

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NOVI  
MONDAY, MARCH 22, 2021 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**Mayor Gatt called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.**

In accordance with the provisions of the Open Meeting Act this meeting was held remotely.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ROLL CALL:** Mayor Gatt, Mayor Pro Tem Staudt, Council Members Casey, Crawford, Fischer, Maday, Mutch

Mayor Gatt, present from City of Novi, Oakland County, State of Michigan  
Mayor Pro Tem Staudt, present from the City of Novi, Oakland County, State of Michigan  
Member Casey, present from the City of Novi, Oakland County, State of Michigan  
Member Crawford, present from City of Novi, Oakland County, State of Michigan  
Member Fischer, present from City of Novi, Oakland County, State of Michigan  
Member Maday, present from City of Novi, Oakland County, State of Michigan  
Member Mutch, present from City of Novi, Oakland County, State of Michigan

**ALSO PRESENT:** Peter Auger, City Manager  
Victor Cardenas, Assistant City Manager  
Tom Schultz, City Attorney  
Carl Johnson, Finance Director/Treasurer/CFO

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

Mayor Gatt added "Outreach & Support" to Mayor and Council Issues.

**CM 21-03-041 Moved by Staudt, seconded by Casey; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**To approve the Agenda as amended.**

**Roll call vote on CM 21-02-041**                      **Yeas: Staudt, Casey, Crawford, Fischer, Maday, Mutch, Gatt**  
**Nays: None**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS: None**

**PRESENTATIONS:**

1. National Community Survey Presentation

Director of Communications, Sheryl Walsh-Molloy said she had the pleasure of presenting the National Community Survey findings from 2020. As you recall, we embarked on the Biannual Citizen Survey last fall. She said she was a little hesitant to the findings, but she thought everyone will agree as she walked through this presentation, she did not think we could be any more pleased with the results and the direction that Novi continues to head. She explained for those listening and were not familiar, the National Community Survey is a report about livability in Novi. It is done every two years in conjunction with

what was formally the National Research Center. The livable community is designed and used to invoke a place that is simply not habitable, but that is desirable. She stated it is not just where people live, it is where they want live. She stated that the National Community Survey considers the views from residents on a variety of different topics, and we will go into those. She said there are 10 facets that they look at when they perform and put together the survey that defined ideal community livability, and those are included on the slide. She quickly read through the safety, mobility, community design, inclusivity and engagement, health and wellness, economy, utilities, parks and recreation, natural environment and education, arts, and culture. She stated for those that have been following the previous surveys, there were eight, they have done a little bit of adjusting and expanding of some categories to make it broader and more defining of all the desirable features of a great community. She mentioned earlier, the National Community Survey in Novi, we have been participating in since 2006. Every two years, we have participated and conducted a Community Survey in Novi, it was previously called the National Citizen Survey which was rebranded. She said this is the eighth survey we have conducted. She stated that we continue to do the same survey for four reasons; the custom benchmarks, the demographic comparisons, geographic comparisons, and now we have added in an online option. We have been partnering with the National Research Center since 2006, recently merged or partnered with Polco, which provides local government leaders with the best in survey research, along with today's most innovative online civic engagement capabilities. She said they thought about doing a full online survey. Historically the surveys were mailed to 1,700 addresses in Novi, you would get a postcard saying you were going to get a survey and a few weeks later the survey would come, and you would be asked to fill it out and mail it back in a postage paid envelope. She said as technology advances, we moved to more of an electronic field in the social media and E- newsletters, etc. She stated that Polco created our online survey option, and there are a few additional options that she will elaborate on later. She explained that instead of going all online and sending people a postcard asking them to key in a link we did a hybrid approach this year. She said they mailed to 1200 hardcopy residents, and we invited 1,500 to participate in it to complete an online survey, so that provided the opportunity for 2,700 people to participate in this year survey. She said we had 483 completed surveys for a response rate of 18%, that is only a plus or minus 5% margin of error, which is very similar to what we have seen historically over the past eight times we have done the survey. She said we also had the opportunity to take that online link and post it to the city's website. We shared it through E-newsletters and social media, and we garnered an additional 53 responses. She said those 53 responses are not included in the scientific data that she was presenting that evening. When you compare those responses to the 483 completed surveys they fall in line, most definitely with the scientific results which is the interesting part of this. The database or the online survey with Polco will provide us the opportunity to complete additional online surveys or conduct additional online surveys throughout the year. They could be surveys on parks, roads, health, and safety, etc., where anyone that is a resident through a link can go to Polco, create a profile, they will be asked their age, gender, what geographic area they live in Novi, not an address per se, but then they become part of our database. She said we can send out links to surveys to dive deeper to some of these results or even a random topic such as roads, they just completed the Roads Report, or maybe a bond, would residents support a bond, etc., we can create our own surveys and use the same

residents to have them completed. She thought this was going to be a great tool as we move forward through the process with our new Polco partners.

Ms. Walsh-Molloy said our national benchmark comparisons we were compared against 600 communities, all of whom participated in the National Community Survey, all the same topics, same questions, etc. Over the past five years, it keeps the results fresh, it keeps who were compared against to most up to date and current. She said we see where we are fitting in with the national trends. We received 42, higher than the national benchmark ratings, and 97 similar, and then five, lower the many of the higher than national average ratings. She said she would highlight those as she went through the presentation. She stated the categories range from safety and recreation programs, customer service, to a great place to raise a family, etc. She found it interesting that the lower ratings revolved around transportation, had you used a bus, had you carpoled, what was the quality of bus services? She mentioned it asked the specific question, have you carpoled to work with a coworker lately. The answers were yes, no, etc., but they never asked would you carpool. She said although we received lower ratings in the transportation category, they do not know how indicative they are, because a lot of those services are offered. It did not ask the condition of your roadways, are you stuck in traffic, those things, it was more of the public transportation component. She said that might be something we might want to look at in the future. She wondered, if knowing that we received lower ratings, should we follow up with a survey just on that category, such as would you ride a bus, we do not have a subway, we do not have a rail, so there are reasons why those categories were lower.

Ms. Walsh-Molloy noted that there were four great key findings. Our high ratings related to our quality of life tended to be higher in Novi compared to those given and communities across the nation. Nearly all residents offered positive evaluations to the overall quality of life in Novi, and rated Novi extremely high as a place to live. They gave an exceptional quality of life 95% rated, Novi is excellent or good when it came to quality of life, the overall image, a place to live, our neighborhoods, a place to raise a family, and our economic health. She said you see that from the year 2006 to 2020. We have continued an upwards trend, with 95% of residents saying they would recommend living in Novi to a friend, 87% plan to remain in Novi for the next five years, and over 90% rated Novi a great place to retire. These ratings are on par with the ratings given in the survey we did in 2018. She noted residents' assessments of overall feeling of safety and in Novi as well as the feeling of safety in their neighborhood and Novi's downtown, safety of property and they were free from violent crimes were extremely strong, which was in the 97% to 99% rating. Those were both up from the 2018 survey and the feeling of safety in our commercial and downtown areas were at 96% which is very much on par with the rating we had in 2018. These present as higher than the national benchmarks, nine and 10 rated as excellent or good for fire services, police services, ambulance and DMS are crime prevention and fire prevention. These are higher than the national benchmark at 98%, free from violent crime 94%, which is higher than the national benchmark, people feel safe in Novi. She said our second key finding is that the economy is an asset and a priority. She found it extremely interesting with the COVID pandemic began last March, and in October when we were during this survey, people generally rated the economy in Novi higher than in comparison communities around the country. She noted that half

of the respondents gave positive ratings to the cost of living into the vibrancy of Novi downtown and commercial area, with about nine and 10 respondents giving positive ratings to our shopping area and shopping opportunities, the overall economic health in Novi. Novi's economy is seen as strong as an asset and a priority.

