

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN
TOWNSHIP BOARD REGULAR MEETING - **APPROVED** -
5151 Marsh Road, Okemos, MI 48864-1198
349-1200, Town Hall Room
TUESDAY, AUGUST 15, 2006, **6:00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting, Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode
ABSENT: None
STAFF: Township Manager Gerald Richards, Director of Community Planning & Development Mark Kieselbach, Director of Engineering & Public Works Ray Severy, Police Chief Dave Hall, EMS/Assistant Fire Chief Dale Monnier, Attorney Andria Ditschman

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Supervisor McGillicuddy called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/INTRODUCTIONS

Supervisor McGillicuddy led the Pledge of Allegiance.

A. Presentation of Resolution of Appreciation to Rob Striker

Supervisor McGillicuddy presented and read to Mr. Striker a resolution of appreciation for his efforts in spearheading a fundraising campaign which saved the 2006 Meridian Community Fireworks Celebration.

3. ROLL CALL

Supervisor McGillicuddy called the roll of the Board.

4. PUBLIC REMARKS

Supervisor McGillicuddy opened Public Remarks.

Charles Willems, PO Box 184, Haslett, stated that the plat of Hickory Island is a plat and Michigan law applies in Meridian Township. He also spoke regarding shoreline erosion as it relates to tax description and assessment.

Pat Lindemann, Ingham County Drain Commissioner, 707 Buhl Street, Mason, presented Supervisor McGillicuddy with a check for \$100,000 of surplus funds for the Proctor Drain Project. He also announced fall planting for the rain garden on Okemos Road, south of the river, may not take place as scheduled.

Supervisor McGillicuddy closed Public Remarks.

5. REPORTS/BOARD COMMENT/NEW WORRIES

A. Election Results

Clerk Helmbrecht reported Meridian Township election results for the August 8th Primary, the first large election with the new precinct based tabulators. The primary was also the first election with the new AutoMARK machine, which allowed residents with disabilities their first opportunity to vote a secret ballot. She stated there was an approximate 22.5% voter turnout, which was light for a primary election. Meridian Township results for the 69th State Representative District saw John Knowles receiving 67% of the Republican vote, while Mary Lindemann received 46% of the Democratic vote. John Knowles and Mark Meadows won the nomination district wide in their respective parties. Each of the three proposals (CATA, County Juvenile Facility and CADL) passed in the Township by wide margins.

Clerk Helmbrecht stated ballots for the November General election are expected to be received in her office the third week of September. She expressed appreciation to the election inspectors for their remarkable work with the new machines and all the new rules which needed to be followed.

6. APPROVAL OF AGENDA — OR CHANGES

Trustee Brixie moved to approve the agenda as submitted. Seconded by Trustee Such.

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

7. CONSENT AGENDA

Supervisor McGillicuddy reviewed the consent agenda.

Trustee Brixie moved to adopt the Consent Agenda. Seconded by Trustee Such.

Trustee Veenstra offered the following friendly amendment:

- **Move agenda item #7E to Agenda Item #10D**

The amendment was accepted by the maker and seconder.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting

NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

The adopted Consent Agenda items are as follow:

A. Communications

(1). Staff Communication/Referral (SC)

- SC-1 Michigan Townships Association Legislative E-Report, July 28, 2006 Edition
- SC-2 Michigan Townships Association Legislative E-Report, August 8, 2006 Edition
- SC-3 Lynn Meikle, Cable T.V. Coordinator; RE: Response to communication from V. Lynn, 3882 Dobie Road, #208, Okemos relative to Upgrade of the Comcast Cable television system

Trustee Brixie moved that the communications be received and placed on file, and any communications not already assigned for disposition be referred to the Township Manager or Supervisor for follow-up. Seconded by Trustee Such.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting

NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

B. Minutes

Trustee Brixie moved to approve and ratify the minutes of the August 1, 2006 Regular Meeting as submitted. Seconded by Trustee Such.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting

NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

C. Bills

Trustee Brixie moved that the Township Board approve the Manager's Bills as follows:

Common Cash	\$ 403,105.75
Public Works	\$ 215,677.56
Total Checks	\$ 618,783.31
Credit Card Transactions	\$ 15,893.00
Total Purchases	<u>\$ 634,676.31</u>
ACH Payments	<u>\$ 277,947.63</u>

Seconded by Trustee Such.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor
McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting
NAYS: None
Motion carried unanimously.

