



Regular City Council Meeting
7:00 p.m., Monday, October 7, 2019
Conference Room
23600 Liberty Street
Farmington, MI 48335

FINAL

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Farmington City Council was held on October 7, 2019, at 23600 Liberty Street, Farmington, MI. Notice of the meeting was posted in compliance with Public Act 267-1976.

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Mayor Schneemann.

1. Roll Call

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Sara Bowman	Mayor Pro Tem	Present	
William Galvin	Councilmember	Present	
Joe LaRussa	Councilmember	Present	
Steve Schneemann	Mayor	Present	
Maria Taylor	Councilmember	Present	

City Administration Present

Director Christiansen (arrived at 7:07 pm, left at 7:32 pm)

City Clerk Mullison

City Manager Murphy

City Attorney Schultz

2. Approval of Agenda

Move to approve the regular meeting agenda with the addition of the topic by the City Manager to discuss an organizational meeting.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Bowman, Mayor Pro Tem
SECONDER:	Taylor, Councilmember

3. Public Comment

No public comment was heard.

4. Board & Commission Interview: ZBA Alternate Seat

a. Julia Mantey

Council inquired about Ms. Mantey's interest in being the alternate member of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

b. Yevgeniya Gazman

Ms. Gazman did not appear before Council.

5. Organizational Meeting for November 14, 2019

City Manager Murphy introduced an addition to the 2019 Council meeting schedule, adding an organizational meeting at 6:00 pm on November 14, 2019 for the purposes of swearing in newly elected Council members, choosing Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem, and assigning Council members as representatives for Boards and Commissions.

Move to schedule an organizational meeting for November 14, 2019 at 6:00 pm in City Hall.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Bowman, Mayor Pro Tem
SECONDER:	LaRussa, Councilmember

6. Consideration of Amendment to City of Farmington Planning Zoning and Building fees

Director Christiansen summarized proposed changes to the Planning, Zoning, and Building fee schedule that will update and adjust fees, better reflecting the actual cost of services and aligning with surrounding communities.

LaRussa asked about prevalent payment methods and credit card fees. Galvin stated that he was glad that the City is updating the fee schedule. Bowman cited her recent home improvement experience and said that she felt it was absolutely appropriate to revisit this. Schneemann asked when the fee schedule was last reviewed and Christiansen replied that he couldn't remember anything previously done on this scope or level.

Move to approve proposed amendments to City of Farmington Planning, Zoning and Building fees, with the proviso that there will be minor amendments as deemed necessary by the City Manager, the Economic and Community Development Director, and/or the City Attorney.**

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	LaRussa, Councilmember
SECONDER:	Taylor, Councilmember

6. Other Business

LaRussa asked to reopen discussion on the Farmington Road Streetscape because he noticed a proviso at the end of the DDA Board motion approving a 50/50 split that added a participation cap of \$1,500,000. He would like to see if Council would consider adding a cap as well, even though it is not binding, it communicates a clear intent to insure that the project comes in at the engineer's estimate. He requested input from other Councilmembers before making a motion to reflect the DDA's motion.

Schneemann said that the design phase is 75% complete already, and that once a project is at that point there aren't many options to be discussed. He also spoke to the point of a motion, asking City Attorney Schultz what the two motions meant as actionable items to the administration and the next council. Schultz spoke to the previous motion as approved and indicated why it was phrased as it was. The motion was to bring all parties onto the same page and to allow grant applications and bid documents to be produced. The City Manager and OHM have their direction from Council to finalize the design and come back with the expectation that the cost will be split. The DDA is on board with all those things, though they do not feel comfortable enough to go past \$1,500,000. Schultz reiterated that no one is bound by the limitation of the decision of the DDA, including the DDA. Further direction would not be necessary, as OHM and the City Manager could take direction from this discussion and will be relevant to them while spotting options. A decision will not need to be made until February when the bids come in.