Ms. Walsh-Molloy said half of the respondents gave apposite rating to the cost of living and the vibrancy of Novi's downtown, as she mentioned, 9 out of 10 respondents giving a positive rating to our overall economic health. Even when you go down to the 49%, excellent or good, that puts us higher with the national benchmark. When you think of what was happening around the country and see where our community views our economic health was outstanding. She stated for long term trends in economic health, 9 out of 10 respondents see Novi is a good place to work, where employment opportunities and the economic development, and their own personal economic outlook where higher than the national benchmark. She said another great statistic is that we are seeing higher than the national benchmarks for people's own perception of their own economic outlook in their homes. While the ratings we have seen fluctuate a bit from 2016, 2018 to 2020. Given the economic climate around the country, the overall trend shows extreme stability here in Novi. She highlighted the third key finding that found residents appreciate local leadership and governance, at least two thirds of residents felt positively about each listed aspect of government in the 2020 survey. She said local government treating residents with respect and treating all residents fairly was among the highest rated with 8 out of 10 residents given excellent or good marks to those categories. She pointed to a time when this survey was being conducted last October and November. Our local leadership in government is receiving extremely high ratings is a true testament not only to City Council's leadership, but the incredible colleagues that she had at the City government offices. She continued to highlight the slide and said it was interesting the stars are higher than the national benchmark. When you look at the 73% of those responding rated us excellent or good that the City is in the best interest of the community higher than the national average. She explained that the confidence in our local government is higher than the national benchmark treating all residents fairly was higher than the national benchmark value of services for taxes paid. This was all conducted when we were in the middle of a pandemic, a national election, and so much going on in the outside world to see that this is what our community members feel about their local governments. She said that puts a smile on her face, it is nothing short of just delightful for us all to receive these remarks. She stated another great testament to the quality of employees here at the City of Novi, 90% overall customer service of the City employees was rated as excellent or good, again, higher than the national benchmark.

She highlighted the fourth key finding says that community design could be an area for opportunity. She looked at a little while, and it gave her pause. We did not vary much from the 2018 results, but we dipped a little. She thought that the are just saying that maybe this is something we should keep our eye on. She said 72%, we went up from the 2018 survey in the variety of housing options available we stayed the same as similar. We are higher than the national benchmark, with a variety of housing options offered. We were like the national benchmark with the availability of affordable housing, public spaces where people want to spend time and the overall appearance in Novi, while we

are like the national benchmark, they show that we have went down 9%. She explained in 2018 we were at 52%, in 2018 we were at 74%, and were at 94% in the overall appearance of Novi, so we have gone down a bit in those categories. She thought this was possibly an area that we needed to pay more attention to, it is possible we may want a more detailed survey to find out what they need.

She stated that we are working on our entryway signs right now, City Council approved in the 2021 budget, enough to refit the refresh of entryways signs with some plantings and just brightening those up. She said that might be something we might want to look at with a more detailed online survey. She said the overall design and layout of Novi, 69% rated as excellent or good which is like the national benchmark, and our code enforcement was at 70% rating, which was higher than the national benchmark rating. She said that tells us the City is staying on top of our issues. Our Code Enforcement team is out there working to ensure a good quality and character of our community. She stated some additional highlights that when some of us went thorough it were worth noting. We have some crown jewels in Novi in many of the things that we do and say, and when Mayor has presented his State of the City that there are some things that we always tout. It was interesting that the community survey also found those as crown jewels, that is something we should really boast and brag about. She said, much higher than the national benchmark were our schools, our K through 12 education received outstanding results and remarks, shopping opportunities, great ratings, and attracting people from diverse backgrounds. She said Novi because of its people, we celebrate and embrace our diversity and that was apparent in the survey. It was great to see that our community members also found that as a strength here in Novi, with a much higher than the national benchmark at 88% rated excellent or good, our openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds. We are a lot to be proud of in Novi, this rating to her was one of the things she was most proud of. We cannot celebrate our diversity enough. We are very fortunate to live in a community where we are at a much higher than benchmark rating there on this topic. The conclusion is Novi continues to be a highly desirable welcoming family place to live. The economy is Novi is an asset in a continued priority. Trust in our local city government is strong, city services have deemed high quality, and well regarded. She said they have the full survey results; it is a 42-page survey available on [cityofnovi.org](http://cityofnovi.org). She encouraged everyone watching to go and visit the City website. We will have the link there for you to join and become an online survey participant so you can participate in surveys as we go forward. She said she was happy to answer any questions.

Mayor Gatt thanked Ms. Walsh-Molloy for the excellent presentation, he said it was better than in years past. He said there were no surprises to him. He has been part of Council for every one of these surveys. We are part of the best city in the state, maybe the whole USA and the numbers just continue to show that. He agreed there has been a lot going on in the country, a lot of negative stuff going on around the country, it is not happening here and there are a lot of reasons for that. He said mostly it is because of the people who live here, the people who call Novi home, and their unique individuals, and we are simply the best. He was very pleased with the survey. He hoped all his colleagues are. He hoped all the residents realize what a great city they have chosen to live in. Ms. Walsh-

Molloy thanked Mayor Gatt and said she will be happy to share the results in the next Engage and social media, etc. We have a good story to tell.

**MANAGER/STAFF REPORT: None**

**ATTORNEY REPORT: None**

**CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS AND APPROVALS:**

Member Mutch removed "Item H" from the Consent Agenda.

**CM 21-03-042          Moved by Staudt, seconded by Casey; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**To approve the Consent Agenda as amended**

- A. Approve Minutes of:
  - 1. February 22, 2021 - Regular Meeting
  - 2. February 24, 2021 - Special Meeting
- B. Approve the Program Year 2021 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Application in the approximate amount of \$130,530 and authorize the Mayor to sign the Application.
- C. Approval of the reprogramming of Program Year 2018 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) in the amount of \$4,871.50 and authorize the Mayor to execute all agreements and or contracts which result from the reprogramming.
- D. Approval to award bid to Kiesler Police Supply, Inc. the lowest bidder, for the purchase of twenty-eight (28) new rifles, additional magazines, and the trade-in of existing rifles for a net cost to the City of Novi of \$22,184.54.
- E. Approval of a Storm Drainage Facility Maintenance Easement Agreement from Haggerty Corridor Partners, LLC for Adams North Technology Centre located north of Mackenzie Drive and west of Haggerty Road (parcel 50-22-01-200-049).
- F. Approval of the final payment to Fonson Company, Inc. for the Flint/Bond Street Construction (SW Ring Road) – Phase 1 project in the amount of \$45,704.79, plus interest earned on retainage.
- G. Approval to award a Guardrail Repair and Maintenance Contract to RMD Holdings, Ltd. d/b/a Nationwide Construction Group, the low bidder, for a one-time structure standardization program, at an estimated lump sum cost of \$78,980, and a unit price routine maintenance agreement, in an estimated annual amount of \$10,000. The unit price contract term is for one-year with two one-year renewal options.