[Bill list in Official Minute Book]

D. Budget Amendment - Lake Lansing Shoreline Protection

Trustee Brixie moved that the 2006 General Fund fund balance budget be amended to include \$8,500 to the Capital Outlay Construction/Improvement Account (#101-900.901-974.000) for construction of a 17' x 8' sea wall on Township property located at the east end of Mack Avenue where it meets Lake Lansing. Seconded by Trustee Such.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor
McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting
NAYS: None
Motion carried unanimously.

8. QUESTIONS FOR THE ATTORNEY (See Agenda Item # 10B, #11A)

9. HEARINGS (None)

10. ACTION ITEMS/ENDS

Public Comment

Supervisor McGillicuddy opened public comment.

Mark Clouse, Chief Financial Officer, Eyde Co., 4660 S. Hagadorn Road, Suite 660, East Lansing, spoke in support of Final Plat #04032 (Eyde), Lake Lansing Estates.

Supervisor McGillicuddy closed public comment.

A. Final Plat #04032 (Eyde), Lake Lansing Estates

Trustee Such moved [and read into the record] NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN approves the Final Plat of Lake Lansing Estates. Seconded by Clerk Helmbrecht.

Board members discussed the following:

- Water service being provided by the Board of Water and Light was an error on the 2004 tentative preliminary plat sheet
- Water service type of detail is not listed on the approved plat sheet for final plat
- Existing water coming from Sierra Ridge off Lake Lansing Road

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor
McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting
NAYS: None
Motion carried unanimously.

B. Tentative Preliminary Plat #06032 (White Family Properties), request for tentative preliminary plat for Whitehills Lakes #8, a seven lot single-family subdivision located north of Pine Hollow Drive and west of Saginaw Highway

Trustee Such moved [and read in to the record] NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN hereby grants approval of the tentative preliminary plat for a seven lot single family subdivision, commonly known as Whitehills Lakes #8, located north of Pine Hollow Drive and west of BL-69/Saginaw Highway, with the following conditions:

1. Approval is granted in accordance with the Tentative Preliminary Plat dated May 15, 2006, prepared by KEBS Inc, indicating seven single family lots, subject to revisions as required.
2. The plat shall be revised to show the following: wetlands as delineated by the Township Environmental Consultant; correct buildable areas on Lot #153, Lot #156 and Lot #159 due to the location of water features or water feature setbacks; the correct setbacks for grading and structures, and the natural vegetation strip on Lot #153, Lot #154 and Lot #155, due to the proximity of the Whitehills branch of the Remy-Chandler drain.
3. Prior to submitting an application for final preliminary plat review, the applicant shall obtain a wetland use permit for impacts to wetlands from the construction of Fenwick Court and the location of utilities. Should a permit be required from the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, no grading or construction work shall be conducted until the permit is final and unappealable at the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ).
4. Where the natural vegetation strip extends onto lots in the plat, it shall be clearly identified with permanent markers on those lots. The size, design, and location of the markers shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Community Planning and Development.
5. Prior to any construction or grading on the site, the applicant shall install silt fencing at the upland edge of all regulated water features. The silt fencing shall be removed after construction once the area is stabilized and vegetation has been established.
6. The applicant shall obtain all other necessary permits and approvals from the Ingham County Drain Commissioner, Ingham County Road Commission, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), and the Township. Copies of all permits and approval letters shall be submitted to the Department of Community Planning and Development.
7. Final utility plans shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Public Works and Engineering and shall be completed in accordance with Township Engineering Design and Construction Standards.
8. Storm sewer leads shall be provided to each lot in the subdivision. The final location of the lead shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Public Works and Engineering. All residences constructed in the subdivision shall be connected to the leads.
9. An overall grading plan for the subdivision shall be required with detailed construction plans, prior to issuance of any building permits.
10. No grading or tree removal is permitted on the site until the applicant receives a Land Clearing Permit. A tree survey may be required with the application for land clearing.
11. A five foot wide concrete sidewalk shall be constructed along the south side of Fenwick Court within the subdivision. The sidewalk shall be designed and constructed in accordance with Township Engineering Design and Construction Standards.
12. Street trees shall be required throughout the subdivision. Species and location of the trees shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Community Planning and Development and the Ingham County Road Commission.

