

**CITY OF LIVONIA – CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF STUDY MEETING HELD JANUARY 5, 2022**

Meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by President Jim Jolly. Present: Scott Bahr, Rob Donovic, Scott Morgan, Brandon McCullough, Kathleen McIntyre, and Jim Jolly. Absent: Laura Toy.

Elected and appointed officials present: Mark Taormina, Director of Planning and Economic Development; Todd Zilincik, City Engineer; Paul Bernier, City Attorney; Susan M. Nash, City Clerk; Brandi Isaacson, Director of Housing; and Mayor Maureen Miller Brosnan.

Councilmember Scott Bahr led the meeting with an invocation.

President Jolly announced there is New Data on Agenda Item #5.

President Jolly extended Happy Birthday wishes to City Assessor, Linda Gosselin, who will celebrate her birthday on January 15th.

President Jolly indicated this meeting will begin with Audience Communication, time limited to 30 minutes, at the start of the meeting. President Jolly indicated this is not the time for Council comments but only the Audience. Council can respond during the portion of the meeting for Council Announcements.

AUDIENCE COMMUNICATION

Mayor Brosnan wished all a Happy New Year at the first meeting of Council for 2022. She indicated there is a new face here tonight on Council and wanted to wish all the very best. Mayor Brosnan indicated she wanted to share some things going on in the community during Covid. In the wake of high numbers of Covid cases throughout the City and Wayne County, she stated we are seeing some of the highest numbers seen throughout the pandemic. The City has decided it was best to take steps to protect our work force. Mayor Brosnan stated along with the work of our Fire Chief, David Heavener and Brian Kahn, our Emergency Preparedness Director, together with all of the Department heads throughout the City, we have put together our Safe Start 2022.

Mayor Brosnan indicated the Safe Start 2022 is designed to be an intermediate step designed to protect our work force now that our work force that is once again being propelled into a front-line situation where they are really in a vulnerable position. Starting January 3rd through January 22nd, the City will require masks be worn in all public buildings regardless of vaccination status. She indicated the Covid numbers throughout that time period will be monitored and the City will reassess things closer to January 22nd. The idea is that coming out of the holiday season there was going to be a 14 day spike in Covid cases. She indicated this was the opportunity to protect our work force against the Covid spike and to make sure that we keep a work force in place to continue to provide the level of service that residents want.

Mayor Brosnan stated in addition to masks, Department Heads have been asked to implement remote work once again and that they work with limited staffing and/or staggered shifts and they will continue to so we can maintain all of our services. She expressed once again we are just rolling it back to where we were doing remote work and staggered shifts. In addition, we are doing socially distancing with all of our City employees. The City will continue to limit gatherings, meetings and events to account for that six-foot distancing. Mayor Brosnan indicated it does mean the City will go back to the Zoom platforms for a lot of our meetings. She stated new signs will be put up because people get used to the old ones and it becomes mundane. She indicated the fact of the matter is the crisis is in a different state right now so there is some fresh signage is going up. We are also providing masks, thermometers, and the protective barriers again and they have been put in place.

Mayor Brosnan indicated all employees are being encouraged if they feel sick, stay home. She stated this is really, really hard with this work force of 635 people. Our employees are people who are used to playing hurt and when they don't feel well, they plow through. Mayor Brosnan stated in addition to that, we are trying to provide Covid testing to employees who do feel they may be susceptible to the virus. She indicated all employees had an opportunity to be screened, for example, before they came back to work. Following what Livonia did, we have seen a number of cities come on line doing the same thing. So we know we are a little bit above the curve, and we are trying really hard to stay ahead of Covid. So, we want to thank you for your support as we continue to step up to the challenge of Covid-19.

Mayor Brosnan indicated she wanted to take this opportunity to welcome Council President Jim Jolly to his new role. She stated it was an exciting time and she knows that before this meeting you had a chance to meet as a Council Committee of the Whole and determine some of the leadership positions within Council and was excited about all of the opportunities that provides to the City. She stated she had had a chance to talk informally about some of President Jolly's ideas, some of her ideas, to really begin to open up those lines of communication to move forward with our agenda in 2022. She congratulated Vice President Toy for her return to a leadership position. She expressed she had an opportunity to talk with her a little bit too, about projects she would like to see move forward and projects the Mayor's office would like to advance as well. And finally, she extended a warm welcome to new Councilmember Scott Morgan. Mayor Brosnan stated with his 20 plus year career in law enforcement reinforces everything that Livonia stands for in terms of its support of first responders. Whether it's the Mayor's Office, the Council, or this community, we stand strongly behind our first responders. She stated having Scott as a member of the Council clearly reflects that with an added level of support. She wished good luck to all and welcome.

