

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN
TOWNSHIP BOARD REGULAR MEETING - **APPROVED** -
5151 Marsh Road, Okemos, MI 48864-1198
853-4000, Town Hall Room
TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 2016 **6:00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Clerk Dreyfus, Treasurer Brixie, Trustees Scales, Styka, Veenstra
ABSENT: Supervisor LeGoff, Trustee Wilson
STAFF: Township Manager Frank Walsh, Assistant Township Manager/Director of Public Works and Engineering Derek Perry, Director of Community Planning & Development Mark Kieselbach, Police Chief David Hall, Fire Chief Fred Cowper, Finance Director Miriam Mattison, Director of Information and Technology Steven Gebes, Executive Assistant Michelle Prinz, Administrative Intern Griffin Graham, Township Attorney Stephen Schultz

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Clerk Dreyfus called the meeting to order at 6:04 P.M.

Trustee Veenstra moved to appoint Trustee Ron Styka as Supervisor Pro Tem. Seconded by Clerk Dreyfus.

Board discussion:

- Board member opposition to only one (1) of the two (2) candidates running for Township Supervisor repeatedly being nominated to serve as Supervisor Pro Tem
- Board member belief the nominations to serve as Supervisor Pro Tem have been “rotated around considerably” as Trustee Angie Wilson served in that capacity for the last Board meeting

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried 4-1 (Scales).

Trustee Scales requested a roll call on this motion for the record.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustee Styka, Veenstra, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: Trustee Scales
Motion carried 4-1.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/INTRODUCTIONS

Supervisor Pro Tem Styka led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. ROLL CALL (None)

4. PRESENTATION

A. Capital Area District Library (CADL) Annual Report-Ann Chapman & Betsy Hull
Ann Chapman, Head Librarian, Haslett Library, 1590 Franklin Street, Haslett, gave a brief synopsis of 2015 activities which included:

- Development of a strategic plan
- Making the phrase “I didn’t know the library had that” obsolete
- Top three (3) new CADL services:
 - CADL mobile app with digital library card barcode
 - “Novelist select” which provides read alike recommendations and reviews
 - Story walk in Orlando Park

Betsy Hull, Head Librarian, Okemos Branch, 4321 Okemos Road, Okemos, spoke to 2015 activities as follows:

- Registration site for Michigan organ donor registry
- Collection site for various food pantries, including the Haslett food bank
- Adoption center for the Michigan Humane Society
- Collection site for many organizations (e.g., Toys for Tots, American Red Cross Blood Drive, clothing drives)
- Outreach programs
- Partnerships with many organizations (local schools, Michigan State University, Meridian Farmers Market)
- Monthly programs provided to the Meridian Senior Center
- Services provided to Wynwood Assisted Living Center and other assisted living centers in Meridian Township
- Programs provided to the Parkwood YMCA and Court One Summer Day Camp
- Story time provided to local day care centers
- Library as a center for family education and enrichment
- People who use services are the library's most important asset

Board discussion:

- Clerk Dreyfus recommended CADL's financial page in the report include a list of revenues and expenses

B. Introduction of New and Promoted Fire Department Team Members

Fire Chief Cowper introduced:

- Lt. Ryan Campbell (promoted from firefighter)
- Firefighter Corey Pant (promoted from part-time to full time)
- Firefighter Amanda Arnett (promoted from part-time to full time)
- Firefighter Charles Malesko (new hire)

C. Introduction of New Executive Assistant-Michelle Prinz

Manager Walsh introduced Michelle Prinz as his executive assistant, highlighting her previous lengthy employment as Executive Director of the Haslett YMCA.

5. PUBLIC REMARKS

Supervisor Pro Tem Styka opened Public Remarks.

Mike McCurdy, 5458 Okemos Road, East Lansing, spoke in opposition to the brownfield tax credit for The Square, stating the developer should cover the cost of development of high-end student housing. He did not believe any part of this development provided an exceptionally needed service to Meridian Township which would require residents to provide millions in tax credits.

Nick Tesseris, 2800 East Grand River, East Lansing, expressed opposition to the bus rapid transit (BRT) system being proposed along Grand River Avenue. He believed the BRT will have a devastating impact on small businesses, especially with the proposed center median dedicated for the bus and restricting left turns. Mr. Tesseris stated many of his tenants (e.g., Whole Foods) indicated they would not have located along Grand River if they had been aware of the proposed BRT project. He added the BRT will slow down Meridian residents who drive along Grand River. Mr. Tesseris stated the current CATA service is good, and the cost benefit must be considered, especially as the BRT is not solving a problem in the Township. He believed taxes will increase going forward, as there will be a cost for maintenance of the system. Although he recognized Board members do not have a vote on implementing the BRT, he asked where each individual stood on this issue.

Danielle Ballard, 5240 Madison Avenue, Apt. B5, Okemos, introduced herself to the Board and volunteered to serve as an alternate member on the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mark Kring, 1141 Gulick Road, Haslett, Senior Pastor, New Hope Church, availed himself for Board questions when Action Item #12B (SUP #16051) is taken up on the agenda.

Ody Norkin, 3803 Sandlewood, Okemos, spoke in opposition to the tax break and abatement that rewards polluters, believing if you pollute you pay for it and are accountable for the cost of cleanup. He voiced appreciation to Trustees Scales, Styka and Veenstra for the time they have invested in the Redi-Ride Review Committee. Mr. Norkin requested the “flaw” needs to be corrected by placing language on the November, 2016 ballot which would allow a service to provide rides to those who need it by not naming Capital Area Transportation Authority (CATA) as the sole vendor.

Betty Caldwell, 2718 Heather Drive, East Lansing, spoke in opposition to the current CATA bus rapid transit (BRT) proposal and inquired as to the position of each board member on this issue. She stated there are several flaws in the design, adding the BRT system is not a good “fit” for Meridian Township. As a frequent rider of CATA buses, Ms. Caldwell is an advocate of mass transit but CATA’s BRT proposal is too grandiose for this community. She did not believe the ridership on the Number #1 bus line was great enough to require the BRT system and the addition of the BRT will not increase readership. Ms. Caldwell expressed concern the BRT will force small businesses to close and create cut through traffic in nearby residential neighborhoods.

Karla Hudson, 6009 Skyline Drive, East Lansing, a member of the Redi-Ride Review Committee, thanked Trustees Scales, Styka and Veenstra for orchestrating the committee meetings and contemplating some no cost options. She encouraged Board members to consider new ideas, establish a Township Transportation Commission, and support a Redi-Ride reauthorization on the November ballot for an unspecified service provider.

Donna Rose, 6207 Cobblers Court, East Lansing, voiced opposition to the BRT because of removal of bus stops, expressed support for the Redi-Ride service, requested creation of a Township Transportation Commission, and take the word CATA out of the millage renewal language. She expressed opposition to the brownfield project for The Square, since the current owner knew it was polluted when he bought it and residents should not have to pay to clean it up.

