personal property for all purposes in any one year shall not exceed 15 mills on each dollar of assessed valuation of property as finally equalized. Under procedures provided by law which shall guarantee the right of initiative, separate tax limitations for any county and for the townships and for school districts therein, the aggregate of which shall not exceed 18 mills on each dollar of such valuation, may be adopted and thereafter altered by the vote of a majority of the qualified electors of such county voting thereon, in lieu of the limitation hereinbefore established. These limitations may be increased to an aggregate of not to exceed 50 mills on each dollar of valuation, for a period of not to exceed 20 years at any one time, if approved by a majority of the electors, qualified under Section 6 of Article II of this constitution, voting on the question.”

Through the late 1970s and the 1980s, Monroe County's tax allocation totaled 15 mills, divided among the County, the school districts, the Intermediate School District, and the Townships. The County's share of this allocation was 4.95 mills. A tax freeze enacted by the State Legislature as Public Act 15 of 1991, held 1991 property values in check for the year of 1992, but when inflationary influences resumed their impacts in 1993, the effect was a two-year jump in the S.E.V., an increase that exceeded the rate of inflation, and forcing implementation of the **Headlee** Millage Reduction Fraction. This forced reduction of the millage from 4.95 mills to increasingly lower millage rates in subsequent years.

In 1993 and 1994, the methods used to raise revenue for public education in Michigan were drastically changed. **Proposal A**, which was passed by Michigan voters on March 15, 1994

to become Public Act 415 of 1994, established the revenue sources to be used. While property tax is still levied, dwelling units that are owned and occupied as a principal residence by the owner, and all property used for agricultural purposes, are no longer subject to taxation for state school aid.

The Monroe County Tax Allocation Board, which met annually for many years to set the local millage rates, was eliminated in a County ballot proposition on August 6, 1996. The division of the 6.25 mills was frozen as follows: 4.95 to the County, .30 to the Intermediate School District, and one to the townships. The County's millage allocation remains subject to modification by the Headlee amendment. The 2012 figure is 4.7952 mills, and is subject to change annually, but it has mostly stabilized in recent years.

TAX RELATED REVENUES

Trends in tax related revenues from 2002 through 2011 are shown in Table III-7. The amount collected is always slightly less than the adjusted tax levy, averaging 95.30% from 2002-2011.

Tax-related revenues other than current property taxes include industrial facilities taxes, trailer fees, payments in lieu of taxes, penalties and interest on taxes, and reconveyance fees.

**Table III-7a
General Fund Tax Related Revenues
Monroe County 2002-2011**

Year	Property Tax Collected by December 31	Increase/ Decrease	Taxes Other Than Current Property Tax	Other Taxes Increase/ Decrease
2002	25,486,802	1,006,250	873,032	7,354
2003	25,754,590	267,788	867,746	-5,286
2004	26,906,643	1,152,053	885,486	17,740
2005	28,389,285	1,482,642	1,102,842	217,356
2006	29,341,646	952,361	1,112,301	9,459
2007	30,809,258	1,467,612	1,116,946	4,645
2008	31,293,165	483,907	893,121	-223,825
2009	30,480,645	-812,520	654,700	-238,421
2010	28,911,080	-1,569,565	803,771	149,071
2011	28,515,307	-395,773	673,223	-130,548

Table III-7b, General Fund Tax-Related Revenues, continued

Year	Total Tax-Related Revenue	Dollar Increase	Percent Increase
2002	26,359,834	1,013,604	4.00%
2003	26,622,336	262,502	1.00%
2004	27,792,129	1,169,793	4.39%
2005	29,492,127	1,699,998	6.12%
2006	30,453,947	961,820	3.26%
2007	31,926,204	1,472,257	4.83%
2008	32,186,286	260,082	0.81%
2009	31,135,345	-1,050,941	-3.27%
2010	29,714,851	-1,420,494	-4.56%
2011	29,188,530	-526,321	-1.77%

Source: Monroe County Finance Department

PROJECTING REVENUES

Current Property Tax

Projections of real estate and personal property taxes are based on variable annual changes in taxable value and the adjusted tax levy, to project property taxes. Table III-8 shows a ten-year history of property tax revenues, and the taxable value and adjusted tax levies they are based upon. Table III-9 projects property tax collections for the next six years based upon moderating decreases in the adjusted tax levies for 2012 and 2013, followed by a leveling off in 2014, and then slowly escalating increases in the following years, assuming a slow economic recovery. (Table III-8 and III-9)

Other Tax-Related Revenues

Tax-related revenues other than current property taxes include delinquent taxes collected, reconveyances, industrial facilities taxes, trailer taxes, and payments in lieu of taxes. The amount in this category has varied significantly over the last ten years, making trends for projection difficult to establish. For this projection, a straight-line, zero increase in other tax-related revenues was assumed. (Projections included in Table III-10.)

Table III-8
Taxable Value, Adjusted Tax Levy, and Property Tax Revenues
Monroe County 2001-2010

<u>Taxable Value</u>			<u>Tax Levy and Collection</u>						
Year	Taxable Value	% Incr.	Tax Collection	Millage Rate	Adjusted Tax Levy	% Incr.	Amount Collected by December 31	Percent Collected by Dec. 31	
2002	4,926,510,403	4.61	→	2003	4.7934	27,147,744	1.37	25,754,590	94.87%
2003	5,100,911,871	3.54	→	2004	4.8090	28,460,227	4.83	26,906,643	94.54%
2004	5,334,377,371	4.58	→	2005	4.7934	29,799,298	4.71	28,389,285	95.27%
2005	5,586,497,737	4.73	→	2006	4.7952	30,772,667	3.27	29,341,646	95.35%
2006	5,887,176,406	5.38	→	2007	4.7952	32,236,926	4.76	30,809,258	95.57%
2007	6,218,440,561	5.63	→	2008	4.7952	32,806,301	1.77	31,293,165	95.39%
2008	6,283,959,923	1.05	→	2009	4.7952	32,027,518	-2.37	30,480,645	95.17%
2009	6,155,641,319	-2.04	→	2010	4.7952	30,246,996	-5.56	28,911,080	95.58%
2010	5,785,534,274	-6.01	→	2011	4.7952	29,669,763	-1.91	28,515,307	96.11%
Average Percent Collected by December 31								95.30%	

Notes:

Tax levy is based on the previous year's taxable value.

Taxable value figures are capped (less than full SEV) under P.A. 415 of 1994.

Tax Levy is ultimately adjusted due to appeals and other adjustments.

2004 millage rate represents adjustment due to error in 2003 rate; but is not statistically significant.

Sources: Monroe County Equalization Department and Monroe County Finance Dept.

Table III-9
Projections of Adjusted Levy and Property Tax Revenue
Monroe County 2011-2017

Year	Adjusted Tax Levy	% Increase/Decrease	Collected in First Year	% Collected
2011*	29,669,763	-1.91%	28,515,307	96.11%
2012	29,224,717	-1.50%	27,851,533	95.30%
2013	28,932,469	-1.00%	27,573,017	95.30%
2014	28,932,469	0.00%	27,573,017	95.30%
2015	29,221,794	1.00%	27,848,747	95.30%
2016	29,660,121	1.50%	28,266,479	95.30%
2017	30,253,323	2.00%	28,831,808	95.30%

*Figures for 2011 are actual.

Projections assume variable annual increases/decreases in taxable value and a 4.7952 millage rate for 2011-2016.

Tax levies, rates of collection, and millage rates could fluctuate in future years.

Table III-10
Projections of Total Tax Related Revenues
Monroe County 2012-2017

Year	Property Tax Collected by December 31	Tax Revenue Other Than Current Property Tax*	Total Tax Related Revenues	Increase/Decrease
2011*	28,515,307	673,223	29,188,530	-526,321
2012	27,851,533	673,223	28,524,756	-663,774
2013	27,573,017	673,223	28,246,240	-278,515
2014	27,573,017	673,223	28,246,240	0
2015	27,848,747	673,223	28,521,970	275,730
2016	28,266,479	673,223	28,939,702	417,731
2017	28,831,808	673,223	29,505,031	565,330

*Based on a straight-line projection of other tax-related revenues using the actual 2011 figure of \$673,223.

Non-Tax Revenue

Non-tax revenue includes federal and state grants, charges for services, interest and rents, reimbursements from local units, fees for licenses and permits, fines and forfeitures, and miscellaneous. Increases in non-tax revenues have not followed a steady pattern, but have been somewhat sporadic. This can be attributed to several factors, including sudden increases in fees for certain county services, changes in methods for figuring state revenue sharing, grants issued, etc. Annual increases in non-tax revenues have not been consistent over the last ten years, and have on several occasions actually decreased from year to year. The average annual increase from 2001 through 2010 was \$191,693, but recent years have been marked by several decreases, the greatest one coming in 2010 (Table III-11).

**Table III-11
General Fund Non-Tax Revenues Monroe County 2002-2011**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Non-Tax Revenue</u>	<u>Increase/Decrease</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Non-Tax Revenue</u>	<u>Increase/Decrease</u>
2002	20,290,661	2,649,315	2007	20,455,716	-463,520
2003	15,324,187	-4,966,474	2008	20,734,225	278,509
2004	20,478,242	5,154,055	2009	21,046,511	312,286
2005	20,928,433	450,191	2010	16,143,117	-4,903,394
2006	20,919,236	-9,197	2011	17,931,508	1,788,391

Source: Monroe County Finance Department

The old method of using an average ten-year increase in non-tax revenues for projecting future increases can no longer be relied upon in today's uncertain economic climate. In light of these uncertainties, a straight-line, zero increase collection of non-tax revenue was assumed for these projections for 2012-2017, using the 2011 figure of \$17,931,508 as a basis. (Table III-12).