H. Approval of a Storm Drainage Facility Maintenance Easement Agreement from Hexagon Metrology, Inc. for Beck North Unit 57 located north of Hexagon Way and east of Hudson Drive (parcel 50-22-04-151-037). **REMOVED/LATER APPROVED**

I. Approval of claims and warrants – Warrant No. 1079.

**Roll call vote on CM 21-03-042    Yeas: Casey, Crawford, Fischer, Maday, Mutch, Gatt, Staudt**  
**Nays: None**

## **MATTERS FOR COUNCIL ACTION**

### **1.        Appointments to Boards and Commissions.**

City Clerk Hanson read the results from City Council's vote for the Zoning Board of Appeals. Travis Malott was appointed to the partial term on the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mayor Gatt thanked everyone who applied. He said there was only one opening, it was a very difficult choice. Everybody was very well qualified. Please stay with us and keep applying.

### **2.        Consideration of approval to award the construction contract to Merlo Construction, the low bidder, for the Segment 51 Ten Mile Road Sidewalk (North Side, Dinser Drive to Woodham Road) project, in the amount of \$182,277**

**CM 21-03-043        Moved by Staudt, seconded by Casey; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Approval to award the construction contract to Merlo Construction, the low bidder, for the Segment 51 Ten Mile Road Sidewalk (North Side, Dinser Drive to Woodham Road) project, in the amount of \$182,277.**

**Roll call vote on CM 21-03-043        Yeas: Crawford, Fischer, Maday, Mutch, Gatt, Staudt, Casey**  
**Nays: None**

### **3.        Consideration of approval to purchase one (1) backhoe loader Michigan CAT, through a MiDeal cooperative purchasing contract in the amount of \$130,192.21.**

**CM 21-03-044        Moved by Staudt, seconded by Maday; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Approval to Purchase (1) 420EX Backhoe Loader with Bundle 1 H65S hammer from Michigan CAT, through the MiDeal Cooperative Purchasing Contract# 07B7700084 in the amount of \$130,192.21.**

**Roll call vote on CM 21-03-044        Yeas: Fischer, Maday, Mutch, Gatt, Staudt, Casey, Crawford**

**Nays: None**

**4. Consideration of Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment 18.295 to include an option for stand-alone, multiple-family residential use in the PD-2, Planned Development Option, subject to conditions. SECOND READING**

City Manager Auger thought the staff did a good job of listening to what counts as to say at the first reading and incorporated some of those thoughts or ideas into the version you have in front of you right now. He said staff was available to answer your questions.

Member Mutch questioned some of the ordinance language they were being asked to consider. He mentioned that between the two meetings, he took some time to look at the existing RM-2 language, which is the zoning district that allows these higher density, taller apartment style complexes, multifamily developments, and the language that was proposed in here. He asked for clarification from staff, because it looked like in certain areas what was being asked to approve would be more intense than what is permitted in the RC District normally. He wondered if staff could address those specifically, the density, the height and the building setbacks, and the type of units that would be allowed in comparison to either what is allowed under the RC PD-2 Option currently or the RM-2 Option which is what he thought they were trying to mirror. City Planner McBeth suggested that Senior Planner Bell answer those questions, it was a collaborative process, but she has been working most on this. Member Mutch said the density component says it shall not exceed 24 dwelling units per acre. He wondered how that compared to what would currently be allowed under the PD-2 Option. Senior Planner Bell replied, under the PD-2 Option, it states that anything related to density should follow the RM-2 District standards. Therefore, we would look at the RM-2 density and it breaks it down by type of unit. She said a one-bedroom unit are allowed up to 31.1 units per acre, but you are only allowed a maximum of 33% of those. If all two-bedroom units were proposed in the RM-2 District, or the old PD-2, it would allow a maximum of 20.7 units per acre. She stated the 24 that we have proposed is in between the midpoint that would kind of approximate what a developer might be able to come in with just under the current standards. Member Mutch wondered what staff thought in terms of allowing a higher density, as compared to what is currently allowed. Senior Planner Bell responded, it is not that much higher and if you took that average, it is about 24 units per acre. She said you do not have a non-residential component in there which could be up to 20% of the development as in a mixed-use project. Member Mutch stated we just had a development before City Council not too long ago over on Haggerty Road. He thought it worked out to be somewhere around 13 units per acre. He said in comparison to something of that density, it seemed quite a bit higher, ever compared to what is allowed under the RM-2. He appreciated the clarification, he understood that staff was looking for something in-between the two. He said you also mentioned the types of units they allowed so that his change would allow more of the smaller units, one bedroom efficiency style apartments as compared to what we normally, or what we currently allow. Senior Planner Bell said that was correct. She said It was responding to allowing a



developer who knows the market better, the changes that can occur over time in the market and knows their audience a little better so it would allow a little more flexibility. This was a more urban area. There might be some more opportunity for the type of renter that is looking for a rental apartment. Member Mutch commented that the building height currently would be allowed to do 45-foot-tall buildings, and this would allow a 55-foot-tall building for the language in the ordinance. Senior Planner Bell said yes, this is a little confusing when we were reviewing something in the PD-2 Option because it says to go to the RM-2 District standards for anything related to density. The height might be considered related to density because the higher you can go, you could get more units in, so this is kind of clarifying. The RM-2 District would allow 65 feet or five stories and the RC is 45 feet or three stories. She said they tried to pick a midpoint there. Member Mutch mentioned that he was reading the PD language and it specifically said, reference back to the RC District which is 45-feet, so we are looking to allow these taller buildings. He said there are a couple of places where reference setbacks and he knew the PD-2 option has some smaller setbacks. What was the thought in terms of reducing some of the setbacks as it compares to what is required under the RM-2 ordinance. Senior Planner Bell replied that they are just keeping them the same as what was allowed under the PD-2. The properties that are eligible for PD-2 tend to be smaller parcels along the south side of 12 Mile Road. She said they did not make any changes to those as it is currently allowed under the PD-2. Member Mutch said the one that he specifically noticed, and it does not apply to this property, and maybe would not end up applying to any properties, at least as it is currently planned. He said the setback to a natural shoreline, so anything that is fronting on that large pond area, to the east of the Mall, it currently is under the RM-2 which requires 125-foot setback, and that was reduced in this language to 100 feet. He said this was curious how this came into play. Senior Planner Bell confirmed on her map that no PD-2 eligible property sits on a natural shoreline. She explained that it was not necessarily intentional. Member Mutch stated this is new language. He said for some reason we had a thought that maybe it might come into play at some point. Senior Planner Bell said a lot of it was reflecting standards from the RM-2, it referenced a setback from the shoreline, so it was included, but it was not necessarily intentional. Member Mutch stated those are the things that stood out. He mentioned they were provided a concept plan. He guessed that Singh is interested in developing a piece of property that would be eligible with these changes. He knew this was just conceptual, it was not a site plan. He said when he read the setback requirements, and then he looked at the plan, it looked like what was being proposed was a 20-foot setback on 12 Mile Road, he wondered if that would be allowed. Senior Planner Bell replied, no, the setback would not change. Their front yard setback under the language proposed, this is the same for all other PD-2 Options, is a front yard setback of 50 feet, side yard setback of 35 feet, and a rear yard setback of 35 feet. Member Mutch said what was referenced in the packet said that they are ready to go once the site plan they have ready to submit once these changes are approved. He thought it was confusing to see this plan and he thought they have looked at what we are talking about he wondered why this plan looked like it conforms with those standards. He said it raised questions about how that will play out

on these properties. He said in terms of the changes since we discussed the last time, he did think it is better to have limited it the way we have. He stated that he still had the concerns that he had previously in terms of process and how we are moving forward with this, encouraging more high density in the case that we are talking about here, we are bumping up the height and the density compared to what would currently be allowed for this area. He said we have not talked about what we want this area around the 12 Oaks Mall and the mall itself if it is redeveloped. He is not expecting the mall to go away at all. He said there is a lot of asphalt around that mall, there is a lot of parking lots that probably do not need to stay in that configuration forever if the mall types of uses in the mall change. He thought we will see redevelopment. He felt it feels a little piecemeal, and he was a little bit concerned again about some of the bump up in density and height relative to these properties and how they sit in relation to some of the neighboring properties. He was open to hearing some comments from other Council members.

