

**CITY OF WIXOM
49045 PONTIAC TRAIL
REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2016**

Mayor Hinkley called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at which time the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Present:

Mayor: K. Hinkley
Deputy Mayor: R. Ziegler
Councilmembers: P. Beagle
K. Gottschall
N. Kennedy
T. Rzeznik
R. Smiley

AGENDA CHANGES: (None)

PRESENTATION:

1.) Proclamation for Cory Lupinacci for his Years of Service on the Planning Commission

Mayor Hinkley introduced Mr. Cory Lupinacci who has recently resigned from the Planning Commission. He read and presented Mr. Lupinacci with a Proclamation in appreciation for his years of service on the Planning Commission.

Mr. Lupinacci thanked the Council for this Proclamation as it meant a lot to him. Lately he has been thinking about all of the activities the Planning Commission has gone through over the past eight and a half years. He thought about those times when applicants came before the Commission with a fantastic package and good presentation. Good for them and good for the City of Wixom. He had the pleasure to vote yes. Then there were those times when an applicant would bring in something that was questionable for one reason or another. He had no choice. He had the obligation on behalf of the City of Wixom to vote no. He said he would take with him and treasure for the longest time those many times when a person brought in an okay presentation and an okay package. The Planning Commission had the opportunity to work hand-in-hand with the applicant and find a way to make it work for them and for us. It gave him the opportunity to vote yes subject to conditions. He learned relatively late in the game that the City of Wixom Planning Commission has a reputation of being very business-development friendly but also thorough. That thoroughness comes from the people on the Commission having a deep understanding of the Zoning Ordinance and the Master Plan for future land use. They have a deep understanding of the applicant's proposal by going through it and having the ability to apply their own individual common sense to find a way to make it work while always in the best interest of the City of Wixom. As he retires, he wanted to leave that as his advice, not just to the members of the Planning Commission that remain but also the members of all of the Boards, Commissions and Councils in the City of Wixom. Always as a starting point, know the laws, ordinances and regulations that govern your activity and know it deeply. Then, take the time to thoroughly understand the issues before you so you can make a well-informed decision. Always apply your individual talents and gifts to

the issue at hand. Always make the best interest of the City of Wixom number one. He thanked the Mayor and the members of Council for the opportunity to serve the City of Wixom.

PUBLIC HEARING:

1.) Public Hearing for LDFA Plan Amendment

Mayor Hinkley read the Rules for Speaking at a Public Hearing.

Mr. Goodlein said the LDFA District was created in 1989 to find different ways to develop long range plans to promote the economic growth within the District, which is primarily at the south end of the City. One of the first projects that the LDFA was responsible for, through the financing of monies that was collected from that District, was the realignment of Wixom Road, otherwise known as the Wixom Road Bypass. When that was completed, it left us with a balance of just over \$3 million. There have been a different number of projects on the list that we were going to consider to do. Most of them were road projects. Some of the delay in not doing these projects sooner was because the roads were not in the state where they needed to be attended to at that time. Recently, and as a result of a road survey that the DPW conducted in conjunction with our engineers at HRC, we put together an entire list of pacer ratings of the roads in the City. At the meeting in December of last year, we talked about the conditions of the roads in the City. He said they went to the LDFA on May 3rd to discuss having the LDFA assist with their funds in the financing of the repair of some roads in the south end of the City that were in need of repair and had low pacer ratings. They talked about not only the West Road Project which is a section of road east of Beck Road on West Road, but also Beck Road, Frank Street, Anthony, Wixom Tech, and West Tech Drive as being some of the ones that needed attention. The members of the LDFA decided to unanimously approve and make a recommendation to City Council that they add some roads to the Project List and create a priority system for the allocation for funds from the LDFA to facilitate the repair of those roads together. Our engineers told us that if we were to put those road projects together, we would probably save about \$300,000 to \$350,000.

The Hearing was then opened at 7:13 p.m. Since there were no public comments, the Public Hearing was closed at 7:14 p.m.

MINUTES:

CM-06-92-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Rzeznik and Beagle to approve the Budget Study Session minutes of May 16, 2016 and the Regular City Council meeting minutes of May 24, 2016.

Vote:

Motion Carried

CORRESPONDENCE:

- 1.) Letter from Cory Lupinacci Regarding his Resignation from the Planning Commission**
- 2.) Public Hearing Notice from the Great Lakes Water Authority on the State Revolving Fund Project Plans for the Proposed Rouge River Outfall Disinfection**

CALL TO THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments at this time.

CITY MANAGER REPORTS:

- 1.) Fire Monthly Report – April 2016
- 2.) Police Monthly Report – April 2016
- 3.) Quarterly Investment and Monthly Budget Report – March 2016

There were no comments regarding any of these reports.

CONSENT AGENDA:

CM-06-93-16: Moved and seconded made by Deputy Mayor Ziegler and Councilmember Beagle to approve the Consent Agenda as presented which included:

- 1.) Approval to receive and file:
 - a. Special Cemetery Board Minutes of August 5, 2015
 - b. Library Board Minutes of April 25, 2016
 - c. Planning Commission Minutes of April 25, 2016
 - d. Planning Commission Minutes of May 2, 2016
 - e. Planning Commission Minutes of May 23, 2016
- 2.) Consideration of Setting June 28, 2016 as the Date for Public Hearings Associated with the Establishment of an Industrial Development District and the Issuance of an Industrial Facilities Tax Exemption Certificate for MJC Assets, LLC in Accordance with Public Act 198 of 1974, as Amended

Vote:

Motion Carried

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: (None)

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1.) **Consideration of a Resolution Adopting and Approving the Fourth Amendment and Restatement of the Local Development Finance Authority (LDFA) Development Plan and Tax Increment Financing Plan**

CM-06-94-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Rzeznik and Smiley to adopt the following Resolution approving the Fourth Amendment and Restatement of the Local Development Finance Authority Development Plan and Tax Increment Financing Plan:

**CITY OF WIXOM
RESOLUTION NO. 2016-49**

**APPROVAL OF THE FOURTH AMENDED AND RESTATED DEVELOPMENT
PLAN AND TAX INCREMENT FINANCING PLAN
OF THE CITY OF WIXOM**

WHEREAS, the City of Wixom, County of Oakland, State of Michigan ("City") is authorized by the provisions of Act 281, Public Acts of Michigan, 1986, as amended ("Act 281"), to create a Local Development Finance Authority; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to Act 281, the Wixom City Council duly established the Local Development Finance Authority of the City of Wixom (the "Authority") which exercises its power within the District designated by the City Council (the "Authority District"); and,

WHEREAS, the Authority has previously recommended and the City Council has previously approved a Tax Increment Financing Plan (the "Plan") pursuant to the provisions of Act 281; and,

WHEREAS, the previous Development Plan and Tax Increment Financing Plan has been amended; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the provisions of Act 281, the Authority has prepared and approved another amendment to the Plan (the "Plan Amendment"); and,

WHEREAS, the Authority has forwarded the Plan Amendments to the City Council requesting its approval of the Plan Amendments.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Wixom City Council hereby determines that it is in the best interest of the public and necessary for the achievement of the purposes of Act 281 to approve the amendments to the Plan incorporated within the Fourth Amended and Restated Plan to enable the Local Development Finance Authority to carry out its purposes more effectively.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Plan Amendments are hereby approved and adopted.

Councilmember Gottschall commented that in the packet earlier this year we saw that there is a new State law that if we didn't give utility companies a certain amount of notice, we would be paying a fine or penalty. He wondered if we were going to incur that with any of these projects. Mr. Goodlein replied no. We haven't begun those projects yet. We will give them plenty of notice from the time we do the engineering for those projects.

Councilmember Gottschall said that in regard to Beck Road, he wasn't sure if any of the other Councilmembers had noticed, when you drive down Beck Road, there are people trying to cross from the Village Apartments to the shopping centers. He wasn't sure if there was a way to look into putting a crosswalk from the Village Apartments to the shopping area to make it safer. Right now, he sees people in the center lane and it doesn't look very safe. Mr. Goodlein said as part of the engineering, we can have the traffic consultants from HRC look at that area to determine whether or not a pedestrian crossing is warranted. That would be part of the package that would come back to Council.

Councilmember Gottschall said that with the Wixom I-96 Interchange, this is the only plan given that isn't clearly defined. For a price tag of three quarters of a million dollars, he wondered if there were more defined plans. He didn't know where a pocket park would go at a freeway interchange. Mr. Goodlein replied that originally when it was discussed at the LDFA, these other issues with the roads were not apparent and subject to discussion with the LDFA. The other roads came to light as Ms. Barker began talking with some of the businesses on those roads about their opinion of the condition of the roads impacting their businesses in a negative way. They talked to HRC and Mr. Sikma, which was the reason it came before the LDFA. It caused the description of the Wixom Road and I-96 Enhancements not to be a bit more explicit and detailed. It was the LDFA's opinion that once the money was spent, there would only be about \$30,000. The priority

was the Beck Road right-of-way and this would take priority over a pocket park or other types of beautification that would occur at that interchange. The idea was to create beautification at that interchange that would facilitate economic development.

Councilmember Gottschall said that a lot of this has us using the hot mix asphalt. He remembered an earlier packet mention that we try to use only concrete in our commercial areas. He wondered if we were learning this wasn't the best route to go. Mr. Booth explained that the engineering design standards of old for the City of Wixom required concrete roads in industrial areas and asphalt roads in residential areas. The experience the City has had in the industrial areas has given us reason to take a step to see if that is really the best approach there. Part of the concept in milling off the concrete and putting back hot mix asphalt is the DPW has better resources, equipment, manpower and experience in dealing with maintaining asphalt rather than maintaining concrete. When we redid the joints in Beck Road in about 2006, we had to hire a separate contractor to do that work. The DPW staff can make asphalt repairs much easier. This is also a lower, upfront cost for rehabilitation to put asphalt back rather than concrete.