Schneemann and LaRussa discussed the goal of LaRussa's possible motion and his concerns with the initial motion. LaRussa wanted to make it clear that this is what Council should want to limit this to. Schneemann reminded him that the 50/50 split is up to the engineers estimate, but a motion could indicate a basis for accountability. The contingency amount already built in to the estimate should be enough, but he wants to be able to actualize other projects. Schneemann suggested that, as a council, they can instruct the City Manager and city engineers to design to a \$3,000,000 cap. Schultz commented that directing OHM and the City Manager to design to what they expect to be a \$3,000,000 bid, Council should understand that the bid might be different. If bid comes in over \$3,000,000, it does not mean OHM or the City Manager did not do what they were requested to do. Galvin noted that the DDA changed the environment with their cap, and that though the cap is non-binding, the relevant point is that the motions are different and all the risk might be borne by Council at this point. He would like to cap Council's portion, so that Council doesn't bear the risk and supported a matching motion. He also reiterated that Council should engage the DDA at a higher level and let them manage the project. Schultz said again that there was literally no risk to be borne stating that when bids come back, if they are not to Council's liking, Council can always say no to the project. Galvin clarified that he was referring to a policymaking risk and feels that there is a value from a policymaking perspective to match the DDA's intent.

Bowman reminded Council that this was not an "us versus them" situation and that Council has lost sight of the fact that the DDA and the Council are all working toward bettering Farmington. She commented that the City has more funding than is available to the DDA and that the City can make sure the project goes forward if there is a discrepancy between the allotted funds and the bids that are returned. Bowman stated that the City missed the boat ten years ago when this project was last planned, that there is less than 10 days to get the TAP grant application in, and that this discussion feels like posturing. She commented that Council and DDA can't even know what the cost will be if the grant is not procured and the project has gotten to the developers so that they can make their bids.

Taylor said she was very proud to make the original motion as a 50/50 split, and now the agreement made isn't necessarily what is going to happen. She felt that there is value to both the DDA and Council agreeing to the same thing. She cited three options: the DDA could get rid of the cap so that the motions are similar, Council could add a cap to match the DDA, or Council goes back and acknowledges that it is not a 50/50 split in funding. She sees value in maintaining the agreed upon 50/50 split, and that Council should pass amendment to resolution to add cap. Schneemann asked Schultz whether the DDA motion would change the Council motion, and Schultz responded that it did not force or require Council to agree to anything. He reminded Council that there is no formal agreement between the DDA and Council at this time, and that the DDA motion does not bind the Council or force the Council to react in any way. Schneemann stated that a future council could make other recommendations upon return of actual bids. Discussion ensued about making a statement of intent, bringing clarity to the situation, and the expressed intention of Council. LaRussa does not see this discussion as an obstacle to completion of the project.

Schultz counseled that this was a very early stage to consider making this decision. He asked how a hard motion with a hard cap could be made and then, as a group, the decision is made to proceed at a different rate than is now being considered. He expressed a practical concern about who had left the meeting with the right understanding of what literally happened. Schultz suggested that the City Manager have a discussion with the DDA, acknowledging their motion and making a plan to have another conversation to see what the future holds. Schneemann indicated that by being present at this discussion, the City Manager has a clear view of the intent of Council. Schultz suggested sending a letter to the DDA indicating that their motion was seen, Council did not make a responding motion, but the actual decision isn't going to come until the actual figures are known and another discussion can be had at that time.

Galvin said he supported a motion to amend the previous motion, matching the DDA's. He felt it was important to show that City Council learned from the Oakland Street project and there is more credence when a motion is made and voted on. He noted that these are atypical times, with a different revenue generation model. He was happy to elevate the dialog and sees value in that.

Taylor indicated support for the motion to promote clarity and make the motions match, being able to look back at it as proof that the two bodies agreed. She made a point of saying that her vote in no way disparaged the DDA and that she looks forward to working with them. Schneemann said that he would be voting for the motion, even though it was essentially meaningless so as not to change the trajectory of project, but also wanted to go on record to say that he was bothered by what happened in this room and that it seemed like it was unnecessary and he thought it got in the way of moving things in a good direction for the City.

Move to add a \$1,500,000 cap to Council's portion of the Farmington Road Streetscape.

RESULT:	APPROVED [4-1]
MOVER:	Galvin, Councilmember
SECONDER:	LaRussa, Councilmember
AYES:	Galvin, LaRussa, Schneemann, Taylor
NAYS:	Bowman

7. Council Comment

Bowman noted the passing of City Treasurer Chris Weber's mother and expressed condolences from herself and her family.

8. Adjournment

Move to adjourn the meeting.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Bowman, Mayor Pro Tem
SECONDER:	Taylor, Councilmember

The meeting adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

Steven Schneemann, Mayor

Mary Mullison, City Clerk

Approval Date: October 21, 2019

******To view approved documents, please see the Agenda Packet link that is relevant to this meeting at <http://farmgov.com/City-Services/Government/Agendas-and-Minutes/City-Council.aspx> or contact the City Clerk.