

October 4, 2004

**CITY OF OAK PARK
REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING
OCTOBER 4, 2004**

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Mayor Naftaly.

PRESENT: Mayor Naftaly, Mayor Pro Tem Frohlich, Councilman Horton, Councilman Seligson, City Manager Hock, City Clerk Gadd, City Attorney Carlson

ABSENT: Councilman Yousif

CM-10-366-04 ABSENCE OF COUNCILMAN YOUSIF - EXCUSED DUE TO ILLNESS

Motion by Frohlich, seconded by Seligson, **CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY:** To excuse the absence of Councilman Yousif due to illness.

CM-10-367-04 MINUTES OF THE REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2004 - APPROVED

Motion by Frohlich, seconded by Seligson, **CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY:** To approve the minutes of the Regular Council Meeting of September 20, 2004 as submitted.

Mayor Naftaly requested that Agenda Item #15C, Invoice from Keller Thoma Counselors at Law, be moved forward to Agenda Item #8.

PUBLIC HEARING – PROPOSED URBAN COOPERATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ROYAL OAK, MICHIGAN AND THE CITY OF OAK PARK

Mayor Naftaly stated that this is the time for the public hearing regarding the proposed Urban Cooperation Agreement Between the Charter Township of Royal Oak, Michigan and the City of Oak Park. The proposed agreement would provide that, for a period of up to 35 years, all of the property in Royal Oak Township, which is located north of 10 Mile Road and east of Greenfield Road, would be deemed for all purposes to have been annexed to the City and further provide for certain tax and state revenue sharing divisions between the City and the Township. Property may be deleted from the Agreement prior to final approval, but no additional property may be added without further notice and hearing. This provides, under Section 5a of Public Act 7 of the Public Acts of the State of Michigan of 1967, that local governmental units as defined in the Act may enter into interlocal agreements, which agreements may provide for the sharing between governmental units of revenue derived from the levy of ad valorem property taxes or specific taxes levied in lieu of general ad valorem property taxes. It allows for the City and the Township, if desired, to enter into an interlocal public agency agreement to provide for and to promote the economic development of the transferred area for the mutual benefit of the citizens

of each governmental unit, in place of the Act 425 Agreement. In return for the tax sharing, the property shall be deemed for all purposes to have been annexed to the City on or before December 31, 2003, and the Township and the City shall cause the annexation of the property described in Exhibit of the Agreement to the City by whatever means are deemed most appropriate and expeditious by the City under state law. Beginning in 2006, and continuing through 2025, the City shall annually pay the Township an amount equal to two mills assessed against the taxable value of all real and personal property within the transferred area. Beginning in 2026, and continuing through 2040, the City shall annually pay the Township an amount equal to one mill assessed against the taxable value of all real and personal property within the transferred area. It also speaks to the City making payments timely by September 30th each year to the Township. It adjusts for exemptions, abatements, or capture. It also addresses federal revenue sharing payments, the current formula under state law, and any adjustments that might be made. This agreement spells out how the City and the Township shall share in those payments. We have more information on the liquor licenses which will be discussed later. Also, Bridgewater, formerly Northgate Apartments, has not agreed to terms of participation; and this will be discussed further.

The public was invited to speak.

There was no one present who wished to speak and no written communications received.

City Attorney Carlson explained how the Urban Cooperation Agreement works in conjunction with the Act 425 Agreement. The Act 425 Agreement is entered into to resolve all the pending litigation that came up regarding the annexation. It is designed to obtain agreement from the Township to recognize the annexations in that they will be sharing some of the revenue from those properties for an extended period of time. It has an effect of continuing the viability of the Township. They are not losing all of their revenue. The essentials of the Agreement are that the properties are all conditionally transferred to the City for a period of time during which we will share tax revenues. At the end of that Agreement, they will be finally and completely transferred to the City as if they had been annexed. The City would get the taxes and the revenue sharing attributable to the population, and we would share some of that with the Township. The Act 7, Urban Cooperation Agreement, is essentially a back up position. It is designed to go into effect if the Act 425 Agreement is determined to be void. In that case, the Act 7, Urban Cooperation Agreement, goes into effect. The Act 7 Agreement does not contain any conditional transfers. As a fall back, it provides that the properties actually be annexed to the City immediately but that the revenue sharing, under the Act 425 Agreement, would continue. We would continue to share two mills in tax revenue, and we would continue to receive the rest of the tax revenue and state revenue sharing attributable to that population. It is the nearest approach to what was contained in the Act 425 Agreement that can be done under a different Act. It is a back up. It will only go into effect if necessary. These agreements have become more common throughout the state. This has become a traditional way of resolving land dispute matters.