**Table III-12
Projections of Non-Tax Revenue 2012-2017**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Non-Tax Revenue</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Non-Tax Revenue</u>	<u>Increase</u>
2012	17,931,508	0	2015	17,931,508	0
2013	17,931,508	0	2016	17,931,508	0
2014	17,931,508	0	2017	17,931,508	0

Projected General Fund Revenues from tax and non-tax categories for 2012-2017 are added and summarized in Table III-13.

**Table III-13
Projected General Fund Revenue Summary
Based on Variable Increases in Adjusted Levy
Monroe County 2012-2017**

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>Tax-Related Revenue</u>	<u>Non-Tax Revenue</u>	<u>Total General Fund Revenue</u>	<u>Dollar Increase/Decrease</u>	<u>Percent Increase</u>
2011*	29,188,530	17,931,508	47,120,038	1,262,070	2.75%
2012	28,524,756	17,931,508	46,456,264	-663,774	-1.41%
2013	28,246,240	17,931,508	46,177,748	-278,515	-0.60%
2014	28,246,240	17,931,508	46,177,748	0	0.00%
2015	28,521,970	17,931,508	46,453,478	275,730	0.60%
2016	28,939,702	17,931,508	46,871,210	417,731	0.90%
2017	29,505,031	17,931,508	47,436,539	565,330	1.21%

*Actual figures for 2011

COUNTY EXPENDITURES

A wide range of costs for operations accounts for the major share of the County's annual budget, and provides for the most visible County services to the general public. This includes court services, law enforcement, health, social services, cultural and conservation services, planning and economic development, Board of Commissioners, and other general costs of operating the County government.

General Government and Public Safety categories make up the bulk of the County's expenditures (Table III-14). Monroe County General Fund revenues and expenditures had traditionally trended upward, peaking in 2008, with expenditures exceeding revenues by more than \$2 million that year. Expenditures were sufficiently reined in beginning in 2009, as revenues continued to decline through 2011. (Tables III-15 and III-16).

**Table III-14
General Fund Expenditures by Category
Monroe County, 2002-2011**

Category	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
General Government	14,193,503	14,379,431	14,605,576	15,237,101	15,482,863
Public Safety	14,904,945	14,693,308	16,363,475	16,685,464	17,433,968
Public Works	33,072	31,655	29,919	38,512	76,623
Health and Welfare	644,622	639,681	590,649	642,291	1,558,508
Comm & Econ Devel	802,985	734,342	843,392	579,605	630,891
Recreation & Cultural	469,108	17,320	429,244	437,132	432,818
Other Expenditures	70,755	1,100,877	1,109,005	1,102,073	58,943
Capital Outlay	686,017	521,648	707,051	552,983	1,454,396
Transfers Out	8,604,963	8,641,347	7,420,438	8,875,611	11,655,142
Total	40,409,970	40,759,609	42,098,749	44,150,772	48,784,152

Category	2007	2008	2009	2010	2010
General Government	16,902,041	17,738,264	16,749,332	14,182,816	15,409,210
Public Safety	18,613,323	20,080,772	18,424,685	17,110,288	16,576,599
Public Works	74,304	102,229	36,070	69,762	56,288
Health and Welfare	1,710,006	1,779,522	1,758,685	1,663,786	1,588,765
Comm & Econ Devel	781,623	764,359	903,024	535,291	620,938
Recreation & Cultural	494,561	513,904	473,173	360,639	44,115
Other Expenditures	78,012	99,651	101,312	108,303	97,112
Capital Outlay	538,183	855,557	768,842	738,429	796,261
Other Uses – Transfers Out	11,479,014	11,820,187	105,13,235	7,506,524	6324165
Total	50,671,067	53,754,445	49,728,358	42,275,838	41,513,453

Source: Monroe County Finance Department

**Table III-15
General Fund Expenditures - Monroe County 2002-2011**

Year	Expenditures	Increase/Decrease	Percent Change
2002	40,409,970	2,405,272	6.33%
2003	40,759,609	349,639	0.87%
2004	42,098,749	1,339,140	3.29%
2005	44,150,772	2,052,023	4.87%
2006	48,784,152	4,633,380	10.49%
2007	50,671,067	1,886,915	3.87%
2008	53,754,445	3,083,378	6.09%
2009	49,728,358	-4,026,087	-7.49%
2010	42,275,838	-7,452,520	-14.99%
2011	41,513,453	-762,385	-1.80%
Average increase		350,876	1.15%

Includes Transfers Out
Source: Monroe County Finance Department

**Table III-16
General Fund Revenues & Expenditures
Monroe County 2002-2011**

Year	Actual Revenue	Actual Expenditure	Surplus/Deficit	% of actual Revenue
2001	40,072,997	38,004,698	2,068,299	5.16
2002	43,720,677	40,409,970	3,310,707	7.57
2003	41,946,523	40,759,609	1,186,914	2.83
2004	45,402,954	42,098,749	3,304,205	7.28
2005	47,352,129	44,150,772	3,201,357	6.76
2006	50,145,697	48,784,152	1,361,545	2.72
2007	51,262,295	50,671,067	591,228	1.15
2008	51,630,988	53,754,445	-2,123,457	-4.11
2009	49,965,196	49,728,358	236,838	0.47
2010	45,857,968	42,275,838	3,582,130	7.81
2011	45,260,607	41,513,453	3,747,154	8.28
Ten-year cumulative balance			18,398,621	

Source: Monroe County Comprehensive Annual Financial Report 2001-2010.

PROJECTING COUNTY EXPENDITURES

A three-year decline in the General Fund Balance (2007-2009) was reversed in 2010, and an even larger gain was shown in 2011. Spending in relation to revenues saw a severe deficit was seen in 2008, and a decline in the General Fund Balance was seen from 2007-2009. Then, 2010 marked a balanced budget and the apparent beginning of a recovery that has continued through 2011. In Table III-17, the General Fund balance is also stated as a percentage of the previous year's spending.

Table III-17
Annual General Fund Balance, December 31
Monroe County, Michigan 2002-2011

<u>Year</u>	<u>General Fund Balance</u>	<u>Gain/Loss</u>	<u>Annual Expenditures</u>	<u>Balance as %age of Exp end.</u>
2002	8,499,495	380,889	40,409,970	21.03%
2003	9,186,210	686,715	40,759,609	22.54%
2004	9,622,997	436,787	42,098,749	22.86%
2005	9,755,924	132,927	44,150,772	22.10%
2006	9,889,983	134,059	48,784,152	20.27%
2007	9,361,587	-528,396	50,671,067	18.48%
2008	5,948,606	-3,412,981	53,754,445	11.07%
2009	3,968,784	-1,979,822	49,728,358	7.98%
2010	5,959,955	1,991,171	42,275,838	14.10%
2011	10,977,856	5,017,901	41,513,453	26.44%

Source: Monroe County Finance Department

Spending projections, presented in Table 18, are based upon affordable increases in expenditures given projected revenues. The projections show future annual spending increases of 2% per year using the 2011 spending figure as a starting basis.

Since 2008, Monroe County has successfully employed a number of measures to substantially reduce expenditures. While staffing levels and some County services have been reduced as a result, the Board of Commissioners has demonstrated fiscal responsibility during this economic crisis. For three years, General Fund revenues have exceeded General Fund expenditures. However, with mixed speculation about a gradual recovery, or the possibility of a double-dip recession, continuance of a very conservative future spending pattern would be advisable. Based on projected revenues, this scenario would allow annual spending increases of 2% and yield an overall positive cumulative balance of \$12,463,666 from 2012 through 2017. Spending increases higher than slightly greater than 2% applied to projected revenues would result in deficit spending during the period (Table 18).

Table III-18
Projections of General Fund Revenues & Expenditures
Based on 2% Annual Expenditure Increases from 2011 Levels
Monroe County 2012-2017

Year	Projected Revenues	Projected Expenditures	Expenditure Incr./Decr.	Percent Incr./Decr.	Projected Balance
2011*	47,120,038	41,513,453	-762,385	-1.8%	5,606,585
2012	46,456,264	42,343,722	830,269	2.0%	4,112,541
2013	46,177,748	43,190,597	846,874	2.0%	2,987,152
2014	46,177,748	44,054,408	863,812	2.0%	2,123,340
2015	46,453,478	44,935,497	881,088	2.0%	1,517,982
2016	46,871,210	45,834,207	898,710	2.0%	1,037,003
2017	47,436,539	46,750,891	916,684	2.0%	685,648

Cumulative Balance 2012-2017 w. 2% spending increases: 12,463,666

*Actual Revenues and Expenditures shown for 2011.

CHAPTER 4

FUTURE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS NEEDS 2013-2017

Previous chapters have discussed the advantages of capital planning, the development of a formalized capital improvements planning process and the county's capacity to pay for proposed capital investments. This chapter includes the project descriptions as submitted by department heads and other County officials. Project forms were provided; these included sections for project description, project justification, planning context, ranking of need, cost estimate, basis of cost estimate, and alternative funding sources. The forms, as filled out, are shown, with only minimal editing. A table showing the major points of each project nomination is shown below. Some projects have been continued from previous editions of the CIP, as necessary.

In order for the Planning Commission, Board of Commissioners, and the Physical Resources Committee to properly evaluate the need for a given project, input from the requesting department is needed giving specific information on what needs the project will meet, what problems it will solve, and what benefits can be expected to accrue. The Project Worksheet is used by departments to describe and justify requested projects. Each sheet sets forth the following sections, each requiring a response.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The department is asked to give a brief description of the project including location, size, capacity, etc.

PLANNING CONTEXT

The department is asked to explain why the project is needed, what benefits the project will provide, and what consequences would result if the project is not funded.

