

City of Hamtramck

Receivership Transition Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, January 24th, 2017

Hamtramck City Hall

Council Chambers - 2nd floor

3401 Evaline

Hamtramck, Michigan 48212

RTAB MEMBERS PRESENT:

**DEBORAH ROBERTS
KAREN YOUNG
AL BOGDAN
PETER MCINERNEY
MARK STEMA**

ALSO PRESENT:

**DREW VAN de GRIFT
Michigan Department of Treasury**

Reported by:

Nina Lunsford (CER 4539)
Modern Court Reporting & Video, LLC
SCAO FIRM NO. 08228
101-A North Lewis Street
Saline, Michigan 48176
(734) 429-9143/nel

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Called to order at 1:00 p.m.

Tuesday, January 24, 2017

*** * * * ***

MS. ROBERTS: It is 1:00 on Tuesday January 24th, and I will call the City of Hamtramck Receivership Transition Advisory Board to order.

Mr. Van de Grift, would you please do roll call?

MR. VAN de GRIFT: Happily.

Albert Bogdan. Absent.

Peter McInerney.

MR. McINERNEY: Here.

MR. VAN de GRIFT: Deborah Roberts.

MS. ROBERTS: Here.

MR. VAN de GRIFT: Mark Stema.

MR. STEMA: Here.

MR. VAN de GRIFT: Karen Young.

MS. YOUNG: Present.

MR. VAN de GRIFT: Quorum's present.

MS. ROBERTS: Thank you.

As a reminder to the public, if anybody would like to speak, please sign up at the podium.

First on the agenda, is approval of the agenda. I would entertain a motion to approve the agenda as presented.

(Mr. Bogdan present at 1:01)

1 MR. McINERNEY: Move to approve.
2 MS. YOUNG: Second.
3 MS. ROBERTS: Any discussion?
4 (No response)
5 MS. ROBERTS: Seeing none, all those in favor
6 say aye. Aye.
7 MR. BOGDAN: Aye.
8 MR. STEMA: Aye.
9 MS. YOUNG: Aye.
10 MR. McINERNEY: Aye.
11 MS. ROBERTS: Opposed the same.
12 (No response)
13 MS. ROBERTS: Motion carries.
14 Next on the agenda is approval of the RTAB
15 minutes from the December 20th, 2016 regular meeting. I
16 would entertain a motion to approve the meeting minutes as
17 presented.
18 MS. YOUNG: Motion to approve.
19 MR. STEMA: Seconded.
20 MS. ROBERTS: Any discussion?
21 (No response)
22 MS. ROBERTS: Seeing none, all those in favor
23 say aye. Aye.
24 MR. BOGDAN: Aye.
25 MR. STEMA: Aye.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MS. YOUNG: Aye.

MR. McINERNEY: Aye.

MS. ROBERTS: Opposed the same.

(No response)

MS. ROBERTS: Motion carries.

Next on the agenda is public comment. Mr. Van de Grift, has anyone signed up for public comment?

MR. VAN de GRIFT: Mr. Bob Zwolak.

MR. ZWOLAK: Good afternoon.

THE BOARD: Good afternoon.

MR. ZWOLAK: Again, I'd like to repeat my encouragement from the last meeting, and that was that if we could -- if you can address the priority of the city manager's contract.

Again, I'm encouraging you to renew it, if she so desires. And, or, start the process of finding another city manager. But I again, I don't know what her position is, but I think it's a priority, considering, as I mentioned, we have some significant political landscaping changing in Hamtramck.

And, I do foresee a tsunami of change, as early as our primary, this year. So I do encourage you to keep that in mind, that -- let's maintain that continuity and consistency that's already been established here. Thank you.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MS. ROBERTS: Thank you.

MR. VAN de GRIFT: That's it.

MS. ROBERTS: Thank you.

We have nothing under old business, so we'll move on to new business. The first thing under new business is the RTAB evaluation. Mr. Van de Grift, would you please provide a summary of this item for the board?

MR. VAN de GRIFT: Sure. Good afternoon.

