APPROVED -2/10/15

## City of Ecorse

## Receivership Transition Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Ecorse City Hall

Council Chambers

Albert B. Buday Civic Center

3869 West Jefferson

Ecorse, Michigan 48229

## 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

## Called to order at 9:05 a.m.

MR. KORYZNO: Good morning, it's 9:05, and I'll call the City of Ecorse Receivership Transition Advisory Board meeting to order. Mr. Van de Grift, roll call?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Robert Bovitz?

MR. BOVITZ: Here.

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. VAN DE GRIFT: Edward Koryzno?

MR. KORYZNO: Here.

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Joyce Parker?

MS. PARKER: Here.

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: All present.

MR. KORYZNO: Next item is the approval of the agenda.

MR. BOVITZ: So moved.

MS. PARKER: Support.

MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to approve the agenda, any questions or additions? Seeing none -- oh, Mr. Bovitz? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye.

MR. BOVITZ: Aye.

MS. PARKER: Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. The motion is app -- or, the agenda's approved. Reminder that if you intend to speak at the public comment portion of the meeting, it's necessary for you to sign up and if you're not signed up, you won't be able -- you won't be recognized. Item C, approval of the RTAB minutes from the December 9th, 2014 meeting, with noted clarifications.

MS. PARKER: So moved.

22.

MR. BOVITZ: Support.

MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to approve the RTAB minutes from December 9th; any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye.

MR. BOVITZ: Aye.

MS. PARKER: Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: Aye. All opposed, same sign. The minutes of December 9th are approved.

Item two, old business. Five year budget. The Board's received documents which indicate that a five year budget is nearing completion. While this Board will reserve formal evaluation until the City Council takes action, we would like to hear from Mr. O'Neal. Could you briefly summarize your efforts to develop a balanced and realistic five year budget?

MR. O'NEAL: Yes sir. And, thank you, Mr. Koryzno, members of the board. When I was here first, I submitted a five year budget, by and through Mr. McCurley. We looked at the, did an incremental approach, to the budget. There was some rejections, I think, made by the TAB board relative some items that were within the five year budget, both that I submitted, and that Mr. Strand had submitted. What I tried to do this time is go back, have Mr. McCurley remove those items that were previously put in there by Mr. Strand, go back to the same budget I had before, except that in the 14 - 15 budget, where there was budget amendments, that were

requested to effectuate those amendments without use of fund balance, from Ms. Parker's comments at one of the TAB meetings, to take a look into the budget, and see if we can find additional revenues and decreases in expenditures. So that you wouldn't have to go to fund balance.

. 12

That was effectuated. Except for the \$70,000 for the body cameras; we didn't do that. Going forward, I took the budget home, and took a look at is as if I was an EFM. What could I do to decrease expenditures, and increase revenues? Without the thought of what, how it would impact the taxpayers, the political arena, those types of things. I didn't look at that. But I kept in mind that anything that we might do in that arena is going is going to have impacts because of the high tax rate for the residents here in Ecorse.

revenues and cuts, that, so that I could -- if we could effectuate that, how that would impact the budget. Since that was put in, we've also gone forward, which you have on your agenda today, for a contractual professional services in the HR area, and also, a modification to the controller. Now, while this is a work in progress, on the surface, we're looking at saving approximately \$100,000 a year in those two areas. Fifty in each, if it comes to fruition. If it comes to fruition.

Also, I had a meeting yesterday with Brad Coulter, from Lincoln Park, relative to fire services. I know there's been a

concern about that. We agreed there's a possibility that we might be able to do some shared fire services. And those shared fire services, I indicated to them, and I spoke for you, and I apologize if I mis-speak, but I spoke for you and I thought that this Board, as well as the Department of Treasury, would want Lincoln Park and Ecorse to effectuate the same types of savings. One shouldn't have more than the other, to me, that's just fair play if we can make that work. So we're looking somewhere between 3 and \$400,000 savings, each, if we can effectuate some services. So we're looking at that, so there's some bigger things that are going on relative to that.

9.

Now -- that being said, some of the things that I looked at in there, with reference to street lighting, and fire department, and things like that, are extremely expensive to the taxpayer. And I realize that. But if we're going to do some budgets going forward, without using fund balance, the way the budget's put together, originally, won't stand without using it. And you'll see in my exhibit I put in there, shows for 15 - 16, there may be some money returned to fund balance, but there won't be a use of fund balance.

And then in 16 - 17, it looks like you're using about \$133,000, 150,000 whatever the number is. Then you compound that going into the five years, and as you get towards the end of the five years, and the bonds have to be repaid, you're looking at some big bites of \$300,000 the first year, and the second year, another

addition of 200, which is 500. Then you're looking at sunsetting the police and fire millage; that's an issue.

11 .

So we've identified those things, and we're going to try to attack those things, with the five year budget. Now, a comment, Mr. Koryzno, that you made about having the city council first make the decisions. While I agree with that, I think it's important that if, while we do the budget process, if you try to do this simultaneously, so that you're kept appraised of what we're doing, city council understands what you think, and what the Department of Treasury might work relative to the revenues and expenses.

So that when we go forward with the mayor and the council, as you'll see, I've put on the -- on your dais, there, a council meeting we're having tonight, and items that are on there. So that I can educate the mayor and the council and the citizens, as to how all this holds together, the capital and strategic plans, and all that stuff. So that we're at least on the same page going forward.

We have a very tight timeline of April 1st, for having our budgets in place, our taxing hearings and all those things, having those in place. So while I keep it in the back of my mind as we go through this process, that I'm trying to be efficient as we possibly can.

Those things that you are, that you absolutely think are not a go, I need to know that. I need to educate my city council on the things that absolutely have to go, or move forward on. There are some bitter pills that are going to have to be swallowed, but we

need to realize that we are in receivership. And we have to balance our budget. And that's where I'm going to lead them, to that end.

. 2

14.

But obviously, we need to do that in such a way that it's sustainable. Now, at the end of the day, if it's not sustainable, based on empirical data, and our process, well, then, that's, we have to face that reality. As we move through the process. I think we all realize, in the short term, in the short term, while we might have a balanced budget, it's those outgoing nears, where we have the problem.

So, that being said, I have put this -- you had it on there as a tabled item, because you had had it before. I put my budget things in there, so you could see where we were going, where we were headed. And open for discussion, and comments. And again, as I indicated, Mr. Koryzno, to you before the meeting, that I'd be more than happy, and I look forward to sitting down with the state's fiscal people. So that we make sure that we're all moving in the right direction.

Because I'm not going to stand here and tell that I've got a magic wand or I'm the expert on every line item of every detail.

I think we need to be a collaborative process, both with the TAB board, with the treasury, my council, and anybody, all the stakeholders. With that, I'm --

MR. KORYZNO: Any questions for Mr. O'Neal from the Board?

MS. PARKER: Yes, I have a question.

MR. KORYZNO: Yes, Ms. Parker.

MS. PARKER: You had mentioned the amount for the body cameras was taken out. Is there still an interest in moving forward with the body cameras, or are you looking for other revenue sources, to cover the cost? Could you clarify that?

1.1

MR. O'NEAL: I will say this, Ms. Parker, that is very important to Mr. Moore; that is very important to the mayor and the council, and myself, it's very important. I just wanted to point out that that was -- there was a, that was one of the items that they were looking for an amendment for. And while Mr. McCurley only had a short period of time, we decided that we would come back and revisit that issue. But no, that's an extremely important issue, for all the reasons.

MS. PARKER: Okay. And then, secondly, Mr. Chair, I wondered if, as part of the process to complete the five year budget for the city, if Treasury could participate with the city, and the city council, so that when we get the document back, we have all of the comments, and hopefully, something that everyone can agree upon?

MR. KORYZNO: Yes, I'm confident Mr. Dubay would be willing to assist the city in evaluating their five year budget.

MR. O'NEAL: Perfect. Perfect. Thank you. Perfect.

MR. KORYZNO: Anything else?

MS. PARKER: No, that's it.

MR. KORYZNO: My only comment is that I'm concerned that the four years out of the five year budget are ever increasing deficits, and by the time to reach to fifth year, the city's

financially upside down. So what you have now, is time to make the necessary adjustments where possible, to bring the budget into balance.

2.4

MR. O'NEAL: And I agree, Mr. Koryzno, and then, that is where I'd like to have Treasury involved, because when we get to that point, where, if things appear to be moving and going to maintain, and point to that direction, we're looking at some additional drastic cuts, in order to balance that budget. And having all the stakeholders in place, and the Department of Treasury involved, so council realizes that those numbers are there and are a reality, and have to be addressed.

I think that's why, well, I know that's why, we had an EFM in here on a number of occasions, because the community either could or wouldn't do those things on their own. And got themselves in trouble. While we realize that, we're going to have to do something with that if we can't come up with a number of dollars. Now I've just indicated about 4 to \$500,000 in additional cuts and revenues that may be able to be effectuated, and that's good. But we need a lot more.

And that's one of the discussions you'll see, that I've got tonight to talk to them about, that I'm going to have the same conversation. I have a couple council people here with us today, but I'm going to have that same discussion with them tonight, that we're looking down the road at some draconian cuts. Or modifications to existing service levels. When you have a tax rate

of 59 mills, where else is there to go? That's, you know, these taxpayers are paying a lot here.

1.3

MR. KORYZNO: I can't let this opportunity pass, to mention that the second year of the five year budget deficit is the equivalent of a savings that the city would have incurred had the CGAP grant been implemented.