PLANNING CONTEXT

This section asks the department to indicate how the project fits in with an overall program. Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a document which has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

RANKING OF NEED

The ranking of need represents the relative need for each project over the next six years. In determining the rankings of capital improvement proposals, consideration has been given to the timing of the proposal, the projects' relation to the County's Comprehensive General Development Plan, population projections, the available sources of local funding, possible funding aid through various grantor agencies, etc. It should be realized, however, that in government "the actual choice and establishment of final priorities are still accompanied by the political process of compromise, a give-and-take between all groups concerned."

The capital improvement projects shown on the subsequent pages are listed under the following five categories:

1. Committed to project / project already begun
2. Project urgently needed this year
3. Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
4. Project is important, but not urgent
5. Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

A blank table is provided for the department to indicate costs of the various stages of the project to date and throughout the multi-year planning period. These stages or elements are: planning/design, site acquisition, site improvements, construction, equipment, other, and contingency. There is a line for annual totals, and a grand total.

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

The department is asked to note the criteria upon which the cost estimate was based, from the following choices: Cost of comparable equipment of facility, rule of thumb indicator/unit cost, cost estimate received from vendor/engineer/architect, bids received for project, and preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”).

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

This section asks how the proposed project will impact on other aspects of the department’s budget over the six-year planning period, for payroll and fringes, professional services, maintenance, equipment and supplies, and other costs.

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

Possible methods of financing the proposals contained in this Capital Improvements Plan are, in some cases, indicated along with the individual project descriptions. The method ultimately utilized, however, is decided solely at the discretion of the Monroe County Board of Commissioners. Possible financing methods include the following:

1. Capital Project Fund: County monies set aside for capital improvements. The balance in the fund may vary greatly.
2. Building Authority: Previously used for the jail, Youth Center, etc.
3. Special Millage: Levys additional property tax for a special purpose. Requires voter approval.
4. Federal Aid/State Aid: Grants, loans.
5. General Obligation Bonds: Bonds issued by the County for which it pledges its full faith and credit. Requires voter approval.

YEAR OF REQUEST

Many worthy projects may go unfunded in their first and subsequent years of being requested. The far right column of Table IV-1 shows the number of years each project has been requested, including the present year. Some projects that have been submitted for multiple years may have undergone minor changes from year to year.

**TABLE IV-1
SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED & REQUESTED
EXPENDITURES FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS 2013-2017**

DEPARTMENT/ PROJECT	RANKING OF NEED	ESTIMATED TOTAL COST	COST TO DATE	COST 2013	COST 2014-2017	YEAR
Buildings and Grounds						
Enterprise-Wide Energy Conservation Projects	Urgent, Not Necessarily This Year	\$1,181,390	0	\$241,713	\$939,677	2 nd
Courthouse Roofing and Ornamental Structures Maintenance	n/a	\$55,000	0	\$55,000	0	2 nd
Main Jail Roof Replacement	Urgent, Not Necessarily This Year	\$125,000	0	0	\$130,277	7 th
Coop Extension Office Facility Roof Replacement	n/a	\$63,500	0	0	\$63,500	4 th
Stoner-Kemmerling Facility Roof Replacement	Important, but not Urgent	\$40,000	0	0	\$40,000	11 th
Employee Parking Lot Asphalt Paving	Urgently Needed This Year	\$18,000	0	0	\$18,000	4 th
Courthouse Exterior Preservation	Urgent, Not Necessarily This Year	\$55,000	0	0	\$55,000	5 th
Youth Center Exterior Facia Covering	Urgent, Not Necessarily This Year	\$25,000	0	0	\$25,000	6 th
Animal Control Asphalt Paving of Drive and Service Area	Important, but not Urgent	\$20,000	0	0	\$20,000	6 th
Museum Rooftop Units Replacement	Urgent, Not Necessarily This Year	\$28,500	0	0	\$28,500	4 th
Parks and Recreation						
Nike Park Asphalt Pavement – Drive and Parking	Urgent, Not Necessarily This Year	\$55,000	0	0	\$55,500	9 th
Habitat Area Development at County Parks	Important but Not Urgent	\$55,500	\$40,000	0	\$15,500	5 th
Nature Trail Improvements – Vienna Park	Urgent, Not Necessarily This Year	\$15,000	0	0	\$15,000	8 th
Nike Park Exercise and Walking Trail	Important but Not Urgent	\$40,000	0	0	\$40,000	8 th

Continued

DEPARTMENT/ PROJECT	RANKING OF NEED	ESTIMATED TOTAL COST	COST TO DATE	COST 2013	COST 2014-2017	YEAR
Parks and Recreation, continued						
Vienna Park Exercise and Walking Trail	Urgently Needed This Year	\$45,000	0	0	\$45,000	8 th
Nike Park Basketball and Volleyball Facilities	Urgent, Not Necessarily This Year	\$25,000	0	0	\$25,000	9 th
Nike Park Disc Golf Course	Urgent, Not Necessarily This Year	\$16,800	0	0	\$16,800	6 th
Sheriff						
Female Holding Cell	Urgently Needed This Year	\$22,000	0	\$22,000	0	4 th
Youth Center						
Kitchen Appliance Upgrade	Urgently Needed This Year	\$27,839	\$19,713	\$8,126	0	2 nd
Security Panels for Emergency Egress Doors	Urgently Needed This Year	\$20,000	0	\$20,000	0	1 st
Corrections Grade Furniture	Urgently Needed This Year	\$30,000	0	\$30,000	0	1 st
Central Dispatch						
Radio Console Technology Enhancement Project – MCC 7500 IP	Urgent, Not Necessarily This Year	\$562,574	0	\$562,574	0	2 nd
Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Enhancement Project	Urgent Needed This Year	\$63,551	0	\$63,551	0	1 st

REVIEW OF DEPARTMENTAL REQUESTS

The review process is a determination of those projects which will be scheduled in the published capital program, the timing of each, the allocation of funds to be made to each project, the priority rating of projects, and the sources from which capital financing is to be provided.

The review process includes a brief evaluation by the submitting department to spell out the criteria, an evaluation by the coordinating agency (Planning Commission) to determine the project's relation to the County's Comprehensive Plan and to study its effect on other governmental entities.

A method of prioritization within departmental groups has been established, and it has recently been modified to give greater weight to criteria of greater importance (i.e. Safety, Health, and Environmental). This task is carried out by a committee of the Monroe County Planning Commission, with substantial input from the department heads and the Director of Buildings and Grounds.

PROJECTS OF MOST URGENT NEED

The Planning Commission’s Capital Improvements Subcommittee, consisting of two Planning Commissioners, met to discuss and prioritize the projects. The following criteria were used in prioritizing the recommended projects:

Category	Points	Weight	Total
1. Public Safety.....	0 to 10	10	100
2. Public Health.....	0 to 10	9	90
3. Environmental Quality.....	0 to 10	7	70
4. Efficiencies/Payback.....	0 to 10	9	90
5. Number of People/Geographic Area Served	0 to 10	5	50
6. Productivity Enhancements	0 to 10	8	80
7. Property Protection/Timeliness of Project.....	0 to 10	7	70
8. Cost Sharing.....	0 to 10	10	100
Maximum possible score per member			650
Maximum possible score for all 3 members			1950

SCORING CRITERIA

1. Public Safety

Projects which enhance and protect the safety of the public. Higher scores are given to projects which have a significant impact on public safety and welfare. Projects may be aimed at improving public safety through improvements to law enforcement equipment and facilities, corrections, criminal justice, emergency management activities, or similar programs. Projects may also be focused on public safety in terms of protecting the public from hazards, and may include sidewalk and entry repairs and traffic safety improvements.

Examples include: communication equipment, jail and courtroom improvements, specialized public safety equipment, removal and repair of dangers and hazards on public property.

2. Public Health

Projects which are focused on improving and protecting public health. Highest scores are given to projects that are focused on providing public health services, medical services, preventative projects, and facilities which provide health education or healthy activities.

Examples include: public health related facilities and equipment, medical equipment, outdoor recreation facilities, trails and walkways, sanitation and disease prevention projects

3. Environmental Quality

Projects which protect and preserve environmental quality, including water and groundwater quality, air quality, protection from hazardous materials, and natural resource protection and enhancement. Higher scores should be given to projects which result in a cleaner, healthier, and more sustainable environment and which prevent pollution and damage to the environment.

Examples include: Energy efficiency projects, sewer and water projects, chemical storage facilities, recycling projects, natural area improvements, water and air quality improvements

4. Efficiencies/Payback

Projects that have a specific payback period, by which the cost of the project would be covered by monetary savings over a specified period of time. Also included are those projects which may not necessarily have a specific payback period, but which represent an investment in improving efficiencies which would realize savings on an annual basis.

Examples include: lighting and hvac upgrades, energy efficiency projects, window replacement, vehicle upgrades

5. Number of People Served/Geographic Area Served

Projects which serve a large segment of the community or a large geographic area. Projects which serve a large majority of the public would receive a higher score than projects which serve only a very limited group. Likewise, projects that serve a large geographic area would score higher than projects limited to a single, small location.

Examples include: traffic safety projects, public outreach programs, emergency management projects

6. Productivity Enhancements

Projects which are designed to improve the productivity of County employees and programs. These projects tend to save money in the long run and improve the efficiency of providing public services. Projects which are designed to improve or enhance the productivity of County workers should receive high scores under this criteria.

Examples include: lighting, interior design improvements, indoor air quality, major equipment and software upgrades

7. Property Protection/Timeliness of Project

Projects which have the result of protecting and preserving County properties and facilities as well as projects which will wind up costing significantly more if their implementation is delayed. Projects scoring high under these criteria are those projects which take actions to protect county property from the elements, from vandalism, and from normal wear and tear, but which go beyond the routine maintenance which should be worked into the normal county budget process. Projects that cannot be deferred without incurring additional costs should be given a higher priority than projects that can be deferred.

In addition, certain worthwhile projects tend to be deferred from the capital improvements program year after year due to the fact that they are deferrable when compared to more urgent projects. Projects which have been deferred repeatedly for this reason may be considered for higher priority in future years.

