CITY OF LIVONIA
PUBLIC HEARING

Minutes of Meeting Held on Monday, September 29, 2025

A Public Hearing of the Council of the City of Livonia was held at the Livonia City Hall Auditorium on September 29, 2025.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Martha Ptashnik, Vice President
Carrie Budzinski
Rob Donovic
Scott Morgan
Lynda L. Scheel
Laura M. Toy

MEMBERS ABSENT: Brandon McCullough, President

OTHERS PRESENT: Eric Goldstein, Assistant City Attorney
Mark Taormina, Planning and Economic Development Director
Debbie Lichtenberg, Finance Director

The Public Hearing was called to order at 8:04 p.m. with Council Vice President Martha Ptashnik presiding. This item is regarding the Proposed Budget for the City of Livonia for the Fiscal Year ending November 30,2026, and the property tax millage proposed to be levied to support the proposed budget.

This item will be moved to the Regular Meeting of **October 20, 2025**.

The Public Hearing is now open. There were approximately 37 persons in the audience.

Ptashnik All right, let's go for the third one. The Public Hearing will now open. With us tonight, we have our Finance Director. Welcome.

Lichtenberg Good evening. Thank you for being here tonight. This evening is the next meeting in a series of meetings that we hold every year on the topic of the annual budget. The first meeting was held on August 11th. That was the early budget input session where Council had the opportunity to present to Administration any priorities that they had, that all of you have, that you would like to see addressed in the budget. Then the second meeting was held on September 18th. That was the meeting, that was the main budget workshop. The budget was submitted to City Council on September 12th, which was ahead of the Charter required, September 15th, submission date. At the meeting on September 18, we did a more in-depth review. The PowerPoint from that meeting is posted to the website and is available as a reference for that meeting. There are some additional responses to questions that occurred during that meeting that we'll talk a little bit more about in a moment. Just hitting on the key highlights of the budget. This is a balanced budget for the General Fund. There's an excess revenue over expenditures of a little over $8,500. We expect to continue to be the lowest city tax rate in Wayne County. There's a slight heavily rollback in the millage rates the proposed budget, as posted, continues to levy two mills below their maximum authorized amount. That is the refuse mill, which is 5/10 of a mill below the authorized maximum and the recycling mill, which is 1/10 of a mill below the authorized amount. Based on that, the total city millage would be 13.1134 mills. However, as discussed during the meeting on September 18th, Administration does recommend reducing the cushion on these two millages and levying the refuse and recycling millages at the full authorized amount. This would place the total city millage at 13.7134 mills and would generate an additional $3,360,000 of revenue to maintain the fiscal stability of the Refuse Fund and to protect the service levels for residents. The impact of this change for the average homeowner would be $64.25 a year, or approximately $5.35 a month for the refuse, recycling, yard waste and other services under this fund. The General Fund revenues are projected to increase by about 2.7% or about $2 million to a total of just under $77 million. Expenditures are projected to increase 3.1% or $2.3 million to a total expense again, of approximately $77 million. As we noted during the meeting on the 18th, staffing and personnel costs are the primary cost of the city. Of the General Fund, 77% is related to staffing and personnel costs, or almost $60 million. The budget includes no new positions in the General Fund. For the fiscal year ending 2026, the full-time positions are projected at 617 and the permanent part time positions would be at 30. Other operating costs are approximately 20% of the total General Fund budget and are a little less than $17 million in total. Capital outlay is the remaining, just over 2% of the General Fund budget, or about $1.7 million. At the end of the proposed budget period, which would end November 30, 2026, the fund balance of the General Fund is projected to be $18.3 million, or approximately 23.8% of total expenditures. In this budget, the total capital outlay request was just over $69 million, and the total funded in the proposed budget is $33.4 million or about 48%. That leaves $35.7 million not funded. The next meeting, after tonight's public hearing regarding the budget, would be the meeting on October 20th. At that time there will be three motions that will need to be approved by Council. One is the approval of the budget. One is the approval of the millage rates, and the third is the approval of the continuation of the half percent tax administration fee on a school operating and PRDA millages only. This afternoon, I sent an electronic version to all of you, of the memo that addressed issues that came up during the September 18th meeting. I've also provided Councilmembers with a hard copy at your place at the dais. This memo has been posted on the website, so it is available for public viewing as well. The items that were covered in the memo were related to the budgetary impact of a 3.5% salary increase for general employees, which would be approximately $614,000 additional cost for the General Fund, and citywide would be approximately $918,000. Within the memo, you will also find additional attachments for departmental variances that had some questions. The building and property listing. It was noted during that meeting that two buildings were not included, and the reason for that was, as of October 2022, those buildings were only covered for liability and the document that you were provided with, was a schedule of from the insurance company, so they are only covered for liability, so we're not separately endorsed on that list. I have provided you with also another listing from the Assessor's Office for all city-owned properties, so you have that in complete form, the old courthouse and Noble buildings, there was a question regarding the continuing costs for those. The old courthouse currently has electricity, heat and water. There's some interior maintenance, and up until this past year that was used for food distribution. Exterior maintenance does continue, and the expected cost is approximately $20,000 annually for all of those items. For the Noble building, power is being restored to that building. There's been approximately $8,000 spent on landscaping, mulching, weed spraying and trash removal. Utility costs are expected to be around $5,000 per year. I've also provided you with some estimates of building demolition costs, which our consultants with Plante Moran Real Point have estimated at $10 per square foot. There were some additional questions and discussions regarding the Refuse Fund and the need to replace the membrane at Glendale Yard. So, I do want to point out that there are two issues at hand with the Refuse Fund. The first is an ongoing operating deficit that is simply being driven by increase in costs. Our current contract for trash, recycling and lawn waste is higher than it was previously. We're in the second year of a five-year contract. If we do not generate additional revenue, we will have to balance the budget for this fund by reducing services. So, as I mentioned earlier, we do have the option here, because we are not levying the full authorized amount of the millages for refuse and recycling. If we do levy those full amounts, that will cover the operating deficit and allow the Refuse Fund to continue operating with a small net income. The second financial issue that the fund is facing is the need to replace the membrane that is in place where the old landfill was on the Glendale property. This has a cost estimate of approximately $2.5 million. If the operating deficit is corrected by generating additional revenue, that allows the existing reserve within the fund to stay intact and at the end of the budget year, that would be a little over $3.6 million. That would provide, in whole or in part, enough funding to do that membrane replacement. If those costs for the membrane replacement were to come in higher than the $2.5 million estimate, we would have the option of potentially using some money In the Brownfield Revolving Fund to bolster that, or to use some Capital Project Funds. So, as I mentioned before, that levying those full millages would generate $3,360,000 in additional revenue for that fund. So, as I just mentioned, there is the possibility of the Brownfield Revolving Fund being eligible to be used for that membrane replacement, or for the demolition of some of the buildings that were discussed earlier as well, the specifics of that would have to be reviewed to ensure that they align with what the original Brownfield Plan is, but that is a possibility that can be considered. There was discussion about the Cable and Communications Department. So the