MR. O'NEAL: And you'll see, Mr. Koryzno, that I have addressed that in those numbers on there. And I'm making it painfully aware to the mayor and the council, that, I've reinforced that with them. And I'm going to continue to reinforce that with them, and we're going down that road. And I mean, we're going down that road. Because we need to have collaborative efforts around the community, just like our meeting with Lincoln Park yesterday, you know.

This is the way cities are doing this everywhere; we have to do these things. We have to. I mean, our structure, our taxing structure, our financial model in the State of Michigan doesn't work. I mean, I'm preaching to the choir with you folks, past managers and finance people. It doesn't work, so we have to work within what we have, in collaborative efforts with surrounding communities are just — it was part of the EGRIP (phonetic) program anyway, but we need to do that, and we will do that.

MR. KORYZNO: All right. Any other questions? Ms. Parker?

MS. PARKER: Just one other question. In the material,

there was a reference to the special assessment, and I wasn't clear on whether the city was planning to ask for some type of renewal 2 related to the assessment, or phase it out altogether? 3 MR. O'NEAL: When you speak to that, I'm thinking of the 4 streetlight; are you --5. I'm referring to police and fire. MS. PARKER: 6 Public safety. MR. KORYZNO: 7 Yeah, well, that's, we will have to go for MR. O'NEAL: 8 9

That renewal's I think, in 2021? I think around, it that renewal. sunsets, I mean, I'm going to recommend, I'm going to --

So was that incorporated in your numbers? MS. PARKER: I will do -- I put that out there as a note, MR. O'NEAL: but yes.

> Okay. MS. PARKER:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

.22

23

24

25

I will do -- we can't function. MR. O'NEAL: that, we are really down the tubes. No, that, to me, that's a That's a given we have to do that. To do that renewal, that's a given. There's no way we can sustain the city without that

And then just one other question. MS. PARKER: streetlight special assessment, when it was reviewed, maybe a couple of years ago, there were a number of areas where the city could make reduction in their expense related to street lighting?

> With LEDs? MR. O'NEAL:

Without the assessment -- well, LEDs was one. MS. PARKER:

There were several options presented to the city through DTE, which would have saved the city funding, related to street lighting. And I don't know if that's been considered, but that might be another alternative or maybe to reduce the impact to residents, related to streetlights.

MR. O'NEAL: I have on my desk, and I can't remember the lady's name, that's our representative. We've been calling each other back and forth, and I have that on my desk as one of the items that's very important that we pursue.

MS. PARKER: Yeah, and she presented several options with lighting on Jefferson, Southfield Road, and certain areas related to the alleys that would decrease the cost, without increasing a special assessment.

MR. O'NEAL: And that's just -- we're going down that path, that's exactly where we're headed. I've made a phone call to her, and it's been the holidays and we're back and forth, but, yes.

MR. KORYZNO: Any other questions from the Board?

MS. PARKER: No.

4.

MR. KORYZNO: All right, thank you, Mr. O'Neal.

MR. O'NEAL: Thank you.

MR. KORYZNO: Item B, approval of Resolution 356.14, budget amendment to 2015-4, purchases for DPW. Previously, Board member Parker requested that this matter be tabled until a budgetary review could be conducted. It's expected that such an investigation will provide a budget neutral method for funding this and other

requested budget amendments.

Mr. O'Neal, have you found specific areas for expense reduction or revenue increases, which will offset the proposed budget amendment?

MR. O'NEAL: Mr. Koryzno, members of the Board, I have not looked at that. And I am asking that you -- I'm withdrawing; I think that was the -- the request was made when I was here the first time, about buying some equipment for the DPW. I'm asking to withdraw that. I've got a new plan; I talked with Kevin Lawrence, with the DPW, relative to where we're going. You'll see on the agenda, I've got some hires for replacement.

The equipment that we were talking about purchasing is long gone, that was some used equipment or what have you. I've talked with Kevin about that; we're going to approach going forward about getting some equipment, and more specific equipment. Maybe some new stuff or whatever, purchase it, do an internal service fund to pay it back. All that stuff. I will be coming back to you soon as I possibly can, with that. So I'd like to withdraw that from before.

That was that Skidsteer, and a backhoe, and a front end and all that stuff. I want to come back to -- that equipment's all gone, we couldn't buy it anyway.

MR. KORYZNO: All right.

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Pardon me, chairman, there may be some confusion. I think, previously, you had requested the purchase of

some capital equipment for the DPW. I don't want to confuse that with the \$50,000 budget amendment that included, let's see, it was requested earlier, it included \$30,000 in contracted services, \$10,000 in overtime, miscellaneous expenses and office supplies. I think this was to bring the DPW in align with --

MR. O'NEAL: That \$50,000, when you're talking about, for the trees, and the overtime and stuff like that, that was covered by additional revenues that we found. So there's no fund balance; that's all covered. I've -- I was under the assumption, you're talking about equipment, was, monies for some equipment that I was going to buy when I was here the first time. That's why I'm withdrawing the other one, we don't need the amendment, because we found additional revenues and stuff.

MR. KORYZNO: And those revenues are from where?

MR. O'NEAL: Tax revenues and unanticipated revenues that came in. I don't have the exact numbers at my fingertips.

MR. KORYZNO: Well, it would be my feeling that I'd like to have Mr. Dubay sit down with Mr. O'Neal and verify the numbers and so forth, before we take action on this item, if that's the pleasure of the Board.

MS. PARKER: Yes, I would, that, with all of the items tabled.

MR. BOVITZ: That's fine.

MR. KORYZNO: Okay, well why don't we take them one by one? I'll entertain a motion, then.

MS. PARKER: So, I would move to continue to have the item tabled until further notice, after review by Mr. O'Neal and the Department of Treasury.

MR. BOVITZ: Support.

1

2

3

4

5

6.

7.

8

9

1.0

11.

-12-

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 -

24

25

MR. KORYZNO: Okay, it's been moved and tabled -- moved and supported to table the item until Ecorse Administrator and Department of Treasury can meet and confer on the proposed DPW expenses. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye.

MR. BOVITZ: Aye.

MS. PARKER: Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. The motion is approved and the item is tabled. Item C, approval of Resolution 357.14, budget amendment 2015-5, body camera purchase. Mr. O'Neal, has a funding source in the amount of \$70,000 --

MR. O'NEAL: As I indicated earlier, no, we did not, we did not cover that. We did not address that. I -- Mr. Moore is currently looking at a couple, three different cameras. We may not need the \$70,000 for that. So once we get more and more information, we'll come forward. We think that expense is very important, as I think the Board does too, for the obvious reasons.

We want to move forward with that, but until we can -- I think there's a lot of competition. There's grant money available, and stuff like that, so until -- how much more time do you think you need, chief?

MR. MOORE: This may be -- just a little bit. Mike Moore, Public Safety Director. It should be a little bit. I've got a 30 day trial on one system we're using right now. We've got another system coming in, it's going to be another 30 day trial. But as I mentioned before, there's going to be grant dollars, because we feel that this is going to be mandated.

.10

So, because this is going to be mandated, we feel there's going to be grant dollars coming down the pike for this. And that we allocated, I think, 70 something thousand dollars for this. We feel this number's a little high. And it's not going to be that type of dollars involved, and even if we do not — even if we get the grant, it won't be that type of dollars, even if we do not get, it will not be that type of dollars. So, I'm thinking maybe we should still table this until we find out what's going on.

MS. PARKER: So, allow it to remain on the table?

MR. MOORE: Yes, please. Until we find out what's going to happen with this. It's not the — the dollar value's going to drop regardless, it's not going to be that type of money, whether we get the grant or not. But we're still evaluating. We've got a camera on an officer right now, today, it's still going on. And we've got another system coming in. And to do another 30 day eval. So it's going to be, before we make the purchase, it's probably going to be spring.

MR. BOVITZ: I move that we remain table the motion.

MS. PARKER: Support.

MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to table this item. 1 Any further discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say 2 3 aye. Aye. MR. BOVITZ: 4 Aye. MS. PARKER: 5 MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. The motion is 6 Item D, approval of Resolution 372.14, budget amendment approved. 7 for the 2015-3 master plan. Any funding, independent funding, found 8 9 for this? MR. O'NEAL: Yes, sir. I think -- I think you need to 10 leave it on the table, just like the other ones, til Mr. Dubay and I 11 have an opportunity to take a look at the numbers, and --12 MR. KORYZNO: All right. 13 MR. BOVITZ: Move to continue to table the motion. 14 MS. PARKER: Support. 15 MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to table; any 16 further discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say 17 18 aye. MR. BOVITZ: Aye. 19 MS. PARKER: Aye. 20 MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. The motion is 21 approved. Item E, approval of employment contract. Last month, 22 this matter was tabled until a five year budget was approved by the 23

city council and submitted to the Board. Also, we voiced concerns

that a -- the Board voiced concerns that a more comprehensive

24

25

employee compensation plan was needed.

24.

While I certainly will entertain any motion, it seems proper to continue to table this contract until the five year budget is approved by both city council and the Board.

MS. PARKER: I would move to allow the items to remain tabled, until the five year budget is completed and approved.

MR. BOVITZ: Support.

MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported; any further discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye.

MR. BOVITZ: Aye.

MS. PARKER: Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. The motion to table the employment contract is approved. Item F, approval of Resolution 403.14, withdrawal from the Wayne County Library system. Mr. O'Neal, is there an update on this particular initiative?

MR. O'NEAL: Yes, Mr. Koryzno and members of the Board, as you'll note again, on the agenda for tonight's meeting, there's going to be a detailed discussion in front of the City Council, relative to the withdrawal. The process for withdrawal. The City Council's already voted to effectuate the withdrawal, or to agree to it. There's a process.