Drew Van de Grift, I work for the Michigan Department of Treasury.

Before you as Attachment 2, is the Receivership Transition Advisory Board evaluation, which was commissioned by this board in months past, and which was originally requested by Governor Snyder in his appointment letter.

The evaluation summarizes the financial recovery of the city during the last two years; it also notes areas for improvement. The recommendation of this evaluation is that the RTAB oversight be reduced, until such time as the governor determines that the city is no longer in receivership.

Such a reduction in oversight may be accomplished by an amendment to the final order. Much of the oversight function of this board is determined by Cathy Square's emergency manager Order 20, and so, you know, in

1 successive months, we may provide a model amendment to
2 that for your review. And we can see what the appetite of
3 the board is, to reduce that oversight.

4 I'd be happy to answer any questions that anyone
5 has.

6 MR. STEMA: I do.

7 When is that determined, lessening the
8 oversight?

9 MR. VAN de GRIFT: Well, so you would be making
10 a recommendation to the state treasurer, for an amendment
11 to the order. So there's a couple of responsibilities
12 that they have, from a variety of sources. State law
13 provides for kind of a skeletal framework, in Section 23,
14 of PA 436.

15 We're unable to amend state law, so those
16 permissive responsibilities that the board can always
17 exercise, the lion's share of those of your duties and
18 responsibilities come from an emergency manager order. So,
19 if the board were to accept the recommendation in the
20 evaluation, it would make sense to amend that order to
21 reduce that oversight.

22 We've done this before, in the cities of Pontiac
23 and Allen Park, so we had a robust final order --

24 MR. McINERNEY: You said Allen Park?

25 MR. VAN de GRIFT: That's right. And so they

1 had a robust final order. When the fiscal progress of the
2 respective city justified a reduction in the oversight,
3 the board voted to make a recommendation to the state
4 treasurer to amend the order. And then the state
5 treasurer approved that recommendation, and the order was
6 significantly modified. So that things like resolutions
7 only needed to come to the board in certain narrow
8 circumstances.

9 Then, in those cities -- and again, this is
10 merely an example -- but in those cities, then, the
11 regular schedule of meetings was cancelled, and special
12 meetings were conducted, whenever those few topics came
13 up, that would necessitate RTAB oversight. And then
14 presumably at some point, the governor will, on his own
15 initiative, determine that receivership has ended in the
16 city. And that will be the conclusion of your board.

17 MS. ROBERTS: Any other questions for Mr. Van de
18 Grift?

19 (No response)

20 MR. VAN de GRIFT: Thank you.

21 MS. ROBERTS: I would entertain a motion to
22 approve, deny, or postpone the RTAB annual evaluation.

23 MS. YOUNG: Motion to approve.

24 MR. STEMA: Second it.

25 MS. ROBERTS: Any discussion?

1 MR. STEMA: I just, like -- I mean, I think -- I
2 read the report, and a lot of it seems, you know pretty
3 accurate. Like, there's some good stuff going on. But
4 there's stuff that I -- especially me, as a resident, I
5 get to see it, some of the negatives. And I know that a
6 push in the state, and stuff like that, to kind of, RTAB's
7 to slowly go away and things like that.

8 I know here, I still have concerns, and one of
9 them is, I'm in agreement with Bob, former councilman Bob
10 Zwolak, because what -- right now, we're comfortable with
11 the way the city's going because Katrina's here. I mean,
12 it's almost February; her contract's up at the end of
13 June.

14 What's their plan?

15 I mean, without knowing their plan, and stuff
16 like that, I don't know if I feel comfortable stepping
17 back yet, because, are they just going to let it run out
18 and promote somebody without negotiate -- you know, I have
19 concerns about that.

20 MS. ROBERTS: And that's where we can amend the
21 order, and so we can require that there are certain things
22 that are brought before this board. Or we can prohibit
23 other things from happening. So that's where we'll need
24 to look at the EM's order, and figure out which things
25 need to be amended, and at what levels.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. STEMA: Okay.