Councilmember Rzeznik clarified that the reinstatement of the LDFA Plan extends it and gives it life through 2030. If all of the projects were completed by the end of 2020, he wondered if the District would still continue to capture the tax increment revenue. Mr. Goodlein replied no. Councilmember Rzeznik said that once the money is spent when we finish West Road, they are gone. Mr. Goodlein said that was correct. Mayor Hinkley added that they were not accumulating now. Mr. Goodlein said that the only thing accumulating now would be any type of interest income.

In regard to Councilmember Gottschall's remarks about a crosswalk, Mayor Hinkley thought this area crossed over into the City of Novi. He would only support something like that if Novi was assisting with the bill. Mr. Goodlein thought that made perfect sense. If our engineers determined there was a need, they would deliver an estimate of the expense. At that time, we would have a meeting with Novi to see if they were willing to share the cost. It would be delivered back to Council as part of the package.

Vote:

Motion Carried

- 2.) Request and Recommendation for Adoption of a Resolution Authorizing the Placement of a Ballot Question on the November 8, 2016 General Election Ballot that would Amend Section 9.2 of the City Charter to Permit the Levying of a New Millage (i.e. in the Amount of 3.50 Mills, Beginning July 2017, and for a Term of Four-Years) for Municipal Operating Purposes Including that of the Police, Fire, Public Works, and Parks & Recreation Departments and effectively allow Continuation of the Existing Special Operating Millage Authorized by Voters on November 6, 2012**

CM-06-95-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Beagle and Rzeznik to adopt a Resolution authorizing the placement of a ballot question on the November 8, 2016 General Election Ballot that would amend Section 9.2 of the City

Charter to permit the levying of a new millage (i.e. in the amount of 3.50 mills, beginning July 2017, and for a term of four years) for municipal operating purposes including that of the Police, Fire, Public Works, and Parks & Recreation Departments and effectively allow continuation of the existing special operating millage authorized by voters on November 6, 2012.

CM-06-95-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Kennedy and Gottschall to amend the motion to adopt a Resolution authorizing the placement of a ballot question on the November 8, 2016 General Election Ballot that would amend Section 9.2 of the City Charter to permit the levying of a new millage (i.e. in the amount of 1.75 mills, beginning July 2017, and for a term of four years) for municipal operating purposes including that of the Police, Fire, Public Works, and Parks & Recreation Departments and effectively allow continuation of the existing special operating millage authorized by voters on November 6, 2012.

Councilmember Kennedy stated that his reasoning for asking for 1.75 mills was without the Municipal Accounting 101, as he understood it, at the end of this particular millage we will have almost \$5 million in the Budget Stabilization fund. When we started, we had about \$300,000 before the millage was passed. Within the four years that this plan has been going on, we will have banked almost \$5 million. The 1.75 mills would cover the spending we are doing. As he understood it, the 3.5 mills brought in approximately \$2.2 million. Therefore, we have been banking into a bank account \$1.1 million, or half of the Budget Stabilization money for the past four years creating a surplus of money. He thought at this particular time, we have had more than enough of establishing a bank account for the City which almost represents 50% of its operating budget.

Councilmember Gottschall believed that was supported by the budget that was just passed where the special millage revenue was bringing in \$2.267 million hoping to put away \$1.1 million. There is a case to be made that we are taking in twice as much as we need.

Councilmember Rzeznik said that if we reflect back on Mr. Heffernan's presentation to the Council at the audit meeting, taking a look at our future liabilities, both in retirement and health care plan for retirees, he thought ignoring that and making such a cut in budgetary dollars would be a detriment to our City. We don't want to see ourselves in the headlines as some of our neighboring communities have in the State of Michigan by not funding these future liabilities. When he thinks about the 3.5 mills and our current Headlee Rollback at 7.54, 11 mills is the new reality. When the Charter was written, adopted and signed on November 1987, the Charter cap was 8 mills. When we think about what has happened from 1987 to today, the median household income at that time was \$26,061. The average home price was \$127,200. The price of a gallon of gasoline was 93 cents. Today he paid \$2.70. He thought it was unrealistic for us to think we can continue with a Charter cap of 7.54 mills and make it with the same level of services that we have in this community. He had the opportunity to attend the last four big public events for our City (Founders Day Festival, Opening Summer Concert, TEAM Golf Outing, and the Business Forum) and he talked to residents and business owners in this City. There was not a single complaint about continuing the status quo. He has not found a single person that has said they would love to get rid of our Fire Department or our

Police Department or our DPW services. He stated in the budget sessions that when we get on the road by 7:30 a.m., we have a path plowed through our subdivisions. He encouraged everyone on the dais, as well as the residents, to go down to the Fire Station to see what those guys do during their training sessions. They'll find that we have a progressive group. They will come to appreciate this level of service. He thought the residents expect it and they deserve it. He would be very much in support of the 3.5 mills going forward.

Deputy Mayor Ziegler concurred with Councilmember Rzeznik. It was clear to him, and made even clearer with the presentation we had on the needs assessment last December, that it was a pretty stark reality to face that we need a lot of things. It is not a matter of just getting by on a day-to-day basis. If we are fortunate enough to have any money left over, we are going to have to address those needs that were put forth at that December meeting, whether with the roads, the debts or the Wastewater Treatment Plan. At least we need to allow the citizens the ability to vote on the continuation of the current level of services. In addition to that, this is what we have been advised to do. He said he fully supported the 3.5 mills.

Councilmember Kennedy commented that this isn't such a cut. It is still an increase in the tax of 1.75 mills. The City has been funding its OPEB. No one is talking about cutting the Fire Department or the Police Department. We've added new policemen under the current budget. We would still be able to fund at the current level. The fact is that we have been able to fund and do all of the services that we've been doing for the past three years, and now into the fourth year, while still banking \$1.1 million. That is half of the 3.5 mills. When Councilmember Rzeznik said that there has been nobody he has heard that has a problem with it, we have a correspondence that wasn't allowed to be looked at. No one is talking about getting rid of any other services. We put forth all of the services in the past three or four years and we have still been able to bank more than \$1.1 million. We will be able to continue to provide those services at 1.75 mills. There is no reason to keep asking the citizens of our community to keep ponying up. The level of services they know will still be the same level of services that they will continue to get. They are funded now. They would still be funded at the next millage. He said he was asking for a tax increase of 1.75 mills, not a tax increase of 3.5 mills.

Deputy Mayor Ziegler asked the City Manager if what Councilmember Kennedy was saying was accurate. Would we be able to get by at the same level if we had a 1.75 mill increase? Mr. Goodlein said he would not be of that opinion. Deputy Mayor Ziegler asked if there would have to be cuts if it was 1.75 mills. Mr. Goodlein thought that we would have to make some cuts. The only way we could avoid that would be to use money from the unappropriated fund balance or Budget Stabilization. There were a number of different reasons why there was money earmarked for the Budget Stabilization fund and then not used by the two prior City Managers. One was as they began, they didn't know what would occur in four years. They didn't know where the economy was going to go or where funding would be in four years. They wanted to save as much money as they possibly could while cutting expenses as much as they could at the same time. There was also the recognition of the fact that there was going to be some investment in the City's infrastructure that was going to be necessary. He believed that became a stark reality toward the end of this special assessment period. We had a pretty good idea of the fact there were \$43 million in total investments that were

necessary if we were to do them all at once to take care of our roads, our facilities and the Wastewater Treatment Plant. He thought that was how we arrived at the surpluses. There was never intent to bank a lot of money. The intent was because no one had a crystal ball to look into the future and know what was going to happen. We have a little bit better idea now of what the future holds. The economy has stabilized. We have a good appreciation of most of our expenses. At the end of this calendar year, he planned for there to be a meeting of City Council to discuss a plan that would assist with paving every road in the south end of the City in ten years. Another plan is to deal with the unfunded pension and OPEB liability. We would also get a hold of some of these facility improvements that we need to do. Those things are not possible without money from this Budget Stabilization fund that we have accumulated. We will not act responsibly if we do not have the funding that prevents us in future years from operating without a deficit.

Councilmember Gottschall said we are talking about cuts but every year we get \$2.2 million or two even stacks of money coming in. Nearly half of that has been going into Budget Stabilization. The other half has been going to our current level of services. We are not saying cut Police and cut Fire. We are saying cut the other half that has been going toward the Budget Stabilization because we are at nearly \$5 million after this budget gets through. That should be a fund where we forget it exists. That way people don't have special projects that come up in the future unless it is an emergency. The Budget Stabilization will be there for the rainy day that it was meant to be there for. In terms of what is in front of us for the actual ballot language, it says "to provide funds for municipal operating purposes including police and fire, public works and parks & recreation." The only thing that has been said so far is roads, Wastewater Treatment Plant and facility improvements. If we are talking about making those, why aren't those items on the ballot? Why are we talking about police and fire? This is a conversation he has had with many people. To him, there are two words that should never be on a ballot – police and fire. Those are the very basic services we are here to provide. If we are to provide only two services, they are police and fire. That is why government exists at its very essence. The first dollars we get in as revenue goes to police and fire. It doesn't go to anything else in his mind. By including that kind of language in the ballot is nothing more than to scare people into thinking that if their house is on fire, firemen aren't going to show up. They are. We have very good firemen. That is where our money goes first. He said to be asked to vote on ballot language that says police and fire, public works, parks & recreation, and then turn around and say we need it for roads, Wastewater Treatment Plant, and facility improvements, is almost two-faced. We are asking people to vote on something that we don't intend to use the money on. He understands the infrastructure needs that we need to improve. He wondered why we wouldn't ask for that money to be earmarked for that. When we make it vague by saying "municipal operating purposes," who knows what that turns into. That is his major problem with a lot of this. If we are going to ask people for money, it needs to be for a specific reason and we hold ourselves to that. The whole ballot language is wrong.