Projects which are considered routine maintenance will not receive points under this criteria and may possibly not even be considered for inclusion in the capital improvements plan. Also discouraged will be those projects which lump together several

small projects in order to qualify for the dollar value (\$12,000) threshold which defines a capital improvement project.

Examples include: major roofing and mechanical improvements; parking lot surfacing and repair; non-routine painting, siding and drainage work; infrastructure improvements

8. Cost Sharing

Projects which are eligible for partial funding through cost-share grant programs or which have other outside funding or financing sources. These projects should be given priority over projects which are fully borne by County funds.

Examples include: federal grants, state grants, CDBG grants, private foundations, low interest loans, revolving loan funds, bonding issues.

SCORING OF PROJECTS

The three members of the Subcommittee scored all projects according to the criteria, using a score of 1-10 for each category. These scores were then multiplied by a weighting factor to reflect the level of importance of each category in the criteria list. The maximum possible score for each project would be **650** points, or **1950** for all 3 members. The scores were then totaled, and scores ranged from **1422 to 811**.

RANKING OF PROJECTS

Projects ranked on the following page, which also shows the individual and cumulative costs. It is recommended that these projects be implemented in the order of ranking as funding permits.

TABLE IV-2
Monroe County Capital Improvements Program – 2013-2017
Proposed Projects and Costs

RANK	SCORE	PROJECT NAME	Total Cost	Cumulative Total Cost	2013 Cost	Cumulative 2013 Cost	Cost After 2013	Cumulative After 2013
1	1422	Emergency Medical Service Enhancement Project - Cent. Disp.	\$63,551	\$63,551	\$63,551	\$63,551	\$0	\$0
2	1309	Enterprise-Wide Energy Conservation Projects - Year 1	\$1,181,390	\$1,244,941	\$241,713	\$305,264	\$939,677	\$939,677
3	1170	Radio Console Technology Enhancement Project - Cent. Disp.	\$562,574	\$1,807,515	\$562,574	\$867,838	\$0	\$939,677
4	1149	Museum Rooftop Units Replacement	\$28,500	\$1,836,015	\$0	\$867,838	\$28,500	\$968,177
5	1138	Employee Parking Lot Asphalt Paving	\$18,000	\$1,854,015	\$0	\$867,838	\$18,000	\$986,177
6	1104	Stoner-Kemmerling Facility Roof Replacement	\$40,000	\$1,894,015	\$0	\$867,838	\$40,000	\$1,026,177
7	1092	Coop Extension Office Facility Roof Replacement	\$63,500	\$1,957,515	\$0	\$867,838	\$63,500	\$1,089,677
8	1072	Security Panels for Emergency Egress Doors - Youth Center	\$20,000	\$1,977,515	\$20,000	\$887,838	\$20,000	\$1,109,677
9	1039	Courthouse Roofing & Ornamental Maintenance	\$55,000	\$2,032,515	\$55,000	\$942,838	\$0	\$1,109,677
10	1030	Corrections Grade Furniture - Youth Center	\$30,000	\$2,062,515	\$30,000	\$972,838	\$30,000	\$1,139,677
11	1017	Female Holding Cell - Sheriff	\$22,000	\$2,084,515	\$22,000	\$994,838	\$0	\$1,139,677
12	993	Main Jail Roof Replacement	\$130,277	\$2,214,792	\$0	\$994,838	\$130,277	\$1,269,954
13	988	Nike Park Asphalt Pavement – Drive and Parking	\$45,000	\$2,259,792	\$0	\$994,838	\$45,000	\$1,314,954
14	889	Animal Control Asphalt Paving - Drive & Svc. Area	\$20,000	\$2,279,792	\$0	\$994,838	\$20,000	\$1,334,954
15	846	Nike Park Basketball and Volleyball Facilities	\$25,000	\$2,304,792	\$0	\$994,838	\$25,000	\$1,359,954
16	844	Youth Center Exterior Facia Covering	\$25,000	\$2,329,792	\$0	\$994,838	\$25,000	\$1,384,954
17	833	Courthouse Exterior Preservation	\$55,000	\$2,384,792	\$0	\$994,838	\$55,000	\$1,439,954
18	830	Vienna Park Exercise and Walking Trail	\$45,000	\$2,429,792	\$0	\$994,838	\$45,000	\$1,484,954
19	828	Nike Park Exercise and Walking Trail	\$40,000	\$2,469,792	\$0	\$994,838	\$40,000	\$1,524,954
20	824	Kitchen Appliance Upgrade - Youth Center	\$27,839	\$2,497,631	\$27,839	\$1,022,677	\$0	\$1,524,954
21	814	Habitat Area Development at County Parks	\$55,000	\$2,552,631	\$0	\$1,022,677	\$15,500	\$1,540,454
22	813	Nike Park Disc Golf Course	\$16,800	\$2,569,431	\$0	\$1,022,677	\$16,800	\$1,557,254
23	811	Nature Trail Improvements – Vienna Park	\$15,000	\$2,584,431	\$0	\$1,022,677	\$15,000	\$1,572,254

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Buildings & Grounds
Project title: Enterprise-Wide Energy Conservation Projects
Date: March 13, 2012
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 1

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

See attached summary of all projects summarized by schedule of the Return on Investment (ROI) for each. The projects are grouped as follows: 1 Yr. or less, 1-3 Yr. ROI, 3-5 ROI, 5-10 ROI and projects with a 10 or more Yr. ROI.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

The project's ROI will provide an ongoing savings from lower energy usage after the initial cost of the project has been recouped.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

County received a Energy Efficiency & Conservation Block Grant from the State of Michigan, Department of Labor and Economic Growth to conduct an energy audit of its facilities. Ten (10) facilities were selected for study and the results were provided in a report dated February 28, 2011 and finalized 3/24/2011.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- X Projects urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

See the summary of report for each project cost:

	<u>Projects Total Cost</u>	<u>Annual</u>
<u>Savings</u>		
Projects with ROI of 1 Yr. or less:	\$31,725	\$57,560
Projects with ROI of 1-3 Yrs.	\$71,622	\$45,799
Projects with ROI of 3-5 Yrs.	\$173,768	\$40,648
Projects with ROI of 5-10 Yrs.	\$431,260	\$60,684
Projects with ROI of 10+ Yrs.	<u>\$473,015</u>	<u>\$37,022</u>
Totals	\$1,181,390	\$241,713

All Projects ROI 4.88 Years

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction							
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- X Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

See summary report for cost savings for each project.

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance					
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Buildings & Grounds
Project title: Courthouse Roofing & Ornamental Structures Maintenance
Date: March 14, 2012
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 2

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Replace the asphalt shingles and roofing coverings on the historic areas of the Courthouse. Sections of the roofing system are asphalt shingle covered and the shingles have been in place since 1982. Repairs have been made over the years and shingles replaced that have fallen off or deteriorated but the scope of the repairs now makes the planned re-roofing necessary. In addition, due to the type of structure, there are a number of areas of the roof at the base of the ornamental structures that have a protective weather membrane covering that are in poor condition and need to be recovered at the time the other work is taking place. There will also be some metal/tin repairs and weatherization related to the ornamental structures on the roof. There has been roof leaks we have been able to respond to but the leaks are becoming more frequent and widespread from a larger percentage of the roofing system now requiring significant repair.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

Roof system is from installation in 1982. The steeple received maintenance services in 2002 with shingle repairs and securing/replacing loose tiles and then painting the bell tower and ornamental structures. The roof has been repaired with spot repair work on a nearly annual basis as part of normal preventative maintenance measures.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

There is no warranty coverage for the roofing system and the life expectancy of this roof has since expired. A planned schedule to prepare for the capital cost of the roof repairs is good maintenance programming. The roof condition has led to increasing frequency of service calls to repair the leaks. When the roof leaks, it can lead to damage to the building's wooden structure, damage to contents, loss of use, damage to the building's ceiling tile and lead to other building quality issues. The leaks effect the County Court system as the courts located on the 4th floor are impacted. We are programming this into the CIP since regardless of the District Court Space Planning Project CIP status, the roof needs to be scheduled for replacement.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction			\$55,000				
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- X Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance					
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Milage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.		
2.		
3.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Buildings & Grounds
Project title: Main Jail Roof Replacement
Date: March 16, 2012
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 3

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Installation of new ballasted roofing system on main jail facility. Removal of stone ballast, rubber membrane and any damaged or wet insulation. Install new 60 mil. thick membrane, new insulation as needed and reinstall ballast material. Project would replace roof sump drains as needed and inspect and address any problem areas around skylights. Area is 25,420 square feet. The unit cost estimate is \$5.00-\$5.25 per square foot for a total of \$127,100-\$133,455.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

Existing roof is estimated to have a normal useful life of 15 years with normal care and conditions. The lower roof area where the cooling towers and elevator and equipment room access is provided was replaced in 2007 due to extensive leaks in this area. We are not far behind in requiring the balance of the roof system be scheduled for replacement. A roof system in good condition is needed to maintain a facility's overall condition. Water damage due to roof leaks can cause significant damage and lead to expensive repairs to facility and equipment. A weatherproof facility is necessary for occupant use and operations as facility is in use 24/7. Annually, we are making spot repairs to the roof based on leaks discovered during the year as part of visual periodic inspections. Estimated annual maintenance for outside contractors is approximately \$3,500 and this cost is trending up along with staff time addressing issues.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

Existing roof was replaced in 1995 with a 10-year warranty. Warranty expired in 2005 and a planned schedule to prepare for the capital cost roof replacement is good maintenance programming. Some frequency of leaks have been identified on the main roof at this time. We are seeing more serious problem areas on the bridge to the Courthouse specifically at the tie in to the Courthouse. have been addressed on an as needed basis. Given current assessment the project is not urgent but is being built into the capital schedule for replacement.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- X Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction				\$130,277			
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance				(\$3,500)	(\$4,000)
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Millage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