President Jolly thanked the Mayor and wished her a Happy New Year.

President Jolly welcomed many department heads present in the audience at tonight's meeting. Jolly also introduced those present at the dais: Paul Bernier, City Attorney; LaShawn Thomas, Director of Government Affairs; Susan M. Nash, City Clerk; Sara Kasproicz, Office Manager of Council Office; Scott Miller, from the Planning

Department; and Todd Zilincik, City Engineer. He also welcomed new Councilmember Scott Morgan, who he indicated he has known for approximately 15 years and stated he would be a great addition to Council.

COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councilmember Bahr, also welcomed Scott Morgan, and stated it was great to have him here. Also, he forgot to mention during the December meetings but after all the attention that was given about 5-6 months ago about the problems with trash pick-up he felt it is only appropriate that we acknowledge that it has either improved or has been resolved. The frequent phone calls that he received about trash pick-up has diminished. He stated he had an opportunity to speak with Sam Carmagno, our GFL representative, and they feel that they really have that under control. He wanted to acknowledge all the hard work it took to resolve the matter.

Councilmember Donovic, wished his brother, Tony, a Happy 25th Birthday. He also welcomed new Councilmember Scott Morgan and welcomed President Jolly and Vice President Toy. Donovic also thanked his family and everyone who supported him for his run for second term.

Councilmember McIntyre congratulated President Jolly, stating it was nice to have him in the middle seat and stated she looked forward to his leadership and thanked him. She also congratulated Vice President Toy and stated she hoped she is feeling better soon. McIntyre also welcomed new Councilmember Scott Morgan and stated it was nice to see him at the meeting. In addition, she wanted to wish her oldest son, David, a very Happy 24th Birthday. Unfortunately, his birthday present was a positive Covid test which was not the way he wanted to celebrate. She also wished a Happy Birthday to Joel Turbiak, a Zoning Board of Appeals member, whose birthday is today and yesterday he welcomed his fourth child, a daughter, after three sons and thanked him for his service to the community.

Councilmember Morgan thanked everyone who assisted him and supported him during his campaign and stated he was very happy to be there and stated you will not be disappointed. He also thanked the Council for their support and all of his friends. He indicated it was a long list of people to thank and wanted to give a shout out to all who supported him.

President Jolly stated tonight is a Study Meeting and there was no voting tonight. He indicated Councilmembers can offer a resolution(s) for items that will then be put over to the next Regular Meeting where voting will take place. He indicated if anyone was present to comment or address Council during any Agenda items, approach the podium to speak on the topic. He indicated if the audience wanted to make a public comment with regard to an item on the Agenda, the time limit is two minutes to speak about a matter. President Jolly also stated if an audience member wished to comment, they should state their name and contact information for the record so that we can contact you appropriately. He indicated one of the changes made is to have Ms. Kasproicz taking notes during Audience Communication so Council may follow up on the items discussed as we see fit.

NEW BUSINESS

1. WAIVER PETITION: Planning Commission, re: Petition 2021-10-02-22, submitted by Century 21 ROW, requesting to construct and operate a vehicle tow yard (Excellerated Towing & Recovery) at 34437 Rosati Avenue, located on the west side of Stark Road just south of the CSX Railroad in the Southwest ¼ of Section 28.

Terry Sever, 37152 Six Mile Road, Century 21 Office. He is a realtor and was involved in brining about the sale of this property and was representing both the owner and the prospective buyer. Mr. Sever stated he read through all of the information and the report from the Planning Commission and have no objections to their recommendations. There is only one item that he would like to address, and it might be his fault. In reading the Engineer's report it referred to a project, storm retention, and a few other things and as I asked earlier I assumed that you received in your packets the Minutes from the Planning Commission. If I could, I would like to just address, obviously we all know based on my experience at the local government level, that action taken by the Council is final and basically remains law per se. Back in 2005, I think it was late December, the owner of this property received site plan approval for this project. He assembled a number of parcels. Upon getting that approval and submitting an additional document showing the setbacks and building envelopes like you would normally get from any development, and this has been at the Engineering office for the last 15-16 years. When the owner got the approvals, he went ahead and built two (2) buildings and that was the only development that occurred on these lots, which are individual lots, retention pond, sewers were built, the road was built, all the utilities.

President Jolly indicated there may be a better way to go about this. Mr. Miller, can you give us a presentation with regards to what exactly is at hand here and then it may be a more appropriate time to go into what may need to be addressed here.