Councilmember Rzeznik asked what would be the total millage required just to support our public safety. Mr. Goodlein replied that the total millage to support police and fire operations is 7.46 mills. Councilmember Rzeznik stated that is about

the Charter cap with the Headlee Rollback. Mr. Goodlein said yes. There is actually eight hundredths of a mill left in the Charter millage after police and fire operations have been paid. The amount is approximately \$52,600. Councilmember Rzeznik said that would be for General Operating, including Parks & Recreation.

Councilmember Gottschall said that by adding in the 1.75 mills, it brings us up to over \$1.2 million. He wasn't saying no millage. He said they were saying this is what we need. They were not saying of the \$1.2 million, that is our current level of services. They were just saying don't take the extra \$1.1 million and put it into our savings account. There is enough money. Residents have been funding that Budget Stabilization fund for the last four years. As Councilmember Kennedy said earlier, it is nearly 50% of our operating budget already. He thought we were squared away.

Mr. Goodlein didn't believe the remainder of that money would pay for the other things that the City does like plowing streets, picking up leaves, providing other types of Public Works, as well as providing Parks and Recreation activities and running the Cultural Center. It is his opinion that this is part of what the community expects. People might conclude that those types of activities are not important and perhaps shouldn't be had, but he thought our senior citizens and the people who come to different events might have a different opinion. They might have decided to move to the community because of the activities or because someone that lived here said the roads are always clear and always safe particularly in the winter time. He knows we have talked about the fact that money is being collected and it doesn't seem to go to the intent of it, particularly the money put into the Budget Stabilization fund. The intent was never to use that for police and fire. He respectfully disagreed. If we look through the list that was discussed last December, we can find a number of facility improvements that need to be made at the Police Department, Fire Department and other City buildings that are within the ballot language. Those things have to be taken care of too. He thought the purpose of the ballot language being proposed in the manner in which it is was to give people an idea of what the money will be used for. It is consistent with the ballot language that we used last time to convey to people the money they would spend in that additional millage would be for the purposes of providing the same services they had and to provide security for the future. When the City plans what it is going to do, it doesn't just look at today. It looks at tomorrow, next week and years from now. When we try to plan how we are going to collect and save our money, we do the same thing that everybody does at their kitchen table. We know what kind of money we are getting, what kind of money we hope to get into the future, and then we figure out how much we are going to save for the roof we are going to have to replace, how much we will save for the driveway we will have to replace and how much we will use for groceries and other types of household expenses that we have for month to month. We do the same thing here. We try to project with help from our consultants what our expenses are going to be and we try to save. We try to cut our expenses as we have over the past year and as we have with prior City Managers. That has brought us to where we are with the Budget Stabilization balance. It has not been for any other reason. The figures in the report he sent to Council have been reviewed a long time. He and Ms. Stamper would not make a recommendation to proceed in this manner if they did not feel it was necessary.

Deputy Mayor Ziegler said it seemed to him that the most logical thing we could do if we really had the City's interest at heart would be to propose with everyone's support a rising of that cap that is in our Charter. If the citizens raised the cap to a level at 3.5 mills above where it currently is, it would leave it to the Council to decide at budget time. The Council would be able to set the tax below that capped amount. We used to do that years ago when we were below the cap, but we can't do it anymore. He thought Councilmember Rzeznik was correct that the new reality is we need money to take care of the day-to-day operations. We need money to put aside for future investments. He thought those discussion could be had if the cap was raised. It was his humble opinion that we try to get passed this particular thing. It would be better than a temporary fix.

Mr. Goodlein said that we looked at what the Charter limits were for millages. They weren't able to do anything better than to get data from 2005. The current 8 mills was established by the City Council in 1958. In 2005, if we looked at the 263 communities across Michigan, we would find 12 had a millage rate and cap of 8 mills or less. Certainly we shouldn't be in the business of setting the millage rate at what everybody else does. That should not be a barometer of what the millage cap should be. There are many other communities that have a much higher tax rate. Their approach to fiscal responsibility is a little bit different and they have more expenses too. He thought Deputy Mayor Ziegler's point was well taken and he thought we have done a good job of managing the money that has been sent to us by the people of this good community. We talk every day about how we can continue to cut our expenses.

Councilmember Smiley said it sounded like the 1.75 mills was going to allow us to keep the services the way we want, which was Councilmember Kennedy's whole point. He thought perhaps the solution is slightly higher than 1.75 mills, but to double the 1.75 mills sounded like we are gouging a little bit here. He thought we all agreed that we need to have a millage renewal and we are here to work out together as a team how much that is. There is a difference of 1.75 mills and 3.5 mills. Can we find some compromise or middle ground where we feel the people of Wixom are getting a little break and we still don't put ourselves into some sort of long term jeopardy in case something unforeseen happened?

Mr. Goodlein said that we must realize every quarter mill is \$160,000. Every time there is a quarter mill increase or decrease, we either add or subtract \$160,000 to the revenue. Councilmember Smiley said yes. The 1.75 mills puts us in a place at the moment where we wouldn't be able to tuck any more into an account that has a robust amount in it. We can look at .25 down from the 3.5 mills is that much less than we are getting, or we could look at it as .25 added to 1.75 is \$160,000 we can tuck away. It is just how much we want to tuck away for responsible purposes. Mr. Goodlein agreed, except the DPW operations is 1.55 mills alone. So DPW costs us 1.55 mills. If Councilmember Smiley was only suggesting to increase the millage 1.75 mills, he would say that would not be enough. Mr. Goodlein wouldn't say \$160,000 more than 1.75 mills would be enough either. We still have to fund Parks & Recreation, the Cultural Center, the Senior Center, City Administration, and the Capital Improvements. The point is the 3.5 mills is predicated on taking care of all of that and liberating the Budget Stabilization fund to be able to focus on taking care of some of these long term projects and expenditures that we are going to have to address. We have \$43 million worth of liability in those projects, not

counting the unfunded liability in the pension and OPEB. The purpose is to try to create money so that we can accomplish all of those things in some sort of planned and structured sort of way. He understood what Councilmember Smiley was saying, and he certainly respected it, but he still remained convinced that a 3.5 millage is required to accomplish all of that.

Councilmember Smiley said the 3.5 mills allows us to save a certain portion of what is coming in. He asked if we could reduce the amount we are saving long term, this money we are tucking away. He wondered what every other department had to do with the Budget Stabilization fund having less money in it. Mr. Goodlein explained that it is all City money. Just like when we sit around our kitchen tables and we look at our savings account and our checking account to determine how we are going to spend our money for the household expenses and how we are going to budget our money for the roof and the driveway. We don't think about just the money in our checking account, nor do we think about the money just in the savings account. We think about all of our money. That is what we are doing here. We are talking about creating a flow of revenue that allows us to take care of all of our operating obligations in conjunction with the money in Budget Stabilization to address some of these infrastructure deficiencies that we have talked about, as well as some of our unfunded liability.

Councilmember Beagle stated that we just went through this a couple of weeks ago with the Library. They have a millage renewal for the same amount they asked for the last time. Nobody questioned their budget. We just said "Good luck. Let the people decide." We need to be doing the same with this. Let the people decide if 3.5 mills is enough or not and go from there.

Mayor Hinkley said that he concurred with Councilmember Beagle.

Councilmember Kennedy stated that Mr. Goodlein said we needed this for infrastructure and capital improvements. We increased the sewer rates by 15% this year and after listening to Dawn Lund, we will be doing that 15% for the next four years. That 15%, according to her projections, was to take care of capital improvements in the sewer system. Therefore, none of this tax increase would be necessary for the sewer system since we are going to do that as a use tax. Mr. Goodlein talked about the roads in the south end of the City, but he said the LDFA fund would pretty much handle all of these roads. The economy has stabilized. We are gaining new revenue from Menards, General RV, new homes being built and the homes that are being sold as they get recalculated for their SEV values. He was not saying to cut the police or fire in any way, shape or form. The 3.5 mills gives us \$2.2 million a year. In four years, we have put away \$5 million. We have been able to produce and give all the services our City has expected. Councilmember Kennedy asked how many new policeman we have added during the last few years. Chief Yon replied that we have added none. We have replaced three positions that we had at the beginning of 2012. Councilmember Kennedy said that has been an additional expense that we have had and we have been able to maintain it and take care of it. We are still able to put \$1.1 million away in our Budget Stabilization fund. The roads have been cleared, the employee pay has increased. From what he remembered from a Plante Moran presentation, the employee pay went up almost a quarter million dollars. Mr. Goodlein said that was incorrect. Councilmember Kennedy said he thought it was \$200,000. Mr. Goodlein said that

was incorrect. Councilmember Kennedy asked when we got the last report from Plante Moran. He remembered Deputy Mayor Ziegler asking the lady from Plante Moran and she said employee expenses or payroll went up \$200,000. He said what he was trying to say was that we have been able to take care of all of these issues and still bank \$1.1 million on the premise on all of the other arguments that Mr. Goodlein was giving the Council. We have operated the City, we have produced the services and we still put away \$1.1 million. If there is no way that there can be any kind of compromise on 3.5 mills, he didn't think he could agree to let this be placed on the ballot. It is not a matter of what we put on the ballot in front of the citizens and let them vote. It is a matter that we have to give them good choices. He didn't believe that 3.5 mills is a good choice.

Mayor Hinkley wanted to clarify a couple of things. First, he asked Councilmember Smiley to explain the "gouging" because he didn't understand what that meant. Councilmember Smiley commented that maybe it was a bad choice of words. He was trying to get his head around the fact that we are tucking away \$1.1 million into the Budget Stabilization fund each year and we are going to go forward and ask for that again for another four years. He said he would like to see us reduce that so we aren't taking a lot more than we need. He recanted the word "gouging" since the Mayor did not like that word.