Mike Hudson, 6009 Skyline Drive, East Lansing, spoke in support of the CATA system and Redi-Ride. He stated it is now hard to get service from Redi-Ride as the program is popular and demand is high. Mr. Hudson supported reauthorization of the Redi-Ride millage without CATA as the sole vendor noted in the ballot language. He suggested CATA use better technology through use of an interactive mobile application for its ridership on Redi-Ride.

Renee Korrey, 4633 Okemos Road, Okemos, stated her opposition to the bus rapid transit. She requested Board members voice their position on the BRT prior to voting. She indicated the constituency does not want the BRT, CATA keeps changing its funding amount and questioned why Meridian Township is involved.

Billy Jo O'Berry, 1195 Clayton Court, Mason, listed her qualifications to serve as the next Ingham County Prosecutor.

Kay Lockwood, 2695 Teri Terrace, East Lansing, requested Board members provide their position on the BRT in writing for public review. She spoke against the brownfield redevelopment for The Square.

Jeff Nielson, 2717 E. Grand River Avenue, requested Board members provide their position on the BRT. He expressed opposition to the BRT, noting the current proposal is flawed and needs to be modified without compromising neighborhoods with divergence of traffic off Grand River Avenue. Mr. Nielson believed local businesses will be at risk.

Steve Vagnozzi, 2144 Woodfield Drive, Okemos and Executive Committee Vice-Chair, Michigan Association of Railroad Passengers, addressed rail initiatives and provided a Coast-to-Coast Passenger Rail Ridership and Cost Estimate Study Executive Summary.

Mary Hoenshell, 2341 Barnsbury Road, East Lansing, and board member of the Everett Farms Homeowner Association, spoke in opposition to the BRT. She noted she is a founding member of a new coalition titled "Stop the CATA BRT". Ms. Hoenshell offered the concept of commuter lots at strategic locations around Lansing, so express buses can pick up Michigan State University students at the various locations and drop them off on MSU's campus as an alternative solution to the proposed BRT. She believed current businesses along Grand River in Meridian Township will be negatively impacted by the BRT program. Ms. Hoenshell stated CATA is not held accountable to the taxpayers and requested each Board member provide their position on the BRT.

Kathy DeVito, 470 Chimney Oaks Drive, Okemos, noted her opposition to the BRT and asked for each Board member's position on the BRT proposal prior to this year's elections. She voiced her support for additional funding for the Redi-Ride Program as she believed the CATA bus system currently in place is sufficient.

Leonard Provencher, 5824 Buena Parkway, Haslett, spoke in support of Trustee Scales request to have equality among Board members in serving as Supervisor Pro Tem for Board meetings in the absence of the Supervisor. He stated he is opposed to the BRT and believed Meridian residents are not receiving a good rate of return on the millage collected from them for CATA's fixed route system (\$4.5 million check written by the Treasurer this Spring). Mr. Provencher suggested CATA focus its efforts and funds on servicing Meridian residents in the eastern third of the Township. He believed the Redi-Ride system needs bigger fixes than what has been proposed.

Neil Bowlby, 6020 Beechwood Drive, Haslett, pointed to a condition contained in the resolution to approve the Okemos Pointe PUD which required the applicant to obtain all brownfield approvals as necessary. He did not believe brownfield requests should be part of the approval process for the project itself. Mr. Bowlby indicated the development project should stand or fall on its own merits and the brownfield should be considered as a separate issue. He suggested more emphasis be placed on a thorough analysis of past uses and investigation of possible environmental problems with the site early on in the planning process.

Kathie Kuhn, 5473 Okemos Road, East Lansing, member of a group titled “Meridian Citizens for a Sustainable Community”, spoke against the proposal for The Square as she believed it would create congestion, promote urban sprawl and a “giveaway” of tax credits. She indicated the increased concentration of residents would create issues of safety. Ms. Kuhn voiced her opposition to the BRT proposal and stated the current CATA bus system is sufficient for her purposes.

Supervisor Pro Tem Styka closed Public Remarks.

6. TOWNSHIP MANAGER REPORT

Manager Walsh deferred his report to the end of the meeting due to the lengthy agenda before the Board.

7. BOARD COMMENTS & REPORTS

A. Treasurer’s Quarterly Report

Treasurer Brixie reported on delinquent personal property tax collection totals for tax years 2011-2015, 2015 total tax year collections as of June 2, 2016, 2015 tax year distribution totals as of March 1, 2016, and current fixed maturity investments and non-fixed investments as of April 30, 2016.

Board discussion:

- Tax distribution amount for CATA does not include the Redi-Ride millage
- Meridian’s Redi-Ride collection for the 2015 tax year was approximately \$314,000 and is included in the Meridian Special Millages 2015 distribution total
- Board member inquiry why there is tax distribution to the Ingham County Land Bank for the Douglas J Brownfield when the project has not commenced
- Douglas J Brownfield capture district was created and begins with a baseline
- Township is required to collect the capture of any increases in value after the baseline
- Taxable value of the Douglas J property has risen, and according to the Brownfield Act, increased property values “trigger” the capture
- Collections include special assessments and drain assessments which are not tax distributions and account for the difference between the tax collections and tax distribution amounts
- Board member concern with an 11 year investment which is yielding only 2.25%
- Aforementioned concern relates to the Federal Home Loan step increase coupon, which has a variable interest rate which will change and increase over time
- Fixed investments show a maturity date, while the non-fixed investments do not
- Non-fixed investments are liquid and can be removed at any time
- Non-fixed investment rates fluctuate according to market conditions
- Board member inquiry as to the interest rates of listed fixed maturity investments for April, 2016
- All maturity investments held by the Township are listed on pages one (1) and two (2)

Trustee Scales objected to the characterization of the brownfield redevelopment rewarding polluters voiced during earlier public comment. He explained the brownfield redevelopment is a mechanism to deal with sites of contamination which have historically been left behind and the state and federal governments have been unable to identify the responsible parties for the contamination.

Clerk Dreyfus stated that while the initial intent of the brownfield tax credit is a good idea, this policy has degraded from its initial vision and can often be used as a market inducement to the developer in an effort to lower risk and increase profit.

Trustee Veenstra alleged the brownfield tax credits are falsely sold to the public as being used to clean up contamination. He maintained the brownfield tax credits are a large “slush fund” which governments can give to a developer. Trustee Veenstra voiced his position on the BRT, indicating he was originally in support of the concept. He stated his position in opposition to the BRT after not receiving a response to his inquiry to the CATA representative on how the funds would be spent. Trustee Veenstra stated the design of the BRT is flawed, is a traffic hazard, dangerous for passengers to board buses in the center of Grand River Avenue and believed reducing the number of stops from 45 to 28 will decrease ridership. He asked the Board to formally oppose the BRT and send a letter to the Federal Transit Administration relaying that position.