Scott Miller, Planning Department, stated Rosati Industrial Park was officially recorded in 2006 consisting of 15 lots. The entire sub is zoned M-1, Light Manufacturing. The subject site is Lot 8 of the subdivision. It is located at the end of the cul-de-sac on Rosati Avenue. The land area of the property is 31,000 square feet or roughly 7/10 of an acre. The front property line measures about 136' in frontage along the cul-de-sac with an average depth of 165'. Lot 8 is surrounded completely by industrial zoned properties. The closest residential district is located about 156' to the south, as you can see on the zoning map. Part of the requirement of Section 6.58, Vehicle Tow Yards, are restricted to M-1 and M-2 zoning districts, are treated as waiver use approvals, except for the front yard setback lot area are required to be entirely enclosed by a fence.

The site plan shows that the building would be 5,800 square feet and is located near the front of the site. The parking lot area is entirely fenced and the parking area is behind the building and to the north. Parking required is based on one parking spot per each 500 square feet of building area therefore this building would require 12 parking spaces available to employees and customers. The facility would have 5 employees. The site

plan shows 31 parking spaces that would be available to employees, customers, tow trucks and recovered vehicles. As specified in the requirements for waiver use approval, the entire lot would be completely enclosed by a six foot high chain-link fence. The access gate to the rear area is at the northeast corner of the building and would be a six foot high wrought iron fence.

The building would be constructed out of combination brick with split face block windows being installed in the front and portions of the side elevation. The rear and north side of the building would contain overhead doors. The building height would be 22'. Floor plan shows a very open floor plan, with a large shop area, an office, vehicle prep room, and restrooms. The site plan does show a dumpster area on the west side of the parking lot. It would be enclosed by a six foot high walls and have a corrugated aluminum solid gates. For site lighting, the elevation plan shows that there would be LED light packs along the top of the building. The site would not have any light poles in the parking lot. The landscaping would consist of four Dagwood trees along the front of the building, would have a row of arbor variety in the front of the building and then grass. For signage, this site would be allowed one sign based on two linear foot of the building frontage or 100 square feet.

President Jolly inquired if the waiver use petition is specifically for this purpose?

Scott Miller answered that is correct.

Mr. Sever approached the podium to answer questions of Council and stated he wanted to add this is an ideal spot for this lot as it sits at the end of a very secluded road off the main street. No residents drive by this property. In talking to different people at the City, he has not spoken with one person and followed through. We went to the Engineering Department when this first came up and at that I was able to obtain a site plan that was approved by the City Council and an additional document that was a working document shown here, which documented all of the setbacks, side yard, front yard and this is the blueprint that we have been working with to build buildings. Mr. Rosati who originally started this project, and I think it was in 2006 or 2007, he built two buildings. I don't know if you have the pictures.

President Jolly stated typically site plans expire if they are not acted upon.

Mr. Sever stated it was acted on, Mr. Rosati built the road, the utilities, etc.

President Jolly stated there would have been a site plan for this particular parcel. Is the site plan that Mr. Miller presented the site plan you would like to proceed on at this point? How does the information you are presenting affect the site plan?

Mr. Sever stated they indicated it might require a variance and based on the site plan that was approved by Council years ago, and it was acted on, we don't want to have buildings' setbacks at different spaces and now the Ordinance enacted some 15 years later is not reasonable either. What I am asking is that Council consider language that it be referred to the Engineering Department for their review to see that it conforms to the plan that

Engineering had. We have already gotten two additional approvals for site plan with the setbacks according to these documents that are at the Engineering Department.

President Jolly stated I think we understand you now.

Councilmember Bahr, through the Chair to Paul Bernier in Law, does the fact that we've recently adopted a new Zoning Ordinance for the City change what is required? Is that the only reason why this Item #2 is in here, saying they may have to go to the ZBA or would that have been the same even if we had not passed the Zoning Ordinance?

Mr. Bernier responded he believed the Petitioner may still have to go to the ZBA if it does not meet the requirements of the setback, stating only the ZBA could give them the variance on that.

Councilmember Bahr stated regardless of what we do here tonight with Item #2, I think you will still have to go to the ZBA for approval. I don't think we can keep that from happening. I understand the logic of what you are saying, I think the Petitioner will have to make that case at ZBA. I am not sure it has any bearing on what we are looking at here tonight.

Mr. Sever stated if they have to they will, but I'm appealing to the Law Department for interpretation stating to his knowledge an Ordinance cannot be retroactive to something that has already been done. You have subdivisions that have been designed and built and then you have different setbacks and designs.

Councilmember Bahr stated he understood the condition the Planning Commission included here states "subject to a determination by the Inspection Department". That's what you're saying here?