**CM 21-03-045                      Moved by Staudt, seconded by Gatt; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Approval of Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment 18.295 to include an option for stand-alone multiple family residential use in the PD-2, Planned Development Option, as amended from the First Reading.  
SECOND READING**

**Roll call vote on CM 21-03-045**

**Yeas: Maday, Mutch Gatt, Staudt, Casey, Crawford, Fischer,  
Nays: None**

**5.            Consideration of a resolution to create a Municipal Broadband Committee.**

City Manager Auger said this was asked at a previous meeting to bring back before Council to possibly put a committee together. He stated they he had communication with the Mayor on how we think that should go, now it is back up for you to make your recommendation to Council.

Mayor Gatt gave a little background information. He said that Council visited through Mayor's Exchanges City once a few years ago, and that city had a broadband system for their entire residential over their entire population. He said it looked beautiful, it worked beautifully, and he has been told with the advent of technology moving the way it is, it might be time to at least investigate that. He believed the cost is still very high, but it would not hurt to look and see what is out there. He said with that he was going to appoint just a two-member committee and let them grow on their own. He recommended Mayor Pro Tem Staudt, he will be representing Council, and the from the public, Mr. Willie Mehta, who is a longtime resident and technical guru. He suggested if Mayor Pro Tem Staudt and Mr. Mehta together and they want to add to that committee, feel free to do so. He asked Mayor Pro Tem Staudt to every now and then please come back to them with a report of what you are doing and what you are finding out. Mayor Pro Tem Staudt stated they have had some suggestions that this will probably be

something that we would like to get back with an Issue Report in three to six months. He said there is no timelines on this. He stated there is a lot of content out there and they want to take time to review it.

**CM 21-03-046            Moved by Fisher, seconded by Crawford; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Approval to adopt the attached resolution and Mayoral appointments to the resulting committee or task force.**

**Roll call vote on CM 21-03-046**

**Yeas: Mutch, Gatt, Staudt, Casey, Crawford,  
Fischer, Maday  
Nays: None**

- 6. Consideration of a resolution to support a grant application by the City of Novi to the United States Department of Transportation, Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development or BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grant program for funding of the multi-jurisdictional Beck Road Business Corridor Improvement project.**

City Manager Auger explained that this goes along with all the work that is going on to move the Beck Road project forward. He said it is an exciting project, we have been meeting with four communities: Wixom, Northville Township, City of Northville, and Novi. He said they have met with our federal legislator, to attempt to get help and better position ourselves for grants, and any other federal money that is coming up. He stated that Representative Stephens requested this resolution so she can move it forward in Washington. He said some other things are happening behind the scenes, maybe the stars are aligned on this and we can get this great project off the ground.

**CM 21-03-047            Moved by Fischer, seconded by Maday; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Approval of the resolution supporting the Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development grant through the U.S. Department of Transportation.**

Member Mutch asked City Manager Auger about the amount that is reference in the resolution, in terms of the total cost, does that reflect the cost across the three communities where the roads being built with some Novi and Northville Township or is that just Novi and Wixom. City Manager Auger asked if it was the \$25 million that he was talking about. Member Mutch replied, yes. City Manager Augers said that would just be Wixom and Novi's matching chair to the total project. Member Mutch stated when we have talked about this previously you indicated that with some was seeking out some grants related to the railroad crossing, and he thought there might have been one other, have they had any luck securing any of those other grants that they were pursuing. City Manager Auger replied, in our first attempt, no, they did not. They still have feelers out there. He said any of those extra costs related to railway specific up in Wixom, they would

bear those matching costs on that part of the project if they were to land something. Member Mutch asked for clarity, so that when we are talking about Novi's share, it is going to be just strictly for what the cost related to our portion of the road. City Manager Augers said that was correct, and it is not part of the resolution, it says that Novi will work to be the bonding community in there because of our AAA Bond Rating. We would have to enter into agreements with the other communities for them to pay the bonds, but using our great credit rating, to do so. He explained each community each of the communities or entities responsible for those roads, because in the township its road commission would be responsible for their own costs on this project. Member Mutch thanked him for the clarification. He said it was Wayne County for Northville Township. He wondered what the timeline on this grant would be, when do we expect to hear from the federal government. City Manager Auger said it depends because there are several grants and what they are working on in Washington DC, it is not called earmarks anymore, but that process is yet to be defined. He said everyone is lining up their projects and what their list of priorities are going to be. He thought that is why the Congresswoman would like this resolution, so that she has it in hand. He stated that we have a lot of things that put us in a really good position on several of these grants. One of the is both Wixom and the Novi have already purchased about 70% of the rights-of-way needed for these projects. He said that is usually a big improvement when these projects go for federal funding. Member Mutch asked for clarification on the grant, is that something separate from what you are talking about? The Congresswoman might be seeking that might be a nod in your mark, so you are working two different paths here. One is the grant process, which takes whatever timeline it takes, then the other would be legislative of some nature that maybe might happen faster, in theory, is that the thinking. City Manager Auger replied, yes, that is correct. There will probably be three or four going at the same time to BUILD grant is one option. That is limited in scope and finding, and the others have advantages as well. He said we are also working with 13 in Lansing, to see if there is any funding available there as well. We are trying to turn every stone to get this project done. Member Mutch said he would support this because the reason he asked about timelines is on of the concerns he had when we first started down this path, it is easy to get into cycle chasing these grant dollars, and as important, and as helpful as it would be. He thought that at a certain point, for whatever reasons that your earmark process does not work out, or this grant process does not work out, he said as a City we have got to decide, maybe it is just best to tackle this on our own. That way we know it will get done, Beck Road has taken almost as long as the Ring Road, and at the end of the day with the Ring Road, we ended up having to pay for most of that which is not our preferred way. He thought it would be great if we could get some outside funding for this, but it could easily be three or four years down the road having the same conversation about where is the money for Beck Road going to come from. He said at a certain point as a city, if it is that important, we as a city will have to bite the bullet on that.

**Roll call vote on CM 21-03-047**

**Yeas: Gatt, Staudt, Casey, Crawford, Fischer,  
Maday, Mutch**

**Nays: None**

**7. Consideration to approve Resolution Declaring and Affirming a Local State of Emergency for The Purpose of Permitting the City Council and Other Public Bodies of the City to Meet by Electronic and Telephonic Means.**

City Manager Auger said we were watching the State's action and the County's action on this and have not seen any we are up against the timeline and work with our legal counsel to give City Council an option if we were to move forward with the Open Meetings Act and continue meeting in zoom or go back to meeting in person. He said this is what this resolution is for. The initial State timeline runs out at the end of this month, and this is our last meeting before our first meeting of the next month. He said we are presenting to City Council as a tool or option for City Council to use. Mayor Gatt asked how long this declaration was for. City Manager Auger replied, it was for a three-month period, but it was up to City Council on how long they would like it, staff took a stab of using the three-month short period of time to get us to see what happen during the summer.