There is concern within the community that if -- they don't want that library to close. And the mayor, council, myself, we don't want it to close. So we're going to go through the process of withdrawing, but before we do that, and by and through the

process, we have a replacement. The new -- replacement board, funding process, the whole nine yards. That's what's going to be discussed tonight; Cassandra's going to be at the meeting tonight to explain that process to the mayor and the council. To the stakeholders.

1.2

.22

Marilyn Oliver is here, I saw her sneak in there somewhere, there she is. Is involved with the library down there, so, she's — she attends our council meetings and has a major concern with that, and we're going to follow through with that and make sure that the library stays open and within budget confines if you will. So if you want to just leave it on the table, until such time as the council comes to it with the exact plan, because there are some charter things that we have to do with reference to millages and planning a library board, and notification to Wayne County, and those things. So we are moving forward with that process.

MR. KORYZNO: All right. Any questions for Mr. O'Neal? I don't believe any action is needed on that item. New business. Item A, approval of resolutions and ordinances for City Council meetings, resolution from City Council meeting of November 25, 2014. I'll entertain a motion.

MR. BOVITZ: Move to accept the council minutes from November 25th, with the exception of Resolution 415.14, 426.14, and 427.14.

MR. KORYZNO: Is there a support?

Support. MS. PARKER: 1 MR. KORYZNO: It's been moved and supported, to approve 2 all the resolutions for that meeting except for three, the DWSD 3 contract, the HR contract with Paychex, and the approval of snowplow 4 bid. Any further discussion? 5 MS. PARKER: Just a question, Mr. Chair. On one of the 6 items, I think it's 422.14, it's called an estate fee in lieu of 7 taxes, relative to the Wade McCree estate. Could someone just 8 explain what that is? 9 MR. O'NEAL: The payment in lieu of taxes -- the council 10 agreed to a set amount of money from the Wade McCree -- they've 11 requested, because it's a HUD, it's a MSHDA program, is it not? And 12 so they've --13 Is it a housing development project? MS. PARKER: 14 MR. O'NEAL: Yeah. 15 MS. CAPRA: Yeah, the Ecorse Housing Commission. They're 16 going to be tearing down the old and rebuilding. 17 MS. PARKER: Okay. 18 MS. CAPRA: That's what they needed for the -- the MSHDA 19 funding. 20 I'm sorry, could you please identify MR. KORYZNO: 21 yourself for the record? 2.2 Terri Capra, Community Development. MS. CAPRA: 23 Thank you, Terri. MR. KORYZNO: 24 Thank you. That's all I had.

MS. PARKER:

25

MR. KORYZNO: All right, any further discussion?

MR. BOVITZ: Just out of curiosity, which building is in question, 4067 West Jefferson had some dissension, with some abstentions on the rezoning?

MR. O'NEAL: Yes, there was a rezoning request for a particular piece of property to a used car lot. They wanted to go to a B2 zone. From a B1 to a B2 zone, to allow it, and it didn't pass; it was on its third reading. And they -- that was the vote. It didn't pass. Nope.

MS. PARKER: What was the objection?

MR. O'NEAL: They don't want a used --

MS. PARKER: They just don't want it there?

MR. O'NEAL: They don't want it, no. Quite frankly, if I'd have been there, it wouldn't have got that far. Because I'd already told them that it's a special use permit after rezoning, and it's -- it doesn't even comply with the state laws, reference to used cars, is that right, Derek? So, I'll leave that to --

MR. BOVITZ: And Councilman Heller's abstention, was that because of independence issues, or personal?

MR. O'NEAL: You'd have to ask him; that's another -- on the horizon, that's another thing to talk about, but the mayor and the council, about Robert Rules and about why you abstain. And give reasons for abstentions and those types of things, and that's a learning process, if you will.

MR. KORYZNO: Thank you. Any other questions? All right,

all in favor of the motion say aye.

MR. BOVITZ: Aye.

MS. PARKER: Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed same sign. Motion is approved. Next item is Resolution 415.14, water service contract with the City of Detroit. Mr. Van de Grift, could you summarize this issue for us?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Certainly. Drew Van de Grift, Michigan Department of Treasury. The Detroit Water and Sewer Department is renegotiating contracts with several municipalities in Wayne County. Ecorse is among them; this contract would adjust minimum and maximum flow rates and consumption for the city, including maximum day and peak hour flow rates.

It may cost the city a bit more, although the memo that was submitted to the Board only included the changes to the contract, not the entire contract and it does not appear as though there was a dollar amount that was fixed yet. However, the flow rates appear to be.

MR. KORYZNO: Was this information submitted to the Board, per our directive, in terms of timing?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Some of it was. We received a memo and the portion of the amended contract timely; we did not receive the contract disclosure form, which warrants that the city attorney has reviewed, and approved to form the contract, until Friday afternoon.

MR. KORYZNO: You know, previously this Board established

submission rules for the city, and Mr. Van de Grift, please remind the city what those monthly agenda, the deadline for those.

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: As the Board knows, the Board reviews all ordinances and resolutions, as well as contracts over a threshold amount. To facilitate this, the city submits a packet that includes items of concern, from the city administrator, that are requested agenda items, as well as contracts over that threshold amount of \$10,000.

The Board has requested that all of these contracts be vetted by the city attorney prior to submission, and that all of this be submitted ten days prior to the next RTAB meeting. If that falls on a weekend or a holiday, we ask that it be a couple of days before that, so that we do have time to submit the packet, in turn, to the board members.

MR. KORYZNO: So the deadline for this particular meeting was?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Two Fridays ago.

MR. KORYZNO: Two Fridays ago.

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Mm-hm.

MR. KORYZNO: And subsequent to that, we received the information the Friday before this meeting?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: It was a week late, mm-hm.

MR. KORYZNO: Mr. O'Neal?

MR. O'NEAL: Thank you. Mr. Koryzno and members of the board, on this particular item, it was a modification to the

existing DWSD water contract. There's no way of knowing what the value is, because the -- these rates are set up by the City of Detroit to their rate setting structure.

11.

21.

. 22

This was a technical detail to -- amendment, when we talk about max and minimum -- max day peak flow amount of gallons. In no way that I, or the City of Ecorse, want to ignore your deadline. I had no idea that you would want the city attorney to review the existing DWSD contract that's in place.

My thought process was the cost of the review of that, and this amendment, being a technical amendment; this is the second time I've done this in the last year and a half. I did it in Imlay City, they come up -- they let us pick the numbers. I had Mark at the meeting, he and I picked the numbers so that it would be the most efficient numbers for the City of Ecorse. To allow that -- because if you -- we fall outside of these parameters that were set, it can have an effect to cost us even more in future rate increases. So we tried to pick the numbers that obviously would keep Ecorse within the parameters going forward for at least the next five years.

And that's what it was about. In no way was it -- I didn't realize that you -- Mr. Van de Grift was very good in chastising me and letting me know what needs to be done. But I never thought that we would have to have the existing contract rereviewed by the attorney. And I don't know how much that's -- I told her to go ahead and do it, but I don't know how much it's going to cost.

And I still don't think they'll understand the technical amendment anyway. I don't understand all I know about it, and I understand it. So, you know, it's very technical in detail, so I had my engineer, my professional engineer, we did the numbers. We think they're very, very good numbers.

.13

Again, we won't know what impact it has, because of how DWSD decides what our rate's going to be. And, as you know, they've shifted from a straight commodity rate to a flat rate, and commodity rate, because of the problems they're having funding theirs. So that being said, the numbers that we used in there were numbers we feel are in the best interest of the City of Ecorse.

MR. KORYZNO: Just a reminder, the Board has a standing resolution that any documents coming before the Board require city attorney approval. My expectation would be that the city attorney would know enough not to review the entire DWSD contract but just the minor changes. And I'm familiar with the DWSD rate structures, I'm sure Ms. Parker was, and so I'm just -- I'm concerned that this was a routine matter that again did not make it to the Board in time.

The packets for the Board went out after the weekend instead of before the weekend, which didn't provide the Board much time to review the packet. And so it'd be my recommendation that we table this matter until the next meeting. I'll entertain a motion.

MR. BOVITZ: So moved.

MS. PARKER: Support.

MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to table this item until the next meeting. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye.

MR. BOVITZ: Aye.

15.

MS. PARKER: Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed same sign. Motion is approved. Next item, Resolution 426.14, Paychex Human Resources service proposal. Mr. Van de Grift?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: The city of Ecorse has operated without a human resources professional for some time. This contract is a — an attempt to fill that need. I'll note that Paychex already has an existing contract with the city for payroll services, and this contract would expand that function to include some, though not all, of the HR services that were performed before.

It appears that this new delivery of services would increase the cost to the city some \$14,000, for a total contract package cost of \$24,388. I also will note -- I believe that a representative from Paychex is in attendance today, so if there is a desire for more specific questions, perhaps they could be directed to him.

I -- my only concern is, Treasury wonders whether the current contract integrates everything? Does it include all the services, the previous and the current services?

MR. O'NEAL: Thank you. This is Carti Penisi, with the, PaycheX with Paycheck (sic). And he can answer the technical things. The

contract itself does incorporate all the payroll items from before, as well as the new items, as enumerated within the packet. By way of presentation, the way this -- we envision this working, is that Paycheck (sic) will be our human resources function. Instead of me coming down the hall and talking to a warm body that's there, if I have a question, or a need in the HR area, relative to COBRA or policy manuals or any of those types of things.

I can contact Paycheck. They need to have somebody onsite, to help us effectuate anything, they will be onsite. If it's a technical question that they have, they will get the answers to me in a timely manner. As a generalist manager, when I need something, or any manager needs something, they go to the professional.