Secondly, Mayor Hinkley asked him what he meant by "tucking away." Councilmember Smiley said we are saving money. We are tucking it away for the emergencies or rainy days. Mayor Hinkley didn't think that was correct. He disagreed with that.

Next, Mayor Hinkley asked Councilmember Gottschall what he meant when he said "we are asking for 1.75 mills." He wondered who the "we" was. Councilmember Gottschall replied that he meant Councilmember Kennedy, Councilmember Smiley and himself. He said he spent all weekend, yesterday and today talking to the City Manager trying to see if there wasn't some compromise for all of the parties where we could come to an agreement to make sure our taxpayers aren't paying more than their fair share. He then asked the Mayor to call the question on this vote.

**ROLL CALL VOTE: (3) AYES – Gottschall, Kennedy, Smiley
(4) NAYS – Beagle, Hinkley, Rzeznik, Ziegler**

MOTION FAILED

Mr. Goodlein commented that his presentation was done to request authorization to place a ballot question on the November 8, 2016 General Election Ballot and allow a vote of the people on that proposal. The current millage is 8 mills (7.5429 due to the Headlee Amendment and rollback). There is a special operating millage of 3.5 mills that was authorized in 2013 to 2016. The Charter millage is equal to approximately \$4.8 million and the special millage is equal to approximately \$2.2 million. Other taxes and revenues total \$3.6 million.

The special operating millage was authorized by the voters in 2012 for four years (3,678 yes votes and 2,435 no votes). Mayor Hinkley pointed out that represented a 36% margin of yes versus no votes. Mr. Goodlein continued by saying that the special operating millage rate was 3.5 mills, which costs the owner of a home

assessed at \$162,000 \$283.50 a year. This provides revenue of \$2.2 million and the special operating millage is 21% of the total revenue we use on an annual basis.

Mr. Goodlein showed a chart of the total millage versus taxes versus inflation. He showed this slide because there are always questions as to whether or not the City has acted responsibly with the money it has been given, particularly with the special millage money. He would say so because the money that has come to us has not dramatically increased over that period of time. Regardless of that, the City has managed to pay for goods and services, which over that time have increased by 15.4%.

The continuation of the special operating millage allows the allocation of some Budget Stabilization funds to capital projects and to provide for emergencies. It also allows for the continuation of existing level of police, fire, public works and parks & recreation services. It also provides financial stability that supports a strong financial rating.

The discontinuation of the special millage causes a 21% decrease in revenue and the inability to provide basic services. The Charter millage is expensed by the police and fire operations because the Charter millage is 7.5429 mills and the police and fire operations expend 7.4617 mills. The remainder of the mills (.0812) totals approximately \$52,606. There is no revenue left to provide public works, administration or parks & recreation.

It was Mr. Goodlein's opinion that the millage could not be less. Every reduction of .25 mills causes a revenue reduction of approximately \$160,000. Less revenue exacerbates the possibility of future deficits and constrains the City's ability to renovate its facilities, roads and other aging infrastructure. A special millage renewal of 3.5 mills supports the City's plan to avoid costs and reduce expenses.

Mr. Goodlein then showed a chart to explain the effect of different millage rates over the next four years. Even with the recommended 3.5 mill renewal, we are estimating that we will have a deficit of approximately \$408,000 in fiscal year 2020/2021. If we collect 2.0 mills, we are projecting a deficit of approximately \$1.4 million in our annual budget. If we collect 1.75 mills, it will deliver a deficit of \$977,000 in 2017/2018; a deficit of \$1.2 million in 2018/2019; a deficit of \$1.4 million in 2019/2020; a deficit of \$1.6 million in 2020/2021.

Mayor Hinkley said that for discussion purposes, the millage sunsets in December 2017. He wondered what the amount would be at that time in the Budget Stabilization fund. Ms. Stamper thought it would be approximately \$4.8 million. Mayor Hinkley asked if we let the 3.5 mills end, how much of the Budget Stabilization we would require to maintain to continue with the 3.5 mills. Ms. Stamper said that at that point, it would be \$2.1 to \$2.2 million. Mayor Hinkley said that going into fiscal year 2017/2018, we would have to tap in to \$1.1 million of the \$4.8 Budget Stabilization to manage the rest of that year. Ms. Stamper added that would leave the end of that year at a \$2.6 million Budget Stabilization balance. Going into 2018/2019, there would be a deficit of \$2.3 million in the Budget Stabilization. Mayor Hinkley said that in a matter of two years, the Budget Stabilization would be gone if the millage were to sunset in 2017 and not have something in addition. Ms. Stamper said that was correct.

Mayor Hinkley asked the age of the majority of the equipment in the Wastewater Treatment Facility. Mr. Sikma thought it was about 25 years old. Mayor Hinkley thought at 25 years, it has met its useful life. He asked what the most expensive machine was that could possibly fail sometime between now and the end of 2017. Mr. Sikma said the influent lift pumps and controls cost approximately \$50,000-\$60,000. The clarifiers are \$250,000. Mayor Hinkley said he could appreciate what the City has done over the years with our Budget Stabilization and the reason why we've had it, like situations like we had with the water fountain for \$100,000. He reflected on something that Mr. Lupinacci said earlier about having a deep understanding of the long term effects of what we do, both positively and negatively, for our community. He has been on this Council for 16 years and he didn't remember a scenario where the staff didn't come to Council with the right recommendation. When he listens to the Finance Director, he tries to balance the wishes of our Council, something that all of us would like to do by reducing our costs and in some cases, it is just not feasible. What scares him as a resident of this City is for the average person who pays taxes in this City \$4 million seems like a lot of money. However, in the scheme of things and operating a large organization that has a budget of \$9-\$11 million, \$4.8 might be half. By doing the math at the end of 2017, if the current millage sunsets and we don't have something else in place, how quickly that goes away. We started the Budget Stabilization fund about eight or nine years ago and we have used it. We have a commitment to our employees and retired employees; the City owes them that. They have given us their service. What a lot of people don't realize is when you work for a municipality it is not like working for General Motors or other companies where the incomes are higher. He said he would like to see any resident hop into one of our police cars and do what the police do for what they are paid. He'd like to see any of our residents put a fire suit on and jump into a raging building at the Village Apartments that called for seven different fire departments to put the fire out at the rate of pay they are paid while having the potential to lose their pension, their retirement and their health care. This is not how a good business runs. A good business runs by keeping good employees who are paid a good wage with good benefits and a good retirement plan. The scenario of running out our Budget Stabilization tremendously jeopardizes this City. He talked to a neighboring City Manager recently about their budget sessions. They met on a Saturday for an hour and a half for a goal session. They met at a Council meeting to discuss the budget for about 45 minutes and they were done. Mayor Hinkley asked him what he told his Councilmembers when they asked him to make cuts. This City Manager said he works for the Council and they need to tell him what to cut. He works at their beckoning. He thought it was the same thing. Many times through the budget session we heard that the City Manager is the professional, or he runs this City. That isn't the way our Charter reads. That is not what the Council was elected to do. The City Manager works at the beckoning of the Council and the Council needs to be able to make those recommendations so the City Manager and Finance Director can make their adjustments and come back to Council with what we can or cannot do.

Mayor Hinkley said his point is that we are still operating on thin ice. We have a few million dollars, which seems like a lot of money, in our Budget Stabilization. But if 25 year old equipment starts dropping like a bad habit, he'd like to know where we will get the money to pay for it. In regard to the roads, he heard

someone say the LDFA would cover the cost of the roads. No it will not. \$3.3 million in the LDFA is for specific projects. It is not going to cover the roads. It doesn't cover the fact that we are going to continually lose opportunity for new businesses because Beck Road is not wider. A very good business owner in this community offered to write a check for several hundred thousand dollars to help support the cost of widening Beck Road. People want to invest in this City but what they don't want to invest in is a City that is going to fall apart underneath us with our DPW and our roads. There are no recommendations from this Council as to what we are going to cut from existing services. When we look at our numbers, we are doing the right thing. The numbers by the electorate of the City said so. He felt and supported that we have been operating for several years on a shoe string. Yes, employees have had pay raises, but they also went seven years without a pay raise. He didn't know anybody who could go seven years without a pay increase and not make cuts in their own plans. Whatever we cut needs to come from this Council because that is what our Charter says.

Mayor Hinkley appreciated the time the City Manager had put into this presentation to clarify the need to continue with our millage at the rate we are at to operate at a minimum. He asked Ms. Barker how long it would be before we saw the revenue from the Menards, the new businesses and the new houses. Ms. Barker said there was \$60,000 to \$90,000 additional in the DDA revenue from the houses, so it will be that much each year for the next five years. We are already seeing partial revenue from the Menards and General RV. As a point of reference, she said it cost General RV almost \$12 million to build their building. They are only assessed at \$5.1 million building because that is what the market shows. We are not seeing their total investment.

For his last point, Mayor Hinkley said that our State Shared Revenue is a loss of income to this City of \$7.9 million. We have still provided the services with \$7.9 million less money. In his business or his home, if he lost that kind of percentage out of his revenue, he didn't know what he would do. In order to maintain exactly what the residents approved in 2012 and continue with the major expenses and upgrades and repairs in front of us, the 3.5 mill renewal is our best bet. We can certainly take from the Budget Stabilization but when it is gone, it is gone. He would feel compelled as the Mayor of this City that we move forward with supporting the renewal of this millage.

Mr. Goodlein finished his presentation by providing the reasons the Council may wish to authorize this ballot question. He said that the community deserves the right to vote to continue or discontinue the millage mandated by their vote in 2012. The ballot question maintains basic services. There is no tax increase as the taxes remain the same. The City has been a good steward of additional funding and we have been fiscally responsible. Part of the evidence of that is that we had a cumulative inflationary rate of 15.4% since 2007 and the increase of property tax revenue has been about 2.4%. Mr. Goodlein indicated that one person on Council used General RV as an example regarding the taxes coming into this community. The City will realize about \$27,000 a year in additional taxes for General RV.

