City of Lincoln Park

Receivership Transition Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, August 16th, 2016

Lincoln Park City Hall

Council Chambers

1355 Southfield Road

Lincoln Park, Michigan 48146

RTAB MEMBERS PRESENT:
KEVIN BONDS
JESSICA THOMAS
GENELLE ALLEN
JOHN ZECH
BRENDAN DUNLEAVY

ALSO PRESENT:

DREW VAN de GRIFT Michigan Department of Treasury

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

1	Called to order at 1:02 P.m.
2	Tuesday, August 16, 2016
3	MR. BONDS: Good day, everybody. We'll start
4	off with roll call.
5	MR. VAN de GRIFT: Genelle Allen.
6	(No audible response)
7	MR. VAN de GRIFT: Kevin Bonds.
8	MR. BONDS: Here.
9	MR. VAN de GRIFT: Brendan Dunleavy. Absent.
10	Jessica Thomas.
11	MS. THOMAS: Here.
12	MR. VAN de GRIFT: John Zech.
13	MR. ZECH: Here.
14	MR. VAN de GRIFT: The quorum is present.
15	MR. BONDS: Okay, next item is approval of the
16	agenda. The chair will entertain a motion to approve the
17	agenda as presented. And a reminder for the public, to
18	sign up to speak during public comment portion of the
19	meeting, please.
20	MR. ZECH: I move the agenda be approved as
21	presented.
22	MS. THOMAS: I support.
23	MR. BONDS: It's been properly moved and
24	supported; all those in favor of the agenda, signify by
25	stating aye. Aye.

1	MS. THOMAS: Aye.
2	MR. ZECH: Aye.
3	MR. BONDS: Any opposed.
4	(No response)
5	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, motion passes. Next
6	item, Item C, is approval of the RTAB minutes. This is
7	the regular meeting of July 19th. Chair will entertain a
8	motion to approve the July 19th, 2016, RTAB minutes as
9	presented.
10	MS. THOMAS: So moved.
11	MR. ZECH: Support.
12	MR. BONDS: It's been properly moved and
13	supported, any further discussion?
14	(No response.)
15	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, all those in favor
16	signify by stating aye. Aye.
17	MR. ZECH: Aye.
18	MS. THOMAS: Aye.
19	MR. BONDS: Any opposed.
20	(No response)
21	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, motion passes.
22	Old business, we have none.
23	New business, which is Item A, the approval of
24	resolutions and ordinances for city council meetings.
25	Number one is the resolution from the regular city council

1	meeting of July 5th, 2016, which is Attachment 2.
2	A reminder that all resolutions from the city
3	council meeting have been approved at our previous board
4	meeting, with the exception of two resolutions.
5	The chair will entertain a motion to approve the
6	rest of the resolutions from the July 5th regular city
7	council meeting, with the exception of Resolution 2016-
8	201, which is accounts and claims payable.
9	MR. ZECH: So moved.
10	MS. THOMAS: Support.
11	MR. BONDS: It's been properly moved and
12	supported, any further discussions?
13	(No response)
14	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, all those in favor
15	signify by stating aye. Aye.
16	MR. ZECH: Aye.
17	MS. THOMAS: Aye.
18	MR. BONDS: Any opposed.
19	(No response)
20	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, motion passes.
21	Mr. Coppler, can you please provide a summary of
22	2016-201 for the board, please?
23	MR. COPPLER: That's the this is the monthly
24	\$25,000 payable accounts.
25	MR. BONDS: You know, I'm sorry about that.

1	This is what happens when you read too tightly over your
2	script. My apologies.
3	MR. COPPLER: No problem.
4	MR. BONDS: My apologies.
5	Okay, this is item number two, which is
6	resolutions from the special city council meeting of July
7	5th, 2016, which is Attachment 3. The chair will entertain
8	a motion to approve, deny, postpone all resolutions from
9	the special city council meeting of July 5th.
10	MR. ZECH: So moved.
11	MS. THOMAS: Support.
12	MR. BONDS: It's been properly moved and
13	supported, any further discussion?
14	(No response)
15	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, all those in favor
16	signify by stating aye. Aye.
17	MR. ZECH: Aye.
18	MS. THOMAS: Aye.
19	MR. BONDS: Any opposed.
20	(No response)
21	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, motion passes.
22	Item 3, which is resolutions from the regular
23	city council meeting of July 18th, which is Attachment 4
24	for the board members. Chair will entertain a motion to
25	approve all resolutions from the July 18th, 2016, regular