Trustee Scales spoke in opposition to the bus rapid transit system, adding public transportation needs enhancement, but this is not the plan to accomplish the desirable improvements.

Clerk Dreyfus voiced support for public transit but no longer supports the bus rapid transit system. He called for the Board to place the bus rapid transit system on the next available scheduled Board meeting agenda for a comprehensive discussion on this issue.

Trustee Scales and Trustee Veenstra both supported Clerk Dreyfus’ call to place the bus rapid transit on the agenda at the next scheduled Board meeting.

Supervisor Pro Tem Styka stated he is opposed to the current BRT proposal, acknowledging the plan changes from month to month. He was concerned with the potential effect of the proposal on businesses relative to the no left turn feature, and was not convinced there was adequate return for the investment. Trustee Styka voiced support for improvement to the existing mass transit system with less cost while achieving many of the same goals.

8. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Treasurer Brixie moved to approve the agenda as submitted. Seconded by Clerk Dreyfus.

Trustee Veenstra moved to amend the agenda by moving Agenda Items #12 C, D, and E (Okemos Pointe Mixed Use Planned Unit Development project) from action to discussion since information has not been received on the Okemos Pointe Brownfield Redevelopment plan.

Seconded by Clerk Dreyfus.

Board discussion:

- Board member preference to keep the aforementioned agenda items on for action, allow the applicant to present their information, and if sufficient answers are not provided, the item(s) can be tabled until the next meeting
- Board member preference for the brownfield tax credit information offered by the applicant to be very comprehensive and detailed
- Board member preference to vote no on the motion as this project has been before the Board ten (10) or 11 times
- Township rules and ordinances do not require the brownfield application to be brought before the Board prior to approval of the project

VOICE VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT: Motion failed 1-4 (Trustee Veenstra)

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried 5-0.

9. CONSENT AGENDA (SALMON)

Supervisor Pro Tem Styka reviewed the consent agenda.

Clerk Dreyfus moved to adopt the Consent Agenda. Seconded by Treasurer Brixie.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustee Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus

NAYS: None

Motion carried 5-0.

A. Communications

(1) Board Deliberations (BD)

- BD12A-1 Frederic Svoboda, 2671 Roseland Avenue, East Lansing; RE: "The Square on Grand River" Student Housing Project
- BD12A-2 Don Isleib, 5400 Park Lake Road, East Lansing; RE: The Square on Grand River
- BD12A-3 Josephine Wolk, 2573 Heather Circle, East Lansing; RE: The Square Project
- BD12A-4 Barb Ringlein, 5030 Park Lake Road, East Lansing; RE: Email exchange with Trustee Scales regarding The Square on Grand River
- BD12A-5 James Noble, 5331 Park Lake Road, East Lansing; RE: The Square on Grand River
- BD13A-1 Mary McAuliffe, 4378 Okemos Road, Apt. D112, Okemos; RE: Costco for Meridian Township
- BD13A-2 Elizabeth Buiocchi, 4143 Breakwater Drive, Okemos; RE: Costco Store
- BD13A-3 Scott Cameron, 2063 Hamilton Road, Okemos; RE: Costco Store
- BD13B-1 Ody Norkin, 3803 Sandlewood Drive, Okemos; RE: Email exchange with Trustee Scales regarding the Redi-Ride Workgroup Meeting of May 26, 2016

(2) Board Information (BI)

- BI-1 Brent Forsberg, President, TA Forsberg, Inc., 2422 Jolly Road, Suite 200, Okemos; RE: MUPUD #15051, WUP #16-02 and SUP #15051
- BI-2 Phyllis Vaughn, 6100 Balog Court, Haslett; RE: Panhandlers
- BI-3 Beth Hubbell, 1158 Woodside Drive, Haslett; RE: Whole Foods
- BI-4 Phyllis Vaughn, 6100 Balog Court, Haslett; RE: Board Meeting of May 17, 2016
- BI-5 Ann Alchin, 5972 Cypress, Haslett; RE: Farmers Market Ad
- BI-6 Don Kagey, 4026 Shoals Drive, Okemos; RE: Constituent Feedback
- BI-7 Phyllis Vaughn, 6100 Balog Court, Haslett; RE: Assisted Living Facility
- BI-8 Neil Bowlby, President, Liaison for Inter-Neighborhood Cooperation, PO Box 40, Okemos; RE: MUPUD #15024 (Okemos Pointe)
- BI-9 Shirley Decker, Mert's Meats, 1860 W. Grand River, Okemos; RE: Email exchange with Debbie Alexander, Assistant Executive Director, Capital Area Transportation Authority, concerning BRT Project Meeting in March, 2016
- BI-10 Judy Kindel, 2915 Margate Lane, East Lansing; RE: May 23, 2016 Master Plan Work Session

(3) Commission Linkage (CL)

- CL-1 Marsha Madle, 1373 Sebewaing Road, Okemos; RE: Letter of resignation from the Economic Development Board effective May 5, 2016

Clerk Dreyfus 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 Treasurer Brixie.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustee Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: None
Motion carried 5-0.

B. Minutes

Clerk Dreyfus moved to approve and ratify the minutes of the May 17, 2016 Regular Meeting as submitted. Seconded by Treasurer Brixie.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustee Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: None
Motion carried 5-0.

C. Bills

Clerk Dreyfus moved that the Township Board approve the Manager’s Bills as follows:

Common Cash	\$	298,782.59
Public Works	\$	574,667.02
Trust & Agency	\$	11,419.68
Total Checks	\$	884,869.29
Credit Card Transactions	\$	12,725.32
Total Purchases	\$	<u>897,594.61</u>
ACH Payments	\$	<u>499,059.41</u>

Seconded by Treasurer Brixie.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustee Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: None
Motion carried 5-0.

[Bill list in Official Minute Book]

D. Ratification of Part-Time Paramedic/Firefighter Appointment

Clerk Dreyfus moved to ratify the appointment of Thomas Levey to the position of part-time paramedic/firefighter. Seconded by Treasurer Brixie.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustee Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: None
Motion carried 5-0.

10. QUESTIONS FOR THE ATTORNEY (See Agenda Items #12B, #12H, #13A)

11. HEARINGS (None)

12. ACTION ITEMS

Supervisor Pro Tem Styka opened Public Remarks.

Neil Bowlby, 6020 Beechwood Drive, Haslett, spoke in opposition to the brownfield tax credit for The Square. He offered his calculation regarding the cost per bed which would allow the developer to cover the cost of the brownfield plan on their own by increasing the rent \$14 per month per bed. Mr. Bowlby believed the developer can afford the funds to clean up the contamination based on his calculation of the developer's net income of over \$72 million over a 30-year period. He suggested a change to the resolution. Mr. Bowlby spoke in favor of the Okemos Pointe project and suggested removal of the phrase "one or more amenities" from the resolution to approve. He reiterated his earlier public remarks regarding not having the brownfield request connected to the project.