13. The space between Lot #156 and Lot #157 shall be widened to at least 40 feet, unless the applicant can demonstrate adequate land is available to install sidewalks and other public utilities.
14. Any wellhead(s) located on the site shall be properly closed and abandoned per the requirements of the Ingham County Health Department and the Township, prior to the issuance of any permit for construction activity, including grading permits.
15. A copy of the information that exists on computer for the plat and construction plans shall be provided to the Township Engineering staff in an Auto Cad compatible format.

Seconded by Clerk Helmbrecht.

Board members and staff discussed the following:

- Decision to have sidewalk on only one side of Fenwick Court maintains consistency within the subdivision
- Need for tree survey will be determined during staff review prior to final preliminary plat
- Portion of the subdivision is part of a potential annexation for which a petition has been filed
- If petition for annexation was successful, this subdivision would be under the jurisdiction of East Lansing
- Conditions which are placed on the plat go with the property
- 90 day time period for final plat approval required by state law and the Township's land division ordinance
- Recommendation by the Township attorney to take preliminary action tonight could be for either approval or denial of the preliminary plat
- Plat approval is a three (3) step process and the tentative preliminary plat is handled at the local level

Jurisdiction during the plat approval process when an annexation petition has been filed:

(Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #8))

- Q. If the vote for annexation might come before final approval, where does the authority then set? Does it set with the jurisdiction that grants final approval or does it set with the jurisdiction that grants preliminary approval?
- A. I can't give you an answer on the timeline, because both of those procedures depend on who gets involved and what kind of responses are made by all the parties, so I can't tell you one will be done more quickly than the other. Without having any of the annexation statutes here with me tonight, I would assume what I know about all state law, is that if there was an annexation in the middle of the process, the Township would not finish out the process as far as any approvals that had not been given. The jurisdiction would then be under whatever area it would be annexed to. As far as this tentative approval, the ordinances were recently passed on land division. I think that your ordinance and the state act say that the Township governing body must act within so many days. So I would say that as far as this tentative plat, the state act and your ordinance, at this point, would direct you to act within a certain amount of time and I think your time is up at the end of August.
- Q. Andria, I would like to ask you do you think we're better off acting on this this evening rather than delaying it?
- A. Again, I would say that because the state act tells you that you have to act on it, I would say that you should follow the state act and your ordinance.
- Q. And the consequences of not acting within the time period, are you familiar with the sanctions, Andria, on that or do you know what they are?
- A. I do not know what those are off the top of my head.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Woiwode, Supervisor
McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting

NAYS: None

INAUDIBLE: Trustee Veenstra

Motion carried 6-0.

C. Possible Rezoning of Hamilton Road Properties

Director Kieselbach summarized the possible rezoning as outlined in staff memorandum dated August 11, 2006.

Trustee Brixie moved to request the Planning Commission, after researching the zoning options for the following properties, 2176 Hamilton Road (21-404-003), a vacant parcel (21-404-004), 2168 Hamilton Road (21-404-005), and 2164 Hamilton Road (21-404-006), select a zoning category and initiate a rezoning of the subject properties.

Seconded by Trustee Woiwode.