Mr. Sever responded yes, that is correct. And indicated they have approved two (2) additional lots and they built a third building last year so they are following these documents now.

Councilmember Bahr stated you most likely have a strong case. He indicated having reviewed the Planning Commission Minutes, and having looked at the plan, I am willing to offer approving on this petition on Consent if there is no objection, there may be more questions for you to answer, but I am putting that out there.

Councilmember McIntyre stated she is confused by the question that Councilmember Bahr asked and was answered. I thought that I read that the only deficiency in the setback was caused by something not being carried over to the new Zoning Ordinance?

Mr. Sever replied yes, I think so, that is the issue. And my point is that it can't be going into effect after the fact.

Councilmember McIntyre stated it could, but that would be another issue. McIntyre asked Councilmember Bahr if she misunderstood the question he posed to the Petitioner.

Councilmember Bahr replied the conclusion that I came to is he thought the issue he is speaking to is outside of what we are being asked to approve tonight. We have a waiver that is before us to consider and let's presume that we approve this, there is going to be our Inspection Department is going to look to see if he needs to go to the ZBA. Regardless of what we include in here tonight, that is going to happen.

Councilmember McIntyre stated maybe I am just missing this. When I read the notes, the current plan with looking at this under the new Zoning Ordinance, the deficient setback is caused as a result of us not carrying over inadvertently. The correct or the setback requirements existed under the previous Zoning Ordinance for M-1. Is that correct, Mr. Miller?

Mr. Miller replied in the affirmative.

President Jolly indicated he understood where Councilmember McIntyre was coming from. He stated we have different Boards, Council, ZBA, we have different authorities and different things that we are able to approve, and to grant and to review. The Engineering Department will review as is indicated and if they find that it is necessary to go to the ZBA, you will have to do that. Do you understand? I understand what you are telling us. Fortunately or unfortunately, ordinances and laws tend to be fluid in nature sometimes where they do have the chance and the opportunity to be changed. This is a circumstance in which that may have affected the overall site's proposal here.

Mr. Sever stated the reason he is raising this is, he spent 14 years on the City Council for Farmington Hills, was a Mayor, County Commissioner and all that stuff, and I have never seen where a new Ordinance would be retroactive and affect work that the City Council has already approved as law. And on top of that, what appears to be in the communications that are written, the person we've been dealing with, Randy at the counter in the Inspection Department, and has approved additional development buildings, it is not a development project, each lot in and of itself, and it has been approved. But, before giving any of those approvals whoever wrote the letter does not seem to be aware of that, and I wanted to make sure that I don't mind that the Engineering Department should inspect and make sure that it meets the plans that the City has on file. So, I appreciate that I am only trying to get this cleared up so we don't keep having to go to get a different answer, from a different person in a different department.

President Jolly asked Mr. Miller if he understood what the Petitioner was saying?

Mr. Miller responded in the affirmative.

President Jolly asked Mr. Miller to provide additional information to the Council and if need be, it will be pulled off the Consent Agenda. As of now, you have an approving offered on the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Sever stated he will take whatever you decide, we are not going to dispute it. If we do we will go to the ZBA, but like you said, I've been there and I've never seen where it's been retroactive 15 years.

President Jolly stated we will look into it and if we find something different, we will let you know.

Councilmember Donovic, to Mr. Miller, or Mr. Bernier, is there an Ordinance that states how long vehicles can sit in a parking lot for recovery vehicles? Is it 24 hours, can it be there permanently?

Mr. Miller indicated he did not know but the plans stated the petitioner may keep the recovery vehicles up to six months.

Councilmember McCullough through the Chair to the Petitioner, part of the documents that show the 120 days for procedure for removing the cars and having it moved on from the site, correct?

Mr. Sever responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember McCullough asked if that would be the owner's policy, or is that a law that is in place?

Mr. Sever I can have the owner speak to that but I believe what he has indicated is that he doesn't do abandoned vehicles, the majority of his business he picks vehicles up on the side of the street and takes them to wherever they need to go for repair by the insurance company, repair shop, or whatever. He doesn't store the same vehicle for any length of time. He processes them. He does private insurance for stuff like that.

Councilmember McCullough stated the other question that I do have is maybe you can answer and if not, the owner, I notice that part of the backup did say that you have multiple locations, you're leasing at a dealership locally, and I think there were two other places. If this goes up, does any of this go away or is this business growing and thriving? I'm just trying to figure this out.

Mike Fields, 14310 21 ½ Mile Road, Marshall, Michigan, was present on behalf of the petitioner.