While before, we had a person on board to do some of the other functions, the Paycheck will be doing -- there are things that I can effectuate, from my experience in the HR area, as you know, being at small cities, you are the chief cook and bottle washer. I was the personnel director in Eastpointe, by charter. I negotiated all the contracts, I did all those things.

So that being said, what I need, I think, and will work for the city of Ecorse, is to have a professional on tap. And also, that will effectuate savings, approximately \$50,000. That being said, just like the part time controller, it's a work in progress. And once we have them on board, it's a week -- a month to month, then we can cancel those services at any time. If I see that it's

not working, we need to expand those services. That being said, I would turn over to Carti, and he can speak to you on the issue.

MR. KORYZNO: Any questions?

MS. PARKER: Can you, maybe, summarize exactly what services you will provide in addition to what you're providing right now?

MR. PENISI: Absolutely. Well, currently what we are doing is payroll, tax pay, I believe some garnishments, things like that. What is going to be in addition to this is essentially a full human resource package that is going to include not just a human resource generalist, which would be a live body person that is assigned to the City of Ecorse to handle all HR issues, whether it be updating employee files, you know, proactively doing a Department of Labor audits, handling hiring, termination concerns.

Doing any type of training, whether it be sexual harassment, non-harassment, safety trainings. It's very, very robust as far as what it offers. I think the most important thing is having that one person that will quarterback all of these things. And you know, be that go to for you, as a city, to make sure that there are no vulnerabilities, liabilities, dealing with employees, dealing with, you know, even, you know, state and federal governments when it comes to the business end of human resources.

MR. BOVITZ: I'm in favor of Paychex; I have a working relationship with the company, and my clients, as an independent CPA, and it really helps me, as an advisor. Because I can't

possibly know all the intricacies of, like, the Affordable Care Act and its implications, and having that resource. And that's what I would call it, is a resource --

MR. PENISI: Absolutely.

MR. BOVITZ: And not a position. You know, as a menu type thing, as a specific issue, you can't possibly have anybody on board here who is going to know all that, at least -- Wayne said.

MR. PENISI: Well, I mean, the way the service is geared, is, it can either take the place of a human resource representative, or even in some cases, when we do have human resource representatives within organizations, I know Better Made is my most recent account. They have a team of human resource people. You still end up putting out fires all day.

And you spend the time worrying about the things that are happening right now, instead of the things that can get you in trouble later. And, you know, this -- this package that I had put together for the City of Ecorse is, one, cost effective, I mean, to fulfill that HR need that you guys would have. As well as, doesn't add the things, like benefits and all those other things a warm body human being that would have to be in the office. And it does fulfill

all of those aspects that would be needed.

MS. PARKER: Now, at any point, will the person that is the contact for the city be onsite?

MR. PENISI: Yes. Many times.

MS. PARKER: Pardon?

MR. PENISI: Many times.

MS. PARKER: Okay.

MR. PENISI: The way the process would work, is once this is approved, that person would come out, do a full HR assessment with Wayne, Laura, whoever's allocated for that. And then, the process from there would be to set up a timeline of events, and them coming out on a weekly, if not bi-weekly, basis in the beginning, to bring you guys up to par, from an HR structure standpoint.

Work at it from a strategic level and then from there, they're here as needed. Whether they have to do a training, whether they're updating the city's handbook, whether they're, you know, coming in and sitting through a special circumstance termination. They are at your beck and call. I mean, there's no added charges for more times they come out, or if they don't. I mean, it's just even keel to your needs.

MR. KORYZNO: Any other questions? Mr. Van de Grift, was this item submitted on time? Within the Board's submittal policy?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Portions were. The contract disclosure form, with the attorney's approval of the contract was not submitted until last Friday.

MR. KORYZNO: But the city attorney did sign off on the contract?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: The city attorney did.

MR. KORYZNO: Al right. Again, my feeling is because this

item was not submitted on time, that item should be tabled. I have absolutely nothing against Paycheck (sic), it sounds like a great firm, but again, I'm adamant about receiving the documentation.

MR. PENISI: I will tell you this much, just as a thought, if it's something that you are planning on tabling, the sooner the process begins, I mean, I know there's been a little turnover here. W-2 costs are included, so if this does begin in January, you negate that bill of having it -- I think it's almost \$1000. That would save the city. I mean, I know it's minimal, but it's just something to think about before that decision's made.

MR. KORYZNO: All right. Thank you.

MR. PENISI: Yes, sir.

2.3

MR. KORYZNO: I'll entertain a motion.

MR. O'NEAL: If I may, Mr. Koryzno. On these issues that came in late -- there are, there were a number of moving parts on this. While we respect and understand that there's a time limit, for submission of the information to the TAB, relative to your meeting, you members as city managers and finance directors know about crunch time within organizations.

Our organization is so thin you can see through it. And to stick up for Laura, Laura wasn't feeling -- hasn't felt good for the last ten days, and has a doctor's appointment at 11:45. And we did everything we could to get these things in on time, and there was some information went back and forth with the city attorney and Paycheck, and the other items that are on the agenda. And we

respect that you need to get these things on time.

. 7

. 8

. 23

One of the other items that needs to be brought up as well, with reference to the Paycheck area is, that it's my understanding that Cassandra has an expertise, of one of her areas of expertise, in employment law, and those types of things. That, along with the HR function, bodes well for Ecorse in going this direction, and saving monies. And I will tell you this, there's no way that I'm going to go through a termination process without the city attorney right at my hip. For all the obvious reasons, so.

MR. BOVITZ: And my feeling is that even though it was without -- outside our time constraint, but the city attorney did sign off on it, and because the timeliness of the nature, I move that we address this issue and approve the contract.

MR. KORYZNO: It's been moved.

MS. PARKER: Support.

MR. KORYZNO: And supported. Any further discussion? My comment is not so much that this particular, that I'm focusing on this particular meeting's tardiness, but this has been an ongoing issue, and, and I want to send a message that we are not going to continue to accept items that are late.

MR. O'NEAL: And, and I hear you loud and clear. And the staff is here, we hear you loud and clear. And I think that what we will -- I know what we will do in the future, we just won't submit it. If we can't get it to you on time we will not submit it, and shame on us. If we needed it. And I apologize.

\_ .

MR. KORYZNO: Thank you. Any further discussion?

MR. BOVITZ: Yeah, just because of the cost savings factor, the thousand dollar savings on the W-2 preparation, the timeliness of having someone on staff for HR issues, unemployment claims, worker's comp claims; I think it's important that we approve it.

MR. KORYZNO: Any further discussion?

MS. PARKER: I was just going to chime in with what the chairperson stated. Again, we did get our packet late yesterday, you know, I was up until 10:30 last night reviewing the packet for the meeting today. So, you know, the timeliness of getting these items to the State is important, and I think in this instance, there's some urgency, but if there isn't an urgent need, I think we should table the other items.

MR. KORYZNO: All right. Any further discussion? All in favor of the motion say aye.

MR. BOVITZ: Aye.

MS. PARKER: Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: All opposed -- aye. The motion is approved. Next item is Resolution 427.14, approval of snowplow bid. Mr. Van de Grift?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: It appears that the City has solicited bids for snowplow services. No information was submitted to Treasury, and so, you know, we're not quite sure what to think of this. We're wondering if there's a contract yet, and or if one will

be submitted in the future, when this is reduced to a contract. I also note that, you know, just because it's January, I don't know if the City has snowplow services now, or if they're in a transition.

MR. O'NEAL: The council did approve a snowplow bid that was late. They got the bid and stuff before I got here, and I, the

MR, O'NEAL: The council did approve a snowplow bid that was late. They got the bid and stuff before I got here, and I, they approved them late. And I apologize for the fact that there's — that wasn't moved forward with that. Again, that was a very late issue, and I'm not trying to cop out, but that's — that was late, and I believed they approved that in early December.

MR. KORYZNO: So we're lacking documentation?

MR. O'NEAL: Yeah.

1

2

3

5

6 -

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

MR. KORYZNO: All right.

MS. PARKER: So there's nothing that we can do?

MR. KORYZNO: Yes.

MR. BOVITZ: Move to table.

MS. PARKER: Support.

MR. KORYZNO: Moved and supported to table the item. Any further discussion? All in favor of the motion say aye.

MR. BOVITZ: Aye.

MS, PARKER: Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed same sign. Item two,

23 resolutions from regular City Council meeting of December 9th, 2014. 24 Entertain a motion.

MR. BOVITZ: Move to accept the resolutions from the City

Council meeting of December 9th, 2014.

10.

1.8

MS. PARKER: Support.

MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to accept the resolutions from the December 9th meeting; any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye.

MR. BOVITZ: Aye.

MS. PARKER: .Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed same sign; the motion is approved. Item three, claims and accounts from regular City Council meeting draft minutes of December 22nd, 2014. Entertain a motion.

MR. BOVITZ: Move to accept the claims and accounts from the regular City Council meeting of December 22nd, 2014.

MS. PARKER: Support.

MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported, any further discussion?

MR. BOVITZ: Well, my discussion on this on this is, that's outside the two week timeframe; why are we just approving the claims and accounts as opposed to the resolutions for this meeting?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: I can speak to that. Previously, the City expressed concern that their bills were getting paid late, because, you know, there's a certain time span from the submission of the claims and accounts to the City Council, the approval, and then the next RTAB meeting. When that was, you know, identified, Tim McCurley and I and Mr. Dubay had a meeting.