Mayor Naftaly stated Bridgewater has been part of the discussion since the initial annexation. They submitted two sets of petitions. The first set was rejected by the county as not having sufficient signatures; and they went through the process a second time. Because they initially said they wanted to be annexed by the City of Oak Park, we included them in all the studies.

Likewise, they have been part of the expenses. They also have tax appeals pending with the Township. Where other property owners have tax appeals pending with the Township that may impact the City of Oak Park, we asked that reimbursement be made to the City. The other property owners have stepped up and done that, however, Bridgewater has not. They agreed to reimburse the City for expenses but have not agreed to reimburse the City for loss of property value. It will take a great amount of service for the Bridgewater apartments from Public Safety, DPW, fire protection, police protection, and everything else. It will have an enormous impact on the City. We computed the benefits to the City versus the negatives based on the current taxable value. If Bridgewater is annexed to the City of Oak Park, and are not part of the Act 425 Agreement, they will not pay the two mills to the Township. Bridgewater wants to leave the Township but not live up to the obligations of the City. They are presenting this to the voters of Oak Park in November. Council may adopt a resolution saying we don't want Bridgewater based on the cost/benefit analysis, and it is not beneficial to Oak Park. If the Township seeks to block annexation, the City may agree that Bridgewater remain with the Township. If we don't think it is in our best interest, and we don't get the cooperation that we have had with other taxpayers, we may urge a "no" vote on the Bridgewater annexation proposal.

City Attorney Carlson stated there is no one involved in this process that would gain more than Bridgewater by coming over to Oak Park in terms of the reduction in taxes they would receive. The expectation is that for a lower amount of taxes, they would get better services. Also, by coming from the Township to the City, mathematically, it will result in an increase in the value of the property. It is based on taking an income stream and dividing it by a capitalization rate, which includes a portion for taxes. With a lower tax rate, the capitalization rate is lower and the calculated value is higher. If they lock in a lower value before coming into the City, then the City, under Proposal "A" may calculate that the value has increased, but will be unable to put it on the tax roll for that amount because cost of living limitations. It might be years before they can get to a comparable assessment value. The City is trying to level the playing field with other Oak Park taxpayers.

Councilman Seligson stated that these folks think they are going to come to the City of Oak Park on the cheap and they want citizens in this City to pay for it. The citizens of this City are not going to pay for it. The citizens are doing this deal because it makes good fiscal sense for the City of Oak Park to take over this property. We are not going to do it if it takes away services and value from the current residents of this City. The citizens of Oak Park are not stupid. They will vote this down.

Mayor Naftaly closed the public hearing.

Mayor Naftaly stated the Township has given informal approval of the Agreement. Signatures have not been authorized yet it is pending working out the final details and completion of all the public hearings.

City Attorney Carlson stated that is his understanding. He suggested Council give him direction to meet with the Township attorneys, finalize the language, and bring it back to Council. We have until October 20, 2004. The public hearing on the Act 425 Agreement was September 20, 2004. You have to wait 30 days after the public hearing before entering into the Agreement.

October 20, 2004 is the projected date for Oak Park to sign the Agreement. The Township date is a little earlier. A conference with the judge is scheduled the following week. He is going to be looking for a signed Agreement at that point. He will bring everything back to City Council at the Regular Meeting of October 18, 2004.

Mayor Naftaly suggested excluding Bridgewater from the Agreement. They have not lived up to the Council's requests. He would like the Township to know this.

City Attorney Carlson stated if Bridgewater sees the light between now and October 18th, he would like to bring them in and not have to do anything additional. If we delete them from the Agreement tonight, we can't bring them back in without having another round of public hearings. We will meet the Township's date. We will do it without Bridgewater, unless something happens before the Township's date.