Cable Department has a separate fund and a separate funding source in the budget that was presented to Council, it did include the reduction of two staff positions in order to correct a structural deficit in the operating budget. In Attachment 5 to the memo, the Director of Communications has provided some additional information to you as to what activities are handled by Communications versus the Cable Department. Our recommendation at this time is to do a modification to the budget that was presented to you that will allow the Administration to spend the next budget year working through a plan to move forward with Communications and Cable to eventually work those two divisions down to a staffing level of six versus the current eight today. In order to accomplish that on page 6 of the memo, there are some recommendations from the department for cost savings, which is almost $40,000 coming out of the Operating Budget, that would offset the amount needed to be placed back into the budget for the personnel and benefit costs, which are approximately $161,000. So, the net of those two is $121,000 504. So, that's the amount of money that we needed to find to be able to fund it for one more year, The fund balance in the Cable Fund as of November 30, 2024, was $267,007 36. We're anticipating the amount of that reserve being used in the current fiscal year to be just under $168,000. Then, with this modification to the budget, fiscal year 26 would use $121,000, leaving a projected fund deficit of a little over $21,000. To correct that, we would include a contribution of $30,000 from the General Fund to the Cable Fund, which would leave about a $9,000 cushion for any unexpected variances. This would allow for, as I said, the process to happen over the course of the next year, knowing that the ultimate need is to correct that structural deficit, and the only way that that can happen within this fund is through staffing reductions. The question also came up regarding Hillcrest Park. We did pose the question to our Housing Director, who oversees the CDBG program, and it would be allowable to use CDBG funds to improve Hillcrest Park. However, it should be noted that the CDBG fiscal year is different from the city's fiscal year. So, the time when this could be submitted as an action item would be in January, when a call for projects is put out. Then the CDBG plan is approved by Council in May, and the new funding year would begin July 1, 2026. So, if this is something that Council would like to pursue, the action would be to make a motion to add Hillcrest Park as a CDBG project for the new CDBG year. Also provided in the packet is additional information on the Rotary Park pavilion. There was just a request for the documentation on the construction costs. Animal control. There's a memo on the update relating to The Humane Society. There was also a request for more detail on conferences and consulting services. Those are included as Attachments 9 and 10. There was a question regarding additional contributions from the General Fund. At this point, as I mentioned at the meeting on September 18th, we don't know what the amount may be that will be available for the current fiscal year, but I did provide you with the history. In 2023 we were able to transfer $2.5 million. In 2024 we were able to transfer $1 million, and in 2025 we transferred $2 million. And then the last thing that I noted here was simply that there were a couple of other topics that were mentioned during the meeting, which was considering a wage freeze for elected officials and consider conducting an employee satisfaction survey. I simply note them here, just for completeness as to the meeting. And obviously within that packet there's a lot more detail, but I did want to give you an overview of what was there. That concludes my points.

Ptashnik Well, thank you. I always enjoy having Debbie Lichtenberg talk money at us. She takes a very complicated topic and really makes it very understandable and very clear and makes it easier for us to do our job at a high level. And I really appreciate your expertise here, so thank you for all that, we will miss you. The Public Hearing is, in my opinion, one of the most important meetings that City Council holds every year, especially I mean the Public Hearing for the budget. This is our opportunity to not only have the Administration present the budget to us formally, but it's our opportunity to also share that with the public, and so you can see how we're going to be collecting and spending your hard-earned tax dollars. So, with that, I will let the mayor give her notes.

Brosnan Thank you, Vice President Ptashnik. I just wanted to take a moment to thank you all. This budget process is not an easy one and I think I mentioned in our last meeting, this one, by far, has been the most difficult of the six budgets that this Administration has worked alongside of you to present. It got to the degree that a budget like this can't get any easier, it got easier following our last meeting with you. You all seemed very much succinct in what we wanted to see out of this budget. Our hope is that some of the recommended changes from our Finance Director meet those expectations that you clearly outlined for us at our last meeting. So, I just wanted to take a moment and thank you for that collaborative effort that goes into this. You know, balancing a budget on $9,000, a little under $9,000 at the end of the day is a tricky, tricky thing. It is even trickier when you are trying to maintain a level of service that people in our community have grown very accustomed to. That can be done in this budget. But it is going to take a lot of fiscal oversight during the course of the year, and we clearly recognize that. This Administration is well-conditioned to do that, it's what we do every single day. So, know that they understand that once the decision is made to put the budget in place, it is going to be a difficult one for all of us, that maintaining that budget is going to be even more difficult. We understand that there is going to be the unexpected. We work really hard in this Administration to negate those to lessen their effect, and make sure there aren't a whole lot of them that come before you. So, we'd really appreciate the opportunity to work right alongside you in making sure this budget is not only successful in its approval and its adoption, but in its implementation as well, so thank you very much.

Ptashnik Thank you, Mayor. Council?

Donovic Thanks, Madam Vice President. I have no questions at this time, just a comment to the Finance Department, Mrs. Lichtenberg. Great job with that packet of answers. I know there were a lot of questions from the Council at the other committee meeting we had and for you to go through all those in such detail and respond back to us. There was a ton of information that you and your department had to put together in a short period of time and I do appreciate that, so you can tell your staff great job there. You guys answered every question I think that we had asked at that time. Not only did you answer those questions, but you brought some solutions and great ideas. I know one of them was from Councilwoman Budzinski in talking about some funding through CDBG for a park and I thought that was a good recommendation. To your point, financially, it's not the right time to do that, it would be January, just a few months away. So, I just appreciate the thoughtfulness in coming up with solutions. Then there are other things, $11,000 we have to spend a month to The Humane Society, that's $130,000 a year just for The Humane Society for the dogs and cats and other animals that are lost. I appreciate the solutions in their talking to other communities and trying to figure out, some of them have been trying to for years now, but it sounds like you guys are continuing that effort to figure out how to save money. I just appreciate that, thank you Madam Chair.

Ptashnik Anything else from Council? All right, at this time, if any of the residents have any comments on the budget, just line up at the podiums and you will be offered 2 minutes. Good evening.

Hefty Hello. As you know, my name is Nicole Hefty and I live in Rosedale Gardens neighborhood. First off, I want to echo some of the sentiments. This is one of the most comprehensive packages that I have seen. I was really impressed to see all of those items that Councilwoman Scheel asked for in one of those committee meetings. I take a lot of notes, so I do appreciate that, it was very well put together. I have a couple of notes that I want to just rise to the top, it was a 950-page document and I did read the whole thing. So, first and foremost, I'm going to put in my notes the page numbers. I've seen a lot of debt, first off, that I'm kind of wondering about. So, first and foremost, page 379 of your packet has a $212K jump in financial administration, specifically for software subscriptions that I'm kind of curious about. Is this a new ERP for example? Just curious. Page 383, as the Finance Director pointed out, it's a $69 million capital request that is not being fulfilled, so half of those projects are going unresolved. We have $36 million debt in drinking water funds on page 387, which is kind of interesting, which I believe are forgiven, I might be wrong about that. I also wanted to rise to the top some of the new debt that we're doing, such as the Go Fund for Shelden, the Capital Fund for Shelden and the Enterprise Fund for Newburgh Village. We're also projected to be $8.8 million in the hole on our Capital Improvement Fund, the Linear Improvement Fund and the Senior Center. On page 403-405 we talk about vehicle usage and stipends. Right now, there are 40 people that qualify for a vehicle. 13 of them get a stipend of $350 times 12 is $54,000 a year. Thank you.

Emling Ron Emling, resident of the city of Livonia. I have a couple of questions, I wasn't really expecting to talk about the budget tonight, I thought it was just PRDA, all about us. What I picked up is, guess the city has a number of hefty buildings, and maintenance goes along with those buildings, the landscape cost, the gas, electric, and the water on the empty buildings and also lawn care and snow removal that's probably gotta be taken care of on these buildings as well. So, I'm just wondering if we've got such a tight budget and we're hitting commercial buildings for TIFs and taxes, how come the city isn't getting busy loaning these properties? It's a hot community, everybody knows it's a great community and we want it to look better and we don't want the buildings going to a blight stage. Why don't you just unload them and cut all the costs out of the budget? Just a question.

Ptashnik Thank you. Good evening.

Mica Denise Mica, Livonia. I too, segway from Nicole here about the cars. In Attachment 2, page 16 talks about all the different cars and so I tried to match up the car's expenses in the budget and I could not do that. I don't know how that, when you add up what they're getting. Is that insurance on it there? You know, it just says Auto Expense and that would be account number 861. Auto expense would be $4200 for a lot of different places and that's where I'm trying to figure out. We hear things and whatever and I just want to know what is going on and where the fuel is for everything. I believe we just replaced two gas tanks, there is one behind the police station and one at DPW, so I would have thought there would be an expense for that one and an expense for that one, to go per tank and each department would be under that, so I couldn't find that. This section was great, you can do a word search and everything, petroleum, diesel gasoline, I looked at it and I looked at every page also and couldn't find it. That's where I, there's no reconciliation, some of these, we have pool cars and some of the cars are from 2019. I hope we're not paying a lease on that or whatever, I don't know the insurance is getting paid so those are my questions, thank you.