Mayor Gatt reiterated that it would be for April, May, and June, ending June 30<sup>th</sup>, is that correct. City Manager Auger said that was correct. Mayor Gatt put his two cents in on the record. He said we have all been faced with COVID now for a year, and he did not remember the last time we all met together, but is has been close to a year, and this was not his preferred way of doing this. He believed that City Council belongs in the Council Chamber. He believed that we should be open to the public and the public should be able to come in at will and address us in person. He knew this resolution, there was a lot of legalese, a lot of thought that has led some people to think negative about this, because if we vote yes, it might be agreeing that the orders, in the beginning were legal or not legal, he did not care a hoot about any of that stuff. He said this was not political to him, he did not care of what our position is on the governor's orders, and whether she has the right or not to do what she has done. It means nothing to him, what matters to him most is the health, welfare and well-being of this Council. He said he has taken a position from day one, that he believed we should all be together, that we should meet, the seven of them in the same room and be together, or be on zoom like we are now, he did not believe that it is appropriate to have five or six members at City Hall, and one or two members at home, or any variation of that number. He said he would be in favor that evening, only because it will get us through the end of June. He said by that time, from what he could see with his own two eyes, and read with what is out there, everyone who wants a vaccination from COVID by then should be able to have one. He said if they do not get one for whatever reason, then it is up to them. He will not be in favor of extending this if this passes that evening. This is the last time he will vote to meet on zoom, but he did think we should give all seven of the Council members the opportunity to get the vaccine if they want one. He said he did not know who has had it or not, he is the second oldest person on Council, and he has had a vaccine. He said before he did, he had no problems with being out and about if he had the proper equipment on. He said he would support a motion if somebody made it. He went on record that he will not support any extensions.

**CM 21-03-048**

**Moved by Crawford, seconded by Gatt; MOTION CARRIED: 6-1**

**Approval Resolution Declaring and Affirming a Local State of Emergency for the Purpose of Permitting the City Council and Other Public Bodies of the City to Meet by Electronic and Telephonic Means.**

Member Fischer asked City Manager Auger if we were technically declaring an emergency in the city of Novi, is that what this resolution does. City Manager Auger replied, yes. Member Fischer wondered if that was impacting our Police, Fire, fire inspections going on, and the police are still investigating crimes, in person. City Manager Auger said yes. Member Fischer asked City Manager Auger if he will be in the office the next three months, while the Clerk's office will be doing their passports. What about the Building Department? City Manager Auger replied yes. Member Fischer asked about the Parks and Recreation, he said some people have contacted him because they are supposed to start soccer the fifth day into this declared emergency with their children. He said Parks and Recreation camps that are being planned for June in the middle of this emergency that we are declaring those canceled. City Manager Auger replied, no. Member Fischer asked about the senior transit, will offer transit through the declared emergency. He said this whole emergency purely is about City Council and the Boards and Commissions meeting in person. He asked if that was correct. He asked City Attorney Schultz if they do not approve this declaration, are we forcing Councilmembers and Board and Commissioner's to attend meetings? He wondered if that was under the law or under our rules. City Attorney Schultz said that if the local emergency is not declared then the Boards and Commissions would be expected to meet in person at City Hall. He stated individual members of the Council, Boards, and Commissions could if they have a medical condition, attend remotely and you would have to find a way to accommodate them. Member Fischer clarified that if someone does have a medical condition, they are able to absent this emergency declaration, we must provide that opportunity under the law. City Attorney Schultz replied, yes. Member Fischer said the real issue he had was that the city's operations are continuing. He said staff are expected to be there in person, they make the required accommodations to keep everyone safe. He said we are sending kids back to school, we are playing hockey, our team just won, we are playing soccer through the City. He said his son is back in soccer, back in school. He noted that at the last meeting, we talked about passing ordinances to continue to encourage people to patronize our restaurants. He said in the middle of January, this body and that tour Lakeshore and film a promotional video to talk to our residents about how great Lakeshore is for getting out and about in a safe manner. He said now, suddenly, we feel the need to declare an emergency for three months to avoid Council and the Boards and Commissions meeting in person, he said that just did not feel right. He said he could not support the motion as is. He said the law permits those who have a condition to attend remotely. He stated even if we extend this declaration, we declare this declaration. He said we will do it for three months, those of the last remaining six months of the year, those people still could call in remotely under the law. He asked City Attorney Schultz to correct him if he were wrong, he would be fine with the us as a Council not counting absences from people, if they do not feel comfortable attending meetings or if they do not feel comfortable telling the City Manager, they would prefer to attend

remotely for the next three months, we could make that accommodation. He thought that there is some concern how they do this logistically, to be honest, trying to get around only having 25 people in the Council Chambers compared to people interrupting people on zoom, the mute, the people falling off the meeting constantly, the bad connections that we continue to have. This is not a logistical dream as it is. He said the COVID condition continues to change, daily, weekly. He said the vaccinations are continuing, the President has made his intentions clear of trying to get everyone vaccinated as well. He thought if we did anything, he would rather Council take a smaller step, and revisit this on monthly basis, possibly 60 days, but a blanket three-month approval did not feel right. He said this was his position on the motion as it stands.

Member Crawford said just because we extended this to possibly three months, does not mean we have to do three months, a month from now, or two weeks from now, we can say things changed. We can resend or revoke the resolution. He said he did not see a problem with it if it sounds like we are going to do it for three months.

Member Mutch asked City Attorney Schultz, in terms of declaring this local emergency, that is really being driven by the requirement of state law. He noted that the state legislature gave local communities the authority to do. He understood Member Fischer's point, it looks a little incongruent to say there is a local state of emergency going on, when we have these other activities going on. He said we must acknowledge reality that is the only option the state legislature gave us, and this is true in several of our surrounding communities. They have declared local emergencies as well. He said the reality of getting together, it is not just us as a Council, it is all the support staff, applicants, residents, 25 people, considering what we typically see in a Council Chamber sounds manageable with something we could work with, but all it takes is one issue for a crowd of people to want to come down to City Hall. He said where we can accommodate pretty much an unlimited number of people here on zoom. He said he has not been vaccinated. He did have concerns in terms of trajectory of some of these numbers currently, but he was not 100% opposed to meeting in person. He said he would be willing, if it is what is necessary to allow us to continue to meet remotely for a little bit longer, maybe a 60-day time which is what Member Fischer suggested. He felt that we were seeing light at the end of the tunnel, as folks are getting vaccinated. He thought a month from now we were going to be talking about how things have turned around because enough folks are vaccinated. He said he would listen to what his colleague had to say. He said he would support the original motion, but he was also willing to do something shorter to protect the health and safety of folks who are participating.

Member Maday agreed with her colleagues. She liked the idea that Member Fisher had of perhaps putting it into a two month timeframe, monthly would be better here. She agreed to the two months, she thought a lot was changing quickly. She said 25% of our population has already been vaccinated at a really short period of time. She said she has already received her first vaccination. She felt that three months was a long time. She was willing to give grace for people who are concerned. She thought in two months if we have not met that comfort level, then she would have to question why. She said she would be willing to go just another two months.

Member Crawford suggested that we do not have to do three months, we can say up to three months, but in two weeks if things have changed, we can say that is it, we are going back to regular meetings. He wondered if this resolution allows us to do that. City Attorney Schultz said the resolution can be amended at anytime by Council once it is adopted by Council. Member Crawford thought that was correct. He did not believe that they needed a different time frame, he said they should stick to the three months. He stated it give us the latitude of if we must do it, we can do it, if we do not, we can always shorten it.