1	city council meeting, with the exception of Resolution
2	2016-216, 216, accounts and claims payable.
3	MS. THOMAS: So moved.
4	MR. ZECH: Support.
5	MR. BONDS: It's been properly moved and
6	supported, any further discussion?
7	(No response)
8	MR. BONDS: All those in favor signify by
9	stating aye. Aye.
10	MR. ZECH: Aye.
11	MS. THOMAS: Aye.
12	MR. BONDS: Any opposed.
13	(No response)
14	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, motion passes.
15	Item B, city manager's items, which is for you,
16	board members, Attachment 5. Items one through three,
17	while action on these three items occurred during a city
18	during a council meeting outside the normal review
19	period for today's board meeting, the city manager's
20	requesting to bring them forward for early review.
21	Number one is approval of Resolution 2016-230,
22	which is to authorize, design and bid solicitation for
23	concrete repairs to retention basin cell number one, which
24	is Attachment 5A. This item has been approved by the city
25	council at their August 1st, 2016, council meeting. Mr.

Coppler, can you please provide a summary of this item to the board, please?

(Mr. Dunleavy present at 1:07 p.m.)

MR. COPPLER: Sure, I'd be glad to. It's kind of timely because we're having a little bit of an issue with storm water, and the sanitary sewers today. But we ended it, so staff, a few months ago, became aware of an issue within the retention basin, where there's water coming out where it shouldn't be coming out. They cleaned it out, and did a review of it, and they found a number of cracks and erosion of the actual wall system in that first cell.

We had to consult an engineer, Hennessy, which you're probably familiar with by now. Looked at that and prepared a course of action that they're estimating a total cost to the city of about \$350,000.

And there's a number of different aspects to it, but primarily, they're filling cracks and repairing walls. So, this money -- ultimately, you'll be seeing that actually in September, at your meeting. There'll be a hand-in resolution to amend the budget.

Money for this is actually residing in a reserve fund that currently totals about one million dollars. And it was set aside many, many years ago, when the system was first built, as part of the requirements for the bonding

1	and federal monies that were a part of the construction of
2	this. And so, we'll be utilizing that to pay for this.
3	MR. BONDS: Okay. Any questions?
4	(No response)
5	MR. BONDS: If not, this chair will entertain a
6	motion to approve, deny, or postpone resolution 2016-230,
7	which is to authorize the design and bid solicitation for
8	concrete repairs to the retention basin cell number one.
9	MR. ZECH: So moved.
10	MS. THOMAS: Support.
11	MR. BONDS: Any discussion?
12	(No response)
13	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, all those in favor
14	signify by stating aye. Aye.
15	MR. ZECH: Aye.
16	MS. THOMAS: Aye.
17	MR. DUNLEAVY: Aye.
18	MR. BONDS: Any opposed.
19	(No response)
20	MR. BONDS: None, motion passes.
21	Item number two, which is approval of Resolution
22	2016-235, which is the award, Pagel Avenue reconstruction
23	and water main replacement project, to RFP Construction,
24	Inc. For board members, that's Attachment 5B.
25	This item has been approved by the city council,

1	at their August 1st, 2016, council meeting. And Mr.
2	Coppler, can you please provide us a summary?
3	MR. COPPLER: Pagel Avenue reconstruction is
4	part of the city's 2016 road improvement program. It was
5	bid out recently, and it came in a little bit over the
6	engineer's estimate by about nine and a half percent.
7	In reviewing it, one of the concepts we had was
8	to pull it, you know, reject the bids, and put it back out
9	over the winter and see if we could get better pricing on
10	it. Unfortunately, the condition of the roadway the
11	residents were experiencing, we felt that we would
12	probably be spending most of the savings that we would get
13	for that, maintaining the road over the winter.
14	I was going to take pictures of this road, so
15	you could understand what I'm talking about, but
16	technically there is no road there.
17	MR. BONDS: Wow.
18	MR. COPPLER: So, it's probably, I think, the
19	worst road in the city, and that's why we wanted to make
20	that a priority to get that done, as one of the first
21	roads, as part of our roads program.
22	MR. BONDS: Any questions? Mr. Dunleavy?
23	MR. DUNLEAVY: Just, does that mean you're going
24	to have to postpone other projects, or you're going to
25	make some accommodation for this in the budget?