McDonnell Good evening, Eileen McDonnell, Livonia, Michigan. I have a few questions. The refuge portion of the budget, I know last year it included leaf pick up and I just wondered if that was on the agenda, because there hasn't been anything made available to the citizens to know what is going on with that. Secondly, I don't know why this bothers me but it does. The reduction of 2, full-time employees, I would imagine there were be somewhere that money could be found to replace $161,000. I know meetings, Council, in the past, had addressed having Public Hearings televised and that isn't happening, I think that was back when Scott Bahr was on Council. There are people that can't attend these meetings that are being shut out, there are people that still can't enter the building so I would think those two staff members could utilize some sort of federal funding to assist getting the word out for people who cannot have any communication with the city, so my take on that.

Ptashnik Anyone else from the audience? Seeing none, I will go back to Council. Councilmember Budzinski.

Budzinski I will just comment on a couple of the things that were brought up that I have an answer for. Regarding the staffing, that was presented just now in a revised presentation. Those positions would be kept through this year and that would be at a cost differential using fund balance, we're going to use about $30,000 from the General Fund. Again, it's on page 6 and 7, it's laid out. So, there will be no staff reductions for this budget year, then using that time to come up with a different strategy moving forward. Just on a couple of the debts that were mentioned. Reminder that here in Livonia, we have a unique situation that we have millage buckets that are separate entities that can only be used for certain things. So, for instance, the Shelden bond funding was going to be split between the Plymouth Road Development Authority and the Parks and Recreation Department. They had a bond that was sunsetting. So, they are just reusing those funds to do these park improvements. Shelden Park is one of the city's three main signature parks. Newburgh Village is operated by the Livonia Housing Commission and is autonomous. It is really a unique entity here in the city that is not directly related to the city or the General Fund. Housing Commission uses its own money to pay back bonds, so that's not necessarily a debt to the city. So, I just wanted to clarify some of those things. I know we had a lot of mention of cars. One of the things that I might have missed Debbie, although you have always given an amazing presentation. I will reiterate what everyone else has said, you are amazing and we're going to miss you terribly. We've talked about salary surveys before, did we have any plan for that or will we revisit that in a year. I ask that because certain positions, the car allowance, or fuel is considered part of the compensation. One of the things we hear often is that Livonia salaries are much lower that our surrounding communities, or we were at least trying to look at where we can compare and be more competitive.

Lichtenberg Just to clarify, so the specific question that was asked at the budget workshop was regarding an employee satisfaction survey that would be just an internal survey, so there's no separate funding related to that. On the question of salary surveys, we do informal salary surveys frequently whenever a position opens up and we need to do a posting it is done on a more informal basis as we go. There is no plan to do a full city-wide survey at this time.

Toy Thank you, if I may. I see Mr. Rohraff, I see you in the audience, I don't mean to put you on the spot, but if I may ask you a question in regards to landfill. I know we've had it since I was a toddler growing up here, I know we have a contract as part of our Garbage and Refuge contract, oh we're going to get Mr. Moore, great. Thanks Mr. Moore. I know that all the tree stuff you guys pick up immediately and do a great job, I just wondered, do we really need this landfill anymore? How does that benefit us, in the long and short term perhaps, could you help me out?

Moore There are two parts to our landfill. We've got the closed portion which was closed 60-70 years ago, which was originally a clay mine. They took the clay out and out trash back in. The part that the liner is covering is over that portion of the landfill, where the trash is. We have an open landfill that only the city uses to dispose of whatever we do out in the city. Roadwork, sewer work, that's the portion that is open. We recently had the fly over it done, we do that every year. Todd Zilincik will go in there and do some calculations to figure out how many more years we can keep it open. Last year we we're at 8 or 9 years. It fluctuates a little bit, depending on what the amount of stuff that we put in. We're somewhere between 7 or 8 years before we are going to have to close it.

Toy Thank you. You know, I remember back when, I think there was a landfill by Stevenson High School, if I'm not mistaken, where the church is, over in that direction. I don't know if you are old enough to remember that.

Moore No, I wasn't here, probably before me even being here.

Toy Before Lincoln, I bet. Well ok, thank you, that helps clarify a couple things in my mind, I was hoping we could maybe shift and save a couple bucks there, but it doesn't look like it. Madam Chair, as it relates to the cars. I've been on this Council here and there for a number of years and I've always had a problem with cars. They are a very expensive item. Each of us that own a car, know how much we pay, not only in insurance but gas and wear and tear on that vehicle. We you go to trade it in, those guys aren't real cooperative on what you're going to receive for that vehicle many times, so that concerns me as we move forward. I realize it's an important entity to attract, perhaps, people, I just don't see many cities doing that anymore and haven't for a number of years. I also want to comment on one of the residents that said how do we control the gas. How do we really control that kind of mechanism. I've heard rumors over the years of different folks that fill up, I'm not accusing anyone, they are perhaps rumors that are unfounded and untrue, but I just voice that concern, if there is a mechanism in place where perhaps we have a car we can identify what vehicle or what department, or whatever. I don't know if that's in place, because gas can go up and down as we all know and so is insurance and wear and tear on the car. I guess what bothers me the most is, they are taken home, they are taken on vacations, they're not taken for strictly city business, there are children's car seats and used as a family vehicle. Again, I have a problem, we are trying to cut budgets and we are saying we don't have enough money here and there, which we don't to a great point, I just need to get my arms around this and I was hoping to do it before I leave, but it doesn't look that way. Thank you, I'll get off my soap box.

Lichtenberg We did talk about this to some extent, and I know you weren't able to attend on September 18th, but on the memo that was discussed at that meeting and the attachment too. There are a couple of pieces of information, the first part of it on page 11 through 13, it's important to know that was from 2022 and that was at the point in time when the Mayor's Office informed Council that we were doing away with city-owned vehicles, so we were limiting the number of city-owned vehicles assigned to employees. In place of that, provided for a monthly stipend of $350 a month. That is intended to cover, often, Department Heads have a lot of travel in and around the city, it takes the place of any mile reimbursement, it covers gas, there's not a separate, you can't drive your personal vehicle over to DPW or the police station and fill it up, that is not something that is available. The $350 a month is all encompassing. So, the city is working hard to get out of the business of being a rental company. So, when you get to page 14 and 15, this is the policy that went into place at the time that switch was begun. Page 16 is a snapshot of where we are today. There are some positions, I'm sorry, this is the memo that was distributed and discussed on September 18th, apologies. It was the response to questions that were raised at the August 11th meeting. So, on page 16, it shows in the section at the bottom, those are all individuals, who, at a previous point in time, would have been issued a city vehicle, but now only receive a monthly stipend. Those at the top of the list, they still receive cars. Its important to note that the vast majority of those are staff members who are largely on call and could be called in to address a water main break or other emergencies that happen at any point in time in the city and they tend to be more utility vehicles, like utility trucks. So, that is a standard practice in most communities for those individuals that need to respond to emergencies. I hope that provides a little more in site to the direction the city is moving and how those things are handled.

Toy I appreciate the Mayor did make those comments and some of those, I don't want to call them restrictions, but nuances if you will. Its in the right direction and I really appreciate your explanation and sending the email going back and forth about 5:30ish, I appreciate it so much.

Donovic Not to belabor the vehicles, but referencing the Department Heads that have them, is the City Clerk driving around doing election business, the Roads Supervisor, the Fleet Manager, the Facilities Maintenance Supervisor, both of those directors, their Superintendent, Water Supervisor, Director of Emergency Preparedness, City Engineer, the list goes on, the Fire Department, Housing, I'm missing some of them of course, Police, Planning and Economic Development Department, Parks and Rec. So, I'm reviewing this, it doesn't seem out of whack. City Council doesn't have any vehicles, it all seems pretty standard to me. Thanks Madam Chair.

Ptashnik	Anything else from Council? Council, do we have any direction?
Donovic	Madam Chair, I'll offer approving, denying and Committee of the Whole.
Ptashnik	Ok, we have an approving, denying and Committee of the Whole. Any comments? All right, with that our Public Hearing is now closed.

As there were no further questions or comments, the Public Hearing was declared closed at 8:51 p.m.