Leonard Provencher, 5824 Buena Parkway, Haslett, reiterated his opposition to the brownfield for the project titled The Square and voiced support for the Pathway Master Plan as submitted. He suggested an "oral" condition that the name of New Hope Church be changed to New Hope Church of Meridian to avoid confusion the East Lansing mailing address will bring and to help with this community's branding image.

Ernie Schaefer, 919 W. University, Rochester and applicant for the brownfield on Grand River Avenue, stated any money received through the brownfield funding mechanism will be used to clean up the site as required by state law. He explained the proposed improvements to the drainage system in the southwest corner of the property if the project is approved.

Eric Helzer, Advanced Redevelopment Solutions and the applicant's consultant for The Square, PO Box 204, Eagle, explained the purpose of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) money, which uses the incremental gain in taxes to pay for remediation of the site. He noted taxes will be paid at their full rate once the project is developed. Mr. Helzer maintained the property is currently generating approximately \$14,000 annually and with the proposed \$21 million investment, the Township taxes alone will increase to nearly \$100,000. He stated the applicant has come before the Board for a reconsideration of costs at less than \$2 million for developer expenses to deal with contamination at the site. Mr. Helzer noted the proposed brownfield plan has been reduced from 13 to nine years. He reminded the Board the developer will only be reimbursed for expenses incurred.

Michael Unsworth, 5948 Village Drive, Haslett, urged the Board to adopt the Township Pathway Master Plan.

Will Randle, WestPac Michigan, 4409 Dobie Road, Okemos, reported on the status of the Okemos Pointe brownfield plan, stating they received the last of the baseline environmental assessment (BEA) laboratory results on June 2nd and are assessing the information provided in those results. He acknowledged they do not yet have the economics ready to present to the Board as they are diligently working to create the detailed due diligence plan. He availed himself for questions on the Okemos Pointe mixed use planned unit development (MUPUD), special use permit (SUP) and the wetland use permit(WUP).

Fred Svoboda, 2761 Roseland Avenue, East Lansing, spoke on behalf of fellow members of the Wardcliff Neighborhood Association who are against The Square project. He listed unknown environmental hazards which need to be remediated, and taxpayer subsidy of a student housing project constructed by an out-of-town developer. Mr. Svoboda believed there is a high financial and quality of life cost to student housing projects, citing Chandler Crossing as an example.

Kathie Kuhn, 5473 Okemos Road, East Lansing, reiterated her opposition to The Square development and additional student housing in the area.

Ody Norkin, 3803 Sandlewood, Okemos, believed the State of Michigan Attorney General's office has a division which "goes after" polluters, and believed they should be the entity to recoup remediation costs from the responsible party. He spoke in opposition to the brownfield request.

Supervisor Pro Tem Styka closed Public Remarks.

A. The Square, 2655 Grand River Avenue-Brownfield

Treasurer Brixie moved [and read into the record] NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN hereby approves the brownfield request in the amount of \$2,068,500 for a period not to exceed 9 years from Campus Village Communities.

The motion died for lack of support.

B. Special Use Permit #16051 New Hope Church 2170 Saginaw (M-78)

Trustee Veenstra moved [and read into the record] NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN hereby approves Special Use Permit #16051 (New Hope Church) to construct a single building totaling approximately 42,000 square feet in gross floor area, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Approval of the special use permit is in accordance with site plans prepared by KEBS, Inc. dated March 18, 2016; and floor plans and elevation plans prepared by Hobbs+Black Architects dated March 15, 2016, subject to revisions as required.**
- 2. Every attempt shall be made to preserve healthy, mature trees measuring 12" dbh (diameter at breast height) or greater. No trees shall be removed from the site until Site Plan Review approval has been granted.**
- 3. Approval of SUP #16051 is granted provided Due Care obligations associated with environmentally contaminated areas of the site comply with State of Michigan requirements to ensure existing contamination does not cause unacceptable risks and is not exacerbated.**
- 4. Street trees shall be provided along the Saginaw Highway and Newton Road frontages of the site.**
- 5. The final site plan, landscape plan, building elevations, building materials and colors, shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Community Planning and Development.**
- 6. The trash dumpster shall be enclosed on four sides; three sides of the enclosure shall be constructed with products to match the building.**
- 7. All mechanical, heating, ventilation, air conditioning, generators, and similar systems shall be screened from view by an opaque structure or landscape material selected to complement the building. Such screening is subject to approval by the Director of Community Planning and Development.**

8. **Site and building lighting shall comply with Article VII in Chapter 38 of the Code of Ordinances and shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Community Planning and Development. LED lighting shall be used.**
9. **Final utility, grading, and storm drainage plans for the site shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Public Works and Engineering and shall be completed in accordance with the Township Engineering Design and Construction Standards.**
10. **The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits, licenses and approvals from the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), the Ingham County Drain Commissioner, Michigan Department of Transportation, Ingham County Road Department, and the Township. Copies of all permits, licenses, and approvals shall be submitted to the Department of Community Planning & Development.**
11. **Copies of the site plan information and construction plans for the project that exist in an AutoCAD compatible format shall be provided to the Township Engineering staff.**
12. **Any future expansion of the church shall require a modification to Special Use Permit #16051.**

Seconded by Trustee Scales.

Board discussion:

- New Hope Church is an existing member of our community and wishes to expand in another location within Meridian Township
- Proposed parking area is reasonable
- Request for bicycle racks to be placed at the two (2) main entrances.

Trustee Scales offered the following amendment:

- **Amend condition #8 by adding “where feasible” after “shall be used”.**

Supported by Treasurer Brixie.

Board discussion:

- Prudent to allow the church to have the ability to show where they cannot place LED lights
- Concern with mandating all lighting be LED, regardless of specific needs
- Trust in Township staff to work with members of the church to obtain the type of lighting necessary for this facility
- Technology does not exist for all lighting needs to be met by LED lights
- Board member belief the phrase “LED lighting shall be used” in condition #8 does not state every light in the church must be LED
- Board member belief it will be more economical for the church to use LED lighting in the interior of the building and the parking lot
- Board member statement Congress passed a law four (4) years ago which would mandate the phasing out of antiquated incandescent bulbs
- Board member belief Congress ultimately rescinded their view through pressure by lobbyists
- Board member belief the subject phrase read into the record in condition #8 sets the direction and makes Meridian the green community leading to the future

Number of votes necessary to pass a motion with five (5) Board members present: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #10)

Q. How many votes do we need to pass something with five people present?

A. You need a majority of those present and voting.

Continued Board discussion:

- Board member with a legal background believes including “where feasible” is stronger language than “...shall be used”
- Board member belief the term “government overreach” applies to the Clerk’s office relative to turning out lights when his office is not occupied
- Concern with the Treasurer using the Board meeting forum to voice personal attacks and offer a political statement “thrown into” public policy debates
- Request by the Chair for Board members to exercise decorum and cease personal attacks
- New Hope Church uses LED lighting at its current location and intends to use the most efficient lighting available at its new location

VOICE VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT: Motion carried 3-2. (Trustee Veenstra, Clerk Dreyfus)

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustee Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
 NAYS: None
 Motion carried 5-0.