1	MR. COPPLER: Yes, the issue is the future
2	years. Because when we were looking at this, you know,
3	the increase is going to have an impact on how we roll
4	down the reserve that we have. One of the first things
5	I'm going to I got into this a long time ago. The city
6	was carrying large balances, with both major and local
7	road funds. And so we put the five year plan together, to
8	draw that down to a level that we think would be an
9	acceptable amount.
10	One of the issues we have pressing out there, is
11	you never know when the county or the state's going to
12	come in and say, oh, by the way, we're going to insure the
13	program, and you're going to be paying a share of that.
14	And so we need to keep a certain amount of funding
15	available for those type of situations.
16	So, it's going to reduce the amount we have in
17	future years, that we were planning on using. So in a
18	way, yes. It will affect the road.
19	MR. DUNLEAVY: Not going to affect current
20	budget, though?
21	MR. COPPLER: No.
22	MR. DUNLEAVY: Okay, great, thank you.
23	(Ms. Allen present at 1:11 p.m.)
24	MR. BONDS: Thank you. Mr. Zech?
25	MR. ZECH: Thank you. You said the engineer's -

1	-, the bid, exceeded the engineer's estimate by about nine
2	percent?
3	MR. COPPLER: A little over, I think nine and a
4	half percent over.
5	MR. ZECH: And, because I'm a little unprepared
6	for this one, what was the bid? The amount of the bid?
7	MR. COPPLER: The total bid was \$800 and
8	MS. THOMAS: Ninety nine.
9	MR. COPPLER: Eight-ninety-nine, yeah.
10	MR. ZECH: Okay. So around \$900,000?
11	MR. COPPLER: Yeah. I was going to say that,
12	but I thought I better be more specific.
13	MR. ZECH: That's okay. Thank you, that's what
14	I was looking for. And it went out to bid like recent,
15	fairly recently?
16	MR. COPPLER: I think it was about the end of
17	July.
18	MR. ZECH: Sometimes when you bid in the summer,
19	they've lined up their projects, and.
20	MR. COPPLER: Well, that's what our thinking
21	was, and this year, you know unfortunately we got a late
22	start on everything. You know, we're going to be going
23	over the winter and going out to bid a lot earlier than we
24	did for this year, for all of our projects. So I think
2.5	we'll escape that issue

1	MR. ZECH: Does the city have experience with
2	RFP Construction?
3	MR. COPPLER: The city itself, I don't think,
4	has used them, as far as the collective knowledge that's
5	here. But Hennessy Engineering has worked with them in
6	other cities.
7	MR. ZECH: Where are they located, please?
8	MR. COPPLER: Southgate.
9	MR. ZECH: Southgate, thank you.
10	MR. BONDS: Any further questions?
11	(No response)
12	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, the chair will
13	entertain a motion to approve, deny or postpone Resolution
14	2016-235, which is the Award-Pagel reconstruction and
15	water main replacement project, to RFP Construction, Inc.
16	MR. DUNLEAVY: Move approval.
17	MR. BONDS: It has been moved by Mr. Dunleavy;
18	is there a second?
19	MR. ZECH: Support.
20	MR. BONDS: And support.
21	Any further discussion on the motion?
22	(No response)
23	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, all those in favor
24	signify by stating aye. Aye.
25	MR. ZECH: Aye.

1	MS. THOMAS: Aye.
2	MR. DUNLEAVY: Aye.
3	MR. BONDS: Any opposed.
4	(No response)
5	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, motion passes.
6	Item number three, which is the approval of
7	resolution and we've added those to your packets,
8	they're right before you all. So the approval of
9	Resolution 2016, which is 261, the 2016 sale of tax
10	reverted properties.
11	This item has been approved by the city council
12	at their August 5th 15th, excuse me 2016 council
13	meeting. Mr. Coppler, can you provide us a summary?
14	MR. COPPLER: And is all right if I cover both
15	of the resolutions
16	MR. BONDS: Yes, please. Thank you.
17	MR. COPPLER: For a speedier progression. So,
18	the building fund program that the emergency manager put
19	in place last year, the city decided to do it exercise
20	its first right of refusal on a number of parcels that the
21	county notified us were going through foreclosure.
22	At present time, there's 21 properties that we
23	put into a package, and marketed it out to what we felt
24	were qualified developers, to purchase through the right
25	of first refusal. We ended up receiving three bids on

this. One of the bids did not take all of the property that we had put out there, and that was one of the mandatory parts of it, is we wanted them to take the whole package.

So they did not continue on in the process. So in the end, we conducted interviews of two of the three proposals, and in the end, JSR, which is the company that was awarded this package last year, presented the best opportunity for the city to take part in this step.

The important part for the city and the residents, in exercising this first right of refusal, is threefold. First off, it allows us to make sure that the person who is going to be acquiring these tax foreclosed properties, is actually going to reinvest in them.

And if you go back, and, it was one of the primary reasons why the EM started us on this path, of this type of project. If you go back two or three years, prior to the first go around with this, you'll see hundreds of parcels that were bought through foreclosure, spread throughout the city, with companies that we are still trying to lasso in, in terms of fixing the issues with the properties, that existed.