Mayor Pro Tem Staudt stated he was one of those people who opposes the inclusion of some of the language in the resolution, he did not agree with it. He said maybe it is politics, but he did not think that some of the things mentioned in it are truthful or relevant, but that was okay, that was his opinion. He said as it relates to the length, the resolution, he did not think it was easy for us to come back and say we are going to change it on this day. He thought we are going to have to go back, make changes to meeting notices regarding now is the time to decide. If it is going to be 60 days, or if it will be 90 days. If that fails, then we can go back to 60 days. However, at the end of this, he was worried about those who have not had an opportunity for vaccination yet, including himself. He said he was not worried about getting the vaccination before coming to a meeting, but there are some who are more uncomfortable because of our physical limitations. He said that is important, he did not think it is just Council, Boards and Commissions. He said clearly in 60 days, we would have a much larger majority of our residents vaccinated and we would be in a better position. He said whether 60 days or 90 days, he was not going to get into a semantics fight. He said he would support if the motion maker wanted to change it to 60 days, or he will support the 90 days. He did not like the resolution, any length of term, but her understood the need for it.

Member Casey said she was pleased to support this resolution, because we are making decisions not just for ourselves, we are making them for our residents who volunteer on our Boards and Commissions. She thought it was absolutely the decision for us to make on their behalf, it is many other public bodies to meet by electronic or telephonic means. She was wondering if this means a Board of Commission could choose to meet n person if they all agreed to do so, is that up to the Board? City Attorney Schultz said the intention would be that the Boards and Commissions would have to follow the resolution for that period. Member Casey thanked him for the clarification. She said the other reason she was ready to support this is the way that the law is written, a resident of a board member will be less specific could ask where indicated, they have got a medical condition, that would be precluding them from attending in person doing that, and having only one individual out of a Board or commission who is, you know distant or zooming in, if you will, versus all of the rest being there, in her mind also violates that person's privacy. She said it would be obvious that person has a medical condition that they may or may not have wanted people to know about, so agree or disagree with that logic. She was pleased to support the 90 days.

Mayor Gatt believed that 90 days is the proper way to go. He said there are a lot of people who are looking for vaccines. He did not care what the President or the Governor or anybody else is saying, they are not available. They are not available to people my



age, they are not available to people that are Mayor Pro Tem Staudt's age, or a lot of people that are younger. He said it was very haphazard right now the way it is being distributed. He echoed Member Casey and said this is not just us, this is every Board and Commission in the City. We do not have any idea how all those members are physically or mentally when it comes to whether they want this or not. He said they are the leaders, and he thought we should decide for the whole City.

**Roll call vote on CM 21-03-048**

**Yeas: Staudt, Casey, Crawford, Maday, Mutch, Gatt**

**Nays: Fischer**

**CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COUNCIL ACTION:**

H. Approval of a Storm Drainage Facility Maintenance Easement Agreement from Hexagon Metrology, Inc. for Beck North Unit 57 located north of Hexagon Way and east of Hudson Drive (parcel 50-22-04-151-037).

Member Mutch stated that Consent Agenda Item H is a request by Trowbridge Landholdings for Taft Knolls Phase III to terminate an existing Conservation Easement that the City currently holds and accept a new Conservation Easement to allow the development of that property to move forward. This was back before Council maybe two-years now and we did not accept that request at the time. He said they have made some changes and gone back through the planning process. He stated they are here tonight to present a set of easements for us to terminate the existing easement, and to accept some new easements. He believed the City Attorney Schultz was in the best position to answer questions that he had in terms of the legal piece of this, because he knew this has gone through his office. He said it was kind of confusing going through the packet because there were three different versions of those easements shown. He said the one he thought was consistent with the language, Exhibit "D", which has the easement areas in gray. He said that exhibit does not include a wetland area on the north side of the property that was shown in one of the other items as being covered by a wetland easement. He wondered why that was not the case. City Attorney Schultz said that question may be better addressed by Senior Planner Bell or City Planner McBeth. His stated his office did review this primarily for the language of the document. Senior Planner Bell responded that she believed that what was on the north side of the property on the backside of those lots was going to be a wetland buffer area which would be covered by deed restriction in the master deed and not in a Conservation Easement. Member Mutch said looking at the site plan that was presented and approved, that a portion of that wetland areas was excluded from the lots. He noted in one of the documents that was provided to City Council was showing an easement over that property. He thought there was a representative from the developer with them at the meeting, he asked Mr. Powell if he could address that easement. Mr. Powell said this project was before Council a couple of years ago, and it was being proposed as an average area project. He stated before they presented it the last time, it was approved by City Council and the Planning Commission in this type of a layout. When that site plan had elapsed, we then presented it as an average lot area project of which City Council

then denied a couple of years ago. He said this one is virtually identical to the one that City Council approved several years ago prior to two years ago. This is a standard R-4 development project. He said they are not asking City Council for anything at all for approval except for the Conservation Easement modification. Mr. Powell addressed the Conservation Easement and said they were asking City Council to terminate is the Conservation Easement across the front of the property along Taft Road. He explained they were asking for that termination because the original Conservation Easement was subject to a driveway that was designed and came in to serve the residential house. He said unfortunately, the legal description of that residential driveway was such that it did not allow a straight through access to the property. The legal description did not include the center portion of that driveway. He explained that legally right now there is no access to this property off Taft Road at all. He said they have worked with staff and redefined the Conservation Easement along Taft Road. He stated they excluded an emergency access drive for the Fire Department emergency vehicles to come off at Taft. It will be gated. He said they have virtually doubled the Conservation Easement that we are asking City Council to terminate. He said they have not included all the area, most of the area on the east side of the project as well. He noted that the original agreement signed in 1986, which is not valid because it does not allow access to the property was 1.5 acres of a Conservation Easement. He said they are asking City Council to replace it with a 3.65 acreage Conservation Easement; we have more than doubled the Conservation Easement that we are asking City Council for and we are back to the plan that City Council approved approximately four-years ago. He stated specifically to your issue of the Conservation Easement along the north side, we are specifically excluding that in a deed restriction and the master deed and bylaws, we are not including any wetlands areas in the lots whatsoever, it is excluded from the lot area and it is deed restricted from the development in the master deed and bylaws. We are not including that in the Conservation Easement, it was never included in the Conservation Easement. He said in the last go around it was included in the Conservation Easement, but that project was denied by City Council and therefore they were not including it in a Conservation Easement. Member Mutch thanked Mr. Powell for clarifying that. He said there are multiple exhibits in the packet, it was confusing. His second question was regarding the easement area, as it is defined on the eastern part of the property. In one of the things in reviewing the plans that were submitted, and the easement that covers it, the proposed development is going to build some retention basins along that area that is covered by the Conservation Easement. He was reading through the Planning Commission woodland review; they are removing 80 mature trees from that area. He wondered if that was typical for a storm basin area, such as this, which is going to have to be maintained on an ongoing basis, to have a Conservation Easement covering it. He said typically when we have seen these come forward these stormwater basin areas are excluded, because they just must be the first off, they have an access road to them. He said they also must be maintained either by the developer, the Homeowner Association, or ultimately the City. He did not recall ever seeing a plan come forward where the conservation areas that surround that also included the basin as well, they are always excluded. He asked if there was a reason why that was included. He mentioned there was no language in the Conservation Easement that we are being asked to approve, that deals with that. He said it is our standard Conservation language and no reference to allowing activities in the stormwater basins to maintain them. City Attorney Schultz said