C. MUPUD#15024 (Okemos Pointe)

Treasurer Brixie moved [and read into the record] NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN hereby approves Mixed Use Planned Unit Development (MUPUD) #15034, subject to the following conditions:

1. **Approval is based on the Cover Sheet, Site and Utility Plans (North and South), and Amenities Plan, prepared by KEBS, Inc., dated January 25, 2016; the Revised Phasing Plan, prepared by KEBS, Inc., dated March 8, 2016, and a Wetland Features Waiver Plan prepared by KEBS, Inc. dated May 25, 2016, subject to revisions as required.**
2. **Approval is based on the building elevations for the apartment buildings prepared by Zehren and Associates, Inc., dated June 12, 2015; and building elevations for the mixed use building prepared by Zehren and Associates, Inc. dated January 21, 2016; and the schematic building elevations for the proposed remodeled warehouse/commercial building, prepared by FUN Architecture, and received by the**

Township on January 25, 2016, subject to revisions as required. Building materials (type of materials and percentage of each material) for the apartment buildings, mixed use building and converted warehouse/commercial building shall be consistent with the products shown on the aforementioned elevation drawings. The character and quality of the building materials and general architectural design of the buildings shall be consistent on all four sides of each building.

3. **The final building elevations and building materials shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Community Planning and Development.**
4. **Approval of MUPUD #15024 (T.A. Forsberg, Inc. and WestPac Michigan) shall be contingent on the approval of Special Use Permit (SUP) #15101 (T.A. Forsberg, Inc., and WestPac Michigan).**

5. Approval is subject to one or more amenities. The applicant proposes the following amenities as identified on the Amenities Plan (Sheet 10) and in the applicant’s project summary: recycle center; construction of a Township pathway system segment; 224 bike parking spaces both covered and uncovered; public pocket parks; public art; outdoor seasonal sales area; rehabilitation of a degraded site; first floor awnings and upper floor balconies; underground utilities; consolidation of multiple parcels into one parcel; bike repair station; foot and bicycle pathways and sidewalks that connect to the Township’s pedestrian/bicycle pathway system; porches; public recreation; public cultural venues; outdoor gathering spaces for residents and public; and LED light fixtures for outdoor lighting.

6. Waivers shall be granted from the Code of Ordinances as follows:

a. Section 86-404(b)(3): The required side and rear yard setbacks for a building, parking, access drive, or other structure, is 100 feet from a residential district line or 60-foot setback shall be required if with a double row of interlocking conifer trees is provided in addition to general screening standards. Waivers are requested as follows:

<u>Building/carport/parking lot</u>	<u>Proposed setback</u>
F3	47 feet
M1	50 feet
M2	90 feet*
M3	90 feet*
M7	94 feet*
P6	75 feet*
P7	55 feet
Carports (west of Bldg. F2)	35 feet
Carports (north of Bldg. P7)	15 feet
Carports (south of Bldg. M1)	17 feet
Parking area (south of Bldg. F3)	45 feet

*If a double row of interlocking conifer trees are provided the required 60 foot setback would be met.

b. Section 86-402(1)a.: The required front yard setback from Jolly Oak Road is 25 feet from the street right-of-way. A waiver of 9 feet is requested for Building M10 to be located 16 feet from street right-of-way.

c. Section 86-471 (b). The required grading and structure setback for wetlands two acres or more in size is 40 feet and for wetlands less than two acres in size the setback is 20 feet. Waivers of 40 feet and 20 feet are requested as shown on the Wetland Features Waiver Plan prepared by KEBS, Inc. dated May 25, 2016.

d. Section 86-471 (c). The required natural vegetation strip shall be the 20 feet closest to a wetland and 25 feet from the top of the bank of an open county drain (Smith Drain). Waivers are requested as shown on the Wetland Features Waiver Plan prepared by KEBS, Inc. dated May 25, 2016.

- e. **Section 86-756(14)**: The required setback for a parking area is 15 feet and the proposed parking area south of the warehouse (2362 Jolly Oak Road) is 9 feet at its closest point from the south property line, for a waiver of 6 feet.
- f. **Section 86-755**: The minimum required number of parking spaces is 945 parking spaces, which includes a 10% reduction when bicycle parking is provided. The plan shows a total of 866 parking spaces (which does not include the 12 on-street parking spaces on Jolly Oak Road), for a waiver of 79 parking spaces.
7. Three percent of the apartment units shall be designated as affordable housing units for residents with income below 80 percent of the median income for the area.
8. The project shall be constructed in two phases. Each phase shall include a commercial building, which is the use permitted by right in the C-2 (Commercial) district.
9. Future site plans shall show wetlands associated within the Smith Drain, the top of the bank of the Smith Drain, and floodplain elevations for the entire project area.
10. If a brownfield plan is approved for this site, the applicant shall secure all applicable approvals from the Ingham County Brownfield Redevelopment Authority (BRA), Meridian Township Board, and Ingham County Board of Commissioners for a Brownfield Remediation Plan, as necessary.
11. Any work in the 100-year floodplain shall require separate applications, reviews, permits, licenses, and approvals from all applicable agencies and governing entities such as the Township, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), the Ingham County Drain Commissioner's office (ICDC) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), as necessary. Copies of all permits, licenses and approvals shall be submitted to the Department of Community Planning & Development.
12. The applicant shall apply for and receive all applicable approvals and permits from the Township and MDEQ for any work in a regulated wetland including filling a wetland or drainage into or out of a regulated wetland. Copies of all permits and approvals shall be submitted to the Director of Community Planning and Development.
13. Any future building additions or expansions to the buildings will require modification to the MUPUD #15024 and SUP #15101.
14. Unless the building elevations are revised, the applicant will be required to receive a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for non-compliance with Section 86-440(f)(2)b.2., stating, "Buildings greater than 50 feet in width shall be divided into increments of no more than 50 feet through articulation of the façade," Section 86-440-(f)(1)b., stating, "Maximum building height shall be no higher than 45 feet," and Section 86-440(f)(2)b.4., stating, "Windows shall cover no less than 50 percent of nonresidential street level facades."
15. Truck standing, loading and unloading spaces shall be provided for the proposed commercial buildings, or a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals is required.
16. Apartments may be occupied by a family; or, for apartments occupied by unrelated persons, no more than two unrelated persons may occupy the one and two bedroom units and no more than three unrelated persons may occupy the three bedroom units.