This allows us to direct the work by those companies, and keep the amount of our -- or help incentivize the amount of investment.

Last year, just to give you an example of this, there was approximately 88 properties in that were part of the package. And to date, the developer's already spent \$1.8 million, in renovations of those properties. And we're seeing somewhere between seven to fifteen percent increase in the taxable value of these properties, that are going out on the market.

\$50,000, we're seeing in the \$60 to \$70,000 range. I think the average is somewhere right around 60, \$61,000 approximately. There's about ten or twelve have been sold; there's ten or twelve more in that package that are pending, and there's probably 20 plus that are going to be put out in market within the next 20 to 30 days.

And so, he had one year to put everything together, and it's very similar -- everything I'm telling you is basically is going to be replicated, going forward with this.

The second piece of why this has worked, is that if we were to let these properties go into tax foreclosure, we would lose money on that. And primarily, it's the water bills, and the special assessments. And I think we're looking at about \$57,000 that the city would lose, if it went to the regular foreclosure. But because of this program, we have been able to recapture and make

1 the water, primarily the water fund a whole factor. 2 And I think the third part is, it does have dramatic impact on the neighborhoods. When you're putting 3 4 that type of reinvestment -- you know, we're only 5 mandating an average of \$15,000. If you do the math, on 6 the 1.8 that he's already spent, that number's probably 7 around 20, \$25,000 per parcel. That they're investing. 8 And again, that is when you bring up the overall value of 9 property in the neighborhoods, throughout the city, and it will help build that tax base over the land value. 10 MR. BONDS: Ouestions of the board members? 11 12 MR. ZECH: Mr. Chairman? 13 MR. BONDS: Yes, sir. 14 MR. ZECH: A couple of questions, maybe a 15 comment. I think this is great. The question is, the 16 ones that you have that were not sold through JSR, are you 17 perhaps taking them through your dangerous buildings 18 ordinance, to get after some of these properties that 19 were, previously went this way, but haven't been fixed or 20 developed? 21 MR. COPPLER: There were a whole lot of -- we 22 started out with about 44 properties. Two of them had 23 been redeemed before we got to this point so we were

dealing with about 42. There were a number of vacant

parcels that were on this list that we decided not to do

24

25

1 anything with.

I think, you know, there was some opportunity there, but it just really didn't make sense, from the budgetary standpoint, to take those properties on to have to maintain them going forward. There were, we ended up with probably about seven parcels or so that needed to be demolished. And we were actually angling toward using CDBG money to acquire those and demolish them.

Unfortunately, our program isn't set up for the acquisition piece of it. The demolishing piece is no problem, but, we don't have plans set up to do that, so one of the actions going forward, is we're going to adjust that plan, and get it recertified so we can do acquisitions.

But the county is, this year, bundling together properties that the cities believe should be demolished. And I'm not sure of all the details of this, I'm still trying to get a handle on it, but we did get them that, those parcels, let them know that we believe those should be torn down. So, we'll see how that program works out for us.

MR. ZECH: My second question is, out of some of these -- I have some experience with this, in the City of Wayne. Some of these parcels that are on these lists, are some of them occupied by the people that have lost them?

MR. COPPLER: They were -- they were getting ten properties identified by the county as occupied. Two of them were taken off the list, they were redeemed, so, we believe that of the ten, that eight will have residents, due to renters or owners, or former owner, I guess, at that point, in those.

We, I think, the city, has done a lot better job this year, and the county's done a lot better job this year, notifying the residents of their ability to not lose their homes. There's been a lot of communication. We are working in part of, you know, what the developer will be doing is, working to help those residents move on into different places to live. But there's going to be some evictions, when it's all said and done.

MR. ZECH: Perhaps some of the people will maybe work with the developer, and --

MR. COPPLER: That wasn't, I think, that wasn't very clear, last year, the way the program's put together. I think a lot of people learned a lot of things, and again, in working with the same developers, we have a better understanding of what to expect, and to try to work with them.

There may be an opportunity, looking through the list, there may be an opportunity there for maybe one or two that may be able to purchase it back. But I think the

1	majority of them just won't have the financial wherewithal
2	to do it.
3	The other side of this is, that, you know, they
4	are pushing to have all these sold as owner occupied
5	homes. But we've let the developer know that there is a
6	willingness that, if the resident that right now is in the
7	home, if they can work out some type of lease, we'd be
8	open to modifying that.
9	MS. ALLEN: Since the county is a party to these
10	transactions, I will abstain from the vote.
11	MR. BONDS: Thank you very much, thank you very
12	much. Any further questions from the board members?
13	(No response)
14	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, the chair will
15	entertain a motion to accept both resolutions, so it'll be
16	approval of resolutions 261 and 262, for the sale of tax
17	reverted properties.
18	MR. ZECH: So moved.
19	MS. THOMAS: Support.
20	MR. BONDS: It's been properly moved and second.
21	Been properly moved and supported, any further discussion?
22	(No response)
23	MR. BONDS: And we have one abstention. All
24	those in favor of both approving both resolutions,
25	signify by stating ave. Ave.