CITY OF LIVONIA
PUBLIC HEARING

Minutes of Meeting Held on Monday, September 29, 2025

A Public Hearing of the Council of the City of Livonia was held at the Livonia City Hall Auditorium on September 29, 2025.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Martha Ptashnik, Vice President
Carrie Budzinski
Rob Donovic
Scott Morgan
Lynda L. Scheel
Laura M. Toy

MEMBERS ABSENT: Brandon McCullough, President

OTHERS PRESENT: Eric Goldstein, Assistant City Attorney
Mark Taormina, Planning and Economic Development Director
Debbie Lichtenberg, Finance Director

The Public Hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. with Council Vice President Martha Ptashnik presiding. This item is regarding a request to adopt a resolution from the Plymouth Road Development Authority, amending the district boundaries of the downtown district of the Plymouth Road Development Authority pursuant to Act 57 of the Public Acts of Michigan of 2018.

This item will be moved to the Regular Meeting of **October 20, 2025**.

The Public Hearing is now open. There were approximately 40 persons in the audience.

Ptashnik Welcome. So, we are going to hear from Mark Taormina first, on this issue, and then we'll go from there.

Taormina: Thank you. And I'll point out that also required notices be mailed to all the property owners within the district as it exists and as proposed. I also included posting notices at 20 locations within the district and notifying by certified mail of the four taxing authorities. This public hearing will consider amendments to the Plymouth Road Development Authority district and development plan. It will terminate the tax increment finance plan as it exists today and adopt a new tax increment finance plan. The Plymouth Road Development Authority, or PRDA, approved these changes at the Regular meeting in July. The current development plan and tax increment finance plan were approved over 30 years ago, and both plans are set to expire in 2027. The PRDA is a Downtown Development Authority, and DDAs are subject to the authority granted by the State, originally under the Downtown Development Authority Act, which was PA197 of 1975 but in 2018, Act 197 was recodified and consolidated with six other statutes that rely mostly on tax increment financing. So DDAs are now under the authority of part two of the Tax Increment Financing Authority Act, which is PA 5720 18, the Act that you cited. DDAs are autonomous in several respects, however, many of the activities of the DDA are subject to the final approval of the local legislative body. This includes establishing the district in which the authority operates, adopting a development plan, adopting a tax increment finance plan, and approving any special assessment districts or special tax monies. The statute enables DDAs with powers to acquire and sell property, borrow money and collect taxes, among other things. In 1998 the PRDA and Council approved the sale of seven and a half million dollars in bonds, mostly to finance the construction of the Plymouth Road streetscape improvements. The life of those bonds was 20 years, and the debt service on the bonds was retired in 2019. This request has two major components. The first is the development plan, which addresses all of the required elements of the statute, including two that are most relevant to the discussion tonight, and these are establishing the district boundaries and identifying projects improvements and improvements that the PRDA intends to undertake during the plan's life, including cost estimates and proposed methods of financing. Exhibit A shows the changes to the Plymouth Road development district boundaries. Several commercial and property industrial properties are not currently in the district are proposed to be added, mostly due to changes in zoning and land use. The properties being removed are mostly residential, including single family homes, multi-family homes and assisted living facilities. The properties being added are mostly industrial and were done-so according to changes in land use and zoning. Overall, the district would be expanded by 29 acres. The largest concentrated area of parcels that would be added are on the east and west sides of Stark Road just south of the CSX Railroad. In this area, about 28 parcels, all of which are developed industrially, would be added. A crucial part of the new development plan is updating the list of projects, programs and capital improvements that the PRDA may undertake. The list now includes the asset maintenance program and the planning design and improvements to Sheldon Park, the former fire station and the former Alfred Noble library sites. The Asset Management program covers all the streetscape and other public improvements along the corridor, including landscaping, walls, piers, fencing, street furniture, plazas, lighting, bus stops and the mast arms for the traffic control devices. The PRDA has also committed to assisting the city in the design and construction of a new Sheldon Park. The PRDA is fronting the full cost of the engineering, architecture and construction administration, and will finance roughly 45% of the debt service on city issued bonds that will pay for the construction of a new park. The development plan also recognizes that the PRDA may take an active role in the planning, design and construction of the remaining areas of the property, including the former Noble library on Plymouth Road and the land adjacent to the former fire station on Farmington Road.

The second major component is the tax increment financing plan. The PRDA is seeking to terminate the TIF plan currently in effect and adopt a new TIF plan. To understand why this is being requested, it's important to understand the history. Initially, the PRDAs funding relied exclusively on the capture of tax increment finance revenues as the taxable value of the properties within the district increased above the base value established in 1994, the PRDA collected taxes on the incremental difference. This is how Tax Increment Financing operates. However, it only works if the taxable value is more than the base value. In 1994 the taxable value of all the real and personal property within the district was roughly $691 million which became the established base value. The adopted TIF plan projected that the taxable value would steadily increase, peaking at around $830 million by the year 2026. This would have resulted in captured taxable values exceeding $200 million with annual tax captures or revenue to the PRDA of about $5 million in the closing years of the plan, unfortunately, the last time the PRDA received any TIF capture was in 2009. Several factors caused a decline in the taxable value of the district, most of which were related to personal property. First, there was the accelerated depreciation tables that apply to industrial machinery and equipment, followed by major tax tribunal cases with Ford and GM, then the recession, and then the final straw was the enactment of the eligible manufacturing personal property tax exemption. In 1999, the taxable value of all personal property in the district peaked at $509 million and today that value is a little over $82 million. Adopting a new TIF plan allows the authority to effectively reset the initial base year taxable value and begin capturing taxes as the taxable value of the district properties increases over time. Exhibit D, which is in your packet, is the schedule of estimated tax increment revenues, which would commence with the adoption of the new TIF plan and run for a period of 30 years, the newly established base value, which is the total taxable value of all real and personal property in the district as of this year, would be $461 million This is about $230 million less than it was in 1994, but still roughly $114 million more than what the taxable value of the district was in 2016 when it filed them down at $347 million. Every year since then, the average annual increase in the value of the district has been roughly three and a half percent. So, if approved, the PRDA could begin collecting tax revenues as early as next year. The plan assumes a conservative annual increase of 1% in taxable value, provided there are no other calamities like there were in the early 2000s and assumptions are correct in terms of the yearly growth the PRDA's annual revenues, via the TIF, could grow to over a million dollars in 10 years. It is important to note that the statute does enable the PRDA in the city to enter into revenue sharing agreements with each of the taxing authorities. In this case, the taxing authorities are the city, Schoolcraft College, Wayne County and the Huron Clinton Metropolitan Authority. And with that, Madam Vice President, I will answer any questions that you may have.

Ptashnik Thank you, Mr. Taormina. Mr. Donovic.

Donovic Thank you, Madam Vice President. Thank you, Mr. Taormina. So, the last part is, there's a lot to unpack here with TIFs and DDAs and the PRDA. The last portion you mentioned, of sharing revenues with organizations outside of Livonia. Can you dive into that a little more and help me understand that?

Taormina It simply means that if a taxing authority approaches the city and would like a portion of those collected revenues, to receive a portion of those, that can be negotiated between the PRDA, the city, and that particular taxing authority. I failed to mention, but I'll point out Mike McGee of Miller Canfield is here. They've been instrumental throughout this entire process, as we have amended the plan and presented this to the Plymouth Road Development Authority.

Donovic So, to speak, in just layman terms, essentially, the city created this, this authority along this area, and it adds a tax to these buildings, these commercial parcels within this authority, we collect an extra tax for them, and that tax is supposed to go to PRDA improvements to fix streetscapes ,to fix certain things within that area.

Taormina So, let me clarify that, if I may. The way a tax increment financing operates is not, in and of itself, a tax increase. The way a TIF operates, is, you establish a base value, which is the value of the district, this includes all the real and personal property, and as that value increases, there's a capture and still the same millages that would otherwise apply to the various taxing authorities and to the entities paying those taxes, that would still remain the same. It's just as the value increases and the revenue that's generated from that increases, that's what's captured and goes to the DDA to maintain their operations. A separate tax levy is permissible under the statute, and in fact, there is a two mill levy for all the properties within the district currently. That levy was initiated in the 2000s at a point in time when the district was having serious problems meeting its financial obligations. So, that millage is still in effect today. That is completely separate, however, from the tax increment financing.