Councilmember Gottschall mentioned at the last Council meeting that sometimes things he says are ignored. He said a few minutes ago that we shouldn't touch the Budget Stabilization fund. We should set it and forget it. That way, it is there

when we really need it for an emergency. When we talk about running out the Budget Stabilization or spending it, one of the slides in the City Manager's presentation said we would allow some funds from the Budget Stabilization fund to be used for capital projects. That plan is spending from the Budget Stabilization fund. We continue to talk about the Wastewater Treatment Plant, which our consultants advised that we consider bonding out for a considerable chunk of the work to be done that. He was still in support of looking into that more. That way, it is a dedicated funding source to a massive project that we have, rather than relying on ballot language to get us there. He thought that was a good route to go since we are looking into bonding for our post-employment benefits.

CM-06-95-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Gottschall and Smiley to amend the motion to adopt a Resolution authorizing the placement of a ballot question on the November 8, 2016 General Election Ballot that would amend Section 9.2 of the City Charter to permit the levying of a new millage (i.e. in the amount of 3.50 mills the first year with an annual reduction of that millage by .25 mills each of the following taxable years, beginning July 2017, and for a term of four years) for municipal operating purposes including that of the Police, Fire, Public Works, and Parks & Recreation Departments and effectively allow continuation of the existing special operating millage authorized by voters on November 6, 2012.

Councilmember Rzeznik said it wouldn't be fair not to give Ms. Stamper some time to do the calculations to see how this would impact both the revenue coming in as well as the depletion of the Budget Stabilization fund. Mr. Goodlein said that if they move diagonally through the chart that was provided in the handout, it would show the effect of this proposal. In 2017/2018, we would have a surplus of \$218,000; in 2018/2019, we would have a deficit of \$173,000; in 2019/2020, we would have a deficit of \$563,000; in 2020/2021, we would have a deficit of \$908,000. Councilmember Rzeznik said it is already into a deficit and utilizing a portion of the Budget Stabilization fund. He appreciated the Mayor mentioning the fact that the State Shared Revenue decrease has also been there. We also didn't mention the loss of the personal property tax. When we were a manufacturing economy, there was a lot of tax revenue generated through the taxation of capital equipment that was in all of the plants in our City. We are more of information and knowledge based economy now. We don't generate that and it is going away entirely anyway. It was hard for him to support a reduction like this because it was going back to his point where the new reality might be 11 mills. He showed the magazine *The Oakland County Prosper*. Going back to Councilmember Gottschall's comment about the only thing government should be providing is basic police and fire. That is eating up that 7.54 in its entirety. He enjoys the services that the DPW provides in terms of plowing, keeping up our parks and recreation programs. He made a commitment by buying a second property in the City. He has invested in a business in this City. He was here to stay. He wants to see the City "prosper," not flounder. He would not be in support of this reduction either. He wondered if there was a way to say in the ballot language "up to 3.5 mills." Mr. Goodlein replied yes. He and Attorney Gillam had this discussion. On an annual basis, this would become part of the budget process where the Council would approve the rate of the additional millage. Councilmember Rzeznik clarified that the Council would be given the leeway on an annual basis to say it is only going to be 2.5 mills this year because we got some kind of a windfall. If it was up to 3.5 mills it might satisfy a

compromise to all of the cases here. Mr. Goodlein confirmed that the Council could create ballot language like that.

Mayor Hinkley asked if our first request on the ballot four years ago was up to a certain amount and that was why we came down to the 3.5 mills. Mr. Goodlein replied yes.

Councilmember Gottschall said he didn't say the only thing we should be providing was police and fire but those were the first things that we are here to provide as a City. How he got to the final millage of 2.75 was by looking at the numbers 3.5 and going down to year two of 3.25, we are still at a surplus. We have taken in more money even though the second year is a deficit. It is less than what we took in for the year prior. It is confusing in that sense. This is based on his real estate knowledge. We look at how the City should be funded based on 50% of property values within the City. That was the way it was before the recession. The taxable value and SEV should be 50% and that is what you pay on. Right now, it is about 40%. There is a discrepancy there. If we had taken 50% of what our values are now and tax it at the regular amount without the special millage, we get amount A. If we look at the 40% that we are able to tax on and look at what we are taxing with our special millage of 3.5 mills, that is slightly higher than what we would be receiving otherwise. The reason for the increments is that he understood we don't want to make dramatic cuts. We had that discussion during budget hearings. It is about \$160,000 a year we were looking to cut to accommodate that quarter mill reduction annually. He thought that was still a good chunk but he thought it was a chunk we could find in the millage every year which eventually draws us down to this stable amount. He would support 2.75 mills at the end of this because at that point we are taxing only on what our property values are within the City. To him, that is our actual revenue that we should be receiving. If we are going to be calling anything a balanced budget, it would be based on that number because that is the value of our City right now. The goal of this is to find that compromise. We are not trying to take a huge chunk from anyone. We are going to break it down into manageable cuts of \$160,000 per year and eventually get it down to the point where we hit that real value of millage based on what our values are. It comes out just below 2.7, but we will throw in the fact that our inflation rates are lower than our real estate appreciation. Every year we are losing that extra chunk. We had talked about the 3.5 mill Charter cap increase. He didn't think he would be in favor of that given the 2.7 or 2.75 is the value within the City right now. He thought this was a manageable process that meets everybody in the middle where we start with what we need, we are above what we need for the first two years and over the course of those years, we will be making our steady cuts in manageable chunks.

Councilmember Smiley liked that. He spoke earlier about finding a compromise. He thought it was important we pass a special millage. We are not ready for not passing one, which has been explored here. He wondered if we would increase our likelihood of passing a millage by bringing it down a little bit or creating a process where the people of Wixom can see we are trying to get out of doing it. This is something to think about as we decide.

Deputy Mayor Ziegler found it a little troubling that it appeared there was a negotiation going on. He didn't realize that was what the Council did. He didn't negotiate. He takes a look at the facts that are presented to him and he makes a

decision based on what he thinks is in the best interest of the City. There has been some discussion that three Councilmembers have gotten together, had discussions over the weekend, did their studying, and came up with these positions to take at the Council meeting as though it were a negotiation session. He thought the proposal that had originally been made was the appropriate amount for the various reasons that have been stated already.

Councilmember Kennedy said it was his understanding that Mr. Goodlein had talked with Councilmember Gottschall regarding some of these concepts. He wondered if he had discussed that with any other Councilmembers. Mr. Goodlein replied that he had talked to Councilmembers Smiley, Deputy Mayor Ziegler and Mayor Hinkley concerning this matter. Councilmember Kennedy said that this is not something that just comes out of nowhere. Everybody is trying to find the right spot. We all have the best interest of Wixom at heart. We just unfortunately think there are different ways to go about it. He was glad there was discussion, not necessarily negotiations. He didn't see anything wrong with someone seconding or agreeing with another position on the Council. That happens all the time. To call it like it might be a problem is unusual.

Mayor Hinkley concurred with Councilmember Beagle. In the interim, we have another amended motion.

**ROLL CALL VOTE: (3) AYES – Gottschall, Kennedy, Smiley
(4) NAYS – Beagle, Hinkley, Rzeznik, Ziegler**

MOTION FAILED

Vote was then taken on the original motion of 3.5 mills.

**ROLL CALL VOTE: (4) AYES – Beagle, Hinkley, Rzeznik, Ziegler
(3) NAYS – Gottschall, Kennedy, Smiley**

MOTION FAILED

Mayor Hinkley explained that this motion fails due to our Charter requirement that says ballot language in regard to a millage increase must be at least a five to two vote.

Councilmember Gottschall wanted to know if a motion could be made to reconsider with an amendment of "up to 3.5 mills." Mr. Goodlein clarified that he was saying he would take the past motion that was just defeated it and amend it to adopt a resolution authorizing the placement of a ballot question on the November 8, 2016 general election ballot that would amend Section 9.2 of the City Charter to permit the levying of a new millage that is up to the amount of 3.5 mills annually beginning July 2017 and for a term of four years for municipal operating purposes including that of police, fire, public works and parks and recreation departments and effectively allow continuation of the existing special operating millage authorized by the voters on November 6, 2012 with the caveat that the new millage would be up to an amount of 3.5 mills. Councilmember Gottschall said that was correct.

Attorney Gillam stated that this is a two-step process. First, one of the members that were on the prevailing side in the last motion would have to bring a motion to reconsider the last vote. Any member of the Council could support the motion for reconsideration. Council would need to vote on the reconsideration. If the motion for reconsideration was approved, the prior denial is off the books and we are back to square one. At that point, another motion to approve a resolution authorizing a millage up to the 3.5 mills could be brought and voted on.

Mayor Hinkley asked about the timeframe. He could see where this was going. Council would have to determine what we would be utilizing of those 3.5 mills. He understood the millage would allow the Council to go up to 3.5 mills, but he asked when we would be determining that.

Deputy Mayor Ziegler understood the Council would determine at the budget session that this year we would need 2.5 mills of the 3.5 mills.

Attorney Gillam confirmed that the determination would be made on an annual basis as part of the annual budget process.

CM-06-95-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Gottschall and Smiley to reconsider the motion to adopt a Resolution authorizing the placement of a ballot question on the November 8, 2016 General Election Ballot that would amend Section 9.2 of the City Charter to permit the levying of a new millage (i.e. in the amount of 3.50 mills, beginning July 2017, and for a term of four years) for municipal operating purposes including that of the Police, Fire, Public Works, and Parks & Recreation Departments and effectively allow continuation of the existing special operating millage authorized by voters on November 6, 2012.