1	MR. ZECH: Aye.
2	MS. THOMAS: Aye.
3	MR. DUNLEAVY: Aye.
4	MR. BONDS: Any opposed.
5	(No response)
6	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, motions pass.
7	Okay, item number four, which is the approval to
8	hire three public service workers in the Department of
9	Public Service, which is Attachment 5C, for the board
10	members.
11	Mr. Coppler?
12	MR. COPPLER: We had, the number of positions
13	that were created as part of the new budget, within DPS,
14	and they're full time positions. One within the roads
15	budgets, and then another number within the water-sewer
16	department.
17	And so the two positions, full time positions,
18	we were seeking to be filled, both are coming from the
19	part time ranks. One's coming from part time, which is
20	Padill (sp) Smith, who has been employed part time with us
21	for a while now. And has gotten his necessary
22	certifications to be put forward. He'll be working with
23	full time individuals on water leaks and everything, and
24	we feel that he's going to be a good fit for us to fill
25	one of those vacancies.

1	And I think the second, which was done through a
2	previous process, again filled, we were able to fill, to
3	start right away, in helping the city out with water bill
4	payments that come in.
5	The third position is a part time position, we
6	have about eight part time positions within DPS, though
7	not all of them are filled, at the present time. That
8	continues, historically, have had a minor league system to
9	see if they're going to work out for full time positions.
10	MR. BONDS: Any questions from any of the board
11	members on this motion?
12	MR. ZECH: I move approval.
13	MR. BONDS: Is there a second?
14	MS. ALLEN: Second.
15	MR. BONDS: And there's been a second. Any
16	further discussion?
17	(No response)
18	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, all those in favor
19	signify by stating aye. Aye.
20	MR. ZECH: Aye.
21	MS. THOMAS: Aye.
22	MR. DUNLEAVY: Aye.
23	MS. ALLEN: Aye.
24	MR. BONDS: Any opposed.
25	(No response)

1	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, motion passes.
2	All righty, the following reports, which are
3	items five through ten, are received and filed, which is
4	the budget to actual, cash flow and balance sheet, check
5	disbursement report, overtime report, tax collection and
6	timing of revenue report, the monthly report.
7	Did anybody have any questions on any of those?
8	(No response)
9	MR. BONDS: Okay, then we're going to move on.
10	City administrator's report which is the look ahead memo.
11	MR. COPPLER: Thank you very much.
12	I've just got a few items for your consideration
13	moving forward. First off, staff is still working to
14	finalize an alternate sheltering for the dogs and cats we
15	collect, as a normal course of business.
16	I believe we had spoken sometime back, that the
17	downriver animal control, which is made up of Allen Park,
18	Southgate, and Wyandotte, which we had a contract with,
19	asked us to move on because of the mix of dogs that we
20	were putting into their system.
21	And so, we've been actually working with another
22	city in the downriver, to hopefully finalize an agreement
23	that will be presented to council on September 6th, so
24	you'll be seeing it as we move forward. We have until

the end of September to finalize it.

25

1	Most likely we were paying about \$25,000 a
2	year to the downriver animal control; my guess is that
3	we're probably going to see an increase in that cost,
4	going to the city. We were looking at it was a
5	foregone conclusion, had we been able to stay with the
6	downriver, that we'd have been paying possibly twice as
7	much as what we're paying right now, so.
8	MR. BONDS: So currently, is this is the city
9	without this service?
10	MR. COPPLER: No, we have until the end of
11	September.
12	MR. BONDS: End of September?
13	MR. COPPLER: To take our dogs elsewhere.
14	MR. BONDS: Okay. And, let me make sure that
15	I'm clear on this. So this is the, what would be
16	considered to be the shelter?
17	MR. COPPLER: Yes. For dogs and cats.
18	MR. BONDS: Okay. And
19	MR. COPPLER: But we collect, or residents drop
20	off, either they find them, or no longer can care for
21	them.
22	MR. BONDS: Okay. And I'm just going to ask the
23	question, because you know, I have a soft heart for these
24	animals. Do you have any relationship with any of the
25	rescue groups? Has the city reached out to both the dog