The question I have is looking through the packet you guys have multiple sites in the area. If this gets approved, do you have any, are you keeping those, is this an expansion of your business.

Mr. Fields stated no, actually we are looking to consolidate and we want to have one central-based location and that is what we planning to do here in Livonia.

President Jolly stated this item will be placed on the next Regular Agenda, meaning you will have to attend that meeting in case we have any questions so you can provide the

3. REQUEST TO APPROVE LOCATION AND SCHEDULE OF DATES AND TIMES FOR THE 2022 BOARD OF REVIEW MEETINGS, AS WELL AS COMPENSATION RATES FOR MEMBERS: Department of Assessment, re: per the requirements of State of Michigan Statute MCL 211.30.

Chris Boggus, introduced himself and thanked Council for their time. He stated he was present on behalf of the Assessor's Office and City Assessor, Linda Gosselin. He stated he is the Industrial Appraiser for the department. This time of year, every year, we come before you to request the approval for the annual Board of Review dates and times as well as the compensation for the Board of Review members. If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer.

President Jolly asking for an approval, correct?

Mr. Boggus responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Donovic stated he thinks this is first time Mr. Boggus has presented before Council and stated he did a great job. He offered approving on Consent Agenda if there were no objections by Council.

Mr. Boggus thanked Councilmember Donovic.

DIRECTION: APPROVING CONSENT

4. REQUEST TO APPROVE SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFIT ADJUSTMENTS FOR THE CLASSIFICATION OF FIRE CHIEF AND DEPUTY FIRE CHIEF: Civil Service Division, re: for the period of December 1, 2021 through November 30, 2024.

Denise Maier, Director of Civil Service, stated she was present on behalf of the Civil Service Commission to present this matter. Traditionally the negotiated wage increases that are obtained with the unions are passed on to unrepresented, in this case Fire Chief and Deputy Fire Chief classifications. You have before you in our letter what the changes would be and what would actually apply. It would be the same salary increases that the union and the members received. And increase in Personal Business time and increase in maximum annual reimbursement for classes. In addition, there were other operational things that we also negotiated during the contract as you know. And we also want to include that if there is a successor Fire Chief or Deputy Fire Chief that is selected from the union ranks, that they will have all of the benefits of the current CBA extended to them as well.

Councilmember McIntyre thanked her and stated it was nice to continue to see Ms. Maier. She inquired if these, and I meant to look this up before the meeting and I didn't, does this make the Fire Chief's salary commensurate with the Police Chief?

Ms. Maier stated that was a very good question. I don't believe so, but I don't know for sure. The Fire Chief might probably know. Are they the same, Chief Heavener? She responded she honestly did not know.

President Jolly stated that was awkward.

Councilmember McIntyre stated she would like to offer an approving resolution on the Regular portion of the Agenda. Part of what, and I think we have expressed this before, we are trying to do is look at all of the salaries wholistically and take a large view of what the Department Heads' compensation looks like understanding the situation of the union increase passing along to the Fire Chief, but I would like to see before the next meeting the Police Chief compensation and the Deputy Chief. And, also to understand what the car policies are for both the Fire Chief, the Deputy Chief and the same on the Police Department? Did they get cars, you know? Are there limitations, and just to look at again where we are from the overall perspective. Happy to offer an approving resolution.

Councilmember Donovan inquired to clarification when we talk about McIntyre's inquiry, are we talking about Department Heads in general? I know that has been a topic and I am still unclear on that process.

Councilmember McIntyre stated what she is asking for, if I may President Jolly, what I am asking for, for the purpose of this, is just the comparison to the Police Department and specifically did the Chief and Deputy Chief and then what the vehicle policies are for Fire and the Police for the Chief and Deputy Chief.

DIRECTION:	APPROVING	REGULAR
------------	-----------	---------

5. REQUEST TO APPROVE INCREASE IN COMPENSATION FOR DIRECTOR OF HOUSING: Livonia Housing Commission, re: to align the compensation range as other Housing Directors in comparable communities.

President Jolly indicated there is New Data on this item.

Denise Maier, Director of Civil Service, indicated she was present to represent Livonia Housing Commission requesting a salary adjustment for the Director of Housing position. She stated you may remember that last month I was also here for two other positions, and this was actually part of that same request, but we were waiting on the Housing Commission's approval before moving it forward to you. You have the information in front of you. The request or the proposed new salary does line up with the HR Director's new salary range that was approved at the meeting and it keeps both positions on par as they were before. Both positions were in the same range prior to this proposal, and it keeps that on par.