NONE

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Buildings & Grounds
Project title: Cooperative Extension Office Facility Roof Replacement
Date: March 16, 2012
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 4

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Replace roofing system on facility with new direct adhered two (2) ply EPDM roof covering. Replace the asphalt shingles covering the vertical roof sections with .45 mil EPDM roof covering. Replace all sheet metal flashing and trim with 24 gauge pre-finished metal. Roof area is approximately 5,000 square feet plus the additional square footage on the vertical sections. As part of project install a roof access hatch to allow for a safer means of access to the roof for servicing HVAC equipment mounted on the roof area.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

Roof system is the original roof installation from 1984 with some extensive repairs made in 1986 after having problems from the original construction. The roof has been repaired with spot seam and joint work on a nearly annual basis. Additional work was done in late 2009. The asphalt shingle areas are failing and the shingles are falling off at an increasing rate. The shingles provide the weather covering and when they are falling off, it exposes the roof to water infiltration. The roof was evaluated in Feb. 09 by roofing contractor and scored its condition at 41 out of 100 points. The facility hosted 272 educational programs, meetings and activities in 2008 and included an estimated 10,650 participants. Additionally, the County is in discussion with an outside agency/service provider to occupy space in facility thereby increasing the value of a weather-tight roofing system.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

Existing roof was installed in 1984 when the facility was constructed. There is no warranty coverage for the roofing system and the life expectancy of this roof has since expired. A planned schedule to prepare for the capital cost roof replacement is good maintenance programming. The roof condition has led to increasing frequency of service calls to repair the leaks. When the roof leaks, it can lead to damage to the gypsum roof deck, damage the building ceiling insulation and lead to other building quality issues.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- X Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction				\$63,500			
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- X Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance				(\$2,500)	(\$2,500)
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Millage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.		
2.		
3.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Buildings & Grounds
Project title: Stoner Kemmerling Facility Roof Replacement
Date: March 16, 2012
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 5

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Replace roofing system on facility with new direct adhered two-ply EPDM roof covering. Replace all sheet metal flashing and trim with 24 gauge pre-finished metal. Roof area is approximately 4,000 square feet plus the additional square footage on the elevator machine room roof.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

Roof system is the original roof installation from 1983 with some repairs made in 1988 and 2000 in conjunction with facility renovation work. The roof has been repaired with spot seam, curb and joint work on a nearly annual basis as part of normal preventative maintenance measures. Extensive time and material selective repairs were made in late 2009 to hold the roofing system over the winter and spring 2010 season. Some minor repairs were made in 2011 and the facility roof is inspected on at least a semi annual basis beyond investigating any calls due to leaks.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

There is no warranty coverage for the roofing system and the life expectancy of this roof has since expired. A planned schedule to prepare for the capital cost roof replacement is good maintenance programming. The roof condition has led to increasing frequency of service calls to repair the leaks. When the roof leaks, it can lead to damage to the building's wooden structure, damage to contents, loss of use, damage to the building's ceiling tile and lead to other building quality issues. We are programming this into the CIP since regardless of the District Court Space Planning Project CIP status, the roof needs to be scheduled for replacement.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- X Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction					\$40,000		
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance				(\$1,500)	(\$2,000)
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Millage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.		
2.		
3.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Buildings & Grounds
Project title: Employee Parking Lot Asphalt Paving
Date: March 14, 2012
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 6

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Install new 1.5" asphalt wearing course on the surface of the 36-car employee parking lot commonly referred to as the Edison Lot at the corner of E. First & S. Macomb Streets. Repair the storm water drainage as part of the project. Area also includes three parking spaces that are outside the parking lot barrier that will be part of the project. The existing perimeter car barricades will need to be changed out or upgraded along with the parking lot lighting system getting upgraded to high efficiency fixture and lamps.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

Parking lot is deteriorating and needs to be resurfaced to maintain surface. Part of a normal schedule to fund capital projects to provide requisite maintenance to existing properties. Recap of existing surface is more cost effective than rebuilding entire surface due to pavement failure. Helps with site drainage, snow plowing and provides a safe surface for employee pedestrian traffic. The site is immediately adjacent to the public square in a high profile location.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

Yes. Long-term maintenance project to maintain in sound condition County properties. The parking lot has continued to receive normal surface crack filling and sealing done approximately every other year to extend life. Some sink holes have developed due to possible drainage system failures and failure of the subsurface.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- X Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction				\$18,000			
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- X Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- X Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance				(\$400)	(\$400)
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Millage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.		
2.		
3.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Buildings & Grounds
Project title: Courthouse Exterior Preservation
Date: March 14, 2012
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 7

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Cleaning of exterior of historic Courthouse structure including all masonry and metal surfaces. Inspection of all masonry joints, cutting out of bad or weak joints and tucking pointing to fill areas. Application of water proofing sealant on all exterior masonry surfaces once repairs have been made. All metal surfaces are to be cleaned, inspected and any repairs made. Rusted areas are to be prepped and spot primed prior to receiving two coats of oil-based paint. Selected areas shall be caulked with 50-year sealant to provide good bond and weatherproof all openings. Inspect and repair all gutters/downspouts on structure.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

Facility is historical landmark and prominently displayed in the public square. There has not been any type of masonry preservation work of this type performed on the facility in over 25 years and weather exposure has begun to spall some of the masonry limestone of the facility. The type of stone material used on the exterior absorbs moisture naturally so after time we begin to see deterioration of the surfaces. Mortar joints also fail and proper maintenance requires the work outlined in order to preserve the facility appearance, to keep the structure in good repair and to prevent more extensive and costly repairs due to lack of proper maintenance. We have done some maintenance by caulking the granite panels in the window openings along the south west wing in 2011. This was done instead of mortar tuck pointing.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

The project is part of normal programming of facility maintenance to protect and preserve the building structure. Over the life and age of the facility, this type of project is limited in frequency, but necessary. As outlined above, properly scheduled capital maintenance projects will be of more value than unplanned repairs due to damages caused by an overall lack of preventative maintenance. The project is labor-intensive involving scaffolding and significant preparation and detail work. It is more cost effective to complete the entire exterior than attempting to phase sections of the exterior over several time phases.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- X Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction				\$55,000			
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- X Cost of comparable equipment or facility
 - Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
 - Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
 - Bids received for project
- X Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance					
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Millage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.		
2.		
3.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Buildings and Grounds
Project title: Youth Center Exterior Facia Covering
Date: March 16, 2012
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 8

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Project to cover the existing wood siding along the exterior of the facility with a metal or similar maintenance free covering. Existing wood has begun to dry rot and will not hold nails. Wood has been replaced in some areas, however, more and more will need to be replaced. The job would involve installing metal siding or similar material over the existing wood facia and over a rigid insulation board. The covering paneling could be screwed/attached right over the existing wood and does not need to be removed.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

Project is needed to replace the existing wood facia. Wood was probably not the best choice for the specific application. To continue to maintain the wood will require more and more repair, staining and weatherproofing. The exterior is a brick and metal structure and the wood is the only non-maintenance free building material used. Project would also improve the appearance of the exterior with an updated exterior finish. The wood covering is dated from 1976 and the facility would benefit from this enhancement. Appropriate energy conservation materials would be used to aid in reducing on-going expenses.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

Project is part of long term facility maintenance. The wood is going to need significant repairs or replacement and the proposed project would provide for a long term solution and not require staining or waterproofing. Most metal and like finishes have a 20 year warranty on the color and finish and therefore would not need to be touched for at least that many years.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- X Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction					\$25,000		
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- X Cost of comparable equipment or facility
 - Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
 - Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
 - Bids received for project
- X Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance					
Equipment & supplies					(\$3,000)
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Millage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Animal Control Facility
Project title: Asphalt Paving of Drive and Service Area
Date: March 14, 2012
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 9

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Prepare surface area by grading, compacting and laying out site. Place 2.5" base course of asphalt and 1.5" of wearing course over all existing gravel area inside the fenced site. Includes the area around the incinerator and garage entry areas. Pave the east side drive along the building. Includes some drainage improvements around the site where water does not drain.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

Improve site conditions during poor weather, in the winter and spring. Will make snow plowing operations more effective. Provide a more suitable work surface for the activities of the facility. Existing asphalt pave drives around the facility have deteriorated to the point where stone mix has been placed on top to fill holes and make site accessible for Animal Control trucks. Improved drainage will help extend life of new asphalt once installed.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

Part of ongoing normal capital expenditures needed to maintain facilities. The need has been identified and now efforts underway to provide awareness of the project and gain funding to complete the project.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- X Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction				\$20,000			
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- X Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance		(\$1,000)	(\$1,000)		
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Millage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.		
2.		
3.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Buildings & Grounds
Project title: Museum Rooftop Air Conditioning/Ventilation Units
Date: March 16, 2012
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 10

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Replace three (3) of 5 rooftop air conditioning units that serve the museum facility. Units were installed in 1986 and are nearing the end of their useful life. The units would be replaced with packaged rooftop units of similar size and capacity to provide for cost effective replacement. The new units would include economizers and have heating capabilities to provide supplemental heat to the facility boiler. \$5,000 per unit, \$2,500 for BMS Controls, \$6,500 for wiring, power, programming, \$1,800 for new thermostat controls, \$10,000 for crane and installation. Total \$25,800.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