17. All utility service distribution lines shall be installed underground.
18. The final design of the recycling enclosure shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Community Planning and Development.
19. Site accessories such as railings, benches, trash and recycling receptacles, exterior lighting fixtures, enclosed bicycle parking facilities, and bicycle racks shall be of commercial quality, and complement the building design and style. Final design and location shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Community Planning and Development.
20. Landscaping shall generally comply with the provisions of the Code of Ordinances, including the mixed use planned unit development standards as outlined in Section 86-440(f)(4) and other applicable sections of the Ordinance pertaining to landscaping.
21. Site and building lighting shall comply with Article VII in Chapter 38 of the Code of Ordinances and shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Community Planning and Development, including the height of any new parking lot light pole.
22. A final sign program shall be submitted as part of site plan review and shall be subject to the review and approval of the Director of Community Planning and Development.
23. All ground or roof mounted mechanical, heating, ventilation, air conditioning, and similar systems shall be screened from view by an opaque structure or landscape material (if at street level) selected to complement the building. Such screening is subject to approval by the Director of Community Planning and Development.
24. The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits, and approvals from the Ingham County Road Department and the Ingham County Health Department. Copies of all permits and approval letters shall be submitted to the Department of Community Planning and Development.
25. The applicant shall apply to the Township for a land division related to the parcel of land addressed as 2360 Jolly Road as part of site plan review. Once approved, documents shall be recorded with the Ingham County Register of Deeds and proof of recording submitted to the Township prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit for buildings constructed in Phase 1.
26. The utility, grading, and storm drainage plans for the site shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Public Works and Engineering and shall be completed in accordance with the Township Engineering Design and Construction Standards.
27. A copy of the site plan information that exists in a computer format for the development project and construction plans shall be provided to the Township Engineering staff in an AutoCAD compatible format.

Seconded by Trustee Scales.

Board and applicant's representative discussion:

- Additional language read into condition #10 allows for the applicant to follow the brownfield rules and secure all necessary approvals if the brownfield is approved

- The applicant's representative assured Board members they are confident with the placement of the buildings on the updated site plan based on available information regarding the location of the on-site contaminants
- Board member opinion the apartments in this project will "fill the nitch" of young professionals who wish to live in Meridian Township but are not yet ready for home ownership
- Appreciation to the applicant for the flexibility shown in modifying the site plans many times based on input from the various boards and commissions as the project moved through the process over the last two (2) years
- Appreciation the proposed project is located close to jobs being located within the vicinity of Jackson National Life and Delta Dental, two employers who continue to expand their business
- Trends show people move to a community for employment reasons and learn an area prior to buying a home
- Board member belief this project will address all types of housing options and needs in the Township
- Board member request for staff to define the area noted in condition #7
- Staff belief it is based on Meridian Township as the applicant worked closely with the Greater Lansing Housing Coalition on the issue of affordable housing
- Board member request for the applicant to supply the number of apartments and number of beds for the proposed project
- Proposed project has 354 units with no conversion to a maximum of 394 units with conversion of the three bedroom units to a two-bedroom and a one-bedroom unit
- Applicant response that with conversion, if the unit count goes up, the bed count decreases dependent upon the unit type
- Applicant will make any necessary changes to the number of units as it develops Phase 2 dependent upon market demand at the time of development
- Applicant estimate there is an average of 1.7 to 2 bedrooms per unit
- Board member belief the language concerning the list of amenities in condition #5 is moot as the applicant does not need the amenity bonus
- Staff clarification the applicant can configure as much as 14 dwelling units per acre (du/a) for redevelopment and request as high as 18 du/a with the amenities
- Board member preference for every apartment complex to offer recycling to its residents
- Board member preference for the Board to adopt an ordinance requiring recycling
- Recycling locations will be placed throughout the site but will be addressed during the site plan phase of the project
- Board member belief the underground utilities and LED lighting should not count as an amenity
- Board member inquiry regarding the setback variance requests contained in the table on pages 3 and 4 of the staff report
- Applicant has not yet completed full landscape plans at this time, but if feasible, a double row of trees will be planted
- At this point, the applicant is requesting the setback variance from the 100 foot requirement
- 15 foot setback variance request is located near the Coyote Creek property line and is for the carports
- Required setback of 100 feet is based on commercial zoning, not use
- Coyote Creek's side yard setback requirement is 15 feet from the applicant's property line
- Board member preference for greater affordable housing in the project
- Although the applicant is unsure whether a variance from the building height will be needed, this resolution is the appropriate place to identify the applicant may need to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals
- Details relative to the variance will be worked out with staff through site plan review
- Issue is dependent upon the finish grade of the ground and what you measure to, as the design of the buildings do not have the typical gabled roof

- Stair tower is an architectural element of the project which protrudes above the roof system, measured between 45 and 50 feet
- Project will provide housing options for young professionals not far from Michigan State University
- Appreciation to the developer for his cooperation with the Township Board as changes were suggested for the project (i.e., removal of housing component near Kansas Road)
- Board member clarification the buried utilities labeled as an amenity are the power lines
- Project will create an additional traffic burden on the Okemos/Jolly Road intersection
- Importance of the Ingham County Road Department moving forward with their review of potential improvements to the Okemos/Jolly Road intersection

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustee Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: None
Motion carried 5-0.

Without objection, Supervisor Pro Tem Styka announced the Board will take up Agenda Item #12H for consideration as the next agenda item.

[Supervisor Pro Tem Styka recessed the meeting at 9:18 p.m.]

[Supervisor Pro Tem Styka reconvened the meeting at 9:28 p.m.]

D. WUP#16-02 (Okemos Pointe)

Treasurer Brixie moved [and read into the record] NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN, pursuant to Article 4 of Section 22 of the Township Code of Ordinances, hereby approves Wetland Use Permit #16-02 with the following conditions:

- 1. Approval is subject to the application materials and plans prepared by Marx Wetlands, LLC dated April 2, 2016 and related materials submitted as part of Wetland Use Permit #16-02 subject to revisions as required.**
- 2. The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits, licenses and approvals from the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), the Ingham County Drain Commissioner, and the Township prior to any work taking place. Copies of all permits, licenses and approvals shall be submitted to the Department of Community Planning & Development.**
- 3. Wetland Use Permit #16-02 shall be subject to the applicant receiving approval of MUPUD #15024 and Special Use Permit #15101 for the mixed use project.**
- 4. Prior to any work taking place, a revised wetland mitigation plan shall be prepared in accordance with the recommendations in the April 15, 2016 report prepared by the Township's environmental consultant, Fishbeck, Thompson, Carr & Huber, Inc. as follows:**
 - **Topsoil from the impacted wetland shall not be used as topsoil within the mitigation area, due to the prevalence of reed canary grass, and invasive species.**
 - **Two habitat structures shall be installed within the mitigation area. Sand mounds shall not be constructed as a habitat structure.**

- A minimum of five (5) one-meter square sample plots shall be used to measure the percent cover of vegetation.
- Five years after construction the performance for vegetative cover shall be 80 percent native, wetland species, comprised of at least 15 different species. Invasive species shall be less than 10 percent of the vegetative cover.