Donovic So, what we're saying, we’re not asking to add, to increase, that two mills on those buildings, with the exception of buildings that currently are not within that Authority, and the buildings were added, I think they're highlighted in purple, those buildings that are added will now start paying additional two mills?

Taormina Those would be subject to the additional two meals tax. That is correct.

Donovic Okay, so, but we are not asking to increase two mills to 2.3 or 2.5 etc.

Taormina That is correct.

Donovic Okay. And I guess again, my concern is those authorities you mentioned, and they very well may be standard practice and procedures. I know we've talked a lot about, you know, if anyone follows budget meetings, everyone thinks of meeting your city, the property tax bill, all that money goes to the city, when, in reality, I think it was 32 cents of every dollar goes to the city, and the rest of that money goes to everybody else, the state, the county, all these different organizations and authorities throughout the county that are taking our tax dollars and doing it what they will. So, I guess I have a problem with that portion. Again, it may be standard operating procedure that those authorities can ask us to take a piece of that, but I guess if it's up to our discretion, I'd like to see that we remove that portion. And I know these dollars are intentional for the PRDA, but I'm open to discussion. And again, I know Miller Canfield is here this evening, and maybe that's standard, just my two cents. Thanks. Thank you, Mr. Taormina.

Budzinski Just that question for part 25 clarification. That 1 million over 10 years is cumulative?

Taormina That would be the annual, so I think what you're referring to is the table that is provided. I think it's Exhibit D in your in your packet. And if you go to that exhibit, and you look at the far-right column where it says total TIF revenue. That is the projection of revenue that would be received by the PRDA over the life of the TIF plan, which in this case would be 30 years. And you can see it starts at about $107,000 for this year, and steadily increased, capping at roughly $3,745,000 by the year 2055. Again, these are rough projections based on assumptions that we've built into the plan.

Donovic Thanks, Madam Chair, Mr. Taormina, that money, that until 2055, the estimated $3.7 million would go towards the PRDA, and those would go for those general improvements and whatnot along the PRDA?

Taormina That's correct.

Donovic So, instead of the city, and/or other taxing authorities, capturing that money, now the PRDA would capture that full amount, as opposed to the general fund capturing the tax

Taormina They would capture the amount. Again, it's the incremental difference between base value and what the value is as it increases over time. So, it's not the full amount. The other taxing authorities are not going backwards in their tax collection. It's that, again, that gap between Is the base value and the rising taxable value that is captured and goes to the PRDA. That's been the case since 1998 and it was the case up until, as I indicated, the mid 2000s when circumstances changed, primarily because of result of personal property tax value going down.

Ptashnik Councilwoman Toy.

Toy Mr. Taormina, under page 10, under salaries, what are we doing here? Clarify this for me a little bit.

Taormina I don't have that.

Toy Oh, wrong packet. Hold on, that's our budget and finance meeting. I'll take that back. Sorry. I'll wait to answer that question, sir, this is what happens when you've got three months to go. I'll answer that question when we come to that. Thank you very much. Thank you, Madam Chair. Just my own mistake.

Ptashnik Okay, so just to explain really quick, we are having a public hearing. These are three, you see three agenda items on your handouts. They are actually treated as three separate public hearings. Just to make it clear to the audience, we will open up to audience comment in just a second. But I just want you to understand that the one we're only commenting on right now will be the district boundaries, which is agenda item number one. We will talk about that after we have audience and public comments, then we'll go back to Council and see if there are any other additional questions or comments from Council. Then there could be some motions. We'll close that agenda item, and then we'll have to restart with a new public hearing. So, I didn't really explain that beginning. I just thought, with this sizable audience, if that makes sense. So, we will now go to the public, and you can line up the podiums. If you have any comments during this particular agenda item, you'll have two minutes. Mr. Donovic, can you keep the time for me? Thank you. This will be on the district boundaries.

Pastor Good afternoon. I'm John Pastor, 34018 Beacon, and I'm still not running for Council. I thought I would make that clear. Being one of the new people in the district going getting those extra 2% tax on a road that, as I sat on Council, has not really done really well. The plan that we sought out back in the day did not go through because personal property and all that stuff, as Mark had said, same thing could happen with this thing. If you guys are now going to add a park and the library and the fire thing, that doesn't even do with Plymouth Road. Let's keep it with Plymouth Road, and you won't need as much money. Maybe you guys can think about giving the 2% tax increase that you get out the industrial buildings and give them their money back, as opposed to keep on nailing the industrial buildings that literally don't have anything to do with Plymouth Road. The idea was supposed to be the businesses on Plymouth Road, who were supposed to pay for to enhance their businesses, to get the retail people to have it walkable, have it new, have it look nice. But let's look at how long has it been there, 25 years? I just don't think the PRDA, was once a good idea. I just don't think it's ever worked out well. And if you look at how much money we have put into that, and stuff Laura would know, she was on Council, and I think maybe Lynda, the city has had to put a lot of money into the PRDA. Again, the parks, the firehouse and the library, that's the city's responsibility, it's not PRDA's responsibility. So, I don't think you need to charge as much as what you're wanting to do and stuff. And let's rethink this. There's a lot of things and a lot of pressures up in Lansing right now. (time) I'll finish later.

Ptashnik Thank you. Good evening

Ingram Good evening. David Ingram, 34413 and 34414 Rosati. I purchased one of the new buildings there. I'm actually building another building across the street. Plymouth Road district is a quarter mile from Rosati. You've got a situation where you're including industrial properties into commercial properties, which is like apples and oranges. From my research and whatever, it's been over 20 years that Rosati hasn't been developed, and now that's being developed. You've got 15 lots that currently, about half has been developed. Property taxes on average, 15 lots were $1,000 and now you're generating, by the time it's done in there, you'll be generating probably over a quarter million dollars. My question is, what is it opening up? It's like, take the money from where it's supposed to be. Commercial properties on Plymouth Road generate $18 to $20 per square feet for rentals. Industrial properties only bring in $8 to $10 on the high side. So, when you're taking two months of rent just to cover property taxes, it takes it to the point where guys like me look and go, why are you doing this? I think, I think the city needs to be more efficient in what they're doing, not just coming back and going more and more and more. Thank you.

Ptashnik Thank you. Anyone else?

McDonnell Eileen McDonnell, Livonia. Question in reference to the listing in the Detroit Legal News. I'm sure it's been done, but unfortunately, the average citizen doesn't have access to this information. Call the library. They don't carry the Detroit Legal News. I call the Detroit Legal News. There's a cost for anyone who wants to review anything that's published. So, if it's supposed to be a public document or public notice, people, the public should be able to review it. So, ia this to the point where we can talk about Noble?

Ptashnik No.

McDonnell Okay, all right. Thank you.

Ptashnik Thank you. Anyone else from the audience? If you want to make a comment, you can start lining up.

Emling Ron Emling, I’m the owner of 34430, 34437, and 34422 Rosati. I’m the developer over here and started the project, and still a number of lots over there. Mr. Taormina here said a lot of legalese, a bunch of stuff in 10 minutes. I couldn't pick it all up. A lot of legal stuff. I couldn't, you know, quite, you can only take it so much in so much time. So, there's a lot there to digest. I'd like to go back over the notes, the city notes, and see the tapes again and give me some time. I did get a text from Mr. Soave and his sons that also own four lots over there, he couldn't make the meeting. He left a lot of text messages to represent him as well. They're not interested in jumping into something at this time. So, if there's a way we can get some time, we get with all the owners and talk to everybody. It is an association. It is a small group of guys at this time. I did go to the City Clerk try to get some more information. They didn't have any information about a week ago, so I couldn't get clarity on what this meeting is all about. So, I need a little more, we all need a little more time to digest all this, figure out what it's all about. I just think it's a lot. We got the letters, but when we go to City Clerks and not give us clarity on what's going on, they don't know either, they don't have the information. It's all coming at us, all at once, and all these business owners are up against the same thing. I think I can say, speak for the whole crowd here. It's a lot to take on, just to say, you know, without a fight, that this is the right thing to do at this time. This is a new development. We're just getting going. The taxes over there are already extremely high for the new construction. So, I don't know how things are assessed. Is it new construction assessed different than old construction, or did Miller Canfield? Is it just this area, or they've been in other areas?