The life expectancy of the equipment is nearing the end and a planned replacement is needed to provide reliable air conditioning and ventilation service to the facility. The museum has on display and houses a significant collection of historical items that need to be in a climate controlled environment. Proper cooling that removes humidity is a necessary part of providing this environment. Additionally, visitors to the museum will have a more enjoyable experience when systems are operating properly. This also applies to staff working at the facility. The existing RTU's are maintained and operational currently. The new equipment will meet more recent designs for better energy consumption including connectivity to our energy/building management system connected remotely to operate the rooftop equipment. The new units will also meet current standards for indoor air quality by ASHRAE (American Society of Heating, Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Engineers) to allow for outside air ventilation. This new equipment is expected to provide a 15% energy savings over existing equipment.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

The project is part of a long-term plan to provide a schedule to arrange the capital cost necessary to replace and upgrade critical facility equipment to keep downtime to a minimum and avoid emergency repairs or unplanned replacement that can be very costly particularly for this type of equipment.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- X Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction				\$28,500)			
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- X Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance					(\$800)
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					(\$3,645)

Annual Budget Electricity: \$15,500
 $\$15,500 \times (.60 \text{ non lighting energy costs}) = \$9,300 \times 15\% \text{ savings} = \$1,395$
 Annual Budget Heating: \$15,000
 $\$15,000 \times (.15 \text{ for efficiency savings spring \& fall}) = \$2,250 \text{ savings}$
 ROI Calculation: $\$25,800 / \$4,445 = 5.8 \text{ years}$

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Millage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.	Millage revenue if approved by electoral in August 2012	100%
2.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Parks & Recreation
Project title: Nike Park Asphalt Pavement-Drive & Parking
Date: March 16, 2012
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 1

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Construct an asphalt surface over existing gravel for park entrance drive and the main parking area at the front of the park. Install 2.5" base course over gravel after grading sub-base and then a 1.5" wearing course. Project would include as much asphalt as could be purchased and placement with the allocation requested. Would include a storm water catch basin draining area to the park open drain and then out to the drain along Newport road.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

The project would enhance the appearance of the park, make it more user friendly, especially for the less physically able who must traverse the gravel parking lot to get to the picnic and play areas. Layout of new pavement area would provide for new surface area to sidewalk connecting this area for accessible parking. It would also eliminate the dust that comes from the parking lot and drive with a prevailing wind from the west that covers the picnic tables and can make picnics unpleasant. This project would reduce the dust and need for applying calcium chloride and performing gravel maintenance work.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

Part of overall goal of Park Commission to improve parks for users and attract more users to County parks. Improving the appearance will help in achieving this goal and will also improve the experience at the park by providing a safer parking and walking surface for users. Project is part of long term park improvements needed at the park and has been requested in past CIP submittals for funding.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- X Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction					\$25,000	\$30,000	
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- X Cost of comparable equipment or facility
 - Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
 - Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
 - Bids received for project
- X Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Payroll and fringes				(\$1,000)	(\$1,000)
Professional services					
Maintenance				(\$1,000)	(\$1,000)
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Milage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.		
2.		
3.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Parks & Recreation
Project title: Habitat Area Development at County Parks
Date: April 4, 2011
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 2

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Develop selected areas in County parks to create wildlife habitat areas and native plant areas. Selected areas would be developed and removed from standard turf mowing and in place would be planted native seed for grasses, plants and trees. Plantings selected would aid color and improve the natural beauty to the park areas that serve limited functions. Areas would no longer need intensive maintenance but instead would be low impact areas. Areas within parks that are low lying and not sufficiently drained will be targeted for these areas and include rain gardens.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

Project is tool to help reduce long term maintenance costs of parks and create additional recreational opportunities within the parks. While adding beauty and helping to reduce maintenance in the areas, these habitat areas could serve by providing an educational aspect of the park. The areas developed would have laminated signs showing the native plants, history of the plants and other related information. These areas can benefit the parks by breaking up some of the wide expanse of the park grass areas. Bench seating could be added near each of the areas to provide a quiet spot to sit and enjoy. In the low lying or poorly drained areas, these locations would be well suited to develop rain gardens to hold the water, drain other park areas into the locations and provide both a wildlife and natural habitat area for park visitors.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

Project is part of the County's newly developed 5 year Recreation Plan. The Park Commission has explored this concept in our parks during site visits and staff has considered ways of reducing the acreage of the parks requiring grass mowing services. The parks did receive a grant in 2008 for up to \$40,000 to purchase equipment, plantings, material and training to begin this initiative. Any additional funding would be used to supplement and expand this initiative on a larger scale in the parks. This initial development began in 2009 and was completed in 2011.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- X Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design				\$1,000			
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction							
Equipment				\$3,000			
Other				\$10,000			
Contingency				\$1,500			
Total	\$40,000			\$15,500			

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- X Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance				(\$500)	
Equipment & supplies				(\$150)	
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Millage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.		
2.		
3.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Parks & Recreation
Project title: Nature Trail Improvement-Vienna Park
Date: March 16, 2012
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 3

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Upgrade the nature trail that winds around the west property side of the park. Contract for the clearing, grubbing and grading of the trail and expand as needed. Add bench seating along the trail and install a gravel compacted surface that is accessible for all visitors. Add educational signage in selected areas to describe the native plantings, etc. along with appropriate signage at the park designating the nature trail.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

Project will provide additional recreational opportunities for visitors to the park and will also enhance the experience by offering some educational information on native plants, trees or related wildlife species.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

Project is described in the County's 5 year Recreation Plan (2008-2012). During development of the recreation plan, public input showed nature trails as the second highest priority behind walking trails. Clearly, the public considers these types of recreational opportunities desirable and the Park Commission has included this type of park improvement in the 5 year plan.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- X Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design				\$1,500			
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements				\$10,000			
Construction							
Equipment				\$3,500			
Other							
Contingency							
Total				\$15,000			

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- X Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance					
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Millage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.		
2.		
3.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Parks & Recreation
Project title: Nike Park Exercise & Walking Trail
Date: March 16, 2012
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 4

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Construct a 6' wide walking, biking, roller blading and jogging trail through selected areas of the park. The trail could be constructed in phases by simply adding additional distance to the trail in future years as more funding becomes available. The trail would be similar to the trail constructed at Waterloo Park, Heck Park and proposed for Vienna Park. Stone base 6" capped with a 3.5" asphalt surface. The improvement would require minimal maintenance above existing operations.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

Goal of the Park Commission is to improve the park, provide additional recreation activities within the park and encourage more use of parks. The project would have different potential uses to attract more users of all ages and abilities. It would serve to promote use of the park and healthy recreation activities.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

The project is included in the Monroe County Recreation Plan dated February 2003 for action in 2005. The project has been included in past CIP requests for funding and remains a project to be considered for funding. In lieu of the asphalt surface, parks staff could begin the trail by placing crushed stone to form the base of the trail and could be used until asphalt surfacing at a later time. Fine crushed stone is an acceptable trail surface but does have limited uses due to it not be suitable for all users. The trail would be designed and developed along the areas where native plantings and habitat areas will be developed as part of a grant funded project from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Foundation. We would supplement the money used from the grant with CIP money to complete the trail along the habitat areas.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- X Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction					\$20,000	\$20,000	
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- X Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- X Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance				\$500	\$500
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Milage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.		
2.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Parks & Recreation
Project title: Vienna Park-Exercise & Walking Trail
Date: March 16, 2012
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 5

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Construct a 6' wide walking, biking, roller blading and jogging trail around selected areas of the perimeter of the park. The park could be constructed in phases by adding additional distance to the trail in future years. Trail would be similar to the trail constructed at Waterloo Park and Heck Park and proposed for Nike Park. Stone base 6" capped with a 3.5" asphalt surface for a smooth/accessible surface. The improvement would require minimal maintenance and would have little impact on maintenance operations.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

Construct a 6' wide walking, biking, roller blading and jogging trail around selected areas of the perimeter of the park. The park could be constructed in phases by adding additional distance to the trail in future years. Trail would be similar to the trail constructed at Waterloo Park and Heck Park and proposed for Nike Park. Stone base 6" capped with a 3.5" asphalt surface for a smooth/accessible surface. The improvement would require minimal maintenance and would have little impact on maintenance operations.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

Project is included in Monroe County Recreation Plan dated Feb. 2003 for action in 2005. This project has been included in past requests for CIP funding and remains a project to be considered for funding. As outlined in the CIP application for the same project at Nike Park, in lieu of the asphalt surface, parks staff could begin the trail by placing crushed stone to form the base of the trail and could be used until asphalt surfacing at a later time. Fine crushed stone is an acceptable trail surface but does have limited uses due to it not be suitable for all users. The trail would be designed and developed along the areas where native plantings and habitat areas will be developed as part of a grant funded project from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Foundation. We would supplement the money used from the grant with CIP money to complete the trail along the habitat areas.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- X Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction					\$25,000	\$20,000	\$45,000
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- X Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- X Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance					
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Millage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.		
2.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Parks & Recreation
Project title: Nike Park Basketball & Volleyball Facilities
Date: March 16, 2012
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 6

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Layout and construct an area for a basketball court including stone base and asphalt surface. Install two basketball goals, backboards and player benches. Layout and construct an area for sand volleyball court including necessary excavation, drainage, stone, fabric separator and sand. Install net posts and net. These activities would be laid out near the playground area to cluster recreation activities together at the park. Basketball court would be 50' x 84' and sand volleyball court would be 50' x 80'.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

The project would provide additional recreational activities at the park for users. The project would advance Park Commission goals of providing more park activities resulting in more park use by visitors. The improvements would not require any additional staff to schedule or supervise and would require minimal maintenance. This development would supplement the playground area, horseshoe throwing courts, swings and sandbox as existing park recreational activities.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

The project is part of the Park Commission's overall goal of providing additional recreational opportunities. This project has been included on past CIP requests for funding.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- X Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction						\$25,000	
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- X Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- X Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- X Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance					
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Milage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.		
2.		
3.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Parks & Recreation
Project title: Nike Park Disc Golf Course
Date: March 16, 2012
Prepared by: Michael Bosanac