**CM-10-368-04 PROPOSED URBAN COOPERATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ROYAL OAK AND THE CITY
OF OAK PARK - RECEIVED**

Motion by Horton, seconded by Seligson, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To receive the proposed Urban Cooperation Agreement between the Charter Township of Royal Oak, Michigan, and the City of Oak Park, Michigan. The City Attorney is directed to meet with the Royal Oak Township attorneys, finalize the language for the Agreements, and bring the matter back to Council on October 18, 2004.

Mayor Naftaly welcomed County Commissioner Helaine Zack, and Donald Thigpen, President of the Oak Park Board of Education, who were present in the audience.

Mr. Thigpen thanked the Mayor and Council for the explanation on the Act 425 and Urban Cooperation Agreement. He also invited everyone to a pancake breakfast, at Roosevelt Middle School on Saturday, October 9, 2004, at 9:30 A.M.

**CM-10-369-04 REQUESTS FOR APPOINTMENT TO CITY BOARDS OR
COMMISSIONS**

Motion by Horton, seconded by Seligson, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To receive the following requests for appointment to City Boards or Commissions. These applications shall be retained in the City Clerk's Office pending City Council review.

1. Rochelle C. Ward, 24581 Oneida, requesting appointment to the Personnel Board, Emergency Services Council, and Election Commission.
2. Sherry Johnson, 23411 Wildwood, requesting appointment to the Beautification Advisory Commission, Community Services Advisory Board, and Ethnic Advisory Commission.

Mayor Naftaly requested Council members to contact the City Clerk with dates they are available for a special meeting to review applications for residents who want to serve on City boards and commissions.

Mayor Naftaly referred to the request for a temporary sign for the Learning Institute of Family and suggested the sign be removed October 23, 2004, rather than after 30 days, because the event will be over on October 16th.

**CM-10-370-04 LEARNING INSTITUTE OF FAMILY - REQUEST FOR
TEMPORARY SIGNS - APPROVED OCTOBER 6, 2004
THROUGH OCTOBER 23, 2004**

Motion by Seligson, seconded by Horton, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To receive and approve a request from Learning Institute of Family, 13300 Oak Park Blvd., to display one 5' x 6' and one 3' x 5' freestanding temporary signs, beginning October 6, 2004, through October 23, 2004, subject to the following conditions:

1. Phone numbers are prohibited on signs.
2. The temporary sign is for a thirty (30) day period.
3. Not more than one thirty (30) day extension allowed.
4. The temporary sign shall not be placed in or project over the right-of-way.
5. The temporary sign shall not create an obstruction or traffic hazard.
6. A \$50.00 bond shall be posted.
7. Not more than two (2) permits for temporary signs shall be issued to a single applicant in any calendar year.
8. Application to be completed and proper fee paid.

**MICHIGAN SUBURBS ALLIANCE - REDEVELOPMENT READY COMMUNITIES
PROJECT**

Mayor Naftaly asked City Council to just receive the resolution. In the letter from Michigan Suburbs Alliance, it says they have produced unparalleled redevelopment standards establishing best practices that help make suburbs more market competitive. Their practices are fully understood by communities, are clear and concise, and contain standards achievable by communities; but, in the next paragraph, they say that the Best Practices may require language modifications, standard additions or removals, or updates as they move through the development plan. This doesn't tell him that they are the best at this point. Also, in 2002, Council discussed membership in the Michigan Suburbs Alliance and voted to allow membership in this organization for one year. He voted in opposition. He stated that he hopes that the membership has not continued just because the funds may have remained in the budget. He suggested the communication and proposed resolution just be received with reference back to the original action in 2002.

**CM-10-371-04 REDEVELOPMENT READY COMMUNITIES (RRC) PROJECT
FROM MICHIGAN SUBURBS ALLIANCE.**

Motion by Seligson, seconded by Horton, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To receive the proposed resolution and outline of proposed standards and requirements for certification for the Redevelopment Ready Communities (RRC) Project from Michigan Suburbs Alliance. Further, it is noted that Council authorization for membership in the Michigan Suburbs Alliance, and payment of the appropriate dues, was given on September 23, 2002, for a period of one year (SCM-09-23-02).