The revised wetland mitigation plan shall be submitted to the Director of Community Planning and Development for review and approval.

5. Prior to any work taking place, a soil erosion and sedimentation control plan shall be submitted to the Director of Public Works and Engineering for review and approval.
6. Erosion control measures shall be installed at the wetland boundary to ensure soil resulting from construction activities does not enter existing wetlands, the water features setback or the mitigation site.
7. Prior to construction, erosion control fencing shall be installed to prevent sedimentation from infiltrating wetlands. The erosion control fencing shall be maintained throughout the duration of the project and shall be removed after construction is completed and the area is stabilized.
8. No straw bales shall be used for erosion control, unless in conjunction with sediment erosion control fencing.
9. Spoils, if any, shall be hauled and disposed of at an offsite location acceptable to the Director of Community Planning and Development.
10. Prior the start of construction related to the wetland use permit, a performance guarantee in the amount of \$5,000 shall be provided in an acceptable form to the Township to ensure completion of the wetland mitigation.
11. The wetland mitigation area shall be monitored annually for five (5) years by the applicant's wetland consultant. A written status report and photographic documentation shall be submitted to the Department of Community Planning and Development each year.
12. A copy of the approved wetland use permit containing the conditions of issuance shall be posted in a conspicuous manner such that the wording of the permit is available for public inspection and the posting shall remain in place throughout the duration of site work.
13. Upon completion of construction, the applicant shall contact the Department of Community Planning & Development for an inspection of the site to ensure compliance with the permit.

Seconded by Trustee Veenstra.

Board discussion:

- Proposed improvement to the wetland is one related way for the Township to protect its environment
- Appreciation for the proposed work to improve reducing the amount of reed canary grass
- Amount of wetland that is filled is .15 acres

- Wetland use permit was recommended by the Township’s Environmental Commission and environmental consultant
- Proposed habitat structures for this project are either leaving logs, dead trees and stumps or turn stumps over to create habitat area for aquatic wildlife
- Mitigation ratio for this project is 1.5 to 1

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustee Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: None
Motion carried 5-0.

E. SUP#15101 (Okemos Pointe)

Trustee Scales moved [and read into the record NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN hereby approves Special Use Permit #15101 (T.A. Forsberg, Inc. and WestPac Michigan) for a group of 22 buildings totaling more than 25,000 square feet in gross floor area subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Approval of the special use permit is in accordance with the Cover Sheet, prepared by KEBS, Inc., dated January 25, 2016; building elevations prepared by Zehren and Associates, Inc., dated June 12, 2015; and schematic building elevations for the proposed remodeled warehouse/commercial building, prepared by FUN Architecture, received by the Township on January 25, 2016, subject to revisions as required.**
- 2. Special Use Permit #15101 is subject to all conditions placed on Mixed Use Planned Unit Development #15024 (T.A. Forsberg, Inc. and WestPac Michigan) by the Township.**
- 3. The gross square feet of all buildings on the site shall not exceed approximately 467,800 square feet unless the applicant applies for and receives an amendment to Special Use Permit #15101 and Mixed Use Planned Unit Development #15024 (T.A. Forsberg, Inc. and WestPac Michigan).**

Seconded by Trustee Veenstra.

Board discussion:

- SUP is required because the buildings are in excess of 25,000 square feet

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustee Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: None
Motion carried 5-0.

F. Sierra Ridge Lift Station/Payback

Trustee Scales moved to approve and adopt the resolution to Amend Terms of Sierra Ridge Lift Station Benefit Charge and Reimbursement Agreement and enter the full text of the resolution into the minutes of the Township Board Meeting as follows:

WHEREAS, the Township and G.S. Fedewa Builders, Inc (“Proprietor”) entered into a payback agreement on or about June 20, 2006, as authorized by Resolution, attached as Exhibit A. The Township agreed to reimburse the Proprietor for lift station oversizing costs that benefited properties beyond the needs of Sierra Ridge Estates for 10 years from the effective date of adopting the resolution authorizing such; and

WHEREAS, the 10-year reimbursement period is set to expire this year and the Proprietor has requested that the reimbursement period be extended for an additional 10 years. During this 10-year reimbursement period, the Township shall retain \$50.00 for each Residential Equivalent Unit (REU) reimbursement charge collected as specified in the payback agreement; and

WHEREAS, the Township has no objection to extending the payback agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Township Board of the Charter Township of Meridian, Ingham County, Michigan, as follows:

- 1. The Township Board approves an amendment to the Sierra Ridge Lift Station Payback Agreement to extend the 10-year reimbursement period set to expire this year for an additional 10 years. During this additional 10-year reimbursement period, the Township shall retain \$50.00 for each Residential Equivalent Unit (REU) reimbursement charge collected as specified in the payback agreement. All other terms of the Sierra Ridge Lift Station Payback Agreement as previously approved shall remain in effect.**
- 2. The Township Board authorizes and directs the Township Manager, Frank L. Walsh, to execute the attached amendment to the payback agreement and such documents as are necessary to effect the amendment of the Sierra Ridge Lift Station Payback Agreement as described in paragraph 1 above.**
- 3. All prior resolutions and parts of prior resolutions insofar as they conflict with the provisions of this resolution are hereby rescinded.**

Seconded by Treasurer Brixie.

Board and staff discussion:

- Inquiry as to the extra cost for “oversizing”, how much of the extra cost has been collected to date and how much remains to be collected
- Inquiry as to the number of residential equivalent units (REU) yet to be built
- REU takes into account the factors of a typical sized home (tubs, showers, sinks)
- If someone built a very large home, there is the potential to have it counted as more than one REU, although historically that has not been the case
- Board member clarification the Township is the entity collecting the fee from residents as a benefit charge for hook up and then reimbursing the developer from the payment received
- Resident must come to the Township for connection to the system which the developer previously paid for
- Lift station was constructed in 2006 and construction came to a standstill during the recession which commenced in 2008
- The developer did not go out of business during the recession and desires to continue with this development
- Sierra Ridge development contained no unique amenities when it was before the Planning Commission in 2004
- Environmental Commission spoke against the proposal, as it was labeled standard suburban development sprawl
- Suggestion was made to the developer to use the planned unit development approach which he elected not to use

