



SPECIAL STUDY SESSION MEETING AGENDA

1. ROLL CALL

Roll Call

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

4. DISCUSSION - ROAD MILLAGE RENEWAL

A. Discussion - Road Millage Renewal

5. DISCUSSION - NON-MOTORIZED (BIKE) COMMITTEE AND STUDY

A. Non-Motorized (Bike) Committee and Study

6. DISCUSSION - CDBG

A. Oakland County Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Renewal

7. COUNCIL CHAMBER RENOVATIONS

1. Council Chamber Renovations

8. DISCUSSION - PARKING AUTHORITY

1. Parking Authority

9. DISCUSSION - COMPOSITION OF PLANNING COMMISSION

1. Composition of Planning Commission

10. DISCUSSION - CITY MANAGER EVALUATION PROCESS

1. City Manager Evaluation Process

11. SPECIAL MEETING FOR JUNE 30, 2014

1. Consideration to Schedule Special Meeting for June 30, 2014

12.REVIEW JUNE 16, 2014 CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

1. City Council Agenda - June 16, 2014

13.COUNCIL COMMENT

14.CLOSED SESSION - LABOR NEGOTIATIONS

15.ADJOURNMENT

**Farmington City Council
Staff Report**
Council Meeting Date:
June 2, 2014

**Reference
Number
(ID # 1589)**
Submitted by: Vincent Pastue, City Manager

Description: Discussion - Road Millage Renewal

Requested Action:
Background:

The current road millage was approved by Farmington voters in 1994. This millage is set to expire with the July 2014 tax bill. The maximum authorized millage was 1.6 mills which reduced over the years to 1.5438 due to Headlee Rollback calculations. Headlee is somewhat complicated formula that essentially reduces the maximum authorized millage when taxable values of existing properties in aggregate grow at a faster rate than inflation. It is a one way street; the maximum authorized millage rates get reduced but never increased. The City has levied one mill for the past several years to maintain an overall millage rate of fifteen mills for operating purposes and roads.

City Administration is recommending that the City Council approve the attached ballot proposal for 1.6 mills for a ten year period. The recommendation is to place this on the November 2014 General Election ballot. The previous millage was for 20 years. City Administration anticipates that the maximum authorized millage will be rolled back as property values begin to increase. Consequently, a future council can determine in ten years whether to reduce the millage, seek a renewal, or seek an increase based on road improvement needs and requisite financial resources.

As redevelopment of Farmington proceeds, I would recommend that future council's allocate the tax base increase toward infrastructure: Capital Improvements Fund, Municipal Street Fund, and tax increment districts. While the City has levied one mill for roads the past several years, I can anticipate a point where the operating millage can be reduced while simultaneously maintaining services but the difference is earmarked for capital improvements and roads, thus the recommendation to renew at 1.6 mills.

Agenda Review
Review:

Vincent Pastue **Pending**
City Manager **Pending**
City Council **Pending**

Ballot Question Re: Road Millage Renewal and Increase

Shall the expired previously-voted increase in the tax limitations imposed under Article IX, Section 6 of the Michigan Constitution in the City of Farmington of 1.6 mills (\$1.60 per \$1,000 of taxable value), which was reduced to 1.5438 mills (\$1.5438 per \$1,000 of taxable value) by the required millage rollbacks, be renewed at and increased up to the original voted 1.6 mills (\$1.60 per \$1,000 of taxable value) and levied for 10 years, 2015 through 2024 inclusive, for the improvement, rehabilitation, repair, and maintenance of public roads within the City of Farmington, raising an estimated \$480,000 when first levied in 2015?

Yes

No

**Farmington City Council
Staff Report**
Council Meeting Date:
June 2, 2014

**Reference
Number
(ID # 1590)**
Submitted by: Vincent Pastue, City Manager

Description: Non-Motorized (Bike) Committee and Study

Requested Action:
Background:

One of the goals adopted by the City Council earlier this year was to establish a bike path committee. As City Administration gave this more thought, it was felt that this project needs to be comprehensive to not only include bike paths, but other modes of transportation involving pedestrians and motorists; think complete streets and sidewalks. The goal would be to link our sidewalk network, proposed bicycle paths, and streets in a manner that leads pedestrians and motorists to a commercial or public space node in a safe and efficient manner; the social integration of the plan is paramount to its success.