MR. BOGDAN: I guess my concern is that, during the time that I've been here for the last year, most of these issues have not come up as a board issue. Like the downtown, the audits, I would think we would have asked, at least I would have asked -- to find out why it's happening. What's happening with the procedure, and have somebody come in and make a report.

And a lot of these issues that are here, I would think we should have that coming before the board as a timeline. You know, this such and such was supposed to be done and it hasn't been done. Can we communicate directly with the council to -- why this has been happening.

MS. ROBERTS: The audits, I'm not sure if it was before you were appointed, or if there was a meeting you were missing, but we did have an audit report and an explanation of what happened.

We did not go along with council on their original auditor, so the city had to go back and look at the next bid, and then go through a contract period, so there was the timing issue there. It was a lag in the contract.

So that one was brought before us the first time. The newest audit, I'm guessing, we'll hear next month. On that one. But it is, has been filed with the

1 state, it is on the state's website. Because I went out
2 and peeked at it.

3 Any further discussion?

4 MR. McINERNEY: I'm in support of the motion.

5 MS. ROBERTS: Okay. So the motion before us is
6 to approve the RTAB annual evaluation.

7 All those in favor say aye. Aye.

8 MR. BOGDAN: Aye.

9 MR. STEMA: Aye.

10 MS. YOUNG: Aye.

11 MR. McINERNEY: Aye.

12 MS. ROBERTS: Opposed the same.

13 (No response)

14 MS. ROBERTS: Motion carries. Next on the
15 agenda, is approval of resolutions and ordinances. First
16 is the resolutions from the regular city council meeting
17 of December 13th, 2016. I would entertain a motion to
18 approve all ordinances and resolutions from the December
19 13th, 2016 regular city council meeting.

20 MR. McINERNEY: So moved, to approve.

21 MS. YOUNG: Second.

22 MS. ROBERTS: Any discussion?

23 (No response)

24 MS. ROBERTS: Seeing none, all those in favor
25 say aye. Aye.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. BOGDAN: Aye.

MR. STEMA: Aye.

MS. YOUNG: Aye.

MR. McINERNEY: Aye.

MS. ROBERTS: Opposed the same.

(No response)

MS. ROBERTS: Motion carries.

Next on the agenda is resolutions from the organizational city council meeting of January 3rd, 2017. I would entertain a motion to approve all ordinances and resolutions from the January 3rd, 2017, organizational city council meeting.

MS. YOUNG: Motion to approve.

MS. ROBERTS: And second?

MR. McINERNEY: Support.

MS. ROBERTS: Any discussion?

(No response)

MS. ROBERTS: Seeing none, all those in favor say aye. Aye.

MR. BOGDAN: Aye.

MR. STEMA: Aye.

MS. YOUNG: Aye.

MR. McINERNEY: Aye.

MS. ROBERTS: Opposed the same.

(No response)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MS. ROBERTS: Motion carries.

Next on the agenda is claims and accounts from the regular city council meeting draft minutes of January 10th, 2017. I would entertain a motion to approve, deny or postpone the claims and accounts from the regular city council meeting of January 10th, 2017.

MR. McINERNEY: Move to approve.

MR. BOGDAN: Second.

MS. ROBERTS: Any discussion?

MR. STEMA: I just have a quick question for Ms. Powell. The zoning thing, where people got approved, and didn't -- what was that about? Just curious. For the rezoning board. Were the original people not qualified, or -- ?

MS. POWELL: So our city planner collected resumes and applications from people that were interested in serving on the zoning board of appeals. She made a recommendation to city council for two people to be appointed to the board.

We had two available spots, and she actually presented three applications to the board, with the recommendation for two to be appointed.

The city council chose to select a member who was an alternate on the board already, who had not attended a meeting -- or had only attended one meeting in

1 three years.

2 MR. STEMA: Okay.

3 MS. POWELL: On the board. And so, there was
4 discussion amongst the council members, about this
5 individual being appointed to the regular board,
6 considering he had never shown up as an alternate, to any
7 of the meetings. And the alternates are required to show
8 up to the meetings, in the event that there's a member
9 that doesn't show up, they actually get to step in and
10 vote.