Board members discussed the following:

- Need for community involvement in the process
- Request for the Planning Commission to carefully explore all options and possibilities
- Request for the Planning Commission to make the properties conforming if at all possible
- Possibility of adjoining properties owned by the same individual which could be combined to make one conforming parcel
- Aerial map lot lines should only be used as a guide

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor
McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting

NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

D. Budget Amendment – Emergency Water Main Replacement

Trustee Veenstra moved that the 2006 Water Fund budget (Account #591-900.901-972.112) be amended to include \$100,000 from the Water Fund balance of the Enterprise Fund (Account # 591-000.000-395.000) for repair of an 8” water main along Lake Lansing Road between Hart Street and Gibson Avenue. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.

Board members discussed the following:

- Leak discovered while digging a hole for a new house
- Aggressive soils which quickly corroded the pipe from the outside
- Water mains were not encased in a polyethylene lining 34 years ago
- Tracking mechanism for water main breaks used to prioritize replacement

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor
McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting

NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

11. DISCUSSION ITEMS/ENDS

Supervisor McGillicuddy opened and closed public comment.

- A. Rezoning # 06050 (Newton Property LLC/Forsberg), request to rezone approximately 26.17 acres, located at 6276 Newton Road and the parcel to the east from RR (Rural Residential) to C-2 (Commercial) conditioned on the sites being developed as a Mixed Use Planned Unit Development

Director Kieselbach summarized the rezoning request as outlined in staff memorandum dated August 11, 2006.

Pete Preston, Trinity Engineering & Surveying, 107 N. Clinton Avenue, St. Johns and the applicant's representative, gave a brief history of this proposed rezoning to date. He requested the Board act on the applicant's original request instead of the Planning Commission's recommendation.

Board members, staff and the applicant discussed the following:

- Newest concept plan titled C-1
- How best to meet the needs of the applicant and the Board
- Possibility of the applicant using two separate PUDs; residential and mixed use commercial which could run concurrently
- Conditional zoning must be proposed by the applicant
- Urge the applicant to listen to what the Planning Commission and the Board has said and react appropriately
- Potential lengthy process for the applicant
- Board consideration to buffer residential from commercial
- Interesting concepts contained in the MUPUD conditional zoning as proposed by the applicant
- Applicant's understanding of the lengthy process
- Questionable expression of legislative intent by the Board
- Applicant's original proposal does not require the Board to send the rezoning back to the Planning Commission
- If needed, ask the Planning Commission specific questions for additional information
- Concern with the concept of the Board rezoning a property conditioned upon mixed use but not having a plan from the developer
- Consideration of a future Board policy that conditional rezoning for a mixed use PUD not be accepted unless the request is made concurrently with a specific plan for development
- Acceptance of limited amount of commercial and/or PO along Saginaw Highway
- Southern portion of this property should be RA to match adjacent property to the south
- Consideration of rezoning to C-1 given possible ordinance amendments to include mixed use in C-1
- Consideration of more RAA than Planning Commission recommendation and less RC
- No specific time frame for Board action
- Staff to work with the applicant to explore possibilities and ideas
- Possibility of the wetland in the middle serving as a buffer between the commercial on the site and the residential
- Important issue for the developer to have flexibility on the site
- Limitation on the site of 25,000 square feet of commercial

Possible request for conditional rezoning: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #8))

- Q. In order for them to request C-2 based on a mixed use planned unit development (MUPUD), they have to submit a plan so we have the plan to look at on which to base the zoning. Correct?
- A. If I understand your question, I think it has to do with the request to condition a rezoning. A conditional rezoning does not have to be based on a specific plan; an applicant can just condition that on a concept (whether it be a PUD, mixed use or that it be some other type of use), limit the size of uses they are proposing, only limit to specific type of uses on the site, or they could say pursuant to the site plan dated this date, or the concept plan dated this date with a percentage used for commercial, a percentage used for residential. It could be very specific in their conditions. Right now what I hear is only two conditions: 1) we limit the size of the commercial and 2) they use mixed use. If what you are asking about is a specific site plan, I don't hear that being one of their conditions yet, but it could be.
- Q. It looks to me that you're trying to meet the criteria that the Planning Commission had suggested to the Township Board; that there be multiple family in the northeastern part and residential to abut the residential to the south and commercial in the southwestern part of the site. If they have not seen this, I just wanted to know how to best meet the needs of the applicant as well as the Board. I will go through the Board and ask what they want to do with this. I think we need to clarify that if he wants to condition it on a particular site plan, what is the best route for him to take? I don't want to waste his time or our time if he wants to base it on a site plan and request a conditional rezoning.