Vote:

Motion Carried

CM-06-95-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Gottschall and Rzeznik to adopt a Resolution authorizing the placement of a ballot question on the November 8, 2016 General Election Ballot that would amend Section 9.2 of the City Charter to permit the levying of a new millage (i.e. in the amount of up to 3.50 mills, beginning July 2017, and for a term of four years) for municipal operating purposes including that of the Police, Fire, Public Works, and Parks & Recreation Departments and effectively allow continuation of the existing special operating millage authorized by voters on November 6, 2012.

Vote:

Motion Carried

3.) Consideration of a Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Pursue the Sale of Surplus City Property at 131 Chambers East in Accordance with Chapter 3.16 (Disposition of Real Property) of the Code of Ordinances

CM-06-96-16: Moved and seconded by Deputy Mayor Ziegler and Councilmember Beagle to adopt the following Resolution authorizing the City Manager to act as its agent and proceed with negotiations in the sale of 131 Chambers East according to Chapter 3.16 of the Code of Ordinances:

**CITY OF WIXOM
AUTHORIZING RESOLUTION 2016-51
DISPOSITION OF REAL PROPERTY
Portion of 131 Chambers East and Parcel Number 96-17-32-351-038**

WHEREAS, the City of Wixom has property located at 131 Chambers East purchased through land acquisition for economic purposes; and,

WHEREAS, the City has received interest from a current developer within the VCA; and,

WHEREAS, there are certain requirements for the disposition of City-owned real property established by the City's Code of Ordinances, specifically Chapter 3.16.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council herein authorizes the City Manager to proceed with City Ordinance requirements associated with the negotiations in the sale of a portion of Parcel 96-17-32-351-038.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council has determined the potential sale of the subject property is to promote and facilitate economic development within the City.

Councilmember Gottschall noted that they paid taxes so he questioned if this was more of a title insurance issue that they own the property and needed something filed or would we sell it but credit them for what they have paid. Ms. Barker said that it was something like that but they needed to work out the details.

Councilmember Smiley questioned if this was a negotiation just with Robertson. He asked if anyone else could be bidding on this. He was told that was correct.

Vote:

Motion Carried

4.) Request and Recommendation for a Three (3) Year Agreement with Michigan State University to Provide Geographic Information System Support, Reviews, Recommendations, Data Collection, Maintenance and Training for an Annual Fee of \$49,500

CM-06-97-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Beagle and Gottschall to approve a three (3) year Agreement with Michigan State University to provide and maintain the City's Geographic Information System for an annual fee of \$49,500 and authorize the Mayor, Kevin W. Hinkley, and City Clerk, Catherine Buck, to sign the agreement on behalf of the City.

Councilmember Kennedy wondered how long the City has utilized this service. Ms. Barker said four years and this was to renew the contract. Councilmember Kennedy thought GIS was mapping. Ms. Barker said that it was. Councilmember Kennedy asked why it was not finished. Ms. Barker said that it was a continual process with new developments and infrastructure. They have also taken on new projects such as the cemetery which had never been done. Additionally, on the list of items were trees in the right-of-way and encroachments on City property. Councilmember Kennedy said he believed encroachments were something they looked at before. Mr. Goodlein said they had begun the process but there was a bunch of different things they consider and prioritize. There was not a smooth flow of work that they could proceed at a regular rate to get done, and there were only

so many hours that they worked during a regular work week as they were not a full time employee. Councilmember Kennedy asked what part was completed by them. Ms. Barker said it was ongoing and it would never be complete because of the new infrastructure. Councilmember Kennedy wondered how much time it could possibly take to add a new development to the map. Ms. Barker said that it wasn't a matter of how much time but rather when the As-Built was received by the City. Councilmember Kennedy asked if that was part of the engineering drawings from the developer. Ms. Barker said that an As-Built came in after the project was completed. She noted they still have not gotten one from Menards. They just received the As-Built from General RV. Councilmember Kennedy noted that the developers had engineers that brought that stuff to the City. He wondered if the projects were built to the specifications as was seen by the Planning Commission. Ms. Barker said sometimes things change and they don't notify the City as that was where the As-Built came to play. Councilmember Kennedy asked if the inspectors had a problem with that kind of thing. Ms. Barker said yes and that was why it's always until the As-Built is complete and that's what is entered. Councilmember Kennedy asked who entered the information. Ms. Barker replied it was the GIS person. Councilmember Kennedy asked if we paid them for data entry. Ms. Barker said absolutely as it is a specialized field.

Dr. Tim Gates, Associate Professor at Michigan State University in the Department of Civil Engineering, explained that the GIS was a powerful mapping tool that manipulated large data set to produce maps and to answer a lot of questions that could not be answered otherwise. It's not just mapping; it's analyzing data too. In the past, things like mailers needing to be sent to all the addresses located in a 500' radius would not be easy to do with any other method except manually. We did data collection that required specialized equipment and training. That survey collection could feed into the City's database. There was a lot of maintenance that was involved as it was not a one-time thing. There were also new developments that came online. These services were typically supplied by a single graduate student.

Councilmember Kennedy asked how much time they spend on the City's needs. Dr. Gates said about 20 hours per week.

Mayor Hinkley thought that this service was much like any app on a smart phone. You needed to have it updated frequently. He explained how he was driving down I-96 and noticed the Tom Tom company driving down the road with all sorts of cameras. He thought they were updating as to what was shown on a TomTom. He appreciated what they did and knew they did a great job. He was aware of how effective it made the Building Department as it helped expedite the manner in which they get the business from permit to shovel in the ground.

Councilmember Rzeznik wondered if we were able to utilize any of the data in the Fire Department rigs (for example, knowing where the water assets were). Fire Chief Roberts said they only had one vehicle that had the Toughbook but they were transitioning to the iPad application. Councilmember Rzeznik imagined they would access the GIS data for hydrant locations and water mains. Chief Roberts said they would. Mr. Goodlein noted that they needed an app written for the GPS devices that the DPW was using to locate underground structures relative to sewer and

water. We didn't have one, so Dr. Gate's wrote one and provided the app to us at no cost as it was part of the contract.

Councilmember Kennedy thanked everyone for answering his questions as he was unsure about it all.

Vote:

Motion Carried

5.) Consideration of Renewing a Contract with Oakland County Equalization Division for Assessing and Related Services

CM-06-98-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Rzeznik and Smiley to approve the Contract with Oakland County Equalization Division Assistance Services to provide equalization and related services to the City of Wixom for the annual fee of \$87,359 and authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to sign the contract on behalf of the City.

Vote:

Motion Carried

6.) Request and Recommendation to Approve and Authorize Changes to the Labor Contracts of the Collective Bargaining Units for the Police Sergeants and Command Officers, Police Officers, Supervisory and Non-Supervisory Employees of the Department of Public Works, and Clerical and Public Library Employees that would Change Blue Cross/Blue Shield Community Blue PPO Medical Insurance Coverage and Cause a Savings of \$43,000, and that the Mayor, Kevin W. Hinkley, be Given the Authority to Sign Agreements, in this Regard, on Behalf of the City

CM-06-99-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Kennedy and Beagle to approve and authorize changes to the labor contracts of the collective bargaining units for the Police Sergeants and Command Officers, Police Officers, Supervisory and Non-Supervisory employees of the Department of Public Works, and Clerical and Public Library employees that would change Blue Cross/Blue Shield Community Blue PPO medical insurance coverage and cause a savings of \$43,000 and that the Mayor be given authority to sign these agreements on behalf of the City.

Deputy Mayor Ziegler pointed out this was something the employees and Administration worked together on to save the City money on their healthcare plan. He commended them as they didn't have to do this. They recognized the opportunity and helped to address the concerns that we all have, which is saving the City money. He certainly appreciated it.

Vote:

Motion Carried

7.) Recording of City Council Meetings for Broadcast Via Comcast and ATT Public Access Channels and/or the City of Wixom's YouTube® Channel

CM-06-100-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Gottschall and Smiley to consider the audiovisual recording of City Council meetings and, if Council

decides to proceed, to do so by procuring its own audiovisual cameras, equipment, and system, by waiver of the bid process and the award of the work to PCT Security, LLC of Clinton Township, Michigan for payment of \$8,502, and also City Council approve a budget amendment in the same amount with funding for this expense derived from account 101-228-956-285 and offset from revenue derived from account 101-000-607-003.

Mr. Goodlein explained that some months ago, there was discussion regarding the recording of City Council meetings. As part of that discussion, there was talk about having that done from the people from the school district. It would be the same people that facilitate the WOCCCA recordings through Parks and Recreation, for example. The staff looked at the costs and availability of the school district to do the recordings and we found that the school district would only be available to accommodate us for one City Council meeting each month from September through April. The other months we would try to get volunteers to perform the services. The cost for that would be approximately \$162 per City Council session that would be paid to the school district. If they were able to find volunteers, the school district would also produce special broadcasts if we were interested, along with the Mayor's State of the City Address. PCT Security is the City's vendor who can provide cameras that would record this room and the room next door for an amount \$8,500 with somewhere between \$900-\$1,100 a year additional for a maintenance contract. The equipment was \$6,500 but there was another hardware/software package that we would have to add to take the 80i format in which the recording occurs and change it to an MPEG2 which was a TV broadcasting format. If you were to choose to go with PCT Security, you could take the money from the Public Education and Government Account, as that was money that came to the City from PEG fees from AT&T. PEG fees that were delivered or paid to the City from Comcast actually flowed to the Walled Lake School District through WOCCCA. The statute required recordings that were performed by the City with equipment purchased with PEG funds be sent to Public Access Channels for viewing by the public regardless of what else we did with them. If we were to purchase equipment with PEG money and decided that we wanted to put our recordings on YouTube that could be done; however, we would also be obligated to take that recording and send it to the School District for the Public Access Channel. The School District noted that if we were to deliver them footage in an MPEG2 format, they would take the footage and put it on the public access at no cost to the City. He noted that they didn't say what they would charge in the future.