1	and the various cat rescues, that could provide
2	assistance?
3	MR. COPPLER: Well the so, the downriver
4	animal shelter is the primary contact with the different
5	rescues. And in working with this other city, that
6	hopefully we'll be presenting to, they have, I would say a
7	better relationship with some of the more special breeds
8	that we've been having an issue with. And with the
9	downriver, that they have been able to, you know, either
10	adopt out or give them to a rescue.
11	MR. BONDS: Okay.
12	MR. COPPLER: So you know, again, I think
13	there's compatibility amongst the types of dogs that we
14	put into the system, and the city that we're looking to
15	partner with, puts into the system. So they have a little
16	bit better relationship.
17	MR. BONDS: I see. Okay. All right.
18	MR. COPPLER: I don't want to say the word
19	dangerous, because they're not dangerous, but they are a
20	little bit harder to rehome than the average
21	MR. BONDS: I understand. Yeah. You don't even
22	have to say the breed, I understand. All right.
23	MR. COPPLER: I think if we're able to complete
24	that deal it's going to be a good thing for both the city
25	we're working with and the citizens of Lincoln Park So

1	I think we may end up paying a little bit more, but I
2	think we're going to get better service and do better
3	towards getting the dogs out.
4	MR. BONDS: Okay.
5	MR. COPPLER: Which, you know, the cost is, if
6	the dog stays there a long time, it drives up the cost.
7	MR. BONDS: Which is why I was wondering about
8	rescue groups, because they usually go in and try to find
9	homes.
10	MR. COPPLER: Interesting enough, we received
11	about a 30 percent decrease in the number of dogs that
12	we're putting into the system, this year over last year.
13	MR. BONDS: That's great. Okay.
14	MR. COPPLER: The second issue is our ice arena.
15	You may be aware of the operator of that, the lessee of
16	that, has let us know that they are no longer going to
17	operate that for the city, so we're putting together a
18	final plan for council to consider. I think that's
19	actually going to happen September 12th, now.
20	One of the options does bring it in house. But
21	we're finalizing everything right now. It's been kind of
22	put over here, working as we get time, with everything
23	else, but that'll be coming to you at least an
24	understanding of where we're going at the next meeting.
25	MR. BONDS: Okay.

MR. COPPLER: And then the last thing, a heads up on the Downriver Utility Wastewater Authority. That still is progressing towards a potential sell from Wayne County to the 13 communities that make up DUWA.

They are trying to come up with a time schedule for when all this is going to happen, and there's three critical path items here that all have a lot of importance, but you know, there's different opinions on you know, which ones should be prioritized over the others.

Which, one is the definitive agreement, actual purchase and sale agreement. The second is all the bonding that's necessary to actually consummate the deal. The third part is the NPDS permits. Which currently, they didn't have them. And the reason it doesn't have one is because the DEQ wants the communities to put in about \$50 million worth of improvements.

But there are some different options that the technical committee for DUWA can go through and hopefully they'll make some recommendations. But the important part that you should be aware of, is right now, they're looking at final consideration of the purchase -- excuse me, service agreements, that are necessary to be able to put this out into the marketplace for revenue bonds.

And the consideration by the communities,

whether they're going to be owners or customers of this system are coming together probably in late October or early November. So council here will probably start taking that item up at some time.

MR. BONDS: Okay. I wanted to comment on your year look ahead, because I think it was in your last, it would have been in your last look ahead memo. Which is the millage the city had passed.

MR. BONDS: So I wanted to formally acknowledge that and reiterate what I think those of us on this board, and also the Department of Treasury, is that the city council and yourself, you all are doing just a great job of keeping this moving. And the passage of that millage, as we all know, it was a very critical piece for the City of Lincoln Park.

So I think, you know, the confidence level is extremely high on all the good work that you all are doing, and you're moving the train in the right direction, so you all should be feeling very good about the work that you're doing, because voter approved millages require a lot of education and outreach, and clearly that the city council has done great work in that, and that shows.

MR. COPPLER: I also want to comment that the men and women of our police and fire departments -- that's what wins -- the work that they constantly do.