CM-10-372-04 REQUEST FOR USE OF CITY MARQUEE

Motion by Horton, seconded by Frohlich, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To receive and approve a request to use the City Marquee, from Oak Park School District, for October 7, 8, and 9, 2004; and October 14, 15, and 16, 2004, to promote registration for preschool openings.

CM-10-373-04 **MERCHANTS' LICENSES - APPROVED**

Motion by Seligson, seconded by Frohlich, **CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**: To approve the following Merchants' Licenses subject to all departmental approvals.

<u>MERCHANT</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>FEE</u>
<u>INITIALS 2004</u>		
Christine's Salon	13701 W. Eleven Mile	\$100.00
HM Investors	12990 W. Eight Mile, #101	\$100.00
Marina's Alterations	15075 Lincoln, #117	\$100.00
Michigan Construction Protection Agency	14211 W. Eleven Mile	\$100.00
<u>RENEWALS - 2004</u>		
Fusion Gas & Mart, Inc. (Gas station & nozzle fee)	13600 W. Eight Mile	\$210.00
Public Storage	20700 Greenfield	\$150.00

CM-10-374-04 **PROFESSIONAL SERVICES RENDERED – KELLER THOMA
COUNSELORS AT LAW**

Motion by Frohlich, seconded by Seligson, **CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**: To approve payment of Invoice #67479, to Keller Thoma Counselors at Law, in the amount of \$2,321.57.

Roll Call Vote: Yes, Frohlich, Horton, Seligson, Naftaly
 No, None
 Absent, Yousif

Mayor Naftaly extended thanks to Keller Thoma for submitting a detailed bill in response to Council's request.

CM-10-375-04 **PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CITY CODE OF
ORDINANCES, SECTION 1600, PLANNED CORRIDOR
DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (PUD), LOT AREA AMENDED TO
FOUR ACRES - FIRST READING**

Motion by Horton, seconded by Seligson, **CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**: To concur in the recommendation of the City Attorney and conduct the first reading of a proposed ordinance to amend the City Code of Ordinances, Section 1600, by changing the minimum acreage in the PCD, Planned Corridor Development District to four acres. The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on the ordinance amendment on October 11, 2004. The second reading and adoption of the proposed ordinance is scheduled for the next Regular City Council Meeting.

City Attorney Carlson stated usually a first reading of a proposed ordinance amendment would occur after the Planning Commission public hearing and recommendation. However, conducting a first reading at this time will save time and assist the appellant.

CM-10-376-04 MINUTES - RECEIVED

Motion by Seligson, seconded by Horton, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To receive the minutes from the following Boards and Commissions:

- A. Board of Review Meeting, July 20, 2004
- B. Independence Day Commission, September 1, 2004
- C. Library Board, September 21, 2004

Mayor Naftaly extended sympathy to Zachary Davies on the death of his mother.

CM-10-377-04 MONTHLY REPORTS

Motion by Seligson, seconded by Frohlich, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To receive the monthly report from the Recreation Department for July 2004.

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

City Attorney Carlson stating Council has a resolution in the agenda packet opposing the ballot propositions concerning the annexation of Bridgewater Apartments and Lincoln Woods. A revised resolution has now been provided opposing the ballot propositions for annexation of Bridgewater Apartments only. Lincoln Woods has agreed to be part of the 425 Agreement. The new resolution has references to Lincoln Woods removed. He presented a summary of the resolution which puts Council on record opposing the Bridgewater Apartments annexation Proposition No. 2004-01.

Mayor Naftaly stated Council's recommendation to oppose the Bridgewater annexation ballot proposal will be placed in the Oak Park Report as well as on cable.

City Attorney Carlson stated if the Act 425 Agreement is approved before the election, the ballot proposal for Lincoln Woods is just a moot question. It won't have any effect. They will be annexed to Oak Park as part of the Act 425 Agreement. If Bridgewater is not a part of the Act 425 Agreement, their ballot proposal will determine whether they become part of the City of Oak Park. Bridgewater was represented at every single meeting we had at Oakland County Circuit Court. They were part of every discussion. Every nickel spent by the City in defense of the lawsuit was related to Bridgewater as well as everyone else.