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 7

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Design, layout, purchase of equipment and installation of 18 hole disc golf course through selected areas of Nike County Park. Project includes all concrete tee pads, 18 goals for the holes, 1 practice hole, message board for course information, 36 tee signs and two small foot bridges to cross the ditch that runs through the course.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

Project was originally proposed as an expansion to the existing 18 hole course at Vienna Park by adding 6 more goals. However, due to the large number of ongoing activities at Vienna including baseball and soccer the Park Commission suggested the concept be evaluated for implementation at another County Park. All parks were considered and Nike was selected as the most appropriate park to develop the disc golf course. There is a need to expand opportunities at this park and with the growth of populations in this part of the County the Commission felt this was the best location.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

The project is not included in the current recreation plan however, the project does meet a goal of the Park Commission to increase the number of recreational opportunities at all County Parks. The Commission is attempting to balance the number of opportunities and use at the parks. Given the popularity of the game at Vienna it is reasonable to anticipate an increase in park use due to the game being available along with scheduled tournaments. The fencing at Nike Park has been adjusted to allow expansion into a section of the park that was not accessible. The course is designed to utilize this area of the park. However, tree and brush cleaning will need to be completed prior to development of the course.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- X Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction					\$14,700		
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency					\$2,100		
Total					\$16,800		

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance			\$0	\$0	
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Millage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.	Labor donated as alternate funding source	
2.		
3.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Monroe County Sheriff's Office / Main Jail
Project title: Female Holding Area
Date: 3-8-2012
Prepared by: Captain John Ciacelli

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 1

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Remodel a 134.4 sq. ft. office into a second female holding cell with a maximum capacity of 4 inmates. Install prison-type water closer/lavatory/drinking fountain unit, tamper proof light fixtures and a 7' x 5' unbreakable glass window.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

Since 2007, the Main Jail has been battling the problem of female inmate overcrowding. In February of 2008, the Main Jail was forced to house 10 female inmates out of County for 30 days. The cost at that time was approximately \$9000. The Main Jail female housing area is designed house 32 inmates. The 2011 average daily female population was 37. Currently, overflow female inmates are being housed on bunks in the open dayroom or in the female holding cell. The current female holding cell is designed for 8 inmates. Because there is only one holding cell, intoxicated, suicidal, mental and violent female offenders are being held in the same cell with the regular population. It should also be noted that there is no toilet or running water in this holding cell.

The additional female holding cell will increase bed space and provide a safer environment for officers and inmates. It will also provide a way to separate intoxicated, suicidal, mental and violent females from other inmates and provide them with a lavatory.

The County of Monroe has known about this problem for over five years. If this project is not funded, the County may be held liable in possible future law suits resulting from this issue. It will also save the County the cost of housing out four female inmates in the future.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

No. No. N/A

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- X Project urgently needed this year
- Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction		\$22,000					\$22,000
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency							
Total		\$22,000					\$22,000

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- X Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance					
Equipment & supplies					
Other: Alternate Housing for Female Inmates	Approx . \$40 per day + medical				

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Milage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.	Unknown	
2.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Youth Center
Project title: Kitchen Equipment Upgrade
Date: 3-21-12
Prepared by: Melissa Strong

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 1

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Replace electric stove with gas range. Replace dishwasher. Replace Steamtable.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

All of the kitchen equipment is original to the building. (Circa 1970) The stove does not work properly and repairs are costly and parts are increasingly more difficult to obtain due to lack of availability due to the age of the equipment. The YC serves nearly 40,000 meals a year – 3x daily. When appliances break down , food must be brought in at a significantly higher cost than if we are able to prepare food on site.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

No, but requests for capital improvement money for this project have been made in the past.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- X Project urgently needed this year
- Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction							
Equipment	Range =\$3358 Dishwasher =\$16,355	Griddle =\$5330 Steamtable =\$2796					\$27,839.00
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Payroll and fringes	n/a				
Professional services	n/a				
Maintenance	n/a				
Equipment & supplies	n/a				
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Milage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.	Unknown	
2.		
3.		

**2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS
PROJECT WORKSHEET**

Department: Youth Center
Project title: Security Panels for Emergency Egress Doors
Date: 3-21-12
Prepared by: Melissa Strong

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 2

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Replace (2) existing security panels that operate emergency egress for resident room doors and external fire escape doors.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

One of the security panels is original to the building and does not function properly 100% of the time. During storms or power outages, room doors sometimes open unexpectedly and this is a serious security problem. Both panels are in need of renovation.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

No.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- X Project urgently needed this year
- Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction							
Equipment		\$20,000					
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project

X Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Payroll and fringes	N/A				
Professional services	N/A				
Maintenance	N/A				
Equipment & supplies	N/A				
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Milage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.	Unknown	
2.		
3.		

**2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS
PROJECT WORKSHEET**

Department: Youth Center
Project title: Corrections Grade Furniture
Date: 3-21-12
Prepared by: Melissa Strong

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 3

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

Replace existing chairs and tables throughout YC with corrections grade furniture.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

The furniture that is being used in the resident living areas is original to the building and is not correctional grade furniture. When residents become angry and hostile as they often do, chairs/tables are tipped over, thrown and can be used as weapons. The current chairs are made of breakable plastic which can be fashioned into a weapon when it breaks. Other furniture throughout the building has literally buckled and broken when members of the public have been seated. The risk of someone being injured is great and this poses a significant issue of liability to the County.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

No.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- X Project urgently needed this year
- Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction							
Equipment		\$30,000					
Other							
Contingency							
Total							

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Payroll and fringes	N/A				
Professional services	N/A				
Maintenance	N/A				
Equipment & supplies	N/A				
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Milage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.	Unknown	
2.		
3.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Central Dispatch
Project title: Radio Console Technology Enhancement Project – MCC 7500 IP
Date: March 2, 2012
Prepared by: Alan D. Frank, Director

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 1

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

The Radio Console Technology Enhancement Project is needed to replace the existing and aging radio consoles housed within the Emergency Services building and operated by Central Dispatch with new radio consoles. The new radio consoles will fit the upcoming industry technology and provide the ability to maintain the radio system over the years to come as well as to meet our mission critical public safety responsibilities.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

The current radio consoles/system was purchased and installed in 2002. The technology is no longer current and the manufacture has projected the equipment software to be maintained through 2013 and available parts for repair a few years beyond that. As the radio consoles operate under the MPSCS 800 mhz radio system the current system can no longer accept the version upgrades provided by the State. Not being able to upgrade will eventually prevent full functionality with the 800 mhz system. Our commitment to the MPSCS 800 mhz system has proved to be a wise decision for public safety. The 800 mhz system has improved communications and interoperability as compared to UHF system it replaced. The new replacement system prevents us from falling behind as the industry moves toward NG 9-1-1 (Next Generation). The consequence of not planning for and committing to this investment is once support for the existing radio system is no longer available, the system will be compromised, eventually fail, and ultimately jeopardize public safety.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

The plan for replacement was originally quoted in 2009. Although not a formally documented plan, the Radio Console Technology Enhancement Project embraces the future of the industry and keeps the dispatch center on track with what will eventually be public expectations for service. The project marries the newly purchased Inform Audio Recording System (2011) and future system integration interfacing all components; radio, CAD, phones, and recording into a more centralize resource. It should be noted that, if funded by 11/15/2012, the projected costs would reduce to \$532,574 a saving of \$30,000.

The project plan is comprised of three major areas:

1. Dispatch Console Equipment – This is for a technology upgrade replacement of the existing Elite console positions at Central Dispatch with new Motorola MCC7500 IP-based Operator Positions, and replacement of the existing Central Electronics Bank with IP network hardware.
2. Radio Dispatch Transaction Logging – One digital archive interface server, logging recorder system, and one playback workstation will be installed at the existing Central Dispatch facility.
3. Conventional Stations Network Reconfiguration – Incorporate existing analog conventional stations such as Monroe County Fire Call-Out onto the IP-based MPSCS network.

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- X Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements							
Construction							
Equipment							
Other							
Contingency							
Total	562,574						

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- X Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance					
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Milage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.		
2.		
3.		

2012 MONROE COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WORKSHEET

Department: Central Dispatch
Project title: Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Enhancement Project
Date: March 2, 2012
Prepared by: Alan D. Frank, Director

Department Priority (only if more than one project is submitted) # 2

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Give a brief description of project, including location, size, capacity, etc.

EMS Enhancement Project provides for state-of-the-art emergency medical dispatching software replacing the existing manual flip card system housed within the Emergency Services building and operated by Central Dispatch. The project provides computerized EMS software, consistent with medical protocols, to include a quality assurance tracking function to reduce liability risks and improve emergency service.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

Why is this project needed? What benefits will the project provide? What are the consequences if the project is not funded?

The public we serve expects EMS efficiency when 9-1-1 is called for medical emergencies. The project provides automated tools to provide the very best in pre-hospital patient care. EMS software guides you through the process of collecting the vital information from the caller, EMS software prompts the dispatcher to obtaining the patient's status, choosing an appropriate dispatch level, and instructing the caller with medically approved protocols until the dispatched units arrive at the scene. EMS software raises the level of Dispatcher competency with an expert system designed to help provide the very best in service and speed. EMS software is becoming a common industry tool used at many dispatch centers in Michigan. The reduction of liability impact has been recognized by our risk carrier who has awarded reimbursement grants up to 50% of costs to some Michigan users. The grant recognizes the impact of better accuracy, better efficiency, and improved quality assurance.

PLANNING CONTEXT

Is the project part of a long-term program plan? Is the plan a formal document that has been approved outside of the department? When was the plan prepared?

RANKING OF NEED

Indicate how the project should be considered in terms of its importance and urgency.

- Committed to project / project already begun
- Project urgently needed this year
- X Project urgently needed, but not necessarily this year
- Project is important, but not urgent
- Project is optional

COST ESTIMATE

List the total project cost along with annual breakdowns.