1	MR. BONDS: Absolutely.
2	MR. COPPLER: And you know, they are an
3	incredible asset to our community. And if you're able, by
4	the way, they're having a picnic, the police department's
5	having a picnic this coming Sunday.
6	MR. BONDS: Sunday. What time, and where?
7	MR. COPPLER: It'll be noon to four.
8	MR. BONDS: Noon to four.
9	MR. COPPLER: But it's for children, the kids,
10	but it's, you know, I'm going to be there, you know.
11	MR. BONDS: Where's it going to be held?
12	MR. COPPLER: It's going to be at the Youth
13	Center Park. So it's actually right behind the ice arena.
14	MR. BONDS: Okay. Thank you. But I wanted to
15	acknowledge that. Thank you.
16	MR. DUNLEAVY: Just out of curiosity, I used to
17	audit drains and sewers when I was with Huron City (sic)
18	so I'm always fascinated by them. I guess it's weird.
19	But this is pretty much a done deal, is that correct? I
20	mean, all of it's?
21	MR. COPPLER: I think if it continues on the
22	trajectory that it's continuing on, yes. As I said, those
23	three critical paths, the permit is a very critical
24	because in the end, the community's going to have to come
25	up with another \$50 million to get this deal done. That

could be -- a number of the communities in DUWA have said that they can't support going forward if that happens.

So that's one tripwire for us.

The second really is the ability to bond. I mean, if we cannot get all the service agreements signed, sealed and delivered, and go out and get favorable rating for the revenue bonds, this is -- could be a very hard deal in that respect.

MR. DUNLEAVY: I always have a problem with the concept of buying something from the county that the community already paid for. It just mind boggles me, because I audited a number of the drains and sewers, and on the debt, each city signed on to it, so this thing could be built.

So you paid for it once, and you're going to pay for it again, and that's a concept I can't get my arms around. And I struggle with it immensely, because part of the county's -- not any longer, but part of their deficit reduction plan was to sell these assets.

And I'm going to say you're selling them to the folks that already paid for them. And that's a concept I can't get my arms around. And I just, I'd be reluctant if I didn't step out and make a point of that, because I -- all levels of government are just an extension of the state.

And this is actually accounted for in an
enterprise fund, or an internal service fund, so the folks
who are the users are going to pay for it. When you talk
about the bonds, that means water and sewage rates are
going up, in essence. So the folks are going to pay for
it again, and I just can't get my arms around the idea the
county sold the property so, that's why I ask, is this
pretty much a done deal, or ?

MR. COPPLER: You know, I think that, again, if it continues on the trajectory that it's going right now, that a lot of the headaches are going to be solved. I don't see any true issues with the bond once we get the service agreements. We're going to be able to generate more than enough money to pay off all those bonds.

You know, the tentative agreement is a semi willing partner to sell it. For whatever reason, they're not, you know, the energetic partner I would expect to try to sell this, so they're not moving very quickly with it. And you have a number of communities that want to own that plant and with the county owning the plant -- it's felt that it just hasn't been managed properly over time.

It really comes down, I think, to that permit, the discharge permit so it's an issue. And if DEQ doesn't buy into some alternate ways around what they're requiring, there's going to be a number of communities

that just will not support the purchase.

But the other side of it is, that it's going to happen. If the state says this is what it is, and yeah, we're going to be paying for it one way or another. If I could just editorialize a little bit, because I want to go the next step, beyond what you just said.

We're not really paying for an asset here.

There hasn't been any review of what the asset truly is worth. The transaction is paying for, putting it kindly, poor management of the system in the -- we're paying for legacy costs.

That 57 million is to pay for you know, retirement benefits, and other benefits that just were never properly budgeted for, historically. And that's it. we're not buying a plant, we're paying legacy benefits. That's the worst part, because we know that all these facilities have a life expectancy.

We know that at some point, we're going to be spending a lot of money to keep that plant up and operational, and we're the losing capacity to fund those required upgrades. Because we're not really transacting the deal that you or I probably would -- like to just try to buy a car from someone, and you're not really buying the car, you're paying for the driver to drive the car to you.

And you find out that there's like, only two tires on it.

MR. DUNLEAVY: I guess that's probably the best explanation I've ever heard. But also the explanation that you're paying for the legacy costs. Because I understand that; I just don't understand how you pay for the sewer, the pipes and the plant that you've already bought.

The legacy costs I understand, and I just think you have to -- you'll figure it out, but you'll just have to be careful and make sure you're not paying for the legacy costs of some other asset. And just for the employees that worked there at that facility, and that it's truly your responsibility, as being a user of the system.

MR. COPPLER: The due diligence part is, from our perspective right now, the hardest part is again we're not seeing that energetic partner who wants to sell the facility. We would expect to see a lot more of the documents to help us understand a very simple thing, we want to know what the plant owns, what the system owns.

And slowly now it's starting to trickle in, but we've been making this request for a number of months now. And again, along your lines, we just want to make sure that if there was a desk purchased -- and I'm being very

small here, but if there was a desk purchased by sewer funds, there better be a desk accounted for. And not somewhere else.

MR. DUNLEAVY: That's a good point, but hopefully you're not going to have to buy the desk you already bought through the sewer rates, that you already charged your folks taxes on.