A comprehensive plan such as this involves the following disciplines: traffic engineering and planning, land use planning, recreation planning, civil engineering, and grants consulting to possibly defray capital costs. The scale of this project is beyond our staff resources in time and expertise. Furthermore, this project would link to the traffic calming study currently underway along Grand River along with PASER street evaluation program.

At this study session, I would like to discuss the following:

1. Whether to secure an outside consultant to facilitate a Council appointed committee that would develop a complete streets plan that would include sidewalks and bicycle paths in conjunction with future road improvements;
2. If the decision is made to secure a consultant, do we solicit qualifications and proposals, or request Orchard Hiltz & McCliment (OHM) to submit a proposal for the project. City Administration recommends OHM since they are capable of performing the work and are familiar with Farmington's infrastructure.
3. As we continue forward, discuss the manner in which we would appoint members to serve on this ad hoc committee.

Agenda Review
Review:

Vincent Pastue Pending
City Manager Pending
City Council Pending

**Farmington City Council
Staff Report**
Council Meeting Date:
June 2, 2014

**Reference
Number
(ID # 1591)**
Submitted by: Vincent Pastue, City Manager

Description: Oakland County Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Renewal

Requested Action:
Background:

City Administration recently received correspondence from the Oakland County CDBG program that the City of Farmington needs to consider whether to continue its participation in the program for another three-year period. The City receives approximately \$24,000 each year under the County program which we allocate to senior service programs administered by the City of Farmington Hills. This defrays our General Fund contribution to the senior programs. Our participation in the Oakland County program also allows eligible City residents to participate in the County's housing rehab and assistance programs. Oakland County didn't provide the City much opportunity to ponder this decision; we need to reply before June 20.

Three years ago City Council and Administration had a good discussion whether to continue participating in the County program or to opt-out in the hope that the City would find an eligible project that the Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC) supports under its CDBG program. At that time, an eligible CDBG project could provide up to \$250,000 toward an economic development project that increases jobs for low-moderate income individuals. Three years ago, I recommended that we stay with the County program because we didn't have a good identifiable project nor any prospects and furthermore, the entire CDBG program was in question at the federal level.

When I received the Oakland County correspondence, I was ready to recommend that we opt-out of the next three-year commitment with Oakland County. Given the current redevelopment interest, I felt the prospects of finding a CDBG eligible project would be good and thus from a cost-benefit analysis would justify opting-out. However, Annette Knowles contacted our MEDC representative, and she recommended that we stay with Oakland County. Her feeling is that the restructured MEDC grant programs are similar to the CDBG program, with some minor differences, that the City would be better to continue with the Oakland County program and possibly pursue economic development grants under their CRP programs. We could continue with defraying our senior program contributions and yet be eligible for MEDC funding for an eligible economic development project.

As a result, I am recommending that the City Council approve a resolution at the June 16 meeting to continue with the Oakland County CDBG program for another three years.

Agenda Review
Review:

Vincent Pastue **Pending**
City Manager **Pending**
City Council **Pending**

**Farmington City Council
Staff Report**
Council Meeting Date:
June 2, 2014

**Reference
Number
(ID # 1592)**
Submitted by: Vincent Pastue, City Manager

Description: Council Chamber Renovations

Requested Action:
Background:

The City Clerk and City Treasurer have coordinated the process to renovate the Council Chambers. There are two elements to the project: audio/visual improvements and physical improvements such as lighting, carpeting, wall treatments, and appearance of the dais. The City will select separate vendors for the audio/visual and physical improvements elements.

Two proposals have been received for physical improvements which are very close in price. Two proposals have been received for the audio/visual. We are awaiting a third proposal for the audio/visual work which will be presented Friday, May 30. The audio/visual work involves cameras to video Council meetings and improvements to the sound system.

At the study session on June 2, we will be summarizing the proposals received and recommending approval for the physical work and the audio/visual work separately. The goal is to start the work July 1 while there is little activity in the Council Chambers during the summer.

Keep in mind that the primary source of funding for these improvements is PEG (Public Education Government access) fees collected from our cable franchise fees.