the planner could maybe talk a little bit more about it, this is probably not typical, they have work within a Conservation Easement, but not necessarily unheard of. He said many of the things that you might normally be concerned about you can deal with in the master deed language, but in terms of do we see these in plans, that seems like a question for City Planner McBeth or Senior Planner Bell. City Planner McBeth said it was a little bit unusual for the Conservation Easement to be including a stormwater basin. She did not know that we have ever seen it, but that is what was being proposed and reviewed at this time. Member Mutch said the developer is going to go in, take-out high-quality woodlands area over with high quality trees, essentially strip that area clear, dig out these basins and there is all the mechanical work that goes with that. He said we are going to throw a Conservation Easement over it and say we protected it. What did we protect? He said at this point that it would not be appropriate to approve the Conservation Easement as it is currently set up, because he did not think it made sense from a long-term perspective in terms of the maintenance. If this development is going forward and the basins needed to be maintained, they should not be covered by the Conservation Easement, it should exclude those areas. He thought it would cause problems down the road. He said ironically, our City Woodlands Consultant at the time thought we should not do it, we should not put those basins there, because it did not make sense because of the trees. He said it got approved anyway. He did not think we should compound that problem then throwing this Conservation Easement over an area that no longer qualifies or justifies that definition. He said there is nothing being conserved in those areas that are being removed in terms of those basins and the impact that has.

**CM 21-03-049            Moved by Mutch, seconded by Gatt; MOTION DENIED 4-3**

**To postpone this item to allow City Attorney Schultz and the applicant to revise the boundaries of that easement to exclude the stormwater-based areas and return to City Council at a future meeting for City Council approval.**

Member Fischer said he wanted to give the applicant the opportunity to respond to some of the comments.

Mr. Powell explained the reason they put the Conservation Easement over the entire easterly end is because once this is established, they have a tremendous amount of landscaping that is going in to buffer the area all the way around this. He said they did not want the Homeowners Association or anyone else to come in and cut down any of the proposed vegetation around these basins. He said only the bottom of the basins will be maintained, and they in no way want anyone to think that they could put a shed back there as a hunting blind, or any other improvements whatsoever. He stated that they want the City to control of what happens in it, not a Homeowners Association, that is the reason it was written the way it is to protect the City and put them in charge.

**Roll call vote on CM 21-03-049**

**Yeas: Casey, Mutch, Gatt**

**Nays: Crawford, Fischer, Maday, Staudt**

**CM 21-03-050            Moved by Crawford, seconded by Staudt; MOTION CARRIED: 5:2**

**To approve of request by Trowbridge Land Holdings for the Taft Knolls Phase III, for termination of the recorded Conservation Easement over the subject property, and Acceptance of a new Conservation Easement in order to allow the buildable portion of the property to be developed with 13 single family homes in accordance with JSP19-34. The proposed conservation easement would result in a larger area of protected land containing wetland and regulated woodland trees. The wider access route excluded from the conservation easement would also allow contraction vehicles to enter via Taft Road, rather than going through the neighborhood to the north via Danyas Way and would be maintained as an emergency access route.**

**Roll call vote on CM 21-03-050**

**Yeas: Crawford, Fischer, Maday, Gatt, Staudt  
Nays: Mutch, Casey**

**AUDIENCE COMMENT:**

Assistant City Manager Cardenas said they received two correspondence emails from residents that the City Clerk would read into the record.

City Clerk Hanson read the email correspondence from Jeffrey Gedeon, 25458 Danyas Way. He disagreed with the alteration of the drainage easement at issue in the Consent "Item H" Agenda item. Significant portions of the mature woodlands on the far eastern portion of the property could be preserved without reducing the number of homes that are planning to be built simply by maintaining the existing drainage plan, including the existing detention pond, instead of building a new detention pond. My concern is strictly with the far eastern portion of the property. This portion of the property has an existing pond labeled as "WETLAND AREA C" in the plans. This pond has an engineered outflow consisting of a concrete pipe. This outflow feature indicates that this pond either was never a natural pond or at least has had its natural outflow altered for drainage purposes in the past. I believe the developer's plans can be achieved with less environmental disruption in this portion of the property. The approved plans do not include any houses in this portion of the property, only a new detention pond. Changing the drainage plans for the property would not reduce the number of homes that the developer is planning to build. The proposed detention pond seems unnecessary and will come with the cost of clearing some of the most mature trees on the property the drainage easement was likely created in the first place to provide an engineered drainage plan for the original property. Because the pond ("WETLAND AREA C") that already exists in this eastern portion of the property has a controlled outflow, it could continue to serve as the detention pond for the new development. It makes no sense to remove the most mature trees on the property to create a new detention pond when the pond that already exists is part of an engineered drainage system. The environmental cost of clearing the eastern portion of the property to build a new detention pond would be far higher than the environmental cost, if any, of discharging stormwater into the existing detention pond ("WETLAND AREA C"). These same concerns were raised during the planning process.

Other than having been read into the record, there is no public indication that they have been considered.

City Clerk Hanson read the email correspondence from Amy Wang, 25472 Danyas Way. She was requesting that the connection point between Taft Knolls II and Taft Knolls III on Danyas Way not be opened until the construction is fully completed. This was mentioned at the meeting from 2020, and the builder had agreed that no construction traffic will be passing through or parking in Taft Knolls I or Taft Knolls II. I am requesting that the commitment is still in place to ensure that Taft Knolls II will not see any construction impacting our existing homes in any way shape or form.

Remko Atteveld said Ms. Walsh could not have given a better intro earlier today about all the reasons that his family moved to Novi. He said he has lived at 21975 Garfield Road for seven-years and those were reasons that Ms. Walsh-Molloy outlined earlier. He said that all stopped in about late 2019, early 2020 and since that time dewatering efforts started around the area of Nine Mile Road and backroads, Nine Mile Road and Napier Road for a new subdivision and a sewer system that required groundwater to be diverted north, the private Garfield leg and the wetlands both east and west of Garfield Roads have its natural water sources. He stated that a lot of levels are down, he would easily say six feet from the averages and about eight to 10 feet from the highs in 2018. He noted that wildlife such as deer and fish that made extensive use of Garfield Lake are nowhere to be found and trees in the wetland are starting to die. He said the City added a pipe to pump water into the lake, water levels remained unacceptably low, even after the City pumped in their own estimation more than 180 million gallons of water into our lake. He said almost a year of raising our hands and voice of concerns, we still are waiting for the City to provide us with a permanent solution to the problem that they helped create. We have not seen a clear plan. He stated the second thing he wanted to voice is because the new subdivision down from our street, we are seeing excessive speeding on our roads. He said these cars, about 80%, go to and from the new subdivision check out their new homes. The vehicles are speeding more than 45 miles an hour. He said they have little kids, animals, some of the wildlife that remains crosses the road regularly and this is all in a 25 mile per hour road. He believed in was a matter of time before a serious accident occurs. He said he knew the Police Department patrols the area infrequently. He said they do sit on their roads sometimes, but he believed we needed a more permanent solution to slow down the traffic on this road. He thanked everyone for his time.

Mr. Jim Bullock said he also lived on Garfield Road until 2015. He agreed with the previous speaker about the observation about the speeding. He agreed it was a matter of time before something terrible happens. He said the main reason for addressing City Council was due to what is happening with the wetlands in Garfield Lake. He said the previous speaker summed it up quite nicely. He said just in his property alone, the water level is now the lowest it has ever been since the pumping started. He said in his pond, it is probably conservatively 15 feet below the high in 2018. He said probably about 12 feet lower than the average level. He would like to have some sort of plan in place. He said they hear from some of the construction workers that some rocks had been drilled through and diverted a bunch of water and that it is not going to be able to be repaired.

