

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN
TOWNSHIP BOARD REGULAR MEETING - **APPROVED** -
5151 Marsh Road, Okemos, MI 48864-1198
349-1200, Town Hall Room
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 2003, **6:00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting, Trustees Brixie, Stier, Such, Woiwode
ABSENT: None
STAFF: Township Manager Gerald Richards, Director of Community Planning & Development Mark Kieselbach, Director of Engineering & Public Works Ray Severy, Police Chief Gary Gibbons, EMS/Fire Chief Fred Cowper, Director of Finance Diana Hasse, Attorney Mike Woodworth

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

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

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Supervisor McGillicuddy led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. ROLL CALL

Supervisor McGillicuddy called the roll of the Board.

4. PUBLIC REMARKS

Supervisor McGillicuddy opened Public Remarks.

Charles Willems, 1387 Hickory Island, Haslett, spoke concerning his homestead that he believes is not lakefront but listed as such in the Assessing Department.

Richard Bush, 6126 Columbia Street, Haslett, stated his piece of property is lakefront, but alleged he was told by the Township that it is not lakefront.

Richard Kerbawy, 1398 Hickory Island Drive, on behalf of himself and a group of neighbors, expressed concern over certain actions by the property owners located at 1387 Hickory Island Drive.

Henry Silverman, 1099 Woodland Trail, Haslett, President of the Lansing Branch of the ACLU Michigan Chapter, thanked Board members for its patience regarding presentations made on the passage of a resolution dealing with the Patriot Act. He also thanked the Police Chief for expressing his concerns at the last meeting. Mr. Silverman requested a timetable for Board action on the resolution against the USA Patriot Act.

Supervisor McGillicuddy closed Public Remarks.

5. REPORTS/BOARD COMMENT/NEW WORRIES

Lakefront Property: (Agenda Item # 8 (Questions for the Attorney))

Q. Mr. Woodworth, we had three (3) people this evening speak regarding Lake Lansing issues. Mr. Willems talked about an incorrect tax listing on his lakefront property; however, I do know that the Tax Tribunal did make a declaration on this property. Mr. Bush stated he has lakefront property but it is not listed as such. And, of course, Mr. Kerbawy. Is there anything we can do regarding Mr. Willems property, in particular? This is not the first time this issue has come up. Is that something he is better off taking to court?

A. At this point, with regard to all three (3) of those issues, the appropriate forum would be in the civil courts as opposed to before the Township. I understand from the comments that perhaps Mr. Bush has not heard back with regard to our opinion relative to the increment of land or the natural ebb and flow of Lake Lansing and how that works. In each one of these cases, it appears to me that the civil courts would be the most appropriate forum to resolve those disputes. Apparently, there are

legitimate arguments on both sides, but that would be the Tribunal's decision.

Q. With respect to any ordinance violation, can't that be handled here at the Township?

A. Yes. If, in fact, there was a nuisance that was being maintained or there was a violation of an ordinance, that could be made the subject of an enforcement action. Again, that enforcement action would occur in the courts as opposed to here before this Board.

Supervisor McGillicuddy announced that the USA Patriot Act will be brought before the Board at its September 16th meeting.

Manager Richards stated the recommended 2004 Budget has been submitted to the Board. It will be discussed one (1) week from tonight. Copies are available at both the Haslett and Okemos Libraries, as well as one at the Township Clerk's Office. Manager Richards explained that under the Township Charter Act, it is his responsibility to submit a recommended budget for the next fiscal year, which coincides with the calendar year.

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.

Treasurer Hunting moved to adopt the Consent Agenda amended as follows:

- **Amend Agenda Item #7G by inserting "Student Resignation and" before "Student"**

Seconded by Trustee Brixie.

Clerk Helmbrecht offered the following amendment:

- **Amend Agenda Item #7D by substituting the word "Receipt" for "Introduction"**

Amendment accepted by the maker and seconder.