Mayor Hinkley stated that he was confused as to what the Agenda item read verses the recommendation. Mr. Goodlein said the Agenda item was to present the information for both things because that was the request that was made to determine if Council wanted to do either of those two options. Mayor Hinkley was trying to clarify because it said the recording of City Council meetings for broadcast via Comcast, AT&T public access channels and YouTube. He knew there was a motion and a second but he wasn't sure what it was for. He asked if the motion should state which option or both options because the Agenda item seemed vague verses the recommendation.

Mr. Goodlein apologized as he may not have done a good job in writing the recommendation. He thought the intent was of discussion among Council as to

whether or not they wanted to either of these things. If they did, they would decide which one they wanted to do. When it originally came to him, there were some members of Council that wanted to do this and some didn't. Or they wanted it done a certain way or with certain equipment. The whole idea was to present the information. Mayor Hinkley understood but it did not look or seem like it was a motion. In the essence of doing this properly, he suggested this be tabled and brought back to Council in a manner that the motion was for either A or B because he didn't think it said the motion was clear. He didn't know what to vote on.

Councilmember Gottschall clarified his motion was to accept the City Manager's recommendation as written. He asked if that was allowable based what was on the Agenda. Mayor Hinkley said that he could amend the Motion.

Attorney Gillam thought that kind of motion would be sufficient.

CM-06-100-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Gottschall and Smiley to consider the audiovisual recording of City Council meetings and, if Council decides to proceed, to do so by procuring its own audiovisual cameras, equipment, and system, by waiver of the bid process and the award of the work to PCT Security, LLC of Clinton Township, Michigan for payment of \$8,502, and also City Council approve a budget amendment in the same amount with funding for this expense derived from account 101-228-956-285 and offset from revenue derived from account 101-000-607-003.

Deputy Mayor Ziegler was not in total favor of recording City Council meetings as he did not believe that it was beneficial to anybody. He noted that he could be wrong but guessed that he was willing to utilize the services they already paid through the School District. Perhaps they could do the recordings on a test basis for a year or so to determine how it worked. They could find out if there was good feedback from the community as it would make sense to move forward if people watched the broadcasts. He thought the recording of meetings tended to elongate them as people may try to play to the camera. He was unsure if that was in the best interest of the City. He believed recordings such as these were often used for political purposes. He was more in favor of having this done on a test basis rather than something permanent. He did not want to invest money before they were sure this would work. He indicated that he did not support the motion that was brought up.

Councilmember Beagle agreed with the Deputy Mayor. He noted they had spent hours during a Budget Session and then turned around and spent \$8,500 on something when they could only spend \$500. It didn't make any sense to him. He was willing to utilize the school. He added that he didn't want it but was willing to give it a shot. He would like to look at it again in a year. He was not willing to spend over \$8,000 on equipment, as he thought that would be foolish.

Councilmember Rzeznik thought they beat this topic to death back in February. He had never heard a compelling reason to videotape Council meetings. He was opposed to it in general. He noted that the Walled Lake School District came to the meeting in February and they said they would do this for the City. He added that it would be \$1,200 worth of money spent on this rather than making an investment in a camera system. He supported letting the School District do their thing and

determine how it worked. If the community continued to want this they would then budget it appropriately in future budget years.

Councilmember Kennedy wondered about the fees collected from AT&T. She said that she didn't have the amount in front of her but thought it was around \$25,000 a year. Councilmember Kennedy asked the purpose of those funds. Mr. Goodlein said the PEG funds can be used to facilitate any public access educational or government broadcasts. You could do a lot of things with that money as that was how the Comcast PEG funds flow to WOCCCA and the schools to broadcast because it was educational. Communities can also use PEG funds to create a means to record public events as long as they broadcast on a public access channel. Councilmember Kennedy asked what the money was used for that was sent to the City from AT&T. Mr. Goodlein said the money was used to roll out the new website. Mr. Goodlein said the balance in that account was just under \$12,000. Councilmember Kennedy noted that every City around Wixom broadcasts their meetings. The compelling reason to do this was not to grandstand or to be on TV. It was a matter of informing those people that could not make it to a meeting. This was not reckless spending. The \$11,500 that was given to WOCCCA and they give to the schools was a whole other issue that we haven't talked about changing. These were funds that were set aside for this purpose. The residents that use AT&T are being taxed for this purpose.

Councilmember Smiley said at this day in age it was common to have this service provided to its citizens. He did not expect any of the videos to go viral as this was not something people would go crazy watching, but it would be available to watch. He was in support of this.

Councilmember Gottschall ran into people all the time, and again at the Ice Cream Social over the weekend, who read the minutes. They say they would love to attend a meeting but don't have the opportunity because of work or family. For him, that was what this did. He clarified Councilmember Kennedy's comment, as it was not really a tax, but money they received from AT&T. The funding of this was not paid by the City's taxpayers but money they had, just as WOCCCA had, and it was an opportunity to use instead of letting it sit until next year when they received another \$25,000.

Mayor Hinkley said the money they received from AT&T and WOCCCA was great. He thought it was terrific they could use it for the City's website. He believed they should continue to use it on the City's website because the website was not there yet. In his opinion, they had a lot of work to do in regard to social media. Again, he agreed with some of his fellow Council where he had not seen residents asking for this. He would support the school coming in and utilizing their equipment before we invested in our own equipment that would technically be old right after it was purchased. He would like to see the response from the community before we spent any money at all. He would not support this motion; however, he would support utilizing the school.

Councilmember Beagle asked if it cost \$162 just during the summer when they needed to recruit a volunteer. Mr. Goodlein said that it cost the City \$162 for every meeting outside of the eight given to the City at no charge.

Attorney Gillam suggested that Councilmember Gottschall withdraw his earlier motion. This would allow the first motion to be taken off the table so Councilmember Kennedy could make an alternative motion.

Councilmember Gottschall withdrew his previous motion and Councilmember Rzeznik withdrew his second.

CM-06-100-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Kennedy and Rzeznik to utilize the Walled Lake School District to video and broadcast eight (8) of the Wixom City Council meeting a year at no cost to the City.

Vote:

Motion Carried

8.) Request and Recommendation to Accept and Approve an Installment Agreement for the Payment of Sanitary Sewer Tap-In Fees Between the City and St. Catherine of Siena Academy Foundation located at 28200 Napier Road and to give Authority to the Mayor, Kevin W. Hinkley, and the City Clerk, Catherine Buck, to Sign the Agreement on Behalf of the City

CM-06-101-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Beagle and Kennedy to accept and approve an installment agreement for the payment of sanitary sewer tap-in fees between the City and St. Catherine of Siena Academy Foundation located at 28200 Napier Road and that it give authority to the Mayor and the City Clerk to sign the agreement on behalf of the City.

Councilmember Beagle thanked the City Manager for all his hard work on this as he knew that it was an ongoing process.

Vote:

Motion Carried

Council recessed at 9:46 p.m. and reconvened at 9:54 p.m.

9.) Recommendation to Award the Purchase and Installation of a New LED Color Electronic Marquee to the Low and Qualified Bidder, Static Controls of Wixom, Michigan in the amount of \$11,725

CM-06-102-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Beagle and Rzeznik to award the bid for the new and replacement LED Electronic Color Marquee on the City Hall campus to the lowest qualified bidder, Static Controls of Wixom, Michigan, for payment of \$11,725 with funding expensed from the Parks and Recreation Capital Program and authorize a budget amendment that would move allocated funding from FY 2015-2016 to FY 2016-2017 due to an unanticipated delay in the installation of the marquee in FY 2016-2017.

Councilmember Gottschall thought the way that it was explained to him from another Councilmember was that electronic billboards were not allowed within the VCA by Ordinance. The City was self-exempt on that so they could have one. He said the Planning Commission was working on amending the ordinance but it was unclear to him if that was just in the VCA. He was hesitant because he did not want the City to self-exempt themselves from any rules they expected everyone else to follow. Mr. Goodlein believed it took a lot of time to get things going

pertaining to the parts, equipment, etc., but they hoped that process and the movement through the Planning Commission was finished before they flipped the switch and the colors came on. The plan was to change the Ordinance to allow for that under controlled conditions. Councilmember Gottschall asked if this was in the VCA Ordinance. Ms. Magee said her understanding was that it would be changing the entire signage for the City.

Councilmember Kennedy asked if she was saying we would allow electronic billboards or signs throughout the entire City, including the VCA. Mr. Goodlein recalled they allowed signs now but they couldn't be multi-colored and they could not be in motion. It was just a message board. The new board would be capable of color and animation. Ms. Magee said that it would have graphics and downloadable images along with being multicolored.

Councilmember Gottschall wondered if the Ordinance came to City Council for approval. Mr. Goodlein said that it would. Councilmember Gottschall thought this was a two-part thing and it was a slippery slope for the décor and beautification of the City, especially the VCA area. He did not like that by happenstance. He was not generally in favor of this because he does not feel they should make the Ordinance change. He certainly doesn't like saying the City did not need to follow the rules. Mr. Goodlein said part of what drove the Ordinance change was some of the case law that occurred relative to some of the message boards. The problem that all of the communities were struggling with was trying to find a way to hit the mark relative to some of the Court decisions while at the same time not make the community look too animated with a bunch of cartoons on signs.

Councilmember Rzeznik supported amending this Ordinance to allow electronic message signs. He believed it was a public service. He asked if the Fire Department sign needed upgrading at some point. Ms. Magee said that it would but it was purchased after the City Hall sign. Councilmember Rzeznik said that the Fire Department sign should be placed into the Capital Plan on future budgets.