And Tim asked if there was any way that we could review,

as a board, that you could review draft minutes, and so you would not need to wait that two week period to get the approved minutes. And so I recognize that these -- these are approved minutes now. They're kind of outside of the normal review period, just to facilitate the timely payment of bills. So, you know, Treasury staff still reviews the journal part, processing the invoices that the City Council saw. It's the same review period; it's just that we now review more minutes than we did before, so that the city can pay their bills two weeks faster.

MR. BOVITZ: All right, so these are draft minutes, as far as we're concerned, because the City of Ecorse council meeting approved the minutes from that meeting within the two week period?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Right. Since the ten day cut off, yeah. Absolutely right.

MR. KORYZNO: Any additional questions from the Board? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye.

MR. BOVITZ: Aye.

MS. PARKER: Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed same sign; the motion is approved. Item B, letter from City Administrator, dated January 2nd, 2015. Item one, approved City Council minutes have been addressed in new business. Item two, approval of budget to actual report. I'll entertain a motion.

MS. PARKER: So moved.

MR. BOVITZ: Support.

MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to approve the budget to actual report; any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye.

MR. BOVITZ: Aye.

MS. PARKER: Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. Motion is approved. Item three, approval of water service contract with the City of Detroit, was addressed in new business. Item four, approval of Paychex Human Resources services proposal, addressed in new business also.

Item five, approval of Department of Public Works replacement hires. Mr. Van de Grift?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Interim City Administrator O'Neal has proposed hiring three part time replacements in the Department of Public Works, as well as one clerk, who I understand is also a replacement. I think that's very helpful disclosure to understand the plan in the Department of Public Works. But there are no contracts. There are no contracts that were submitted for the specific employees.

I'll note that while the Board does have the authority to review contracts as well as resolutions and ordinances, as a plan for future employment, it's unclear what action the Board can take.

MR. KORYZNO: All right. Do you want to say something, Mr. O'Neal?

MR. O'NEAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Initially, we

submitted, and I wasn't aware -- I was remiss in not knowing that you had to have specific contracts with individuals. The one item that's on the agenda here, to hire Wanda Jones as a replacement AFSCME employee, that has a contract. AFSCME has a contract. And so that would be a replacement for an AFSCME unit person.

. 7

1.5

And now, I understand that the TAB board, anything in excess of \$10,000, they have to approve it, so the way that was submitted, is that she had gone through the background check, the drug screen and everything like that. And it's a replacement hire. So I don't know what else to do with it, but I don't have an individual contract with her, she's covered under AFSCME.

And then Mr. Lawrence had lost two of his part time people in the DPW, and in the missive to you for January 13th, is to replace those two people that have left with people we interviewed, did a drug screen, background checks, and they're in excess of \$10,000. Well, we're not going to have an individual contract with them, there is some information — there was some conversations with Cassandra, city attorney, relative to are they employees and what have you.

All I'm trying to do is get these individuals on board, realizing that almost everybody here has a contract of some kind, or a letter of understanding, or whatever. But there was some thought that Cassandra had relative to are they employees, and do they have contracts or whatever. Now, I'm not an expert and that's why I've got Paycheck, and I've got Cassandra and that stuff to help me in

this area, and of course we got a -- I'm feeling my way through the TAB board and how to replace these people that have already been in the budget.

.2

So, I -- and I apologize, I'm kind of muddling my way through that process. While the original missive was to get permission from the TAB board to hire three individuals for the DPW, Joe indicated to me I can't -- you can't operate that way. You don't operate that way. So that's why we went through with the interviews, and tried to do it this way. And not necessarily have a contract, and Cassandra, I'm kind of floundering here little bit because of your conversation about are they employees, are they contractual employees. Are they 1099 or whatever, I want to make sure that we as a city get that right.

But to move forward with replacements hires, if you will, so if there is some misunderstanding on that, that's my bad on the original memo that I sent to Drew, and then you got my missive of January 13th.

MR. KORYZNO: So you're proposing to hire one full time replacement person, and two part time replacement people?

MR. O'NEAL: Two part timers, to replace the two that are, that --

MR. KORYZNO: And the full time person falls under the AFSCME contract --

MR. O'NEAL: Yes, sir.

MR. KORYZNO: The part time people fall under no contract?

MR. O'NEAL: No contract.

5.

.12

1.5

2.2

MS. PARKER: Possibly the threshold is the \$10,000.

MR. O'NEAL: All I'm -- getting your blessing, because, it's beyond \$10,000. And that they meet the qualifications, the drug screen, and all that, has been passed. And the background to the police department. Everything's good. So, if -- I'm learning this as I go along, and I know that talking to Drew is very, very helpful. That -- on this, and that if they, and the -- in excess of \$10,000, so that's, I don't know how much they'll make. Depends on how many hours we work them, and those types of things, so.

That's why I put the blanket in excess of \$10,000, because you have to approve that.

MR. KORYZNO: Any further comments; Mr. Van de Grift?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Perhaps one. In order for the Board to comply with the final EM order, I note that there is provision for the Board to review and approve contracts in excess of \$10,000.

That implies that there must be a contract to approve.

I'm very sensitive to what Mr. O'Neal said, that, you know, these employees may be governed by an existing collective bargaining agreement. I wonder if like, the rate of pay or the identification of the individual would be necessary in order to review the contract. But the Board is well within their authority to approve it as is, I'm certain.

MR. KORYZNO: All right, thank you. Entertain a motion.

MS. PARKER: I would move for the approval of the

replacement of the public works part timers, and the full time employee.

MR. BOVITZ: Support.

1.8

MR. KORYZNO: It's been moved and supported, to approve the request. Any further discussion?

MR. BOVITZ: Just a caution, on the -- what you define as contractual hire. Be sure that, and Paychex, as human resource advisor, I'm sure would give their input on this. Is you can't -- you can't designate, you know, you are contractually, you'll be getting a 1099 versus you are an employee, you'll be getting a W-2. It's the nature of the work they do; if they give the impression that they represent the City of Ecorse, they are an employee, which is W-2, which would then fall under your employment contract.

MR. O'NEAL: Thank you, Mr. Bovitz, that's exactly what we're going to do, whatever's legal and proper, that's exactly what we're going to do. And I'm not going to do that unless I get the okay from Ms. Boomes, and our professionals. That's kind of my point.

MR. KORYZNO: All right.

MR. O'NEAL: Whatever they are, they are.

MR. BOVITZ: Right, because the IRS, the State of Michigan Unemployment Agency, they might have a problem with that.

MR. O'NEAL: And we also want to review existing employees.

MR. KORYZNO: All right. Any further discussion? Seeing

none, all in favor of the motion say aye.

MR. BOVITZ: Aye.

. 23

MS. PARKER: Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: Aye. All opposed same sign. The motion is approved. Item six, approval of city financial controller services. Mr. Van de Grift?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: As the Board knows, Plante Moran, the previous contracted city controller has separated from the City of Ecorse. Their services ended with the calendar year, and the city has a great need for a replacement city controller. Mr. O'Neal has solicited services from UHY. The contract that was submitted anticipates 850 hours of labor for a year, at an hourly rate of \$100 an hour, for a total not to exceed cost of \$85,000.

I've been in discussions with the city's financial advisor, RW Baird, and there are concerns that a previous debt issuance from 2011, some fiscal stabilization bonds, involved the services of a verification agent, which among other things, set millage rates that were appropriate to service the debt. Plante Moran will be continuing as verification agent through February 28.

After that time, the city will not only need a city controller, but will need a verification agent for all the outstanding debt and perhaps for future debt issuances, as well. So, when we reviewed the contract, we noticed conspicuously that there was no provision for verification agent in the contract that was submitted. But that -- there's still an undiminished need for

the city to have a verification agent. Otherwise, they jeopardize raising the ire of the bondholders.

MR. KORYZNO: Could you identify yourself for the record, please?

MR. PLEWICKI: I am Edward Plewicki, from UHY; John Pepperman from UHY.

MR. KORYZNÓ: Thank you.

MR. PLEWICKI: Good morning Ms. Parker, Mr. Koryzno and Mr. Bovitz.

MR. KORYZNO: Good morning.

MR. Phewick: Yeah, Mr. O'Neal, and he will, I'm sure, Manager O'Neal explained a little bit. He contacted us in late December to look at the possibility of UHY supplying a part time controller. With all due respect to your timing issues that I've listened to a little bit, we first submitted a contract to the city around December 22nd. As late as December 30th and 31st, we actually were renewing terms on the contract, making some modifications. I was in contact with both the city attorney and Mr. O'Neal on that date.

We did resubmit a contract that the city attorney has reviewed as of January 5th, and I think approved. It is a month to month agreement, cancellable by either party at any time on 14 days' notice. It is set at \$100 per hour. The list of duties, I'll have Mr. Pepperman maybe explain some of these duties that are in the contract.

The idea is, can the City of Ecorse function with a part time controller, as many municipalities do in the State of Michigan? At two to maybe three days a month. Excuse me, a week. The hours and terms of what duties, responsibilities, and hours per week will be set by the city manager, who will be the supervisor of the part time controller.

The identified part time controller would be John Pepperman; introduce yourself for the record, please?

MR. PEPPERMAN: Good morning, Board, my name is John Pepperman; I work through contract with UHY.

MR. PLEWICKI: Mr. Pepperman is performing the same functions, basically, in Royal Oak Township. We don't know, on a day to day basis -- you don't have a controller in the City of Ecorse, we don't know if you need a full time controller. I think you paid about \$130,000 last year.