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

NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

The adopted Consent Agenda items are as follow:

A. Communications

(1). Board Information (BI)

- BI-1 Will Tyler White, 4695 Okemos Road, Okemos; RE: Suggestions for a mixed use zoning overlay district in Okemos Village
- BI-2 Stacy Hickox, 4291 Indian Glen Drive, Okemos; RE: Sample Board resolution to protect civil liberties
- BI-3 William G. Youatt, Attorney, 1558 Haslett Road, Haslett; RE: Recent property purchased by his clients at 6052 Columbia in Haslett
- BI-4 Charles Pratt, 3640 East Arbutus Drive, Okemos; RE: Opposition to the Capital Area Freedom Defense Coalition's request for a Board resolution against the USA Patriot Act
- BI-5 John Dirkx, 4311 Cherry Hill Drive, Okemos; RE: Growing traffic congestion at the Grand River-Dobie intersection
- BI-6 Eleanor V. Luecke, President, LINC, PO Box 40, Okemos; RE: Copy of letter to

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN, REGULAR MEETING, SEPTEMBER 2, 2003 *Approved*

Okemos Board of Education President on the Proposed Roundabout Structure at Bennett & Hulett Roads

BI-7 Eleanor V. Luecke, President, LINC, PO Box 40, Okemos; RE: Suggested Traffic Solutions

BI-8 Eleanor V. Luecke, President, LINC, PO Box 40, Okemos; RE: Copy of letter to the City of East Lansing Planning Commission on the August 5, 2002 Act 425 Agreement between East Lansing and Meridian Township

(2). Regional Linkage (RL)

RL-1 John W. Midgley, Managing Director, Ingham County Road Commission, 301 Bush Street, Mason; RE: Setting Speed Limits on County Roads

(3). Staff Communication/Referral (SC)

SC-1 Correspondence from Cindy Cummings, Police Records Supervisor; RE: Response to Freedom of Information request from Henry Silverman

SC-2 Correspondence from Luann Maisner, Director of Parks & Recreation; RE: Letter of appreciation from Capital Area District Library for facilitating summer visits to Wardcliff School and Snell-Towar Recreation Area

SC-3 Correspondence from Luann Maisner, Director of Parks & Recreation; RE: Letter of appreciation from the Wesley Family for the Director's attendance at Cornell Elementary's Open House.

SC-4 Michigan Townships Association Legislative Fax August 15, 2003 Edition

SC-5 Michigan Townships Association Legislative Fax August 22, 2003 Edition

Treasurer Hunting 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 Brixie.

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

B. Minutes

Treasurer Hunting moved to approve and ratify the minutes of the August 19, 2003 Regular Meeting as submitted. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.

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

C. Bills

Treasurer Hunting moved that the Township Board approve the Manager's Bills as follows:

Common Cash	\$ 208,936.26
Public Works	\$ 48,545.43
Total Checks	\$ 257,481.69
Credit Card Transactions	\$ 25,913.14
Total Purchases	<u>\$ 283,394.83</u>
ACH Payments	<u>\$ 986,961.28</u>

Seconded by Trustee Brixie.

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

[Bill list in Official Minute Book]

D. 2004 Draft Budget – Receipt

Treasurer Hunting moved to acknowledge receipt of the 2004 Draft Budget. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.

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

E. Outdoor Gather Permit, Autumn Classic 8K Run Walk

Treasurer Hunting moved that the Township Board approve the outdoor assembly license for the Autumn Classic 8K Run or Walk on September 21, 2003. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.

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

F. Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Funds

Treasurer Hunting moved to approve Township application and acceptance of Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Funds for Federal Fiscal Year 2003 and to authorize the Township Manager and staff to process required paperwork and forms. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.

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

G. Student Members to the Environmental Commission

Treasurer Hunting moved to accept Eunice Yu's resignation from the Environmental Commission as a student member. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.

Treasurer Hunting moved to appoint Alex Voice to the Environmental Commission as a student member. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.

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

H. Amended Whispering Oaks Streetlighting District-Resolution #1

Treasurer Hunting moved to approve Whispering Oaks Amendment to Streetlighting District-Resolution #1 tentatively declaring its intention to install and maintain one (1) additional streetlight and defray the cost of operation and maintenance by special assessment against the 36 parcels and setting a public hearing for October 7, 2003. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.

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

8. QUESTIONS FOR THE ATTORNEY (See Agenda Item # 5, #11B, 11C)

Ingham County Road Commission Letter on Setting Speed Limits on County Roads:

Q. A communication was received from the Ingham County Road Commission regarding Township input on setting speed limits. It sounds to me that we only have input if it is a unanimous decision. What happens if the vote is not unanimous?