11 So on this, this individual had not attended but
12 one meeting in three years. So he was not recommended by
13 our city planner or by anyone, actually, to be appointed
14 to the permanent -- to the spot. The city council chose
15 to place this person in a regular position on the board,
16 and selected the -- one of the people that the city
17 planner had recommended, and chose the other person who
18 had submitted an application, that the city planner did
19 not recommend.

20 So essentially, there were two people placed on
21 the board that were not recommended to serve on the board,
22 based on various things. The two people that were
23 recommended, the one that was not appointed and actually
24 has a Master's Degree in Urban Planning, which was one of
25 the reasons why the planner recommended that they be

1 appointed to the board.

2 So, but the city council voted, and the majority
3 voted to place these other two people on the board. So
4 that's kind of what happened.

5 MR. STEMA: Just a question about the zoning,
6 how it works. So if the person that doesn't show up to
7 the meetings, if he's not showing up to the regularly
8 scheduled meetings, does he get removed then?

9 MS. POWELL: Yes.

10 MR. STEMA: Is that a requirement, of something
11 you have to attend meetings?

12 MS. POWELL: Yes. And our city planner now is
13 keeping a spreadsheet of attendance, so that in the event
14 people are not showing up for these meetings, then they
15 will be promptly removed.

16 MR. McINERNEY: Say that again, Mark?

17 MR. STEMA: Oh, I was just wondering, because,
18 if they decided to -- and maybe I got it wrong. You said
19 that they decided to appoint somebody that wasn't showing
20 up to meetings, for three years he showed up to one
21 meeting.

22 So now, you put him on the board. If he's not
23 showing up, I was just wondering if there's procedures to
24 remove him, then. Because I would think you would want
25 people showing up, if you were going to be on the board.

1 MS. ROBERTS: Is it the same rules for the
2 alternate member?

3 MS. POWELL: Yes.

4 MS. ROBERTS: So the alternate member should
5 have been removed.

6 MS. POWELL: Correct.

7 MS. ROBERTS: But they didn't go through with
8 the procedure?

9 MS. POWELL: We didn't have a city planner on
10 staff at the time, and no one really paying that much
11 attention to the attendance records. But now, our city
12 planner actually sent me a spreadsheet on Monday. She's
13 tracking attendance; not just for the zoning board of
14 appeals, but for the planning commission, as well. So
15 there is certainly a change that's happening on our
16 boards.

17 MR. BOGDAN: Was there a reason the council gave
18 for doing that, or the members? For not accepting the
19 recommendations?

20 MS. POWELL: There was discussion, and one of
21 the council members made the comment that he didn't need
22 to take the recommendation from the city planner because
23 he didn't know about her qualifications and he didn't need
24 to listen to her, so. That was kind of the discussion.

25 And this individual called several of the

1 council members about being appointed to this position,
2 and other than that, I don't know anything more, as far as
3 why they were selected.

4 MR. McINERNEY: I just want to go back to Mark's
5 point about the -- there may be procedures here, removal
6 of board members based on non-attendance, but I don't know
7 the local procedure. I don't -- state law would allow for
8 removal for cause, but I don't know if by for mere
9 attendance, that there -- anything would be automatic.

10 MS. POWELL: I want to say that there's
11 something in the ordinance. I could be mistaken, but
12 typically, there is something written in the ordinances
13 that are regulating those boards that would say if you
14 don't attend a number of meetings --

15 MR. McINERNEY: My understanding is that the
16 procedures would be the same for the alternates.

17 MS. POWELL: Right.

18 MR. STEMA: Okay, no, I get it. I'm just, just
19 seems odd that, appointing that never showed up to a
20 meeting for three years.

21 MR. McINERNEY: Promoting them to --

22 MR. STEMA: Yeah.

23 MS. ROBERTS: Yeah.

24 MR. STEMA: And that's fine, if they think it's
25 great, but it's very weird -- that's fine. But if he

1 doesn't show up again, I would -- I'd hope there'd be some
2 type of procedure to say, okay, we took your
3 recommendation, he's not showing up. We need to get
4 somebody that's actually going to show up.