The duties may have been somewhat different over that last few years with Plante Moran and what they did. But looking at your budget and speaking with Mr. O'Neal, he believes, and we believe, that we would like to try to see, from a cost savings yet efficiency standpoint, can we use a part time controller? Or, is that not practical? And we'll figure it out in a few months, and maybe you do need a full time controller at an additional cost. And one other thing I would point out, please.

With Mr. Van de Grift is correct, with -- now wait one moment. Mr. Van de Grift is correct on, I have also been in

discussions with the Baird Group, from Brian Lefflor, obviously, and the list of duties on this at \$100 an hour that Mr. Pepperman can

recitate off for the record, if you'd like it. But you have the

4 contract in front of you.

That does not include -- there are three issues that you do have. One issue is, you may have some new stabilization bonds, so that issue, that would be outside the scope of this agreement, according to the Baird Group. Also, you haven't finished your financial data for your public annual disclosure upload. I'm not sure why that wasn't done, but we'll have to talk with the city manager about that. That is a municipal requirement, and state requirement.

And with respect to being a verification agent, we've just looked at the agreement now. We know that there are some dates; May 31st is your first date, then July 1st, where reports are due. We're looking, and we'll have discussions that we may act as your verification agreement, if we can come to agreement with similar terms and conditions that presently exist.

The Baird Group said that they believe they would like us to also be the verification agent, as per discussions yesterday.

So, Mr. O'Neal, I --

MR. O'NEAL: Thank you. Mr. Koryzno, members of the board, you'll also notice in the missive that was sent to you relative to the items that would be required under the contract with UHY would include all those items that were of concern to Plante

Moran relative to being outside their scope. Also, I would like to point out that a lot of the items that -- now, let me rephrase that.

1.5

1.9

Plante Moran, that Marcia Cotton, our assistant controller, is currently doing now, trained herself on now, and there were a lot of items, relative to HR that were part of her function, that were not allowed for her to do by Mr. McCurley, for whatever reason.

But she's effectuating those duties, and will work hand in glove with Paycheck, with the new controller, and in my mind, I talked to Mr. Plewicki about John Pepperman training Marcia Cotton to do that job, as part of the things that they're doing here. So that as we move forward, we've got cross trained people, and we've got more options available to use. We'll look at this as a win - win.

MR. KORYZNO: I have a concern that -- about the verification agent. I think that's a significant issue that's unresolved before us, and I would feel much more comfortable if your firm would commit to do that, Mr. Plewicki.

MR. PLEWICKI: We can commit to do that as long as we take a look at what the fees that -- there's an issue just with the fees, where there's \$4,000 being placed aside, and that was what's done last time, or the \$200 contract. And basically was done by the controller side. So as long as the Baird Group believes it was a \$4000 fee that's used as the verification agent, that's what we were informed by the -- Mr. O'Neal. If that's true, then we can do that

under the same terms and conditions. Again, that contract, though, is not up again. We haven't notified the banks or anybody, et cetera; not for -- I think February is that. But it's our intention that we would be the verification agent too.

MR. KORYZNO: Thank you. Ms. Parker?

MS. PARKER: Well, I was just going to suggest, given your comments, there's maybe three areas that's not addressed in the proposal. And so we really don't know what the total cost is going to be. So it's --

MR. PLEWICKI: And we wouldn't know either, because it's basically 16 -- one -- two to three days a week, at \$100 per hour, cancellable on 14 days' notice, and really the hours required will be with Mr. O'Neal's direction on a weekly basis with Mr. Pepperman, this is what I want, what do we need done, and this is what should be done. I believe you may or may not have the contract in front of you, that these would be the duties and responsibilities, so, again.

MR. BOVITZ: Yeah.

2.4

MS. PARKER: Right. But I believe there is a not to exceed amount, that's included?

MR. KORYZNO: Mm-hm. Yes.

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: I would interject. There are two contracts in play here; I, my understanding is the current version is a January 5, a contract --

MR. PLEWICKI: The January 5th contract, correct.

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: In your packets, you may have a

previous December 22 contract.

MR. KORYZNO: The December 22nd, yes.

MR. PLEWICKI: The previous one would have the same list of duties and responsibilities; there was just some better delineation of the term of the agreement. Cancellability 14 days, et cetera. And basically, it will be up to Mr. Pepperman, and the needs of the City, on a daily basis. There may be a week they need them for four days, and maybe a week they don't need them for the week.

MR. KORYZNO: Thank you. Ms. Parker, your final order or one of your orders, EM orders, had Plante Moran embedded in the city up until I think June, of this year, at 40 hours a week, so I'm concerned about, given the city's financial condition, of being pennywise and pound foolish. In terms of this contract.

MS. PARKER: Well, and I agree. I just think that we need to have a clear picture of what to expect, related to the finances, given that Plante Moran was here, and they were here 40 hours a week. And I think the cost was maybe \$130,000. And we're talking about 85 plus for part time services, when again, we don't really know what's necessary. You know, I, for one, would like to see something more comprehensive brought back to this Board. It is important to the city.

MR. O'NEAL: If I may, Mr. Koryzno and members of the Board. As you know, we were notified December 1st, that Plante Moran no longer wanted to service the needs of the City of Ecorse.

That being said, the verification agent and the need to have a controller on board is very important.

12.

I received, I believe, four or five different names from Treasury, people I could contact. I contacted those people. Only one person called and said no, we can't do it. They didn't even call back. The -- Raymond Robson, all of them. They didn't even call back. And I called on more than one occasion. This is a month to month situation. And we need to have something on the stopgap, for at least -- I can go on List Serve and get any RFP for services, and have somebody, and have a go at the bids, should this Board think that's the way we need to go.

I think it's prudent for us to at least review in the short term, whether or not this will work, if this is tenable. If it's tenable, and there's a savings to be made, I think that that's prudent. I mean, we're in tough financial straits. I don't know that we need somebody for 40 hours, now that we've got the Plante Moran's done such a good job and got the books and got everything in a very good process.

I think Mr. Pepperman could be better speak to that, once he gets in here and takes a look at what we have and if he -- the employees that we have, and how to effectuate using them to the maximum degree. That being said, I can still go forward with an RFP for those services, if we -- if we decide, going forward, that it will, this will work, and everybody's in agreement, well we can do this, or we can do the 40 hour thing.

I think it's the best of both worlds, but there is the issue of the verification agent. There's the issue of having an onboard controller right away. And with reference to the fees for the verification agent, Plante Moran was already paid in full. In my mind, they should be doing all that work through next July 1st, they have a — they paid themselves in full, for that verification agent, that \$4,000.

That's -- that was the next thing I was going to look at.

I haven't been able to get to it, but, I did note that they went on, and they were paid, and -- was it July that they were paid, or August? August, that they took -- they paid, they were paid the entire \$4,000 for the verification agent, and if they have, if they were supposed to go until next July, well that's, that's another issue that we need to cross, to deal with. I mean, if they owe us for doing something, they need to perform their work.

MR. KORYZNO: Well, I agree with Ms. Parker, that I think we need to be conscientious of terms of financial work here in the City. And so, I would be amenable to approving this contract, contingent upon a report from you in a month and a subsequent report on the effectiveness of this part time relationship. And then the Board could take action, based upon that information. The Board --

MR. PLEWICKI: That would appear very reasonable, and see how we move forward.

MR. O'NEAL: And, further, if I may, and I apologize to the Board and Mr. Van de Grift; I didn't realize that the Tuesday

phone calls at 4:00 were something that were set in stone. And I'm, now I've cleared my schedule, and I think that we can talk, and where we need to conference in Mr. Pepperman, and Mr. Plewicki, relative to this -- if we do that, and we talk about that, and if there's a need for Paycheck to be involved with that as well, if there are discussions or concerns relative to the State.

21.

I think that's an excellent way for us to communicate and make sure that we're all moving in the right direction. I think it's great. If that's --

MR. KORYZNO: It's up to the Board. I'll entertain a motion.

MR. BOVITZ: Do you -- are you, motion is to accept the contract with UHY advisors on a per diem basis, on a temporary month to month, is that?

MR. KORYZNO: Yes, that's the proposal.

MR. BOVITZ: Okay. So moved, then.

MR. KORYZNO: And then, I would add that we, Mr. O'Neal, provide us with a report in one and two month, the next one and two month increments, on the -- to demonstrate the success of the part time or provide us information at least with how it's working.

MR. BOVITZ: That's in the motion.

MR. KORYZNO: Is there support?

MS. PARKER: Support.

MR. KORYZNO: Any further discussion? Everyone's comfortable with the motion? Seeing no further discussion, all in

favor of the motion say aye.

MR. BOVITZ: Aye.

MS. PARKER: Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. Motion is

approved.

4.

MR. PLEWICKI: We will also timely look at the verification issue and timely look at other stabilization bonds are being processed, working in coordination with the Baird Group.

MR. KORYZNO: Item seven, permanent city administrator contract. The City previously committed to and contracted with the Michigan Municipal League for a permanent city administrator search. The city communicated such a great need for this search that the Department of Treasury had agreed to pay half the search costs, in order to support the city.

Now, the city has abandoned the League search, and this action, in my opinion, is a grave error. Now, the resolutions approving Mr. O'Neal's appointment and his contract fall outside the normal review period for this meeting. Nevertheless, Mr. O'Neal has urgently requested that this matter be addressed today, and so, Mr. O'Neal?

MR. O'NEAL: Thank you, Mr. Koryzno and members of the board. While the city has agreed, and I'm speaking for the mayor and the council, so I'm kind of wearing two hats, here.

There was a -- there were some issues that were presented to the City of Ecorse, relative to doing a manager search, Plante

Moran, and the whole search process in the past. There was an agreement by the City of Ecorse and the state, to go do a MML search, relative to the issues with Plante Moran, and the concerns of the state. Subsequent to that, they've rehired me to be the interim city administrator.