A. The State Transportation Department would make that determination. You have to have unanimity between the State Police, the County Road Commission and the Township in order to have the force of law.

Q. So how does the State Transportation Department make the decision?

A. They have their own Engineering personnel and own in-house recommendation.

Q. The Township wouldn't be submitting information to them?

A. The Township always has the ability to submit information, but the ability to actually make the decision itself is one that requires this unanimity.

Q. The letter suggests that we have to actually take an action if we want to have authority and I wasn't clear if that would be happening. Can you explain?

A. They ask you to respond regardless. It is an interesting invitation. It says, essentially, either way you decide to go, they want to be notified. I would suggest that we need to notify them as soon as possible that we would like to be involved in that process.

Manager Richards stated that, with the Board's permission, he will send a letter to the Ingham County Road Commission expressing our interest in participating.

9. HEARINGS (None)

10. ACTION ITEMS/ENDS (None)

11. DISCUSSION ITEMS/ENDS

Supervisor McGillicuddy opened public comment.

No one spoke.

Supervisor McGillicuddy closed public comment.

A. 2003 Citizen Survey Results

Manager Richards presented highlights of the survey. Two detailed reports are available on the Township's website and at both libraries; one shows the results and one compares results with other communities across the United States using the same survey questions. A summary report is also available.

Board Members and staff discuss the following:

- Reason(s) for poor rating on land-use planning
- Possible mailing of customer satisfaction cards to pinpoint land-use planning issues
- Informal or formal focus group to determine areas for improvement
- Total percentages of growing too fast and growing too slow nearly equal the percentage which indicated fair or poor land use planning and zoning
- Percentage of good value in return for taxes paid response
- Necessity of in-depth study of percentages as comparisons may only include actual respondents vs. raw numbers
- Repeat same survey in two (2) to three (3) years as an indicator of progress or need for improvement
- Comparison of 1998 to 2003 survey percentages relative to pace of development showed a

- significant decrease
- Comparison of 1998 to 2003 survey percentages relative to traffic congestion showed a significant decrease
- Low rating of adequate library services v. high number unwilling to raise taxes for library services
- Pursuance of items included in survey (e.g., resurfacing of existing local roads as a special assessment, Township-wide garbage collection with recycling)
- Use of survey information as community input during budget deliberations

B. 2004-2009 Public Improvements Program (PIP)

Director Kieselbach introduced the Public Improvement Program (PIP) as outlined in staff memorandum.

Board Members discussed the following:

- Selection of PIP projects along with millage renewals on specific ballots
- Section 9 Review criteria of location, character and extent
- Lack of definition in Municipal Planning Act for location, character and extent
- Exclusion of Grand River Avenue enhancements identified as upkeep and maintenance issues
- Exclusion of central library due to lack of funding source
- Mixed message in survey relative to library
- Question of known source for Central Fire Station expenditure in 2006
- Infrastructure improvements to the Farmers' Market pavilion (parking) as a future project
- Process for Board appropriation of funds vs. Municipal Planning Act requirements
- Board as final authority on the budget and inclusion in the PIP
- Legislative intent of Section 9 Review to require districts not doing advanced planning to do so
- Insertion of library back in the PIP and purchase of land identified for library during August election
- Mixed use concept as a means to generate revenue for library building

Identification of location for land acquisition contained in the PIP: (Agenda Item # 8 (Questions for the Attorney))

Q. Would it be in our interest to specify location (e.g., the library) within a four-mile radius of the center of the Township for land acquisition?

A. It is one of the things we discussed with staff. First of all, let me emphasize that Section 9 is written quite poorly and there are two parts to it. As a Board, you can always submit for Commission Review the particular character, location and extent of a project. One of the difficulties which arose with the Planning Commission was their understanding that by doing a PIP and submitting it, they essentially have looked at the area of character, location and extent. In the last portion of Section 9, if there is a project that arises, there is nothing about it not being included in the PIP which would prohibit the Board from submitting it for Section 9 Review for the particular approval of location, character and extent.