- A. I'll try to answer that further. If the applicant were to say he wants to condition it based on this concept or this site plan, then you can add that condition at this point. I don't believe the new conditional ordinance is in effect. In the past, if it had not been brought up, it was referred back to the Planning Commission for another public hearing based on the new information. Then it would come back to the Board, rezoned to the C-2 based on a specific concept plan with a maximum of commercial square footage. Does that help?
- Q. If this is what the Board chooses to do, would the appropriate response from the Board then be to send it back to the Planning Commission? It's not tied to the rezoning, which is the problem at this point.
- A. When you say, "If this is what the Board chooses to do" do you mean the concept plan? If so, the Board either needs to decide whether it likes the C-2 that was proposed, the Planning Commission's recommendation, or if it wants the Planning Commission to look at another type of zoned property and send it back. To send it back based on this specific layout, the Board can't do that because it hasn't been submitted as a condition. You cannot require the rezoning to be based on this layout at this point.
- Q. If we rezoned it commercial based on a MUPUD; I think the reason people have trouble with it is because unless the limitation is placed on the commercial (which it sounds like it is), but can we just accept it at that value?
- A. If I understand your question, let's say that the Board approves the commercial, and all they approved it as is a condition that it be a mixed use PUD. It still has to go through the mixed use PUD process of approval. The problem is, and I think this is the concern both from the developers and the Township, what if it never gets to that point because there is a misunderstanding of what was intended in the first place by the approval. That's why it would be my recommendation that it be more specific than that, but under conditional zoning, it hasn't been tested and could be approved as a mixed use PUD. I think the concern with that so far is if you just do that, how does that ever get approved down the road.
- Q. It leaves a lot of unanswered questions. I know that is my problem. If you are coming in with a plan, a request for conditional zoning based on a concept plan, I don't have as much of a problem with it, as I do the open ended C-2.
- A. I think the way the mixed use is set up, it allows latitude for the developer and maybe not a lot of latitude for the Board to deny it. If they meet all of the requirements of the ordinance and all the extras that are necessary, then you need some basis upon which to say the Board doesn't like this. That may not be written into the ordinance right now; it is somewhat new. I believe that is probably a concern of the Board, just leaving it open.
- Q. Mixed use as conditioned is one of the things being battered around here without us having the option of conditioning it. I understood from previous discussion that we would probably have to refer it back to the Planning Commission in order to even get to the point where we have a proposal in front of us. Correct?
- A. If what the Board is interested in is a mixed use overlay with commercial, and they say they would consider that without more specifics, I believe the Planning Commission has already considered that. That is what went back to you.
- Q. I'm saying with more specifics. That is the challenge; it sounds like we wouldn't be able to, at this point, simply accept conditions and adopt a zoning that would be a mixed use over a C-2 with conditions.
- A. The only thing that might be of use in this situation, even though it was already referred to the Planning Commission once, as the applicant has stated. Perhaps referring it back to the Planning Commission (maybe Mark can assist here if he thinks it is a good idea or not,) mixed use overlay commercial with the legislative intent from the Board of their mixed use ordinance in the first place. Maybe a better understanding of how they might use that concept, with the understanding that no matter how it comes back, the applicant tying the mixed use into rezoning that specific plan shouldn't be considered in approving or denying it.