This is my second spin here, and the majority of the council has determined, that in the best interests of the City of Ecorse, that they hire me as a permanent administrator. They received your report last week, relative to what they did and what they did not do over the previous year, under the RTAB.

An overriding theme within that RTAB report was, no permanent, professional, qualified city administrator. That they had had four city administrators within that period of time. I was counted twice. All right, they have decided that the best course of action, for the City of Ecorse at this time, is to retain my services as their permanent city administrator, based on what I've done in the past, what I've done for the last month and a half. And that there is an urgent need to have a professional administrator that is up to speed with the items — with the issues facing the City of Ecorse.

While I was requested to come to Lansing and to talk about some of the items that were facing Ecorse, I was up to speed on those items. Coming back, I was able to hit the floor running on those items, and move this city forward. I plan on doing that, move the city forward. They drafted me. I want to do the job, I think

I'm the best person for the job as a personal thing.

23-

Speaking for the mayor and the council, they believe that that's true, as well. They realize that the report that you, that was submitted to the governor, and talking about not having a professional administrator, that they have — they feel that with me being on board, seeing how I fit with the community, and seeing how I fit with the department heads and the employees, and the majority of the council. Is that I am the best fit at this time, and don't see a need to go forward with the MML search, by find — any of the same place, thereby saving an additional \$6,000 of taxpayer's money.

That being said, there are members of the city council in attendance today; the mayor, I believe, is on the phone and is listening to what is going on, and has a concern that we -- this is approved today. I personally, obviously, would like to see it approved today.

But the City Council, of which they are here, are concerned that this is approved today, then we can move forward and take care of those issues that were enumerated within the report from the State of Michigan, and do the right thing here in Ecorse.

MR. KORYZNO: I am personally disappointed that the City Council chose to jettison the Michigan Municipal League search. My understanding is that it was proceeding, that there were qualified candidates, and certainly I'm sure you would have been one of those, or are one of those, Mr. O'Neal. I've known you for a long time.

And the search would have been consistent with what

Treasury has done in every other receivership city, in that, a impartial process to select a qualified city administrator would have taken place. Very likely, you would have ended up perhaps as the finalist in the position. But until that process is followed, that Treasury had committed to pay for one half, I'm not in favor of approving this contract. Board members? Any comments.

MR. BOVITZ: I'm kind of torn, because I want the city to move forward, and I think that you have been, you know, doing a good job of mending the problems we've had in the past. And then we did tell the governor in our letter that part of the problem is the stability in the city. So the question is, are you a band aid, or are you a permanent fix?

And I wasn't aware of the status of the Michigan Municipal League search, but even if they found a qualified candidate, would that candidate be willing to take on this job, and start from scratch? So, my personal thought is, I like the fact that you're here as interim city manager, and I don't -- do we have to approve a permanent manager at this point, or is this tabled, do things continue as is?

MR. KORYZNO: And I would say that, because Mr. O'Neal is here, in an interim capacity, things will continue to move forward, until such time as that, in my belief, that a search takes place and council selects from a pool of candidates to determine that Mr. O'Neal is the best candidate. If there was no interim city manager, that would be a different situation, but there is someone here,

moving the city forward.

. 17

MR. O'NEAL: Well, I don't want to be out of order, but, I am the interim administrator. And, with all due respect, with all due respect — how I couch this, I can only use words, so don't take them negatively, if you will. But while I am the interim city administrator, I don't appreciate any benefits that the permanent administrator might get. Vis a vis, health care, which is extremely important to me at this time, based on my family's issues and what have you. And that's extremely important to me.

And with that, it's also important that I have a full time position. And, there are full time positions available, one of which I think I could probably get tomorrow, or today, but I have to make a phone call. I want to stay here, I like it here; I enjoy it here. The employees like me. The council likes me, it's a good fit. I'm using my skills. I, and I'm speaking for the mayor and the council that are in the prevailing side, and if I misspeak myself, I'd ask them to come forward.

They want me here. And I'm needed here, and I want to be here. And there's no reason -- need to even go on with the search. While I understand -- I appreciate your comments, Mr. Koryzno, and we have known each other for a long time, Ms. Parker, we've known each other for many, many years.

And you know, when you do these searches, when you get down to the end, who will take the job? You have people drop by, they applied for it because they needed it. Or they want it, or

whatever, when they finally do their homework, are they really going to take the position? Okay, I'm here to stay. I'm not -- this is a career ender for me, I'm not going anywhere.

1.8

22 .

But that shouldn't be held against me, and then table this. I need those benefits now, the council wants me to be here, I suspect, and again, I'm speaking both for myself and the council. You can go through your search, and they're going to wind up with me. So why — their comments are, why spend the \$6,000 if you're going to wind up in the same place? Unless you have no intention of approving me at the end of the day. And then, I guess I need to know that now. Because, you know, it's not fair for me to be the interim twice in doing this. And there's a lot of heavy lifting here. And a lot of this heavy lifting's got to be done immediately, and you're not going to have anybody on board for months.

That being said, so I do all the heavy lifting, and hand it off. So, and I know that Mr. Elam wants to say something, and the other council members. And it's up to you, but I've spoke, and I don't know if the mayor's on the phone or not, but.

MR. KORYZNO: Do you wish to speak, Councilmember Elam? Please approach the podium and identify yourself.

MR. ELAM: Good morning.

MR. KORYZNO: Good morning.

MR. ELAM: Councilman Elam, I'm here to speak on behalf of the administrator here. Number one, since he's been back -- you know that this is his second time back. We been through over nine -

- O'Neal as the interim, and he's back for the second time.

However, since he's back for the second time, if you can remember, this is what you all have approved. We've been going through all those things diligently, together. Back at the beginning of this meeting, you've stated that how we going to be faring at the end of the five year period. At the end of the five year period, better find some other revenue. Knowing that we borrowed some money from Great Lakes, and that we got to find taxation money to foot the bill. And now we've been working with developers, also. Which is not on here, that's something else he been working on.

But to make matters short, this administration is only here for, number one, for a two year period, and not a four year period. And we have been going through some drastic things in this two year period.

Now, knowing that we did solicit the Michigan Municipal League to search for a permanent person, that permanent person won't come on board til maybe March or April. And then March or April, you know, this is election year. And a lot of people in this administration, including myself, probably -- might not be here for the next election year.

What we're trying to do, the next administration -- what we are trying to do, is get everything that we possibly can in place, where the -- whoever's here, can hopefully get this city back on track. So if you noted on the first five minutes of the meeting

-- meetings you'll note, like I said, where we're going to be in the five year period, and we have been working diligent -- the council and Mr. O'Neal, we have been working diligently, trying to get these things together. Along with all the department heads. And I think it would be a drastic thing not to make him the permanent person.

So we can continue working and getting things going forward here. Thank you.

MR. KORYZNO: Any questions for Councilmember Elam? All right, any --

MR. MOORE: Yes --

MR. KORYZNO: Public Safety Director Moore?

MR. MOORE: One thing I -- Mike Moore, Public Safety
Director. One thing I've found, when I got here at Ecorse, that
people did not stay in positions long. Even in my position, and
other positions, and even the way the elections are set up here.
They're two year elections. And my predecessor said he had been in
his position three years, and he was one of the longest tenured
chiefs that had ever been here. He even got his weapon at the end,
I couldn't believe it.

Because he had been here three years, he was one of the longest tenured people here. But the thing about it is that, you have to be here a certain length of time, to get acclimated and to make a difference and to make changes. So the thing is, if you get somebody here, and you get a abundance of turnover, you can't get anywhere. And since I've been here, as far as bosses, I've had just

nothing but turnover. But then when you get somebody here that says, hey look, I'm here, I'm ready to be here, I'm ready to stay, I'm ready to commit, I think we should take advantage of that.

And if you can get somebody that can get here and maybe get long term contracts or something like that, where they can dig in and make changes, and not have to look over their shoulder and worry about somebody coming after them. I think it would be a travesty to let Mr. O'Neal go.

MR. KORYZNO: Thank you.

- 12

MS. OLIVER: May I speak, as a resident?

MR. KORYZNO: No, thank you. You'll have your chance during public comment. Mr. O'Neal is interim right now, so, it's not as if he's leaving, number one. And number two, there's nothing to say that Mr. O'Neal could not be selected as the permanent city manager, after an independent search and all the candidates were evaluated. Mr. O'Neal was fired by this council once, he was brought back another time, as an interim manager, or let go by the council or whatever and so, we —

MR, MOORE: With all due respect, he wasn't fired.

MR. O'NEAL: I wasn't fired.

MR. KORYZNO: Well not fired, I'm sorry, my mistake. Mr. O'Neal was here as interim city manager, and left, and now he's returned. And so, my position -- my apologies, Mr. O'Neal.

MR. MOORE: And I say, you shouldn't let them get away.

Maybe I should clarify. Shouldn't let him get away.

MR. KORYZNO: Well, thank you. It's my -- it's my opinion that independent search was engaged, the city was halfway through it, we had viable candidates, and it should have been continued. Board members, any comments?

MS. PARKER: Just a question for Mr. Van de Grift. What's the status, right now, of the MML search? Where are things at?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: I believe the woman's name is Kathy Grizinger, who is spearheading the MML search. I have not spoken to her personally, someone at Treasury has. I believe that there were a number of candidates that were identified, and a larger number of applicants that, you know, kind of, that was the initial stage of the search.