MR. COPPLER: Yeah.

MR. DUNLEAVY: And that's my problem. If it's the legacy costs I can get my arms around that, that's unfortunate; it's just something that happened, it's something Ford Motor, GM and everybody else had to deal with. Too generous with the benefits, and it is what it is.

And hopefully you'll get the list on the assets you're purchasing. But I would also question how they calculated the legacy costs and how they came up with the, well, if it's 50 million you're paying, I'd have an interest in knowing what the 50 million is buying.

And I'd also have to say that while we had four or five plant supervisors that worked there since 19-whatever, and here's the legacy cost associated with it.

Because I think the downriver's an older system, and you might have a lot of legacy costs there, and the folks that are retired, so.

MR. COPPLER: Well, and I think the auditors
probably would appreciate you know, we did our own
analysis of legacy costs and it came in a lot lower than
50 million.
MR. DUNLEAVY: Well, that's why I have a
problem. Because I really have a problem when you're
buying it and I had a problem with Plymouth, where I live,
they were going to sell the system back to Plymouth, and I
was trying to bang my shoe on the table, saying we already
bought it. Why are we going to buy it again?
And I just think that people need to understand
that when you buy an asset like that, you've already
bought it, you go back to the historical records; each one
of the communities signed onto the debt when they put the
first pipe in the ground. And when they put the plant up,
so be careful you don't buy an asset and cause yourself
some other financial trouble.
MR. BONDS: All right, good discussion, and that
is on the record, so that will help the public as well.
Mr. Zech?
MR. ZECH: Mr. Chairman, two things. I have to
excuse myself; I've got a meeting at 2:00 in Southgate,
and more importantly, Southgate's one of the communities
that's struggling with the same issues that Lincoln Park

and others of the downriver area are struggling with, and

25

1 so, I've only been there a couple weeks on the job. 2 I don't know the City of Southgate's position on this very important subject, but I've heard these 3 4 discussions going on, and so, very same thing you said. 5 Why are we buying something we've already paid for? is the first time I'd heard the matter about legacy costs. 6 7 So, and perhaps when this does come in front of this 8 group, if it ever does come in front of this group, if my 9 community that I'm working for is taking a different view 10 than the City of Lincoln Park, I probably will have to 11 recuse myself, or abstain, or leave the room, or whatever. 12 And I had that discussion with the folks at 13 Treasury Department, and I've consulted with -- although I didn't consult with Pat, or with Drew, but with their 14 15 cohorts, and they said if that ever should occur, I need 16 to abstain, I quess. 17 MR. BONDS: Okay, thank you. 18 MR. ZECH: So I hope to see all of you in 19 September. 20 MR. BONDS: We're going to move into public 21 comment. 22 MR. VAN de GRIFT: City Councilman Kelsey. 23 MR. KELSEY: Good afternoon. Just a brief 24 I'm glad I attended this one; I appreciate the comment. 25 comment about the buying it twice issue. I think it's

1	been a discussion among some of the council people here
2	indirectly, off the cuff, so to speak. I think it's a
3	good point, and I'm glad you're looking at it because it
4	will come up I'm quite sure, when that expenditure is
5	done.
6	So I appreciate the knowledge of the folks
7	looking into things like that, to make sure that it's done
8	the way it's supposed to be. Something is a deep dive, I
9	guess is a better terminology used where I come from.
10	Thank you very much.
11	MR. BONDS: Okay, any board comment?
12	(No response)
13	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, move for adjournment.
14	MR. DUNLEAVY: Motion to adjourn.
15	MS. THOMAS: Support.
16	MR. BONDS: Any discussion?
17	(No response.)
18	MR. BONDS: Hearing none, all those in favor
19	signify by stating aye. Aye.
20	MS. THOMAS: Aye.
21	MR. DUNLEAVY: Aye.
22	MS. ALLEN: Aye.
23	MR. BONDS: Meeting is adjourned, thank you all
24	for your good work.
25	(Meeting adjourned at 1:46 p.m.)

```
1
    STATE OF MICHIGAN
 2
    COUNTY OF WASHTENAW ).ss
 3
    I certify that this transcript is a complete, true, and
 4
 5
    correct transcript to the best of my ability of the RTAB
    meeting held on August 16th, 2016, City of Lincoln Park.
 6
                                                               Ι
 7
    also certify that I am not a relative or employee of the
 8
    parties involved and have no financial interest in this case.
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
    RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:
                              August 25th, 2016
    s/ amy Shankleton-Novess
17
18
19
20
    Amy Shankleton-Novess (CER 0838)
21
    Certified Electronic Reporter
22
23
24
25
```