Agenda Review
Review:

Vincent Pastue Pending
City Manager Pending
City Council Pending

**Farmington City Council
Staff Report**
Council Meeting Date:
June 2, 2014

**Reference
Number
(ID # 1593)**
Submitted by: Vincent Pastue, City Manager

Description: Parking Authority

Requested Action:
Background:

This is a continuation of the discussion from the April 7 study session. Attached is correspondence from Beth Saarela from Johnson, Rosati, Schultz and Joppich following up on the items discussed at the study session. It appears that Birmingham, Ann Arbor, and Grand Rapids have adopted ordinances pertaining to parking but nothing that is established by ordinance. Most cities have an advisory committee assist either the City Manager or the City Council in managing their parking systems.

Agenda Review
Review:

Vincent Pastue Pending
City Manager Pending
City Council Pending



JOHNSON ROSATI SCHULTZ JOPPICH PC

27555 Executive Drive Suite 250 ~ Farmington Hills, Michigan 48331
Phone: 248.489.4100 | Fax: 248.489.1726

www.jrsjlaw.com

MEMORANDUM

*Privileged and Confidential
Correspondence from City Attorney*

TO: Vince Pastue
FROM: Elizabeth K. Saarela
DATE: April 3, 2014
RE: Parking Authority/Commission Concept

At City Council's direction, we are enclosing the following additional information requested at the April 7, 2014 City Council Study Session regarding the creation of a parking authority to manage City parking operations:

- State of New Jersey Statutes for the creation of parking authorities.
- City of Birmingham Ordinances relating to operation and management of parking facilities.
- City of Grand Rapids Ordinances relating to operation and management of parking facilities.
- City of Ann Arbor Ordinances relating to operation and management of parking facilities.

New Jersey Statutes

Unlike Michigan, which does not have any formalized structure for the creation of parking authorities, New Jersey provides for the creation of a separate governmental entity by counties and municipalities to finance, construct, operate, and maintain parking authorities:

Parking Authorities

April 14, 2014

Page 2

The governing body of any county or municipality may, by resolution or ordinance, as appropriate, create a public body corporate and politic and a political subdivision of the State to be known as the "Parking Authority of the,," inserting all or any significant part of the name of the municipality or county creating such authority. The creating resolution or ordinance, as the case may be, may provide that no real property shall be acquired by the power of eminent domain without the consent of the governing body. Such authority shall constitute an agency and instrumentality of the municipality or county creating it. Thereupon the governing body shall, by resolution or ordinance, as appropriate, appoint five persons as commissioners of the authority...

Although the scope of powers given to parking authorities is generally broad, and includes such powers as issuing bonds and hiring parking enforcement officers, the statutory scheme also includes some limitations and conditions which would allow local government to keep the parking authority within the control of the local government:

(2) The purposes of every parking authority shall be the construction, provision or operation of offstreet parking projects within its area of operation and, subject to the provisions of R.S. 39:4-202, shall include, *to the extent authorized by the governing body of the municipality*, the management and operation of onstreet and other parking meters and related facilities and enforcement of the applicable law, ordinances and regulations as to the parking of vehicles in such municipality, and the consequent promotion of free movement of traffic and relief of traffic congestion on the streets of said area or municipality and improvement of conditions affecting the public safety and welfare therein. {Emphasis added}

Some examples of limitations include limited authorization for the authority to condemn property only with the approval of the local governmental entity. Also, although the authority may issue bonds, the statutes also provide for the local government to issue bonds to fund the authority as an alternative.

Although some of the statutory provisions probably could not be translated into a Michigan local ordinance due to the differences from what is authorized by the Revenue Bond Act for financing, many of the provisions could serve as an example for local ordinance creating a parking authority. I have reviewed the municipal codes for both New Brunswick and Jersey City which both have parking authorities. Though there is no specific statute creating the parking authority within either community, both identify a local parking authority as authorized by statute and incorporate certain duties of the parking authority into the municipal code:

§ 12-3. Authority continued; membership. [Amended 9-13-1989 by Ord. No. McC-19; 6-14-1995 by Ord. No. 95-050]

The Parking Authority, as heretofore established pursuant to law (N.J.S.A. 40:11A-1 et seq.), is reconstituted and continued. The Jersey City Parking Authority shall consist of seven members, appointed in the manner provided by law.

Parking Authorities
April 14, 2014
Page 3

Therefore any City Ordinance prepared based on the New Jersey Parking Authority Statute would have to be modeled on the New Jersey statute itself rather than a local ordinance created pursuant to the statute.