I don't know who the applicants were, and I don't think anyone, including council, will know, unless the search were to be completed. But I would urge you, perhaps, to call Ms. Grizinger, because I have not spoken to her myself.

MS. PARKER: Okay.

6 .

MR. KORYZNO: Any further discussion? I'll entertain a motion.

MS. PARKER: Just another -- do I have to make a motion, or can I --

MR. KORYZNO: Go ahead and speak.

MS. PARKER: Have a question of -- Mr. O'Neal, you had mentioned, you know, the issue related to your benefits, not having benefits. I guess at this point, it appears to me that, you know,

the city is pretty comfortable moving forward with you. On the other hand, a dilemma is, you know, where we're at with the search process.

Is it something that we as a Board could perhaps table, to get more information and then perhaps even meet, prior to our next regularly scheduled meeting, to take action?

MR. O'NEAL: While I've made my presentation relative to the reasons why I think I should be made the permanent. Let's set that aside. Let me give you an out. The city an out, everybody an out. My biggest concern that I have, is relative to the benefits. If I can — if I can have the benefits starting today, the benefits ascribed to the manager, and you are adamant that they go through the process. Now, I'm not speaking for the council now.

Because I can tell you right now, I know that one in particular, and as well as these -- I know four in particular, are going to be not happy campers. But for to be a peacemaker, if I can avail myself to the benefits beginning today, I don't have a problem with going through the process. Because I feel at the end of the day, the city council is going to choose me. Based on my background and what I've done.

I have every confident -- I'm not trying to be conceited, or parochial. I just, I believe that. And I believe that's fair to me, if I'm going to do the heavy lifting. And I don't have a problem with it, okay. And I know about being the manager, and you do what you're supposed to do, so. I'm conservative, so, my point

is, if I can avail myself to the benefits, specifically, the medical benefits, then I'll -- I'm fine with that. Not sure if the council's going to be fine with that, but I'll be fine with that for the -- of being a peacemaker.

MR. KORYZNO: I'm not sure we can pick and choose the specifics of the particular contract before us. It would be my suggestion that the council approve an amended contract with that benefit increase, and we would be open to a special meeting, if necessary, to approve that.

MS. PARKER: Yes, because we have to act based on the council's actions. But certainly, if the council could meet and make their amendment.

MR. O'NEAL: There's a meeting -- there's a meeting tonight.

MS. PARKER: There's what, now?

MR. O'NEAL: There's a council meeting tonight. Perhaps they can --

MS. PARKER: Okay. I think if the council could do that, then, we as a Board could look at this.

MR. KORYZNO: At the special meeting.

MS. PARKER: Yes.

MR. O'NEAL: Then what I -- so there's no -- so that there's no surprises, I'm going to ask the City Council, then, to give me the benefits that inure to the other employees. And, going forward, if the make me the permanent, no harm, no foul. If they

don't, well then, no harm, no foul.

1.6

MR. BOVITZ: Personally, I'd like to see you stay, I think you're doing a good job. The fact that you scheduled a work study session tonight says that you're trying to move forward. I think Ed's concern is just to complete the process. So if you can at least get through, and obviously, you're the choice of the City Council at this point, you're at will for the next administration, so in my mind you're always an interim city manager, you know, subject to their approval. So, I'd like to see you stay.

MS. PARKER: So, should we table the item until further notice from the city?

MR. KORYZNO: City.

MS. PARKER: Okay. So I would make that motion, then.

MR. BOVITZ: Support.

MR. KORYZNO: So. The contract that -- permanent city administrator contract -- has been tabled until further action from the city. All right, any further discussion? All in favor of the motion say aye.

MR. BOVITZ: Aye.

MS. PARKER: Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed same sign, motion is approved. Item eight, five year budget status report was addressed in old business. Annual audit report, informational only and item number ten, approval of checks released is informational only.

Our next segment of the meeting is public comment. You'll

have two minutes to speak, pursuant to the Board's rules. And Mr. Van de Grift will act as the timekeeper.

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Councilman Elam?

MR. ELAM: Councilman Elam. I don't know how much I can piggyback on that. But, actually, what I noted earlier in the meeting is where the review of some 20 to 21 issues, was that the assessment for the police and fire?

MR. KORYZNO: Yes.

MR. ELAM: I mean, that's looking at renewing that beyond 2021? Okay. Now, also on the agenda was some contracts that were tabled. What contracts were those?

MR. KORYZNO: All right, well, I'll respond to that in public comment. I mean during Board comment.

MR. ELAM: There again, getting back to the situation that we're in. Even if we went through the process with MML, we're still going to be looking at March or April. When we get a permanent person. And if it's not O'Neal, then we're looking at a new person, to try to get acquainted with. And, there again, this administration is over. In maybe, say, in September, right after August. There's not going to be anything much done throughout the administration; it will be people in this administration campaigning. To see if they can get re-elected.

And that's what we're trying to do now, is to make sure that they get everything that we can for the city. And we're not going to be able to do that, not in this administration. Table it if you want to; you just -- we were trying to get out of a problem.

And I don't think this is getting us out of a problem. I think it's getting us more into a problem. How you were talking about actually how you are going to cut things, I heard you mention Lincoln Park, consolidate, perhaps, and some issues and things.

Really, there's nothing here in the city to cut, any more. You can eliminate, but there's no cutting.

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: That's two minutes.

MR. KORYZNO: Thank you, councilmember.

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Wayne O'Neal, you're on the list?

MR. O'NEAL: I have no comment.

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Director Moore?

MR. MOORE: Mike Moore, Public Safety Director. I just had some clarification. A prior meeting, I talked about part time fire employees, and I got the blessing of this body to go ahead with the hiring of part time people. The question came up, do I have to come back to this body with every single hire? Because each person could possibly go over \$10,000. Or do I have like a blanket PO, to just bring the people in?

MR. KORYZNO: Correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Van de Grift, but I think the approval allowed you to proceed forward, and then with the contractual obligations, he would have to come back to us, or would that be part of the blanket approval?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: That was my understanding. Unless there was a dollar amount that was approved, it would simply need to

be an agenda item, with the contracts as finalized, and then the Board could approve the contract.

MR. KORYZNO: For the position, since they would -- would they fall under the union contract, or would they be outside the union contract?

MR. MOORE: Well actually, there was language in the union contract which provides for part time people. So what happens is that, sometimes I get -- we just advertise for people, and I've got a few applications on my desk. And what happened, I had a few come in, you know, we sent them for physicals and things like that; I've got a couple coming in now, so the question came up, do I have to bring these people in front of the Board or do I just send them through the process?

MR. KORYZNO: Mr. Van de Grift will be in contact with Mr. O'Neal, to clarify that.

MR. MOORE: Thank you.

. 9

MS. PARKER: I was just going to add, you know, if, I think it might depend on what you present to the Board. I mean, if you present to the Board a request to fill so many positions, with some parameters, I'm thinking that might be an action that the Board could take.

MR. MOORE: Well, I think that's kind of how we guess how many people do we get, or what we're going to have.

MS. PARKER: Yeah, I'm not sure what was presented.

MR. MOORE: We talked about, you know, how many police and

fire that we were going to do, and.

MS. PARKER: I don't know if we received that type of detail.

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: I do recall that there were some particulars of the agreement that were submitted. We're talking several meetings ago. I think it might benefit everyone if we reviewed that resolution, and then contacted the city, is that all right?

MR. MOORE: Absolutely. I just wanted clarification.

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Certainly. Ms. Marilyn Oliver?

MS. OLIVER: Marilyn Oliver, long term citizen and concerned resident. Sitting here at the meeting today, I was very hopeful and excited about the actions taken by the Board, until we got to Mr. O'Neal, and I was -- I didn't know that was on the agenda, because I didn't have it in front of me. I want to say that we need continuity in the City of Ecorse. And I think having Mr. O'Neal here, in just six weeks, again, has proven that, that he and that is what we need, a permanent person. As well, the council know that I felt all along that they made a mistake by not renewing his contract.

So here we are, back at square one again, and now, the council has awakened, and they realize that they needed to correct the mistake that they made. So now we're moving forward, and the things that are in place that have happened within the last six weeks, is so needed here. We are a dying, decaying city, we need

continuity. I hope that -- I suggested, even, that we suspend that search, because we have the person that we need.

And we need to move forward and continue to move forward, and I'm hoping that we can get Mr. O'Neal. I don't trust the process that it will be him in the end, because I just know how things work, like that. And you get someone that has to come in and start from square one. He's very knowledgeable about how municipalities work, he has connections to get things done in a faster manner than most people, especially the two that we had previously.

So I just want to advocate that we can stop the search, and keep Mr. O'Neal. Thank you.

MR, KORYZNO: Thank you.

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: That concludes public comment.

MR. KORYZNO: All right. Thank you. Board comment, any comments from the Board? Councilmember Elam had asked what contracts were tabled by the Board earlier, and it was the approval of the employment agreement. Not Mr. O'Neal's, but another employment agreement. And I believe that was the only other contract; am I correct on that, Mr. Van de Grift, that was tabled?

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: The snowplow bid was tabled. And then all of the previous tabled contracts.

MR. KORYZNO: Tabled items were all tabled, so, that's the answer to your question, Mr. Elam. Any other discussion by the Board? Seeing none, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

1	MR. BOVITZ: So moved.
2	MS. PARKER: Support.
3	MR. KORYZNO: Moved and supported to adjourn the meeting
4	at 10:49. We will stand adjourned.
5	(Proceedings conclude at 10:49 a.m.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:
11	
12	s/Nina Lunsford
13	Nina Lunsford CER 4539
14	Certified Electronic Reporter
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	·
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	