Councilmember McCullough, through the Chair to Ms. Maier, indicated I think we always ask it but how many more times will we see you? I know you are supposed to be retired at this point, but do you foresee any more in the future. I know we ask this question every

time and I know probably from the last, it seems like every meeting we have had, an increase is being proposed. I fully, I love the back up and I love the information, but I think it is becoming repetitive in nature rather than just throwing a whole bunch at us. Are there any others coming at us down the pipeline?

Ms. Maier stated as you know there is the one that was moved to the Committee of the Whole, and as it stands right now, there are none that I am aware of. There are no other requests that have been presented to the Civil Service Commission. I will also explain that while it may seem like a comprehensive salary survey is a great idea, it costs a lot of money to do that. It's anywhere between \$50-\$100,000 to do that. The City has not been in a position, I have spoken to my Commission on several occasions requesting something along those lines so that you can look at the whole picture and they haven't feel that it was the right time to spend that kind of money to do that. So by doing it the way that we have been, it is more cost-effective and it gives us we are doing this in a way that as these positions are people retire from them or people leave or we need to replace people, then this is already set up. So, we are trying to stay ahead of it as best as we can but, in order to do a big comprehensive salary study, it is very expensive and time consuming. And the other fact is when you do that people expect change. People expect more.

Councilmember McCullough thanked her for that. I know there is a lot of work that goes into it and for the salary increases, and the data that is obviously transparent from different communities, the back up that you guys present is top notch. This is something that I think every meeting that I say the same thing is that we need to be competitive. It helps you guys out, definitely, and we want to be a destination employer. So, with that, I just wanted to see if there were more and more coming at us. I remember this position being part of waiting on the Housing Commission's approval. So with that, I would be happy to offer an approving on the Regular.

Councilmember Donovic, through the Chair to Ms. Maier, can you explain the step process for these positions? I believe they should be approved. So, when a Department Head receives this new salary adjustment, is there step change as well? Do they go down a step or do they move up a percentage to meet the next closest step?

Ms. Maier stated that depends on what their current step is. It is very rarely, if ever, a step down. It could be a lower step, I guess. But what we do is look at what would be the closest salary and that is 4% above what they are making?

Councilmember Donovic asked that's a 4% limit?

Ms. Maier replied yes, it is never exactly 4% but we find the number that is closest to that and that would become their new step. So, they don't go from Step 5 to Step 5 or from Step 4 to Step 4 because that would be a very large increase but that also provides to them additional steps that if they were at Step 5, they didn't have available to them any further steps.

Councilmember Bahr stated looking at the back-up, thank you for sending that over and thank you to the Administration. There are a number of cities on here that responded: Canton, Farmington Hills, Novi and Troy, but the salary information says “N/A”. Can you just explain why that is?

Ms. Maier explained they usually do not have that classification, which is normally the case when we take these surveys. Yes, Canton Township does not have that position, Farmington Hills does not have that position, etc. So, if they don’t have that position they can’t provide us with this.

Councilmember Bahr indicated he was fine with the approval on the Regular, however, he did want to clarify what Councilmember McIntyre had asked on the previous item for some information. Councilmember McIntyre, were you asking for that information just on the Fire Chief and the Deputy Chief, or were you asking about that for all Directors?

Councilmember McIntyre responded just for that item. If I may President Jolly, I was just asking for the comparison only of the Police and Fire, for matters of comparing what I think are very similar positions and similar departments understanding their functions are different.

Councilmember Bahr stated I am fine with this being an approval on the for Regular, but I would appreciate seeing what Councilmember McIntyre asked for regarding our Directors, a table summary sort of what you’ve done here, but all in one place what the salaries are, what the whole compensation level of each of our Directors all in one place. Bahr stated it would be helpful for this and the other topic referenced. So, I guess I would ask the Administration if it would be possible to provide that to us prior to the next Regular meeting?

Ms. Maier asked Councilmember Bahr when you say entire compensation package, what do you mean?

Councilmember Bahr replied yes, I guess I should clarify that. I guess I would like to see a compensation comparison in one place of all of our Directors and just to get a sense of how they line up. I am assuming you have it, because I think as part of the study you have done here, the materials have been provided to us and you said you had undergone a comprehensive look to see what is not in sync with what is in the market. These three positions, this one and the previous two, that you felt needed to be adjusted. I guess I would just like to see more of that information. It would be very helpful for us.

Ms. Maier responded so far I see that you want to see the salary, the car package and the car allowance? Is there anything else? As you know everyone’s vacation is a little different.

Councilmember Bahr replied yes, just those two things. I think this will be constructive for some of the other things that we are talking about too.