When it comes to the issue, for example, of land acquisition for open space, one approach that I had suggested is that for PIP purposes, we might be able to divide the Township into sections. We could then say in the PIP that every section has as much as or a maximum of thirty (30) acres per section. This way, we have location (the particular section), character (open space) and extent (up to thirty (30) acres). This doesn't work quite as well when you are talking about as specific a project as you are in terms of the library. I think you are almost better to state we are submitting this for Section 9 Review location, character and extent. We have an idea as to where we would like to see that facility and allow the Planning Commission to act upon it with the specific information.

Q. We have had members of the general public appear before us earlier saying that because a particular project is not in the PIP, the Township can't do it. Am I understanding that this is not true, based on what you just said?

A. It is not true. There is some understandable confusion which comes from the language of

Section 9. The real issue is that it does not appear by way of the Township's Master Plan. What we are really looking at is an amendment to that plan, where the two-thirds (2/3) super majority vote comes in to amend the Master Plan to include a particular improvement. It really isn't about the PIP. A problem arose recently in dealing with a wetland issue. The fact was we had already had this particular project on the PIP, where clearly the Planning Commission must have considered character, location and extent. In a roundabout fashion, they had already passed on this very issue. But to say the project is not included in the PIP and, therefore, cannot be done, is a misread of Section 9. The PIP is just a recommendation from the Planning Commission in terms of what it, as a body, thinks we ought to do in terms of phasing.

Funding Source Identification as an Element of the PIP: Agenda Item # 8 (Questions for the Attorney))

- Q. We have already established the authority of the PIP. A recommendation from the Planning Commission which states they don't have an idea where the funding comes from is just their opinion?
- A. It really is not the focus of a PIP. The focus of a PIP is location, character and extent. It is true that the Planning Commission is provided with financial information from the various department heads. They really ought not to be overly concerned with the budgetary issues. Those issues are reserved for this Board.

Manager Richards stated the Township has several millages which are collected, and those funds can only be used for the purposes which are voted upon. Two are for public safety services; \$841,000 generated for Police (.61 mills) and \$886,000 generated for Fire/EMS (.65 mills). Both millages will expire at the end of this year and need to be renewed. A park millage will expire at the end of 2003 (.32 mills) and a pedestrian bicycle pathway millage due to expire at the end of 2004 (.28 mills). The pedestrian bicycle pathway renewal in 2005 represents a challenge as it is the even years which has either the gubernatorial or presidential election. He recommends placing the Police and Fire millages on the ballot for August and the park and pedestrian pathway millages in November. He also suggested that a portion of the pedestrian pathway millage be put on the ballot for street repair to address a need without raising taxes.

Board Members and staff discussed the following:

- Recommendation to increase length of time for millages
- Renewals easier to pass than new millages
- Staggered length of renewals

The consensus of the Board was to keep the library within the Public Improvement Program.

Manager Richards indicated that the site of the proposed library facility needs to be addressed, as he owes the broker a response. He stated if there was sufficient interest by the Board, he would pursue an extension to keep the property off the market for approximately 30 days to explore financing alternatives. Conditions of the option have expired; the broker is awaiting a response by the Board relative to the purchase.

The consensus of the Board was to direct the Township Manager to pursue an extension in order to explore options toward acquisition of the land which was the proposed site for a central library facility.

- C. SUP #03051 (Newman Equities), request to construct an approximate 96,500 square foot commercial retail building at the northwest corner of Newman Road and Central Park Drive, Okemos, in Section 22 of the Township

Director Kieselbach summarized the project as outlined in staff memorandum.

Martha Mertz, a partner in Newman Equities, spoke in support of the use of this property by Kohl's Department Store. She expressed concern over the following conditions placed in this special use permit by the Planning Commission: conditions # 3 (restoration of wetlands), #4 (all sides of the building either brick or stone material), #6 (reduction of proposed parking spaces), #18 (length of building setbacks) and #20 (excessive greenspace requirement).

Board Members discussed the following:

Conditions imposed by the Planning Commission: Agenda Item # 8 (Questions for the Attorney))

- Q. As I was reading over some of the conditions that the Planning Commission placed on this SUP, it struck me that some of them seemed to deviate from our normal procedures and might have some potential legal problems. Did you have a chance to look over the conditions and could you comment on which ones you think are problematic?
- A. I have looked over the conditions. Many of those that have already been highlighted by Mrs. Mertz would present some potentially problematic areas. I say potentially because the conditions, on their face, are not invalid. The real question becomes what factual support to impose these requirements existed first before the Planning Commission made their recommendation and, more importantly, before this Board makes its final determination as to what conditions will be imposed. What the law tells us is that to impose these conditions in discretionary land use permit cases, we have to have something that is tied to public health, safety and welfare, the other legitimate concerns that this Board has in terms of planning, for example, for traffic and preservation of natural resources.