Toy Thank you. I appreciate some of the comments, especially Pastor's, you sound like John Engler. Still love you John. In giving back money and we don't collect through taxes, the Governor was real big on that when we served, which made a lot sense. We have some time I stand corrected, right? I mean, we're not going to vote on this till November. Am I right on that Mark?

Ptashnik The procedure would take time. We have to do two reads. The first read, second read. It's probably November 5 would be the first possible, if not two weeks after that.

Toy So, if that helps you at all, you still have a lot of time to discuss this with your fellow business owners, etc. I own a business on Plymouth Road, have for about 47 years. I gotta tell you, though, since we were looking at, you know, putting the park in there at Sheldon and everything, I'm in the middle of selling my business because I'm old now and tired of working that hard as Rob and others would know that they are small business owners. Unbeknownst to that, I point to what the city is doing to improve Plymouth Road, and that helps me as I sell, okay with the broker I, you know, and, and he sells it that way. And it's, quite frankly, not that I'm promoting this or not promoting it. I don't mean I don't mean to go there. It's just there's two sides to every story. And I just wanted to share that with you as I move along, and I'm at the end of my future as a business person here in the community, I just want you to know as we're developing things down there in a very older section of Livonia that's well kept up, Rosedale Gardens is a premier area, you know, that we back up to. We're down by Bill Brown Ford there, that you know, in some cases, it really has helped us out, and it will help us, I think, in the long run, with the sale of the store. So, I just wanted to add that to the comments, Madam Chair, thank you.

Donovic Thanks. Madam Chair. So, to the resident that asked about Detroit Legal News posting, that's a good question. Procedurally, per Charter, the city has to post in the paper certain notices, like Council notices, changing ordinances, public hearings like this. As you all know, the media landscape has changed, so we don't have an Observer, which, you know, would still go to every single household, but we still our Charter still mandates, and we have to post certain legal notices. So, my understanding, because we've had some conversation over the years, the only other paper that is, whether it be affordable or that that prints often, is the Detroit legal news. So that is where the notice is printed. There's no longer an active paper that goes to people's homes, so we can't post in the Livonia Observer anymore. So, the Detroit Legal News meets that legal requirement. If that makes any sense, we do post it online. So, if you go to our City Council agendas, and this is the same, similar with every other community, and every community has different Charter requirements, but that's basic legalese of that is that requirement.

At the same time, you hear there was a breakdown, where there's a resident and business owner that comes to City Hall and gets certain addresses here, received this notice, and it was very confusing. I received multiple texts and phone calls and emails from residents asking about what does this mean. And it's confusing. It's legalese paper, so it's not I'm not happy to hear that there was that breakdown that someone in the city offices downstairs in the first floor could have direct you to the Council Office on the second floor, because our Council Manager, Sara Kasprowicz, could have easily answered that question for you. So, that's frustrating, and that just process and procedure, unfortunately, but I hope that for the residents that know, if you do have a Council related question, and you go to City Hall and you just got to ask the Council Office, and Sara in the Council Office will be able to give you more of those details. But these packets, the packet that we're all looking at, 100 pages. It's all online. If you go to the City Council website, you can find that packet, the same one we look at. But again, to your point, sir, it's, you know, you get these notices. And there's so much, so much depth there. It's a lot to maintain and understand. Mr. Taormina, so essentially, tonight, so all the residents know in public hearing, there could be a multitude of motions offered this evening. We're not actually going to be voting. So, there could be three different motions potentially that could be offered tonight that will just move us in the process. They'll eventually take us to more formal Council meetings, and we'll start having actual discussions and votes, but this is the first legal public hearing that we as a Council have to hold. Mr. Taormina, so essentially, we're trying to, you're asking us to do essentially two things. One, reset the kind of authority, the dollar figure, to capture the legal framework in the TIF and the confusion there, all those legal things. That’s why we have to hire smart Attorneys and Planners like you. And then the second portion would be adding some boundaries and removing others. Basically, that’s the gist.

Taormina Yeah, there are three components, really. There's the district boundaries. So, you could make a motion to accept the recommendation the PRDA has submitted to establish the boundaries as presented. You can make a resolution to modify those boundaries in any way. If you wanted to not include the additional industrial properties that are shown, you can make that resolution. We would have to make those adjustments. The alternative would be other district boundary changes. The other important aspect here, is to approve the changes, the amendments to the development plan. PRDA can't do anything that is not identified in the development plan, so that's why we focus this evening on talking about those additional programs and activities. So, though that's important for you to understand that the development plan needs to be amended in order to give the PRDA its charge on the types of projects that it can be involved with over the next 30 years. The plan can be amended anytime along the way, but this is to do it at this point, and really to memorialize what has already been done with respect to Sheldon Park and also some of the other bigger issues that are on the forefront of discussions these days. The next element is to terminate the TIF plan and adopt a new TIF plan. I guess that would be the third one. Technically, it's two things. So, by terminating the TIF plan and adopting a new plan, you reset that base value, and you start basically from fresh in the ability to collect taxes. You have to understand that since that base value was established in 1994 and we had this precipitous drop in personal property values. It has not been able to catch back up to the point where they can begin collecting tax increment revenues. By resetting that base value and dropping it down, now you've set that bar lower, and now as property values increase, they have the ability to capture taxes once again and thereby bring revenue to the PRDA to be able to fund some of these identified projects. It doesn't mean they have to spend all that money. Again, as I indicated, they could have cost sharing agreement with the city of Livonia to give some of that money back. They could work with the other tax authorities. It just gives them that ability to fund those projects identified in the plan.

Donovic Mr. Taormina, as you talk about amending the development agreement, is it possible to include in this amended development agreement, for example, on PRDA, we had some conversation this year about significant signage. A lot of signs, whether they be for sale signs, they’d be advocating or advertising, business or political, signs on these corners. We invest all this money in these PRDA corners. It's beautiful. They're really doing a nice job right now and fixing those corners. Is it possible to include in this new development agreement that we prohibit the placement of any signage to not discriminate against the particular type of signage? Rather, there would be no signage affixed in these corners that we invest so much money in. You don’t have to give the answer tonight.

Taormina	I'm not going to touch that one. I'm going to look at Eric and probably over at Mr. McGee, because signage is a whole another element.
Donovic	And that's my position here is I'm not discriminating against any specific type of signage, rather the affixing and you may call it littering, you may refer to whatever you want. But I do think we already are establishing development agreements that set certain parameter requirements throughout the PRDA. It would only make sense that we maintain the cleanliness of the PRDA, and we're taking 2%, roughly $3.5 million over these years that we keep these clean. And I think I'd like to explore that. It may not be legal, you may say you shouldn't do that, and I understand that. I disagree in principle, but I understand that. So just something, this is the proper time to bring that up. And then also Council. You know, I understand what the Planning Department wants to do. I think that the PRDA is large in scope. I'd be okay with not adding new, because if you look at the magenta, the purple areas, that have been added, there's I don't want to say insignificant, that would be wrong to characterize in that way. But I do think in today's economy and things like that, I think the PRDA is rather large as it is. I understand the relief that some of the business owners that are residents are asking for, and I would be open as one member. I don't know how my colleagues feel to not adding those new areas and just reset the TIF. I think we're still accomplishing things and it's going to be a better product long term. I just think, hey, we got an opportunity here to save some taxes for some of these smaller businesses. They're very small areas. There's only a few added areas. I think that'd be nice of us, I don't know the temperature of the Council. I guess we can continue to have that discussion and debate. And then lastly, back to my signage. Maybe I didn't ask the right question, but something for you in Planning and Law to talk about is, how do we manage signage if we can't prohibit it, which I think we should and we can. How do we manage that signage within that PRDA corner? And that's something that I'd like the legal minds and planning minds to kind of as we go throughout this process. Thanks, Madam Chair.
Ptashnik	Thank you, Councilman Morgan.
Morgan	Yeah. I just wanted some clarification from Mr. Taormina regarding this. You know, as I'm looking at this here, this is kind of, it looks like it's now selective enforcement to add Rosati Drive on there and a couple of other spaces. If the property, and I just wanted to clarify, is that correct? Is that exactly what's happening?
Taormina	So, those are the parcels that are shown to be added. In particular, Rosati was not developed at the time. If you go back and take a look at the minutes of the City Council Public Hearing from 1994 where this was discussed, these boundaries were discussed. The question came up as to why these areas were not being included. The answer primarily, was

that they could be developed residential, that they're undeveloped currently. Now, that doesn't hold true for all the parcels, but it certainly holds true for the majority of them, along portions of Stark Road and Rosati Drive, in particular. So that's why those areas were not included in the district in 1994, but it was clearly the intent to include all the industrial properties up to the CSX Railroad, running from east to west, from Inkster Road all the way to Eckles. So, as we looked at the boundaries and we knew we had to make changes to the district boundaries to eliminate residential properties that were added since 2013, which is the last time this was amended. These areas were identified as fitting, I guess, the parameters of the original district with respect to developed industrial properties extending north of Plymouth Road, south of the CSX Railroad. So that's why they're shown being added. But again, it's Council's decision this evening, or when you adopt the ordinance, whether or not to include these areas.