7. REQUEST TO CONSIDER NAMING THE DOG PARK AT BICENTENNIAL PARK AS SUPER'S DOG PARK: Department of Parks and Recreation; re: in honor of Super Celani.

Ted Davis, Superintendent of Parks & Recreation, indicated they requesting Council to concur in this proposed naming of the Bicentennial Park to "Super's Dog Park" as approved by the Parks & Recreation Commission. This comes to us really from Tom Celani and the work he has done and all the great things he has done in our community. As Council knows, Mr. Celani was responsible for a large donation to our Ben Celani Play Area in the amount of \$250,000 to re-do that playscape there that will be completed this coming Summer or early Fall depending on how supply chain issues go. Tom has been a pillar of our community and has been intimately involved in projects involving St. Mary's and projects all throughout the community and we think this is a good honor for him. Again, the Bicentennial Park, the Dog Park, has not been named and this is asking for it to be named for the first time and it did pass through the Parks & Recreation Commission. I'm not sure if it was included in the packet but we had gone through facility naming guidelines a few years ago when we had this issue come before us with regards to the Harry Tatigian naming and what we did with the Harry Tatigian Park and Nature Preserve so we do look at that. This does follow civic or charitable organization definition and I think this is a good idea for this site. I would be happy to answer any questions Council may have regarding this request.

Councilmember Donovic stated he felt this was a good idea when you look at what that family has done for our community and not only for the City of Livonia but surrounding communities, hundreds of thousands if not millions of dollars have been raised through the various charitable organizations and the work they do. Looking at the packet to your point, Mr. Davis, we talk about naming parks and other recreational areas, this meets the definition and it would be cool to see a dog park with a name. But not only a name, a name that has done so much and is doing so much for our community now and I believe will continue to do good things moving forward for our community and other surround communities. With that being said, I would like to offer an approving on the Consent if there are no objections from my colleagues.

Councilmember McIntyre stated it meets the threshold or the guidance which is intended to be an art not a science. She inquired if Mr. Celani, has there been any conversations between Mr. Celani and the City about his interests in his business in the marijuana field. His family is very, very active and has a large business and I know he is interested in retail distribution.

Mr. Davis responded not with the Parks & Recreation Department we have not had any of those conversations regarding his retail businesses or his other interests. Other than in passing, I know he owns a winery out in California and that sounds nice.

Councilmember McIntyre indicated she knew about the winery too, but stated his family has a rather large-scale marijuana operation as well.

Mr. Davis indicated that has not been brought up at all.

Councilmember McIntyre, through the Chair, I'd like this item placed on the Regular agenda and would like a response from the Administration if there have been any discussions with Mr. Celani about his interest in the marijuana business in the City of Livonia.

Councilmember Donovic stated as the Council member that offered the approving, I'm not sure what his personal businesses and legal businesses have to do with the Dog Park, but I would just like to clarify that I think that his family has done a lot of great work for our community and in precedent of naming parks and other facilities in the past, people, organizations, etc. that do great work for the community, above and beyond work for the community, this is a normal process. So, I'm not necessarily sure what the legal and private business of him has to do with that, but I naturally respect my colleagues' opinion and have no problem with it going to the Regular part of the meeting.

Councilmember Bahr, inquired through the Chair to Ted Davis, so Super's Dog Park we understand where that comes from but 5-10 years from now when somebody walks up and sees the sign for Super's Dog Park, you anticipate to have any kind of signage or recognition there? What do you have in mind for that?

Mr. Davis responded that is a really good question Councilmember Bahr. I think we will put up some sort of plaque or acknowledgment or some bio of Super and his lineage, if you will, or his relationship with Tom. We will come up with a picture and something nice to say on the sign out there to commemorate it.

Councilmember Bahr stated okay. He continued and stated he certainly appreciates and respects the involvement the Celani family has throughout the City, at St. Mary's Hospital, and the park and other things, so I don't begrudge the request and it does meet and I appreciate whoever included in this in our packet the guidelines for this. It does fit within that. It just strikes me as odd for all the things he has been involved in that this is where the naming would go. And I'm not proposing anything here, but even to just kind of make my point is that the Dog Park was, if I recall correctly, one of the signature accomplishments under the previous Administration. Like if we were to, I'm not proposing this necessarily, but naming it after former Mayor Wright or something like that would make sense. But, I am struggling with okay so this guy does a lot of work in our community and so we are going to name the Dog Park after his dog, it just like. I am glad this is on the Regular. I would like a little more time to reflect on this. Again, certainly appreciate all that Mr. Celani has done and probably I have belabored this enough.