- Q. Is there some way to explain how the Board actually expresses legislative intent?
- A. Perhaps it is from the minutes of the Board in developing the ordinance; that's one way to look at it. I don't know if Mark has any other written information; I wasn't at the Planning Commission meeting, I don't know if this was even discussed. It sounds like, from the applicant, there may have been some confusion as to what can be done with this ordinance; what's allowed under the ordinance.
- Q. Andria, if we were to do as Andy suggested, we would not need to act on it; we would just sit on it and let them talk about it?
- A. Correct.

The consensus of the Board was to allow the applicant time to work with staff to better define how the site could be developed and report back to the Board at a later date.

B. Proposed Lighting Ordinance

Director Kieselbach summarized the proposed Outdoor Lighting Ordinance analysis as outlined in staff memorandum dated August 11, 2006.

Board members discussed the following:

- Appreciation to staff and the Township attorney for work on the dark sky ordinance and analysis
- Retain prohibition on mercury vapor lights
- Concurrence with the dark sky handbook not to limit pole heights
- Concurrence with staff recommendation to not regulate porch and garage lights in single or two-family districts
- Concurrence with staff recommendation regarding signs and billboards being regulated within the sign ordinance
- Concurrence with the increase in the compliance term from five (5) to ten (10) years
- Cost of cut-off fixture will be dramatically reduced when more communities adopt a similar ordinance
- Turn off lighting in parking lots during non-business hours to conserve energy
- Staff notification of the public hearing to businesses and offices which have illuminated parking areas and developers
- Possible educational and informational session prior to a public hearing which describes previous Board discussion
- Possible Township Manager report to the Meridian Area Business Association (MABA) at its next monthly meeting
- Public hearing for input by residents, developers and business owners
- Presentation by the Police Chief during the informational hearing on the public safety aspect of leaving some lighting on during non-business hours
- Township to take initiative to retrofit its own lighting as the process begins

The consensus of the Board was to finalize the proposed language as recommended by staff and organize an informational workshop prior to a public hearing on the proposed lighting ordinance.

C. Tree Protection Summary

Director Kieselbach summarized the proposed Tree Protection Ordinance as outlined in staff memorandum dated August 11, 2006.

Board members discussed the following:

- Greatest threat is in the large lot areas which have the potential to be split
- Specified time period regarding major permit for tree removal of more than one landmark tree
- Include definition of significant tree within proposed text of the ordinance
- Opposition to an ordinance which regulates use of trees on private property
- Opposition to a tree protection ordinance
- No definition for an orchard

- Right to Forest Act within the State of Michigan to go before the Natural Resources Commission for action which contain provisions for generally accepted practices
- Benefit of trees to the community (e.g., cleaner air and water, warmer temperatures in winter)
- Replacement mitigation
- Possibility of limiting the tree ordinance to certain zoning categories
- Activities which will not be regulated by the ordinance listed on page 2
- Consideration of the general common good
- Possibility for the Township's GIS system to identify lot exemption based on size on the provided map
- Identification of significant wood lots

The consensus of the Board was to blend the land clearing ordinance into the tree protection ordinance in draft form and bring it back to the Board within the next two (2) to three (3) months.

12. PUBLIC REMARKS

Supervisor McGillicuddy opened and closed Public Remarks.

13. POSSIBLE CLOSED SESSION

Trustee Brixie moved that the Township Board go into a closed session to consult with the Township Attorney regarding settlement strategy in connection with pending litigation. Seconded by Trustee Woiwode.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting
NAYS: None
Motion carried unanimously.

The Board adjourned to the Administrative Conference Room for a closed session.

Trustee Brixie moved to return to open session. Seconded by Trustee Such.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting
NAYS: None
Motion carried unanimously.

Trustee Brixie moved to go forward as discussion in closed session. Seconded by Trustee Such.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Such, Veenstra, Woiwode, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting
NAYS: None
Motion carried unanimously.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Supervisor McGillicuddy adjourned the meeting at 9:36 P.M.

SUSAN MCGILLICUDDY
TOWNSHIP SUPERVISOR

MARY M. G. HELMBRECHT
TOWNSHIP CLERK

Sandra K. Otto, Secretary