Morgan — Okay, and the area that Sheldon Park, where the Noble library is, and that park there, that's highlighted also is that…

Taormina — You know, that is actually technically in the district. We wanted to make it clear on this map that Sheldon Park is part of the district. It was not shown on the original maps being within the district. It was described in the plan as being in the district. The PRDA has a resolution of verifying that, in fact, it is part of the district, but we wanted to make it clear on these maps today that it is part of the district.

Morgan — Okay. There's something right off Globe Street. What is that?

Taormina — You know, let me check.

Morgan — I just want to make sure I'm clear on exactly what I'm looking at.

Taormina — That's Newburgh Road, and I believe that's a DTE, that's a utility, yeah, that's either Consumer, excuse me, no, that's a Consumer's Energy, one of their pressure reducing stations.

Morgan — Okay, yeah, I think I would be more comfortable with what Mr. Donovic has recommended regarding staying with the TIF and maybe not adding these areas at this current time. But okay, thank you for your presentation.

Ptashnik — Councilmember Toy.

Toy — Thank you. I'm trying to understand it, I can't really see it well. Does that include the shopping center there on Farmington and Plymouth Road?

Taormina — Yes, that has always been a part of the district.

Toy — Yeah, I thought so, I just wanted to make sure we didn't exclude anyone. Is this whole topic of reducing, I mean, because we formulated a possible

Task Force for that area as it comes down the pipe, and I just wondered if we should see and explore before then. I didn't know if this was time sensitive, or where we're at on that.

Taormina It's only time sensitive if you want to have the potential for generating the TIF revenues beginning as early as the election for the end of this year or the winter, winter 2025, okay.

Toy I appreciate that. Thank you.

Ptashnik Thank you, Councilmember, Budzinski.

Budzinski So, I think that this is a really exciting plan. You know, economic development isn't easy, if you know, especially in Livonia and the PRDA is an avenue for economic development in the city that's unique. It's one that a lot of other communities have that have helped build their commercial districts into being walkable, appealing to help businesses that exist and help attract new businesses. Personally, I am comfortable with the new boundary lines and, you know, including the businesses that now meet the criteria for the existing district, just for the matter of consistency. But I think that this is important to move forward so that we can leverage, you know, the possible gains sooner rather than later, because how we can use these funds, you know, we can do business support. We can invest in the businesses that are there with money that's not coming from alternative sources. I think that that is a great opportunity. And what the TIF really means is that we just set the ceiling for how much the city collects in property taxes there, and as the values in those areas increase, which the goal with the PRDA is to make investments that help increase their property values. That's good for the business owners, but it can be really good for city and residents as well. So, I think that's great. I think it's a nice opportunity to also invest in amenities at Sheldon Park, at Noble or, you know, the current or former fire station, because, again, you know right now, those are underutilized city resources that we don't necessarily have the ability to make the best investment for. But it's a really great neighborhood. It's a really vibrant, walkable commercial district. We don't have a lot of walkable commercial districts in Livonia where residents can walk and go to dinner, where they can walk and get groceries or flowers. And I think that, you know, having a new park that's going to attract residents, that's also going to attract businesses who want to invest we've already seen so many businesses coming along Plymouth Road and this adds to that. So, you know, I guess my question, I don't, I know you said for this one in particular, we need a motion to accept new boundaries. Will this, will you guys be drafting an ordinance for this, or will this come to us to where we could then discuss as a Council what the definition of the new boundaries as it relates to the mill part, which I know doesn't really set out with this conversation here, but it does in the sense that we're going to need boundaries for new possible taxable businesses. But it's separate from the TIF.

Taormina We would need direction relative to how you would want to district to establish the boundaries, because the ordinance itself will identify, identify those boundaries and have a legal description, so, with that direction, we'll be able to prepare the ordinance for you to consider.

Donovic Thanks, Madam Chair. I think it would be appropriate for us to have what people call the godfather of the PRDA, Mr. McGee, come up, which is our bond Council. I'd like to ask him a few questions, if it's okay.

McGee Madam President, members of Council. My name is Mike McGee, 150 West Jefferson Avenue, Suite 2500, Detroit, 48226. I'm happy to answer any questions.

Donovic Thank you, Mr. McGee, for being here this evening. It's a pleasure. So, I like what we're doing, and great job to you and your team and your knowledge of PRDA and Mr. Taormina. I just have a problem with adding additional businesses. Can you help me understand so we're now, again, if I understand it correctly, we would be applying 2% mill on these added buildings that would now be paying additional, if they're paying, for example, 50 Mills a year for their commercial building, they'd be paying 52 mills. Correct?

McGee I don't know what the millage rate is. Properties that are being added would be subject to the levy that the PRDA is letting out two mills. And I do want to congratulate Mr. Taormina for, I think, really laying out that we're talking and we have to, this is sort of state law requires that we talk about these things together. But we are talking about two different financing positions. The tax increment finance has nothing at all to do with the two mills. You know, the two mills is over here to something separate. And I agree with his characterization that at the time the district was originally created, the idea was to capture commercial and industrial. And so, I think the logic here is ultimately one of equity, that you have people that are commercial and industrial, that have been subject to the 2 mills for a long time, and now you have some properties that have become commercial and industrial, represented by the gentleman who has spoken before. And so, the question is, should he be subject to the same 2 mills or not? And that'll be up to you guys to decide.

Donovic Okay, well, thank you for that. For those that don’t know, Mr. McGee was a former Livonia City Councilman for a number of years, and the Council president.

McGee That would be Councilmember Toy, she was Council President a couple times.

Donovic Oh, 1960s okay.

Pastor I want to say Mr. Pastor was serving in about the same time, too, but he didn't go to Bently.

Donovic I will, you know, Council, as noted, I think there's continued conversation here. In essence of time, I will offer approving, denying and a Committee of the Whole for this item, just for Council sake, we can keep talking about all night long, but we do have those three options. We can move forward to future meetings and continue to discuss, unless there's anything urgent.

Ptashnik Okay, so we have an approving, denying and motion…

Taormina If I could just seek some clarity on the approving.

Donovic As presented.

Taormina And is this related to, just related to the district. So, would it be approved as submitted, approved as modified? Because I know you said earlier you had suggested it potentially not including some of the properties. Should the approving be as modified or be as submitted?

Donovic Yeah, I would say submitted currently and continue to have that investigation and discussion and kind of see where Council goes. I mean, again, my position is that we modify it, but I don't know how Council feels right now. So, I guess in light of that, I will offer two approving motions, one for modifying the removal of these additional parcels, and then approving as presented to the Council. I guess legally, do we need to offer an additional motion for the TIF portion of it all?

Taormina That's the next item.

Budzinski Do we also need to make a motion to approve the amendment to the development plan or is that part of the second one?

Taormina That is the second one.

Donovic I would also ask that we handle the signage portion as well with a report a recommendation, but I don't know that this is the platform to ask if I'll handle that later on.

Ptashnik Any other comments from Council? All right, seeing none. We are going to close this first public hearing.