City of Birmingham

Locally, the City of Birmingham has created an, "Advisory Parking Committee," comprised primarily of local business owners, to report to the City Commission on the "management" of Birmingham's Auto Parking System. The Advisory Parking Committee is not created or structured by ordinance. It is likely a committee created and appointed by City Council.

Based on the enclosed Birmingham ordinances, it appears that City Commission makes all determinations and ultimately controls the management of parking with advice on management being provided by the "Advisory Parking Committee."

City of Ann Arbor

In Ann Arbor, it appears that parking facilities and programs are controlled by City Council with day-to-day supervision by the City Administrator:

2:81. Supervision of system.

The automobile parking system of the city shall be under the supervision and direction of the City Administrator or designee.

Issues such as parking rates and regulation are set by City Council pursuant to the City's Automobile Parking System Ordinance, a copy of which is enclosed.

City of Grand Rapids

The City of Grand Rapids has created a Parking Commission pursuant to its Automobile Parking System Ordinance. Though the Grand Rapids Ordinance is more detailed regarding the appointments and purposes of the Parking Commission, it appears that like Birmingham, the Parking Commission is also largely an advisory committee that makes policy recommendations to City Council:

(5) Matters pertaining to City public parking that concern major overall policy considerations dealing with the categories listed below shall be referred to the Commission for study, deliberation and recommendation:

- a. The supply and location of public parking, including capital improvements to the System.
- b. Service objectives toward user groups and user fees.
- c. Zoning changes as they relate to the parking requirements within the Central Business District.
- d. Public relations issues that relate to methods of informing the public of the availability, features and benefits of public parking and public transit related to public parking.

**Farmington City Council
Staff Report**
Council Meeting Date:
June 2, 2014

**Reference
Number
(ID # 1597)**
Submitted by: Vincent Pastue, City Manager

Description: Composition of Planning Commission

Requested Action:
Background:

About three years ago, City Administration recommended the reduction in the number of planning commission members from nine to seven. Along with this was to break the tradition of having the Mayor Pro Tem serve on the Planning Commission. During my recent series of meetings with individual council members, there seemed interest in reconsidering this change. I would support going back to a nine member planning commission with a council member designee on the commission. The purpose of this agenda item is to discuss whether to formally pursue this change.

Agenda Review
Review:

Vincent Pastue Pending
City Manager Pending
City Council Pending

**Farmington City Council
Staff Report**

Council Meeting Date:
June 2, 2014

**Reference
Number
(ID # 1594)**

Submitted by: Vincent Pastue, City Manager

Description: City Manager Evaluation Process

Requested Action:

Background:

Mayor Galvin will provide the evaluation system to the City Council at the study session. He would like them completed and returned within the next week. He will use the week of June 9 to compile the evaluations which will be presented at the June 16 meeting. The City Council will receive a memo from me requesting that my evaluation be held in a closed session in accordance with the Open Meetings Act

Agenda Review

Review:

Vincent Pastue Pending
City Manager Pending
City Council Pending

**Farmington City Council
Staff Report**

Council Meeting Date:
June 2, 2014

**Reference
Number
(ID # 1595)**

Submitted by: Vincent Pastue, City Manager

Description: Consideration to Schedule Special Meeting for June 30, 2014

Requested Action:

City Administration is requesting that the City Council schedule a special meeting for Monday, June 30, 2014 to begin at 7:00 p.m.

Background:

The purpose of the special meeting would be to review and discuss the following land use items that the City Council will formally act upon in either July or August: Old Courthouse Site PUD for a memory care facility, the Flanders residential development PUD plan, Kimco PUD plan, and the lot split proposed for the Grand River-Halsted Shopping Center. Everyone recognizes that these are significant redevelopment projects and we need to provide adequate time to consider all aspects of the proposed site plans and PUD agreements. It is City Administration's desire to have this meeting before the Planning Commission's regular meeting scheduled for July 14.

Agenda Review

Review:

Vincent Pastue Pending
City Manager Pending
City Council Pending

**Farmington City Council
Staff Report**

Council Meeting Date:
June 2, 2014

**Reference
Number
(ID # 1596)**

Submitted by: Vincent Pastue, City Manager

Description: City Council Agenda - June 16, 2014

Requested Action:

Background:

Agenda Review

Review:

Vincent Pastue Pending
City Manager Pending
City Council Pending