PROJECT ELEMENTS	COST TO DATE	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Planning/design							
Site Acquisition							
Site Improvements		19,000*					
Construction							
Equipment		55,051					
Other							
Contingency							
Total		74,051*					

*Site Improvements figure has been revised from an earlier estimate.

BASIS OF COST ESTIMATE

What is the source of the above estimate? Check one of the following, and provide other information if necessary.

- Cost of comparable equipment or facility
- Rule of thumb indicator / unit cost
- X Cost estimate received from vendor / engineer / architect
- Bids received for project
- Preliminary estimate (“guesstimate”)

COST IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

If implemented, how will the proposed project impact other aspects of the department’s budget?

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Payroll and fringes					
Professional services					
Maintenance					
Equipment & supplies					
Other:					

ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES

List amounts and sources of funding if the project can be financed through sources other than the General Fund/ Public Improvements Fund (i.e. Special Milage, Federal or State Aid, Building Authority, Grants, etc.)

	SOURCE	AMOUNT
1.	MMRMA RAP Grant(reimbursement-grant up to 50%)	\$10,000
2.		
3.		

CHAPTER 5 LONG-TERM DEBT

BONDING CAPACITY

The principal purpose of this section is to analyze the potential of Monroe County to finance current and future capital improvements via bonds which require the "full faith and credit" powers of the County. The County's ability to issue bonds to finance capital improvement projects is determined by several interrelated factors. The most important of these are: 1) legal debt limit; 2) amount of present long-term debt; 3) growth trends of state equalized valuation; and 4) the Headlee Tax Limitation Amendment. Each of these factors is listed below and briefly described.

1. Legal Debt Limit: Monroe County is permitted to obligate up to ten percent of its state equalized valuation in support of long-term debt. The Michigan Constitution makes several references to county borrowing. One of the most important provisions is contained in Article VII on Local Government in Section 11. The indebtedness limitation is spelled out, therein, as follows:

“No county shall incur any indebtedness which shall increase its total debt beyond 10 percent of its assessed valuation.”

Although Proposal A, which resulted in Public Act 415 of 1994, put a cap on the annual increase in taxable value (see Chapter 3), the County's debt limitation is still determined by the full assessed valuation.

2. Present Use of Bonding Capacity: On December 31, 2011, the County's legal debt limit was \$621,029,996, or ten percent of the 2011 SEV of \$6,210,299,964. The outstanding total net principal on all of Monroe County's debts subject to constitutional limitation (with adjustments) totaled \$89,811,292 (excluding the amount set aside for repayment of general obligation bonds), leaving a very substantial margin for bonding of \$531,218,704 at the end of 2011. The County is using about **1.462 percent** of the uncapped State Equalized Value, or **14.62 percent** of its total bonding capacity. Table V-2 shows the total amount remaining due in future years on bonds issued by December 31, 2011. It should be noted, however, that a portion of the County's total debt belongs to the "indirect or secondary county obligation" category. Sewer and water systems for various local units of government within Monroe County were financed through the County, but the retirement of the debt is primarily the responsibility of local units of government. (Table V-1)

3. Headlee Tax Limitation Amendments: The Headlee Amendment requires that bond issues providing full faith and credit be approved by the voters. Under the Tax Limitation Amendment, school districts lost their power to levy bonds (previously limited to 5% of their equalized assessed valuation) without voter approval. This method had been

commonly used for building improvements and occasionally even to construct new buildings.

Monroe County's bonded indebtedness involves separate bonds which fall into three major categories. A list of these bonds is shown in Table V-1, and a the annual costs in paying principal and interest is shown in Table V-2.

Monroe County's bonded debt falls into several categories. 1) General County Long-Term Debt includes Building authority bonds, (several buildings built by the County in past years), a bank installment loan, and compensated absences for library employees. 2) The Monroe County Agency, administered by the Drain Commissioner's office, issues multiple bonds for sewer and water construction through local municipalities. 3) The Drain Commissioner issues notes for drainage district improvement, and 4) The Monroe County Road Commission issues bonds to finance some of their projects. Many bonds have been retired over the years. Table V-1 compares current debts with the legal debt limit (The unpaid principal/S.E.V. ratio must never exceed 1/10.), Table V-2 lists debt categories, and Table V-3 shows future costs of paying principal and interest on debts.

**Table V-1
LEGAL DEBT MARGIN December 31, 2011**

Assessed Value (full SEV)	6,210,299,964
Legal Debt Limit (10% of SEV)	621,029,996
Debt applicable to limit:	
Long term debt including component units	90,019,110
Less: Amount set aside for repayment of general obligation bonds	(207,818)
Total net debt applicable to limit	89,811,292
Legal debt margin	531,218,704
<u>Percentage of debt limit being used</u>	<u>14.62%</u>

Source: Monroe County Finance Dept.

**Table V-2
MONROE COUNTY LONG-TERM DEBT December 31, 2011**

Category/Description	Unpaid Principal 12/31/11
BUILDING AUTHORITY BONDS	11,080,000
COUNTY AGENCY BONDS	60,020,527
<u>ROAD COMMISSION OBLIGATIONS Installment Lease & Bonds</u>	<u>4,977,303</u>

Source: Monroe County Finance Department

OTHER BONDS

The County of Monroe is associated with several other bonds that do not carry the full faith and credit of Monroe County and do not weigh upon the County's legal debt limitation.. Detroit Edison pollution control bonds are limited obligation bonds issued by Monroe County The bonds are limited to payment by the trustee who acts for and on behalf of Detroit Edison. These bonds are of no obligation to Monroe County in the event of default in payment.

Bonds handled by the Monroe County Drain Commissioner's office for Special Drains are backed by the full faith and credit of the townships where the applicable drains are located.

Bonds for operating leases by the Monroe County Community Mental Health Authority and long-term liability of the Monroe County Library System are not backed by the full faith and credit of the County of Monroe.

Bonds for delinquent taxes are handled by the Treasurer's Office. They have short terms of less than one year, carry no amortization schedule, are in a constant state of flux, and are generally paid off through late collections. These are not included in this compilation.

CHAPTER 6 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS

1. **SEV and Taxable Value.** The full State Equalized Value (S.E.V.) for Monroe County in 2012 is \$6,040,218,341. This is the fourth consecutive annual decline in the full SEV after many decades of constant increases. Public Act 415 of 1994 placed a cap on property taxes using a formula based on the rate of inflation. The taxable value for 2012 is \$5,604,486,636, and this is the third consecutive year after many decades of increases that showed a decrease in that figure, whose impact on County revenue is significant.
2. **Millage.** The authorized operating millage for Monroe County is **4.7952**. This is the current reduction under the Headlee tax limitation. (The pre-Headlee County millage was 4.95 mills.) This rate has remained generally stable since 2003.
3. **Revenue.** Tax-related revenue is expected to remain the most important source of revenue for the next six years.
4. **Top Taxpayer.** DTE Energy remains the single largest property taxpayer in Monroe County, with **16 percent** of the County's taxable value in 2012. DTE Energy's taxable value and its percentage of the County's total have fluxuated in recent years. At its peak during 1987 and 1988, the company represented 45 percent of the County's tax base.
5. **Debt Limit.** On December 31, 2012, the County's legal debt limit was **\$621,029,996**, or ten percent of the 2012 SEV of **\$6,210,299,964**. The outstanding principal on all of Monroe County's debts subject to constitutional limitation (with adjustments and excluding the amount set aside for repayment of general obligation bonds) totaled **\$89,811,292**, leaving a very substantial margin for bonding of **\$531,218,704** at the end of 2011. The County is using about **1.462 percent** of the uncapped State Equalized Value, or **14.62 percent** of its total bonding capacity.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Proposed Projects.** The total requested amount for all **23** projects for 2013-2017 is **\$2,584,431**. It is recommended that the Board of Commissioners fund as many projects as possible in the order of priority as funding is available.
2. **Redefine the Capital Improvements Process.** While it is difficult to draw a hard line between projects that are true capital improvements and those that are merely ongoing maintenance needs, the Monroe County Planning Commission has, for several years, expressed the desire to more clearly define the distinction. Types of projects specifically mentioned as not belonging in the process are carpeting, copier

and computer replacement, roofing, etc. It is proposed that the Board of Commissioners limit future capital improvements proposals to items as already defined as “physical facilities of government or recurring expenditures for physical items . . . such as equipment or vehicles.” New construction or additions, major renovations to buildings, vehicles, and large, long-term items of physical equipment should form the bulk of the requests.

- 3. Institute a Proactive Maintenance Program.** Many ongoing needs for the routine replacement of necessary office equipment and physical amenities can be easily anticipated and planned in a coordinated fashion. The life expectancy of many such items can be clearly determined upon purchase. Funds should be set aside on a continuous basis, with planned replacement for those items as their useful life expires. The Proactive Maintenance Program should work side-by-side with the Capital Improvements Program to satisfy the needs of County government.
- 4. Spend Conservatively.** Monroe County continues to face a critical point in its fiscal outlook. In light of the tax limitation of recent years (the Headlee Amendment and Public Act 415 of 1994) and other constraints on revenues, Monroe County must pursue a conservative approach to spending. County appropriations should be given scrupulous, individual attention, and spending decisions should be made with a clear understanding of projected revenue levels.
- 5. Update the Capital Improvements Program Annually.** As circumstances change, it is important to anticipate and re-evaluate the needs of the County government, and to provide the means by which to meet these needs. Only with sound and vigorous planning can we be assured of achieving our objectives for the future. An annual update of the Capital Improvements program is recommended so as to adequately reflect the needs of the County of Monroe.
- 6. Review Scoring Methodology Annually.** In addition, the Planning Commission should annually review the methodology used to score and rank projects to assure that the rankings adequately address the proper concerns of the County.