5 MR. McINERNEY: I don't know, but I'd be
6 cautious about that.

7 MR. STEMA: Yeah. I'm just curious about what
8 the city ordinance is, and what the policies are. Because
9 it stood out, when I was reading the minutes for this
10 meeting.

11 MS. ROBERTS: The motion -- I did have a motion.
12 The motion before us is to approve the claims and accounts
13 from the regular city council meeting of January 10th.
14 All those in favor say aye. Aye.

15 MR. BOGDAN: Aye.

16 MR. STEMA: Aye.

17 MS. YOUNG: Aye.

18 MR. McINERNEY: Aye.

19 MS. ROBERTS: Opposed the same.

20 (No response)

21 MS. ROBERTS: Motion carries.

22 Next on the agenda is the city administrator
23 items. We have already taken care of the city council
24 meetings.

25 The next item would be approval of the budget to

1 actual and cash flow reports. I would entertain a motion
2 to approve, deny, or postpone the budget to actual and
3 cash flow reports.

4 MR. McINERNEY: I'll move to approve.

5 MR. BOGDAN: Second.

6 MS. ROBERTS: Any discussion?

7 (No response)

8 MS. ROBERTS: Seeing none --

9 MR. STEMA: I'd actually, just one quick
10 question of the revenue?

11 For the fines and the, for the district court.
12 It's budgeted for 1.5; we're at \$511,000, which is 34
13 percent. We're halfway through the year. I'm just
14 curious on that. If they don't come close to that, is
15 that going to cause a lot of issues with deficit for them,
16 or any -- just wondering?

17 MS. CAIRNS: It's definitely not as much as we
18 collected last year.

19 MR. STEMA: Okay. What is that going to do for
20 budget reasons and all that? Because if we just guess,
21 and say, we're going to double it, we're going to have
22 \$400,000 left --

23 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, we may have to balance it
24 with the fund balance we have.

25 MR. STEMA: Okay.

1 MS. CAIRNS: If we don't have the revenues.

2 MS. ROBERTS: Okay.

3 The motion before us is to approve the budget to
4 actual and cash flow reports; all those in favor say aye.
5 Aye.

6 MR. BOGDAN: Aye.

7 MR. STEMA: Aye.

8 MS. YOUNG: Aye.

9 MR. McINERNEY: Aye.

10 MS. ROBERTS: Opposed the same.

11 (No response)

12 MS. ROBERTS: Motion carries.

13 Next on the agenda is the approval of the
14 invoice register and preapproved expenditures. I would
15 entertain a motion to approve, deny, or postpone the
16 invoice register and preapproved expenditures.

17 MR. STEMA: Motion to approve.

18 MS. YOUNG: Second.

19 MS. ROBERTS: Any discussion?

20 (No response)

21 MS. ROBERTS: Seeing none, all those in favor
22 say aye. Aye.

23 MR. BOGDAN: Aye.

24 MR. STEMA: Aye.

25 MS. YOUNG: Aye.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. McINERNEY: Aye.

MS. ROBERTS: Opposed the same.

(No response)

MS. ROBERTS: Motion carries.

The approval of Resolution 2016-15 was taken care of in new business; next on the agenda is approval of Resolution 2017-14, towing contract extension with Boulevard and Trumbull Towing.

While action on this item occurred during a council meeting outside the normal review period for today's board meeting, the city manager has requested that we bring this item forward for early review.

Ms. Powell, would you please summarize the item for the board?

MS. POWELL: Yes, ma'am. This is a contract that was negotiated by the emergency manager. And within this contract, there is an option for us to extend the contract by one year, up to three years. And so this contract actually expired at the beginning of January, and so I'm requesting this be approved, so that we can extend it for just one year. And it would be addressed again at the end of this year.

MS. ROBERTS: Okay.

I would entertain a motion to approve, deny, or postpone Resolution 2017-14, towing contract extension.