Mayor Naftaly stated they took part in the discussions and made us believe they were part of the whole thing.

City Attorney Carlson stated that is correct. We spent many lengthy discussions that had to do with Bridgewater.

Councilman Seligson requested that the City Attorney inform Bridgewater, as soon as possible, that we will use every method we have to get the message out of what Bridgewater is trying to do. He wants to make sure it is very clear that City Council is 100% committed to making sure, if they do not sign on, they will lose. He wants this on the front page of the Oak Park Report.

**CM-10-378-04 RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO BALLOT QUESTION 2004-01
- ANNEXATION OF BRIDGEWATER APARTMENTS -
ADOPTED**

Motion by Seligson, seconded by Horton, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To adopt the following resolution:

WHEREAS, The Oakland County Clerk has determined that ballot propositions concerning the annexation of Bridgewater Apartments be placed on the ballot at the General Election to be held on November 2, 2004; and

WHEREAS, Conducting the election and defending litigation likely to arise therefrom, as well as administrative expenses incurred by the City in connection with annexation of property from Royal Oak Township and the liabilities for which the City becomes responsible by such annexation, are expected to create significant expense to the City, and the Bridgewater Apartments properties are also the subject of pending property tax assessment appeals which could result in future tax revenue losses to the City; and

WHEREAS, Despite its best efforts, the City has been unable to reach agreement with Bridgewater respecting the payment of a portion of the costs and expenses which the City has and will incur in connection with the annexation and/or property transfer of the properties to the City from Royal Oak Township and the loss of tax revenue expected to be incurred by the City as a result of the Bridgewater assessment appeals.

CM-10-378-04 Continued

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY the City Council of the City of Oak Park, Oakland County, Michigan, that:

1. The City Council hereby determines the annexation of the Bridgewater Apartments at the November 2, 2004 General Election, unless and until agreement can be reached with respect to reimbursement to the City of expected costs, expenses and revenue losses described above, is not in the best interest of the City.
2. The City Council urges Oak Park residents to vote “No” on Ballot Question 2004-01, the annexation of the Bridgewater Apartments, at the November 2, 2004 General Election.
3. All resolutions inconsistent with the foregoing resolution be and the same hereby are rescinded to the extent of any such inconsistency.

Roll Call Vote:	Yes,	Horton, Seligson, Naftaly, Frohlich
	No,	None
	Absent,	Yousif

Mayor Naftaly raised the issue of what happens to the liquor licenses for the businesses in the area proposed to be annexed. We could have included this in the Act 425 Agreement. Enforcement would be up to the Township, but the Township could contract with the City of Oak Park. The returnable fees would go to the Township, but they could agree to allot a portion to the City of Oak Park. Liquor license renewals or transfers would be up to the Township. All authority and control would go to the Township.

City Attorney Carlson stated that is correct. He discussed this matter with the Attorney General as well as the Liquor Control Commission. If this was included in the Act 425 Agreement, for all Liquor Control Commission purposes, the property would be deemed to be in the Township. That would include liquor law enforcement. A contract could be developed for enforcement. However, there are other issues, such as requests for transfers, revocations, renewals, and these would go to the Royal Oak Township Board and not the Oak Park City Council. He would not recommend that Council do this. We would have to regulate with our hands tied, and this is not desirable.

Mayor Naftaly stated the only other option then, under State law, is to place this on the ballot in November of 2005. The proposition would be to allow liquor by the glass for the whole City of Oak Park. It cannot be restricted to just the two properties in the area proposed to be annexed.

City Attorney Carlson stated that is correct.

Councilman Seligson asked if Council could adopt a policy to not approve any other liquor licenses.

Mayor Naftaly stated future Councils would not be obligated to honor this position.

City Manager Hock stated other communities have adopted the philosophy that they will only issue liquor licenses in the name of economic development, such as a restaurant. However, future Councils do not have to follow this philosophy.

Mayor Naftaly stated the former mayor tried to find out if we could restrict licenses to establishments with more than 50% of their business in food sales. He thinks it was determined we could do that, but we couldn't restrict it by tables. He stated he thinks we have to leave it up to a vote of the people.

Discussion followed on sale of alcohol by the glass.