DIRECTION:

APPROVING

REGULAR

8. AWARD OF CONTRACT: Department of Parks and Recreation; re: for Senior Fitness Passport memberships to the Jack E. Kirksey Recreation Center.

Ted Davis, Superintendent of Parks & Recreation, stated this is again another senior Medicaid membership offering. There are so many of these right now, Senior Sneakers

of course being the most popular and the one everyone has heard of as it the brand name. Council recently approved Peerfit, with another provider. This is again through Optim Healthcare Solutions called the Senior Fitness Passport membership. It will follow the same guidelines as our existing two contracts do offering matinee memberships free of charge. This one has a higher reimbursement rate. It is per visit, \$3.20 per visit, for a maximum payout of \$32.00 per month based of course on the number of times a person visits in a particular month. This is a good deal for us considering our current matinee membership is \$19.00 per month. So, again this is open to residents and non-residents. We have already done this with Silver Sneakers and Peerfit. We are asking Council to approve the contract for Optim Healthcare Solutions to offer this Senior Fitness Passport. I would be happy to answer any questions Council may have.

Councilmember McCullough offered an approving resolution on Consent if there are no objections.

DIRECTION: APPROVING CONSENT

9. REQUEST TO WAIVE THE FORMAL BIDDING PROCESS AND APPROVE CONTRACT WITH ALLIED, INC.: Department of Public Works: re: to perform the replacement of the hydraulic power unit for Hoists #1 and #2 in the fleet maintenance garage.

Jacob Rushlow, Superintendent of Public Works, stated good evening and congratulations to our new Council members as well as congratulations to our new Council President. Happy New Year to all! This item before you, just a little background on why we are taking this request, is approval waiving the bidding process. In early 2020, the Department had solicited bids to replace basically the sister unit of this pump which powers hoists #3 and #4 in the fleet maintenance garage. The field of qualified contractors for this type of work is very limited in the area and only two bidders had responded back in 2020. The project was awarded to a contractor that we found to be very non-responsive and they failed to complete the work. The award of bid was eventually rescinded and given to the second low bidder after a very arduous process. Allied, Incorporated at that time came in and completed the work quickly and to the satisfaction of the Department. Given their past performance issues with the other qualified contractor that would likely bid on this project here in the area, we recommend this project be awarded to Allied, Inc.

Mr. Rushlow explained specific to the project, it involves replacing the pump unit, the power unit is 40+ years old, that is being replaced. As I indicated, it is the sister unit to the one that is right next to it that powers two other hoists, #3 and #4. This one provides power to hoists #1 and #2. This power unit is a safety concern due to leaking fluids from the box as well as excessive noise that it causes during its motor operation which can be an issue when trying to give direction and you're working side-by-side with someone else in the shop and having that loud motor running right next to you. Therefore, it is our recommendation that Council proceed to award a contract to Allied, Inc. in the amount of \$16,460.00 to provide all labor and materials necessary to perform the replacement of

this hydraulic power unit and authorize the expenditure in that same amount from budgeted funds. Lastly, the request is to waive the formal bidding process in accordance with the City's Ordinances as we feel there would be no advantage to the City resulting from a competitive bidding process in this situation.

Councilmember McCullough wanted to thank DPW for the detail in the backup. As much as I hate waiving the formal bidding process, I remember this distinctly before us, last year and with the non-responsiveness of the other contractor. I am actually familiar with Allied in this industry and they are very good so I'd be happy to offer an approving on the Consent if there are no objections.

DIRECTION:

APPROVING

CONSENT

COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councilmember Donovic stated while Mr. Rushlow is present tonight I just wanted to commend him and his Department's work on the Middlebelt and Schoolcraft construction project. I know we recently had a meeting talking about Great Lakes Water Authority (GLWA), talking about the road closures and the inconveniences to business and residents alike, and your Department worked really hard and so far its opened up and flowing a lot better so thank you for your work and anyone back in your Department that has worked on this matter as well.

AUDIENCE COMMUNICATION

None.

As there were no further questions or comments President Jolly adjourned the Study Session at 9:06 p.m. on Wednesday, January 5, 2022.

For the 1,936th Regular Meeting of January 19, 2022.

DATED: January 13, 2022

SUSAN M. NASH, CITY CLERK

In accordance with Title II of the American with Disabilities Act as it pertains to access to Public Meetings, the City Clerk's Office of the City of Livonia, upon adequate notice, will make reasonable accommodations for persons with special needs. Please call (734) 466-2236 or email clerk@ci.livonia.mi.us if you need assistance. **Council agendas are available on the City's website – www.ci.livonia.mi.us - under Government, City Council, Agendas.**