As there were no further questions or comments, the Public Hearing was declared closed at 7:51 p.m.

CITY OF LIVONIA
PUBLIC HEARING

Minutes of Meeting Held on Monday, September 29, 2025

A Public Hearing of the Council of the City of Livonia was held at the Livonia City Hall Auditorium on September 29, 2025.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Martha Ptashnik, Vice President
Carrie Budzinski
Rob Donovic
Scott Morgan
Lynda L. Scheel
Laura M. Toy

MEMBERS ABSENT: Brandon McCullough, President

OTHERS PRESENT: Eric Goldstein, Assistant City Attorney
Mark Taormina, Planning and Economic Development Director
Debbie Lichtenberg, Finance Director

The Public Hearing was called to order at 7:52 p.m. with Council Vice President Martha Ptashnik presiding. This item is regarding a request to adopt a resolution from the Plymouth Road Development Authority, amending the Development Plan and termination and adoption of a new Tax Increment Finance Plan pursuant to Act 57 of the Public Acts of Michigan of 2018.

This item will be moved to the Regular Meeting of **October 20, 2025**.

The Public Hearing is now open. There were approximately 40 persons in the audience.

Ptashnik All right. Well, good evening. Let's do this again. We've kind of already discussed a lot of this already, but Mr. Taormina, I'm going to bounce back to you for just a quick overview of what we need to discuss here again.

Taormina So, the way these were separated, the first group, or set of resolutions offered, dealt specifically with the district boundaries. This second item relates only to the development plan. Again, the major changes to the development plan involve the projects and programs being added to the planning. Again, those are projects and activities that the PRDA may choose to undertake over the life of the plan. And then the second part of that, is the termination of the current TIF or tax increment finance plan, and the adoption of a new tax increment finance plan.

Ptashnik Thank you. Council. Councilmember Budzinski.

Budzinski Well, I guess I'll just say that. I am supportive of this, as I stated in our previous conversation. So, I will offer an approving amendment to the development plan and a motion to terminate the current tip and adopt the new plan as proposed.

Donovic I'll offer denying and a Committee of the Whole as well. To the maker the approving resolution to note again, the signage portion, or there'd be some sort of report recommendation from administration to investigate further on overall signage control along the new development grid.

Ptashnik Anyone else from Council? All right, we'll go to the audience. If anyone has public comment, please come on up. Good evening.

Pastor I'm John pastor, 34018 Beacon, and I'm still not running for Council. When the PRDA was first going, it was never intended for any of the industrial buildings. It was just for the buildings along Plymouth Road only. It was never intended to get all the industrial buildings, because it was supposed to benefit the buildings on Plymouth Road. Secondly, all the businesses that do a remodel and all that stuff are supposed to bring it up to the PRDA. So, I'm not sure what the PRDA really needs money for, other than maintaining the grass and the power, that's really the only thing that the PRD needs money for. And secondly, parkland is residential. It's not industrial. It's not commercial. So, it shouldn't be in this to begin with, the Noble library and the fire. If you guys want something done with that, that's a city issue, not a PRDA issue. And if you have to sell the fire station, sell Noble, that's what you can do. And then that can be, you get revenue from that to help out the PRDA. And would also be, how much does PRDA need to run the PRDA, and then maybe that's when you'll be able to find out how much money they truly need. They don't need to do any more new projects. There's no property for them to do any more projects. The businesses that do it have to comply. So, I don't see the reasoning for that. And maybe you should look at the existing businesses and reduce the 2% that those people are paying to begin with, we don't always need more money. Maybe we need to live within our means just like everybody else does. So those are my comments. Thank you.

Ptashnik

Anyone else in the audience? Seeing none? I'll go back to Council. Council? Sorry

Emling

Ron Emilng, owner of 34422 Rosati, 34430, 34437 Rosati. I’m the developer on Rosati, owned for four years, I had a quick question for Mr. Taormina. When Mille Canfield did the research as far as doing this park, I've never been to Shelden Park. I have no idea what it's about, what it needs for updates. But did they go to Rotary Park? Because Rotary Park just got done. There's another park up on Seven Mile that just got remodeled. Were those people subject to tax increases tips to improve those parks over on Seven Mile Road, it just got all remodeled and rebuilt with all those placement centers and stuff like that, or just as retirement this us for this little Shelden Park. I got to address Carrie Budzinski, it's nice to have the flower shops and the little stores and everything go close to the park and include that area, that's not doing nothing for these commercial buildings over here that doesn't have these building owners don't even live in the community or go over to that park. So why are we getting hit with the inconvenience of the flowers that might be needed over there at Sheldon Park, we don't even go to the park. You've got hundreds of people, hundreds of business owners up and down Plymouth Road that can pay for that, that enjoy that park and live in that community. They should ask those people or TIF those people that are around that park area. You don't go outside of the park area and rezone everything and try to get us involved with something that we're not even a part of. And I just need to get some questions answered again. I don't think anybody, any commercial buyer here is investing a million dollars in a building over here is interested in another tax hike to cover a park expense. It just doesn't make any sense. You should cover the people that around the park here, that enjoy the park here.

Biga — Good evening, Jim Biga, Livonia, Michigan. With regard to the earlier comment about where do you publish news articles? I understand there aren't any other newspapers available, but the legal news is a unique publication, just to the legal community. And if the public library cannot have a copy of it, I don't know how the general population in the city would be able to get a copy of it. So, it'd be very good if we could increase the ability of the public library to be able to subscribe to Legal News. Thank you.

Ingram — Ingram, 34413 and 34414 Rosati. When I looked at the district and what you're trying to provide, a park, a library, fire station, funds, why are you excluding residential property in that district for those funds, you mentioned Rosedale Park being a nice neighborhood, part of the Plymouth Road area. Tax the residents that are getting the benefit of having a walking district, you know, to be able to go to lunch and dinner. The people in the industrial building are not walking over to a restaurant. So, that’s all I have to say, thank you.

Budzinski — So I'll take on some of these comments and try to share. So again, the TIF is not a new tax on businesses, it sets the ceiling for what the taxes currently are, and then as those rise, that portion will go to the PRDA, the new boundaries that we discussed previously, that if imposed as presented, would mean businesses, there are certain parcels that are exempt from the current 2 mills that have been applied to the PRDA district, and that they would then be included in that those are separate things. I believe that Livonia is a community as a whole. If you invest in our community, that you care about our community, and that you want to do well across the board, the Plymouth Road corridor is along Plymouth Road, so Rotary was mentioned. There's no other DDA in Livonia, there are a lot of DDAs in other communities. Multiple neighborhoods in Detroit have DBAs, Lake Orion, Southfield, Wyandotte, Northville, Plymouth, just to name a few. You can Google them. When you talk about, what do you need money for with those entities? And what is, again, business development right now, you do have people who are paying a special assessment on their businesses. Do you know which businesses those are? Not necessarily, because we don't have a website that tells you about what those businesses are, and I talked to businesses along the corridor. We had a committee meeting not too long ago where I had us send invitations to as many of those business owners as possible. There are lots in the PRDA district, so we could not send letters to all of them, because we don't have that kind of postage budget. But those owners would like to see a higher profile, more connectivity within the city, because that is how development authorities are generally handled. The purpose of that is to elevate your city's value across the board, for your Commercial Investments, for your private property owners. A lot of talk is being given to Sheldon Park, Noble or the fire station, well it's a former fire station. Currently, it's just, it's a building used for our Housing Commission. The purpose of expanding it is not unusual. A lot of DDAs operate parks. They operate buildings that are used for public gathering spaces for pop up events or sublet to smaller businesses to help them springboard into more permanent establishments. This is common practice. It is not unusual. So, and then, of course, that also includes the beautification of the streetscapes. So again, the TIF portion is not a new tax. The boundary setting for a select parcel is that would be a change, but for a vast majority of those are already the PRDA, they've been paying that additional two mill for over a decade. So, I think that that hopefully addresses some of the comments.

Ptashnik Council, anything else? All right, we have an approving, a denying and a motion to go to committee already out there, so if there are no more comments, we'll close this public hearing.

As there were no further questions or comments, the Public Hearing was declared closed at 8:03 p.m.