I see the issue of restoring the wetland and I'm hearing that there really isn't a wetland out there. A wetland determination is made based upon soils, vegetation and hydrology. I don't know whether or not those exist, what facts have been presented to indicate that there really is a wetland capable of being restored. Certainly, that type of factual basis is what the Court would look at in determining whether condition #3 is valid.

When it comes to the issue with regard to condition #20, we can impose a requirement that says there will be no further split, but it has to have a legitimate basis in our ordinances or in what state law permits us to do in terms of preserving natural areas, traffic, making sure we can accommodate the load.

As I read condition #18 on the setbacks, I think that comes right out of our ordinance(s) as I understand the calculations. Let me give you the formula, because I can't tell you the specifics. When we grant a special use permit in these areas involving regional shopping centers (as this one would be), our ordinance provides the setback will be twice the height of the building, the height measured from the grade to the roofline. If we have a thirty (30) foot high roof, that would translate into sixty (60) feet of setback.

The critical thing with regard to every condition is what is the factual basis we have and how do we tie that to public health, safety and welfare. These conditions aren't void as you look at them. You can't say there is just no set of circumstances that could justify them. The question is what factual support would there be for this. One of the options that's available is for this Board to conduct a public hearing at which that type of evidence could be taken. I would suggest that with regard to each condition, the Board keep in mind the goal of furthering public health, safety and welfare and ask itself what facts we have to support the imposition of that condition.

Board Members discussed the following:

- Need to review minutes from the Planning Commission public hearing
- Lack of information from the Ingham County Drain Commissioner
- Lack of sufficient information to discuss controversial issues
- Last township wetland consultant report more definitive than previous report
- Maintenance and preservation of existing wetland
- Potential plans by applicant to develop northern third of property
- MSU experiment on lawn areas with concrete grids underneath as a solution to the number of parking spaces
- Stated percentage for pervious surface (46%) based on the applicant's proposal of 501 parking spaces.
- Parking standards adjusted over the years to prevent "bleeding space"
- Board stipulation on parking requirements at Farmer Jacks
- Size of parking lot as a critical issue relative to high water quality for Township residents
- Process remaining within the purview of the ZBA allows applicant creative flexibility

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN, REGULAR MEETING, SEPTEMBER 2, 2003 *Approved*

- Indirect relationship of conditions #9, #10 and #11 with condition #3
- Expense to build/recreate a wetland
- Information needed from the ICDC on relationship between retention area , the “wetland” and the drain
- Existing weather conditions during site visit for wetland determination
- Height of building used to determine setbacks is to the roofline
- Service drives for connection to MSU Credit Union and parking lot connection with Kroger
- Frontage off Central Park Drive instead of Newman and placement closer to the road
- Assertion by applicant that entrance off Central Park would prohibit parking close to door
- Two entrances which front onto the parking areas
- Assertion by applicant that shape of site prohibits alternative placement of building on the parcel
- Number of entrances into site
- Procedural questions for movement on agenda
- Permission by property owners for Board member(s) on-site visit

Number of parking spaces and setback requirements: (Agenda Item # 8 (Questions for the Attorney))

- Q. Is the applicant correct in that the normal way of settling things like the number of parking spaces and building setbacks would be at the ZBA level?
- A. It certainly would be the way it has been done in the past. It is not beyond the reach of this Board to impose a condition like this. But this would take it away from the ZBA.
- Q. If we put these conditions in, then the applicant doesn't have the right to appeal to the ZBA because it is a condition of the SUP?
- A. You would put the applicant in the unusual position that if they went to the ZBA to obtain a variance, they would be in violation of the condition of the SUP. As a practical matter, they couldn't do that.
- Q. So this would grant the applicant the greatest amount of flexibility and yet not put them in the box?
- A. Not with this condition.
- Q. If these conditions were removed?
- A. Yes.

