

MINUTES  
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS  
CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION MEETING  
CITY HALL – COMMUNITY ROOM  
JANUARY 14, 2019

The Study Session meeting of the Farmington Hills City Council was called to order by Mayor Massey at 6:00pm.

Council Members Present: Bridges, Bruce, Knol, Lerner, Massey, Rich and Steckloff

Council Members Absent: None

Others Present: City Manager Boyer, City Clerk Smith, Assistant City Manager Mekjian, Directors Barr, Gardiner, and Schnackel and City Attorney Joppich

**NOTICE OF INTENT RESOLUTION FOR THE COMMUNITY CENTER PROJECT (HARRISON HIGH SCHOOL PROPERTY)**

Jeff Aronoff, Bond Counsel from Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone, explained the process for issuing bonds for the Community Center project. He stated that it is a two-step process whereby City Council would be requested to authorize publication of the Notice of Intent to Issue Bonds in a not-to-exceed amount. The notice would publish once and there is a 45 day referendum period. After the 45 day referendum period, the City Council would then be requested to adopt a Bond Authorizing Resolution and staff would be directed to work with Bond Counsel to consummate the sale.

Discussion was held on having the Notice of Intent include funding for the Costick Center.

Mr. Aronoff explained that the Notice of Intent resolution could be used for multiple projects and it does not expire and the City could use it for a potential project or not. The resolution should include a reasonable maximum principle expected in a not-to-exceed amount.

The consensus of City Council was to have staff review the funding required for the Costick Center renovations and to include that as part of the resolution to be brought back to City Council for consideration.

**TAX ABATEMENT POLICY**

Samantha Seimer, Economic Development Coordinator, explained that in November, 2018, she brought before Council the current Tax Abatement Policy with the knowledge that there were a few companies that may be requesting abatement from the City. At that time, Council expressed an interest in strengthening the policy. Ms. Seimer reviewed the proposed amendments to the policy.

City Manager Boyer added that this is coming before Council as several larger corporations have expressed an interest in abatement for proposed expansions.

The consensus of City Council was to move forward with the amendments as presented with the 6-year maximum and to bring this back to Council at a regular meeting for consideration. It was suggested that on Page 3, Item C, it is clarified to read ". . . no outstanding taxes owed to the city by the applicant or entity."

**MARIHUANA UPDATE**

City Attorney Steve Joppich reviewed past legislation adopted regarding medical marihuana and the facilities licensing that created 5 types of businesses or facilities that each community had the ability to allow by agreeing to opt-in. Communities that did not want to allow such businesses were not required to opt-out and the City determined at that time to not opt-in and wait to see what future legislation may bring. Attorney Joppich stated that the new Recreational Marihuana Act was recently approved by voters in November, 2018, that provides for laws that are both conduct-related and business-related with regard to recreational use of marihuana. He explained that the laws in place for conduct of use by persons 21 years of age or older cannot be prohibited by the City; therefore any current local ordinances will be reviewed and suggested to be revised accordingly if needed.

Discussion was held on past legislation and federal law and what prevails. Attorney Joppich stated that there is some crossover with past legislation and the new law without a lot of information yet on what takes precedence. He confirmed that marihuana is still illegal under federal law. In answer to Mayor Pro-Tem Bridges, he clarified that under the new law, recreational marihuana cannot be smoked in a public place, which has yet to be clearly defined.

Attorney Joppich reviewed the business-related uses allowed under the new law and the ability for communities to either opt-in and allow for such businesses or opt-out so that they would not be allowed in that community. He further explained that if a community was to opt-in, they could adopt zoning ordinance regulations to restrict where the businesses could be located or adopt licensing regulations to limit the number of licenses allowed. He explained that under the new law, a community must opt-out if they do not want to allow for the businesses and suggested that if the city decides to opt-out that this is done by way of two separate ordinances; one amending the City Code and one amending the Zoning Ordinance. He stated that a community could opt-out now and study the issue further and then opt-in at any time. The state has one year to establish administrative rules but once that is done, those are the rules unless a community has already opted-out.

Discussion was held on opting-in versus opting-out. Due to time constraints, it was determined that this discussion would be continued at another study session in February, 2019.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The study session meeting adjourned at 7:21pm

Respectfully submitted,



Pamela B. Smith, City Clerk