1 MR. STEMA: Motion to approve.

2 MR. McINERNEY: Support.

3 MS. ROBERTS: Any further discussion?

4 MR. McINERNEY: And so, has council approved
5 this, or seen this?

6 MS. POWELL: Yes, sir.

7 MR. McINERNEY: And approved it?

8 MS. POWELL: At the last meeting.

9 MR. McINERNEY: Thank you.

10 MS. YOUNG: I have a question.
11 Is there any reason for the extension only one
12 year?

13 MS. POWELL: Well, it only allows -- you can
14 only extend it for up to one year, but you can extend it
15 for three years.

16 MS. YOUNG: Okay. One year per, okay.

17 MS. POWELL: One year, yes, in one year
18 increments.

19 MS. YOUNG: Okay.

20 MR. STEMA: Was there any talk about putting it
21 back out to bid, or looking at others?

22 MS. POWELL: No. There was, I mean, we've not
23 had any issues with them at all. They are Johnny on the
24 spot, they are great to work with, and we just didn't see
25 the purpose of putting that out to bid. Because we have a

1 good rate, we've got good service, and you know, typically
2 if you're not having any issues, you're not just going to
3 put that back out to bid.

4 MR. STEMA: Okay.

5 MS. ROBERTS: Okay, the motion before us is to
6 approve Resolution 2017-14. All those in favor say aye.
7 Aye.

8 MR. BOGDAN: Aye.

9 MR. STEMA: Aye.

10 MS. YOUNG: Aye.

11 MR. McINERNEY: Aye.

12 MS. ROBERTS: Opposed the same.

13 (No response)

14 MS. ROBERTS: Motion carries.

15 Next on the agenda is approval to hire one full
16 time police officer and one part time dispatcher, for the
17 police department.

18 Ms. Powell, would you please provide a summary
19 of this item for the board?

20 MS. POWELL: Yes, ma'am.

21 As you all are aware, we have a revolving door
22 going on right now, with people recruiting our employees
23 out of the police department. So we are backfilling a
24 part time dispatcher that left, as well as a full time
25 police officer. We had a vacancy, and so we're trying to

1 fill it. Both of these people have had successful
2 background checks and drug testing.

3 MS. ROBERTS: Okay.

4 I would entertain a motion to approve, deny, or
5 postpone hiring one full time police officer and one part
6 time dispatcher, for the police department.

7 MR. STEMA: Motion to approve.

8 MR. BOGDAN: Second.

9 MS. ROBERTS: Any discussion?

10 (No response)

11 MS. ROBERTS: Seeing none, all those in favor
12 say aye. Aye.

13 MR. BOGDAN: Aye.

14 MR. STEMA: Aye.

15 MS. YOUNG: Aye.

16 MR. McINERNEY: Aye.

17 MS. ROBERTS: Opposed the same.

18 (No response)

19 MS. ROBERTS: Motion carries.

20 Next on the agenda is the approval of the city-
21 wide overtime report.

22 Ms. Powell, would you please provide a summary
23 of this?

24 MS. POWELL: Yes, ma'am. I'm not real sure how
25 this happened, but our overtime was down \$26,000 this

1 month. So it was up in November, and I expected it to
2 really be up in December, given the holidays. But
3 ironically, it's down by \$26,470. So hopefully, it will
4 remain low; I'm --

5 MR. McINERNEY: Ironically, or sound management?

6 MS. POWELL: Let's go with the sound management.

7 You know, given that we've had issues filling
8 spots in our police departments and stuff like that, it's
9 actually, I was pleasantly surprised. But you know, I
10 don't want to be too optimistic, given that we still have
11 a huge recruiting issue going on in other counties, you
12 know, recruiting our people.

13 So you know, unfortunately, I polled the
14 benefits of some of these communities, and have polled our
15 officers, and prior to emergency management, the benefits
16 that people were getting don't compare to the benefits
17 that are being provided by these more affluent
18 communities, that have the money to put forth into a lot
19 of great benefits.