Councilmember Kennedy said he agreed that it appeared we were changing the Ordinance because we wanted something different. He thought we could have waited for this until the Planning Commission hashed it all out. He was looking forward to hear what the Planning Commission had to say first.

Ms. Magee said there were two things of consideration. The sign was failing and it was non-repairable. Councilmember Kennedy thought that we would still be in compliance with the Ordinance. Ms. Magee said even though the new sign is multi-colored, we could comply and have it in only red until the Ordinance was changed.

**Roll Call Vote: (5) AYES – Beagle, Hinkley, Rzeznik, Smiley, Ziegler
(2) NAYS – Gottschall, Kennedy**

Motion Carried

10.) Request for Authorization to Purchase Kennametal Carbide Inserted Blades for the Snow Plow Trucks from Shultz Equipment of Ithaca, Michigan for a Sum not to Exceed \$9,000

CM-06-103-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Kennedy and Beagle to authorize the purchase of Kennametal Carbide Inserted Blades for snow plow trucks from Shultz Equipment of Ithaca, Michigan for a sum not to exceed \$9,000.

Vote:

Motion Carried

11.) Consideration of the Introduction of an Amendatory Ordinance to the City of Wixom Code of Ordinances, Title 17, "Environment", Chapter 17.11 "Woodlands", to Add a New Section 17.12.100(K) to Establish a Tree Fund

CM-06-104-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Rzeznik and Gottschall to approve the Introduction of an amendatory Ordinance to the City of Wixom's Code of Ordinances, Title 17, "Environment", Chapter 17.12, "Woodlands" to add a new Section 17.12.100(K) to establish a tree fund.

Councilmember Rzeznik understood if they established a tree fund as a portion of the Ordinance, it would not be at the discretion of the developer. If the reason precludes it, they would offer an option of payment in lieu of the tree. Mr. Sikma said yes. The goal was to plant a tree if it was replaced. If they cannot because of size or area, then they would be able to submit and apply to a tree fund.

Councilmember Kennedy clarified this tree fund would be used for the replanting of trees and nothing else. Mr. Sikma replied yes.

Deputy Mayor Ziegler asked if there was a fund for trees right now. Mr. Sikma said there was an account that was in the budget that was roughly \$6,000 a year. Deputy Mayor Ziegler said that it was his understanding that this was geared toward the developers that have not done what they were supposed to do. Mr. Sikma agreed and said that the initial driving force was to recapture those funds from previous planning and construction sites. Deputy Mayor Ziegler asked if there was a storm that took out trees on his lot but he chose not to replace them, would he have to pay into the fund. Mr. Sikma said no. The replacement of trees within the City budget was only in the right-of-way or trees the City maintained.

Mayor Hinkley asked about someone deciding to cut trees that were on the City property. Mr. Goodlein said that may be a felony crime for destroying City property in which they may be prosecuted.

Vote:

Motion Carried

12.) Consideration of the Introduction of an Amendatory Ordinance to the City of Wixom Code of Ordinances, Title 18, "Zoning", Section 18.24.110, "Definitions S-T", to provide a definition for "Tree"; to add a new Section 18.14.020(L), "Payment in Lieu of Landscaping and Screening"; and to Establish Amounts for Tree Permit Fees and Payments in Lieu of Tree Planting

CM-06-105-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Beagle and Kennedy to approve the Introduction of an amendatory Ordinance to the City of Wixom's

Code of Ordinances, Title 18, "Zoning", Section 18.24.110, "Definitions S-T" to provide a definition for "Tree", and to add a new Section 18.14.020(L), "Payment in Lieu of Landscaping and Screening" and establish, by the following Resolution, amounts for tree permit fees and payments in lieu of tree planting:

RESOLUTION NO. 2016-52

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING FEES FOR A TREE PERMIT AND PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TREE PLANTING.

At a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Wixom in Oakland County, Michigan, held in the City Hall on June 14, 2016, at 7:00 P.M., with those present and absent being,

PRESENT: (7) Beagle, Gottschall, Hinkley, Kennedy, Rzeznik, Smiley, Ziegler

ABSENT: (0)

the following preamble and resolution were offered by Councilmember Beagle and supported by Councilmember Kennedy:

WHEREAS, the City finds that rapid growth, the spread of development, and increasing demands upon natural resources have had the effect of encroaching upon, despoiling, or eliminating many of the trees and other forms of vegetation and natural resources and processes associated therewith, which, preserved and maintained in an undisturbed and natural condition, constitute important physical, aesthetic, recreational and economic aspects to existing and future residents of the City; and

WHEREAS, woodland growth protects public health through the absorption of air pollutants and contamination, the buffering of excess noise and wind, the screening of undesirable views, the cooling of buildings in summer, and insulating buildings in winter; and

WHEREAS, the preservation of trees and woodland growth is a matter of paramount public concern and an essential component of the general welfare of the City; and

WHEREAS, the City has adopted Chapter 17.12 of the Code of Ordinances, Woodlands, to ensure the protection of such natural resource; and

WHEREAS, the City has also provided for the protection and planting of trees through its Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 18 of the Code of Ordinances; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary to establish fees for a tree permit, as well as a fee to be paid in lieu of tree planting into the City Tree Fund pursuant to Section 18.14.020(L) of the Code of Ordinances.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED:

1. The following fees are set with respect to a tree permit and a fee for payment in lieu of tree replacement:

Tree Permit Fee - \$50.00

Payment in lieu of tree planting - \$425.00 per tree

2. It is further determined that this Resolution may be amended from time-to-time by further resolution of the City Council.

Deputy Mayor Ziegler wondered how the cost of \$425.00 per tree was determined. Mr. Sikma sought the advice from the folks that we purchase our trees from and, depending on the species, the cost was higher or lower so we took an average with the cost of two hours of installation.

Vote:

Motion Carried

13.) Recommendation and Request to Convene a Closed Session of the City Council in Accordance with the Open Meetings Act, after "Council Comments" for the Purpose of Discussing Attorney-Client Privileged Communication Pursuant to MCL 15.268(h)

CM-06-106-16: Moved and seconded by Councilmembers Smiley and Rzeznik to convene a closed session of the City Council in accordance with the Michigan Open Meetings Act (PA 267 of 1976, as amended) for the purpose of discussing attorney-client privileged communication pursuant to MCL 15.268(h).

Roll Call Vote: (7) AYES – Beagle, Gottschall, Hinkley, Kennedy, Rzeznik, Smiley, Ziegler

(0) NAYS

Motion Carried

CALL TO THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments at this time.

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS:

Mr. Goodlein noted that on June 20th at 1:00 p.m. Representative David Trott will be at Backyard Coney Island in Wixom to meet with residents. Also, on June 27th at 12:00 p.m. Representative Klint Kesto will be at the Senior Center to discuss the current affairs of the Federal and State Government.

COUNCIL COMMENTS:

Councilmember Smiley had no comments.

Councilmember Gottschall appreciated the discussions that were had tonight even though it went way over in terms of meeting length that Councilmembers like. He thought a lot of what was said had not been addressed. He appreciated the opportunity to talk to everyone about it to get their feedback and to get the things done that everyone wanted.

Councilmember Rzeznik thanked Ms. Stamper for finding another reduction in the Workman's' Comp package. He asked if it was through reclassification. She said no. It was a modification due to the claim history. He noted that the summer concert series and the band last week was good. He hoped they would come back. He asked the attorney if four or more members of Council went to go see Kesto or Trott, would that be a violation of the Open Meetings Act. Attorney Gilliam said that it was not a violation as it was a social meeting. He added that if there was some intention on behalf of the members to talk about City business, it would be different.

Councilmember Beagle thanked Cory Lupinacci for his years of service with the City. He congratulated Lieutenant Moore on his graduation from the FBA Academy. He loved seeing the updates throughout his time in the Academy on Facebook. He asked to be excused from the Joint Meeting on June 20, 2016. He also noted that

school was out for the summer, so please be cautious of the kids around the neighborhood. He thanked all the golfers, sponsors, volunteers, donators, etc., for the golf outing they had on Friday. He noted that next year's outing will be on the 3rd Friday of June in 2017.

Councilmember Kennedy thanked Cory Lupinacci for his service. He was one of his mentors, along with Kurt Gottschall, on the Planning Commission. He thanked Lieutenant Moore for giving up time with his family to further his career and to help the City of Wixom. He hoped to see everyone at Backyard Coney Island next week as Congressman Trott will be there to answer any questions.

Deputy Mayor Ziegler congratulated Lieutenant Moore on his graduation from the FBI Academy. They also thanked Cory Lupinacci for his service on the Planning Commission.

Mayor Hinkley congratulated Lieutenant Moore and appreciated his sacrifice for the City. He explained that he did not understand the length of the meetings lately. He said that it seemed to him that dialogue was good, but he was unsure if prep from Council was complete. He wondered if his fellow Councilmembers were researching or learning enough about the particular items. It seemed like there were a lot of questions that were asked, especially on items that are being renewed. He said that if the members notice an item that is up for renewal on the Agenda and to move the meetings along, he highly suggested that they get with the City Manager to ask some of the simple questions that are being brought up at some of the Council meetings. He noted that he would stay as long as it was needed but he thought for a Regular City Council meeting to run until 10 p.m. or 11 p.m. was aggravating. He did not believe they needed to be there that late. He suggested the City Manager spread some of the items out over two meetings. It was great to see the local members of congress come to Wixom. He recently learned the City of Novi was considering repaving Beck Road from Grand River to just south of 8 Mile. In talking with their City Manager, there may be some opportunity for us to work together. He hoped to talk with Congressman Trott on some federal funding that may be obtainable.

Council recessed at 10:25 p.m.

Council entered the Closed Session at 10:31 p.m. and rose at 10:47 p.m.

Council reconvened the meeting at 10:55 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

Catherine Buck
City Clerk

Approved 6-28-2016