Property division or split (Agenda Item # 8 (Questions for the Attorney))

- Q. I am trying to get a handle on condition #20. Can someone explain to me if the SUP is for 13.4 acres, then that means it takes in all of the land. There would have to be a modification to the SUP in order to even consider any additional on-site building?
- A. It would include all of the property. One of the questions I would have for Director Kieselbach would be what the potential was for split on this property anyway?

Director Kieselbach responded that the special use permit goes with the land. If this SUP is granted for 13.4 acres, it is for the entire site. Before any split could occur, the SUP would need to be amended.

Roger Drobney, a partner in Newman Equities, addressed the process and depth of drilling to determine if water was present to qualify as a wetland. By way of history, a drainage ditch was dug on the western corner and then the road was built.

The Consensus of the Board was to put this item on for action at the September 16th Board meeting.

- D. Comprehensive Development Plan – Demographic Analysis Chapter

Board Members and staff discussed the following items and changes to the Demographic Analysis Chapter:

- Glossary definitions for the Comprehensive Development Plan as a whole
- Assign actual numbers v. statements which allude to but do not give definitive number(s)

- Label charts and maps with different letter references
- Page 1, line 8 - delete “up”
- Page 1, line 15 - hyphenate well-educated
- Page 1, line 32 - designate actual numbers
- Page 1, line 21 – read “indicate the Township may have between 44,850 and 46,366...”
- Page 2 – prove key to map X-1
- Page 3, line 23 - include Act 425 Agreement and 108 East Lansing with annexation(s)
- Page 7, line 9 - delete “the green fields of”
- Page 8 – define baby-boomers in birth years
- Page 8, line 6 – delete “that follows”
- Page 9, line 9 – change “primary” to “main”
- Page 9, line 12 and page 10, line 19-20 are inconsistent
- Page 11, line 5 - should read “These include capped annual property tax increases and a shift of taxes from real property tax to increases in sales tax, tobacco, etc.
- Page 14, line 22 - question on how a person defines themselves
- Page 19, line 14 - delete all language in the sentence after the word “limitations”

It was the consensus of the Board to hand in corrected grammatical and mechanical errors.

A suggestion was made to have the Planning Director address questions in an effort to avoid chapters being sent back to the Planning Commission with resulting delay.

The Natural Features and Community Facilities Chapters will be discussed at the next Board Meeting.

12. VISION SESSION/ENDS: (None)

13. PUBLIC REMARKS

Supervisor McGillicuddy opened Public Remarks.

Lynn Ochberg, 4383 Maumee, Okemos and PIP Subcommittee Chair, apologized for being unable to attend the meeting earlier and made herself available for questions regarding the Planning Commission’s PIP recommendations.

Board Members and Commissioner Ochberg discussed the following:

- Planning Commission exclusion of the library in the PIP, as inclusion would have signified the Commission passed on the location criteria of Section 9 Review
- Central Fire Station funding

John Veenstra, 320 Piper, Haslett, spoke in support of acquisition of the land which was the site of the proposed central library, a curb-side recycling program, elimination of property taxes on solar energy collection devices and wind-powered devices, park millage renewal and bicycle parking facilities for the proposed Newman Equities project.

Richard Bush, 6126 Columbia Street, Haslett, expressed concern that he has not yet received a copy of the letter from the Township Attorney regarding properties on Lake Lansing.

Supervisor McGillicuddy closed Public Remarks.

14. POSSIBLE CLOSED SESSION

Treasurer Hunting moved that the Township Board go into closed session to consult with its Attorney regarding trial or settlement strategy in connection with specific pending litigation. Seconded by Trustee Stier.

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

Supervisor McGillicuddy recessed the meeting at 9:17 P.M.

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

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

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

Supervisor McGillicuddy reconvened the meeting at 10:00 P.M.

Treasurer Hunting moved to go forward as discussed in closed session. Seconded by Trustee Woiwode.

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

15 ADJOURNMENT

Supervisor McGillicuddy adjourned the meeting at 10:02 P.M.

SUSAN MCGILLICUDDY
TOWNSHIP SUPERVISOR

MARY M. G. HELMBRECHT
TOWNSHIP CLERK

Sandra K. Otto, Acting Secretary