20 I actually looked at one of them and said wow,
21 maybe I should become a police officer, just so that I can
22 get these benefits. Unfortunately, we're in the situation
23 that we're in, and while on paper we look really good,
24 right now we're still dealing with some OPEB outstanding
25 lawsuits, related to our retirement benefits. And until

1 that's resolved, and you know, we're still kind of at a
2 standstill.

3 But, we definitely have got to look at giving up
4 something. You know, we've either got to provide family
5 coverage, give raises, do something, and not just to our
6 police department, but to the entire city.

7 These are people that have been here through the
8 long haul, have been through the good, bad and the ugly,
9 and sometimes, you know, you've got to bite the bullet and
10 give them something to keep them here. You know, we've
11 got good people that work here. And people who are
12 dedicated, and come in every day and put forth 150
13 percent.

14 So, it's certainly something that we've got to
15 look forward, you know, into trying to figure out what the
16 best way is to compensate people, but still keep the city
17 in a great financial position. So I'm optimistic, but I'm
18 also a realist, and I know that these numbers may appear
19 low right now, but they may not continue into next month.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. STEMA: I have a, one quick question, just
22 based on the numbers and all that, with the police
23 department, the regular OT. Are you going to be -- I
24 would think you would at least need to, at least soon,
25 making a budget adjustment? I'm going to guess you guys

1 will probably be 100, \$120,000 over the budgeted amount,
2 so that's going to have to come from somewhere.

3 MS. POWELL: Bite your tongue.

4 MR. STEMA: All I've got is the numbers to work
5 on.

6 MS. POWELL: We certainly will be doing a budget
7 amendment, obviously. I mean we're already, we've already
8 exceeded the overtime budget in the police department, by
9 about \$12,000 already, so, yeah, we'll definitely be doing
10 a budget amendment.

11 I'm a little nervous about doing it yet, because
12 I know that we've got some things coming down the pike,
13 you know, the police study has come down. We're waiting
14 on a final report to be submitted, and so there's going to
15 be a lot of changes that need to happen.

16 So I'm a little hesitant to really do something
17 major with this right now, until I see exactly how much
18 it's going to cost for us to implement what's being
19 suggested in that report. So it could be that we save
20 money, it could be that we've got to spend money to save
21 money. I won't know until we really delve into it, and
22 have the final product to work with.

23 MS. ROBERTS: I would entertain a motion to
24 approve, deny, or postpone the citywide overtime report.

25 MR. BOGDAN: So moved.

1 MS. YOUNG: Second.

2 MS. ROBERTS: Any further discussion?

3 (No response)

4 MS. ROBERTS: Seeing none, all those in favor
5 say aye. Aye.

6 MR. BOGDAN: Aye.

7 MR. STEMA: Aye.

8 MS. YOUNG: Aye.

9 MR. McINERNEY: Aye.

10 MS. ROBERTS: Opposed the same.

11 (No response)

12 MS. ROBERTS: Motion carries.

13 We do have the district court revenues as a
14 informational item. Next on the agenda is board comment.
15 Would anyone like to speak?
16 (No response)

17 MS. ROBERTS: Seeing none, the last item on the
18 agenda is adjournment. I would entertain a motion to
19 adjourn.

20 MR. McINERNEY: So moved.

21 MS. YOUNG: Second.

22 MS. ROBERTS: All those in favor say aye. Aye.

23 MR. BOGDAN: Aye.

24 MR. STEMA: Aye.

25 MS. YOUNG: Aye.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. McINERNEY: Aye.

MS. ROBERTS: Opposed the same.

(No response)

MS. ROBERTS: Meeting adjourned. Thank you,
everyone.

(Proceedings adjourned at 1:27 p.m.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COUNTY OF WASHTENAW) .ss

I certify that this transcript is a complete, true, and correct transcript to the best of my ability of the RTAB meeting held on January 24th, 2017, City of Hamtramck. I also certify that I am not a relative or employee of the parties involved and have no financial interest in this case.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED: January 30, 2017

s/ *Amy Shankleton-Novess*

Amy Shankleton-Novess (CER 0838)
Certified Electronic Reporter