City Attorney Carlson going out for a vote is probably the best way. You have to have some very clear and consistent standards if you limit it to just the two businesses.

City Attorney Carlson suggested Council meet in Closed Session, at the end of this Regular Meeting, to discuss the Northland Plaza Tax Appeal and other Tax Tribunal matters.

**CM-10-379-04 CLOSED MEETING SCHEDULED AT THE END OF THIS
REGULAR MEETING TO DISCUSS PENDING LITIGATION AND
TAX TRIBUNAL MATTERS**

Motion by Horton, seconded by Seligson, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To schedule a Closed Meeting, at the end of this Regular Meeting, to discuss pending litigation and Tax Tribunal matters, in accordance with provisions of the Open Meetings Act.

Roll Call Vote:	Yes,	Seligson, Naftaly, Frohlich, Horton
	No,	None
	Absent,	Yousif

CM-10-380-04 CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT - RECEIVED

Motion by Frohlich, seconded by Seligson, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To receive the City Attorney's Report.

Roll Call Vote: Yes, Seligson, Naftaly, Frohlich, Horton
 No, None
 Absent, Yousif

**CM-10-385-04 CHANGE ORDER NO. 1 AND PAYMENT APPLICATION NO. 2, KOALA-T
CONSTRUCTION, FOR THE 2004 SIDEWALK REPLACEMENT PROGRAM,
M-486 - APPROVED**

Motion by Frohlich, seconded by Seligson, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve Change Order No. 1, to Koala-T Construction, for the 2004 Sidewalk Replacement Program, M-486, in the amount of \$7,174.86, and Payment Application No. 2, in the amount of \$152,136.44. Funding is available in the Sidewalk Program Capital Improvement Fund No. 451-71-970.004.

Roll Call Vote: Yes, Naftaly, Frohlich, Horton, Seligson
 No, None
 Absent, Yousif

**CM-10-386-04 PAYMENT APPLICATION NO. 2, DOWNUNDER MUNICIPAL SERVICES,
LLC, FOR THE 2004 SEWER CLEANING AND TV INSPECTION PROJECT, M-
488 - APPROVED**

Motion by Horton, seconded by Frohlich, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve Payment Application No. 2, to Downunder Municipal Services, LLC., for the 2004 Sewer Cleaning and TV Inspection Project, M-488, in the amount of \$41,264.39. Funding is available in the Water and Sewer Fund Repairs & Maintenance Account No. 592-18-550-930.

Roll Call Vote: Yes, Frohlich, Horton, Seligson, Naftaly
 No, None
 Absent, Yousif

CALL TO AUDIENCE

Mayor Naftaly announced that now was the time for the Call to Audience and invited interested parties to speak. Mayor Naftaly stated that each speaker's remarks are a matter of public record; and the speaker, alone, is responsible for his or her comments. The City of Oak Park does not, by permitting such remarks, support, endorse or accept the content, thereof, as being true and correct. There is a three-minute time limit per speaker.

There was no one present who wished to speak.

Close of Call to Audience.

COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilman Horton commended Public Safety, on behalf of Dr. Bailey, Superintendent of the Oak Park School District, for assistance provided for football games.

Public Works Director invited everyone to a Enviro Magic, October 21, 2004, 6:30 P.M., in the Community Center.

Mayor Naftaly extended condolences to the family of Norma Lewis on her death.

The meeting recessed at 8:44 P.M., to meet in Closed Session, and reconvened at 9:25 P.M. back into Open Session.

**CM-10-387-04 NORTHLAND PLAZA ASSOCIATES, LLC - ALTERNATIVE
DISPUTE RESOLUTION AGREEMENT - APPROVED**

Motion by Seligson, seconded by Horton, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the Alternative Dispute Resolution Agreement, between the City of Oak Park and Northland Plaza Associates, LLC, and authorize the Mayor, City Manager, and City Clerk to execute the Agreement on behalf of the City of Oak Park subject to final approval of the City Attorney.

Roll Call Vote:	Yes,	Horton, Seligson, Naftaly, Frohlich
	No,	None
	Absent,	Yousif

The meeting adjourned at 9:26 P.M.

Sandra K. Gadd, City Clerk

Gerald E. Naftaly, Mayor