He said they were not getting a lot of good information when they do get information and they would like to know what is going on and what the solution is long term. He said he would love if anyone would like to come out to his house, you are more than welcome, he is home almost every day. He asked that someone please come by and check it out and see what happened to the wetlands. He said it was sad what is happening right now.

State Representative Breen said she was recently contacted by the Sierra Club. They have been contacted by several members, including Mr. Bullock, who has weighed in concerns about Garfield Lake and she wanted to let the City know that they do have some resources that may be able to help the City they actually have a hydrologist who is willing to come out there and help with whatever you may need in order to rectify this, and she encourage them, she was happy to provide their contact information to utilize these resources. She said they do have some angles they voiced to her that she did not think have been brought to the table yet and she wanted to put that out there to see if we can help come to a resolution. She said the citizens are looking for a permanent resolution.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS: None**

**MAYOR AND COUNCIL ISSUES:**

Mayor Gatt said he added "Outreach and Support" to Mayor and Council Issues and that is just part of the title. He thought it was very appropriate that he talked about this after the presentation that Ms. Walsh-Molloy gave earlier about how great the city of Novi is. He thought we would all agree that everything that was said in that report was accurate and true. He thought we could make it even better. We all know that the United States government, through the Congress has signed a bill into law that is going to bestow quite a bit of money around the country to states and counties, and in municipalities, and the City of Novi is going to get around \$6 million dollars, the way he understood it which is a lot of money. He said there are very few restrictions on that money. He talked to a couple other colleagues and he proposed that the City start a program called the Senior Outreach and Support, and he wanted to add people with handicaps to our Senior Outreach and Support Program, he wanted to do something for our seniors with this money. He gave one example and said he understood that to get an appointment on our Senior Transportation in the City it can take sometimes up to two weeks, and he could see Mr. Cardenas shaking his head, so he thought he was accurate with that statement. He said if you were a senior living at home alone, and you needed to go to the doctor, or you had an opportunity to get a vaccine, you must wait two weeks, that is not going to work. He proposed that the City get together with their management team and come up with a system of maybe putting a sum of money, he thought between \$60,000 to \$100,000 into an account that we will pay for Uber rides for the senior citizens to get to their medical appointments only. He said he was not talking about going shopping at the mall, he was talking about something that is necessary that they need to do. He said Uber, or any of the ride services are immediate, and it is something that we can do and should do. He thought that we should think about treating our citizens, our seniors, and our handicapped citizens with a little bit more kid

gloves during this pandemic for the past year. Mayor Gatt mentioned the seniors and handicapped citizens have been holed up in their homes, some without any visitors from anybody. They are not health mentally, and they need activity, they need something with interaction with other human beings. He said this is something, he was winging it, he thought we might talk about with some of our CERT volunteers, or maybe Parks and Recreation can have volunteers or a combination of the two to go out and visit our seniors who are holed up if they would like a visitor, if not in person, on the phone, but something that gives them the opportunity to communicate. He said if we must pay for some of these services, certainly, we are going to have \$6 million to do so. He said they talked a lot tonight about vaccines. He said he was not sure where we all stand on that, but he knew for a personal fact that a lot of people, seniors, and handicapped citizens are having a hard time getting vaccines. He thought that the City should start flexing their muscle a little bit with our State Representative, State Senator, and US Representative. He said they have a very good relationship with our US Senator, we visited Pete Nye in Washington, with our County Commissioner, we need to start flexing our muscle and get something done for our seniors in Novi. He said if we want to stay the best, we want to claim the best, then we should be the best. He said if it cost some money then he proposed that we spend that money, and he is going to talk a lot about this in the coming months. He hoped all his colleagues get on board. He thought we should carve off some of this money and dedicate it to our seniors, and our handicapped citizens and make life in Novi better for them. He was not asking for any motions, but if anybody wanted to add, he would entertain that. He asked City Manager Auger and his management team to investigate this with great earnest.

Mayor Pro Tem Staudt agreed with Mayor Gatt. He thought what he was proposing was just the tip of the iceberg as to what we can provide for our seniors. He said he saw this as a seven figure at least a million-dollar investment. He said these are the people who have built our city, and they need us no. He noted this is an extraordinarily difficult time for a not our seniors, not just those who live in independent living, but those who are living in some of our finest senior establishments in the community. He stated that during the pandemic, it was extremely difficult to maintain our staffing for our Senior Services, we did not have a lot of events and programs going on. He said one of the things he would like to see as those people as quicky as possible be reinstated. He said this is not something that we can wait two or three or four months on, this is the whole issue of vaccines and reaching out is extraordinarily important right now. He said whether we need to use some of the funds that we have set aside for fund balance until we get our money from the federal government, he would strongly encourage that. He stated tomorrow morning, our City staff, Parks and Recreation, Senior Services, get together, and put their heads together with a 30-day plan of getting this launched. We need to get out to the community making sure that if they want the opportunity that it is going to be there, whether it is Uber, whether it is local, our current senior transportation, nobody should be not able to get a vaccine. He said a 90-year-old lady called him a few weeks ago who was extremely frustrated and was clearly very lonely. He said that was not acceptable for a community like ours. He was 100% supportive with the Mayor's proposal. He said we need to start with a million dollars and work our way up.

Mayor Gatt said he wanted to include handicapped people, because he has a personal reason for that. He said he had a niece who is handicapped, she has muscular dystrophy, and you know they are not jumping to the top of the list for vaccines. She is 23 years old, and she is treated like any other 23-year-old when having COVID. He said he was sure there are many other people in the City, it is not just seniors, it is handicapped people who cannot act on their own and need our help.

Member Fischer said he agreed wholeheartedly with the proposal on the table, and he thanked the Mayor for bringing this forward. He thought it was important to jump quickly to be at the forefront of doing something like this. He said it shows a leadership that he has, and he echoed the previous speaker that this is the tip of the iceberg and that City staff can run with this. He was fully in support. He said we talked about the vaccines and from some of the older residents that he has talked with, just navigating the technology, navigating the sites, and how to fill out the forms, that is part of the problem with access. He thought whatever we could do to use some of those federal funds to get things moving, he thought was a great idea, let the City run with these ideas and think of even better ones.

Member Maday said she agreed 100% with her colleagues. She felt that it was important beyond the immediate need to help our seniors get what they need to get through COVID. She said we need to communicate with our seniors, we need to get the youth involved with them. She suggested Novi Youth Assistance calling our seniors and just checking in to see how they are doing, that would be huge. She said mental health is important for our students, seniors, and quite honestly, for every age demographic in our city, this year has been tough on them. She said she had a lot of ideas to help make things better. She said she would love to see a senior citizen playground built in the City. It adds green space, and it add mental health, mobility for seniors, there are so many ideas. She was in full support, whatever you need.

Mayor Gatt added a handicapped playground. They want things that they see their friends doing that they cannot do. He said there are special playgrounds made for them. He said they could spend this money easily.

Mayor Gatt announced that City Council was entering Executive Session and they did not expect to return to Open Session.

**ADJOURNMENT** – There being no further business to come before Council, the meeting was adjourned at 8:57 P.M.

---

Cortney Hanson, City Clerk

---

Robert J. Gatt, Mayor

---

Transcribed by Deborah S. Aubry

Date approved: April 12, 2021