- Board member belief there are always problems associated with payback districts (e.g., Georgetown)
- Board member belief payback districts are a form of public policy decision making which is often decided at a staff level
- Payback district memoranda to the Board need to include the pros and cons
- Inquiry as to why the Township requested the developer “oversize” the lift station
- Payback districts are often allowed in a community to minimize the number of potential lift stations in an area which reduces infrastructure costs
- There is an “economies of scale” by overbuilding a lift station to take into account future growth
- Some communities build the infrastructure and charge a connection fee when residents tie into it which pays for the infrastructure; however, the community is carrying the cost
- In 2006, the Township Board established a ten-year (10) payback district
- Board member belief the Township should not extend the ten-year (10) period because development in the area did not occur
- Board member belief the Township does not have to pay for the oversizing, but are required to collect fees from residents who build a house within the payback district
- Board member belief the requirements for oversizing should be approved by the Township Board, (e.g., Champion Woods)
- Board member belief the word payback, by definition, means to pay something back
- Extension would allow the developer to receive their payback when residents hook up to the system
- Inquiry if the “pot” of money owed to the developer grows at a five percent (5%) interest rate per year
- Value of the REU fee grows at the negotiated five percent (5%)
- Interest rate accumulated is higher than the cost of inflation
- At year seven (7) of the original agreement, the Township began to keep a portion of the 5% as an administrative fee, dependent upon if someone connects
- If the agreement is not extended, the developer will lose his investment in the lift station
- Inquiry if there has been any residents who have connected within the last ten (10) years for which the Township collected money
- Lake Lansing Estates was required shortly after the original development which consisted of 16 REUs
- There are 105 REUs available at the present time
- Ten year extension was at the request of the developer
- Board member belief the Board should consider the issues incurred with payback districts as lessons for the future
- Clarification for the public that it is the homeowners who pay back the developer by purchasing homes and paying the cost of the infrastructure when they hook up

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustee Scales, Styka, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus

NAYS: Trustee Veenstra

Motion carried 4-1.

Trustee Scales moved to take up agenda items past 10:00 P.M. Seconded by Treasurer Brixie.

Board discussion:

- Board member preference to only take up the remaining action items
- Members of the public are present to hear Board discussion on Costco
- Township has paid for its attorney to be present for advice on Costco

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried 5-0.

G. Pathway Master Plan

Treasurer Brixie moved to approve and adopt the Pedestrian/Bicycle Pathway Master Plan (Map A) and the Pedestrian/Bicycle Pathway Priority Guidance Map (Map B) as presented. Seconded by Clerk Dreyfus.

Board discussion:

- Appreciation to Director Perry and Friends of the Meridian Township Pathway System for coordination with Tri-County Bicycle Association, etc. for such high quality public input for the plan
- Grand River Corridor is already on the Pathway Master Plan and any modifications can be included in the design when the route is constructed
- Importance of the Board being satisfied with the intent of the overall route
- Board member suggestion to change addition #4 by adding “through the Sander Natural Preservation Area” at the end of the sentence for clarification
- Need for east/west connections for Tacoma Hills and Dobie Road
- Support for closing the gaps in the pathway system (e.g., north side of Grand River in front of the driving range) and amend the list to show this gap as priority one
- Board member preference for the highest priority pathway gaps to be listed rather than reading the map

Trustee Veenstra moved to fill the pathway gap on the north side of Grand River around the driving range be included in the priority one list. The motion died for lack of a second.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustee Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: None
Motion carried 5-0.

H. ZBA Appointments

Trustee Scales moved that Danielle Ballard be appointed as an alternate member to the Zoning Board of Appeals to fill a vacancy for a term ending December 31, 2017. Seconded by Treasurer Brixie.

Board discussion:

- Appreciation to Henry Kwok for his previous service as an alternate on the Zoning Board of Appeals
- Ms. Ballard has the qualifications to serve (i.e., legal student, clerk at the Ingham County Court)
- Appreciation for her willingness to become involved in the community and serve the residents of Meridian Township

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried 5-0.

Treasurer Brixie moved to appoint Gerald Richards as an alternate member to the Zoning Board of Appeals to fill a vacancy for a term ending December 31, 2017. Seconded Supervisor Pro Tem Styka.

Parliamentary procedure for supporting a different candidate: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #10))

- Q. I want to support somebody else. Can I substitute that other name in a substitute motion or do we have to vote down Mr. Richards?
- A. You have a motion to appoint somebody, so you have to vote on that motion before you can take up another one.

Board discussion:

- Mr. Richards has 17 years of experience as the Meridian Township Manager and is well qualified
- Board member belief Mr. Richards left the Township with a \$27 million debt and allowed the central fire station to “rot”
- Board member belief other candidates are better suited for the position
- Board member preference for someone with a fresher vision
- Board member belief the Township needs “new blood”
- Appreciation for Mr. Richards years of service
- Board member belief there needs to be fresh new faces, as the Township cannot move forward if it keeps reaching backwards

VOICE VOTE: Motion failed 2-3 (Trustees Scales, Veenstra, Clerk Dreyfus).

Clerk Dreyfus moved to appoint Shane Goodale as an alternate member to the Zoning Board of Appeals to fill one of two vacancies for terms ending December 31m 2017. Seconded by Trustee Veenstra.

Board discussion:

- Mr. Goodale previously served on the Planning Commission
- Board member belief Mr. Goodale was not reappointed to the Planning Commission for political reasons
- Mr. Goodale is a graduate of law school, committed to community and has overcome several personal challenges

VOICE VOTE: Motion failed 2-3 (Trustees Scales, Styka, Treasurer Brixie).

Trustee Scales moved to appoint Rico Rios as an alternate member to the Zoning Board of Appeals to fill a vacancy for the term ending December 31, 2017. Seconded Treasurer Brixie.

Board discussion:

- Remaining three (3) applications are over one year old and unsure if the individuals are still interested in serving
- Mr. Rios is a fresh new face as he has not previously served on any Meridian Township Board or Commission
- Concern with Mr. Rios’ selection of 11 positions on which to serve
- No apparent area of focus on Mr. Rios’ application

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried 3-2 (Trustee Veenstra, Clerk Dreyfus).

I. Local Roads 2016

Trustee Scales moved to approve the Local Roads 2016 Project List at a cost not to exceed \$700,000. Seconded by Clerk Dreyfus.

Board discussion:

- Township has a budget of approximately \$650,000 which is supplemented by a small amount from the General Fund
- Meridian Township receives \$115,000 from Ingham County
- Existing plan has been to evaluate the road system throughout the Township and review past complaints
- First priority is the entryway into subdivisions so the most utilized roads are paved
- Township has repaved various subdivision entryways over the last three (3) years
- Local Roads 2016 Project List is the result of more subdivision entryways and some roads within the subdivisions which would allow the contractor to work on the entryway and the subdivision at the same time
- List is a systematic approach to improving the Township's road using limited resources
- There has been no substantive work on the roads shown on the list in over 25 years
- Board member belief that due to lack of funds, the Township is only fixing the "worst" roads
- Board member belief that because the Township is only fixing the "worst" roads, it will cost the Township more in the long run
- Board member assertion it costs approximately half the amount for road repair if the roads are kept in good condition

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustee Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: None
Motion carried 5-0.

13. BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS

Supervisor Pro Tem Styka opened Public Remarks.

Ody Norkin, 3803 Sandlewood, Okemos, requested the Board seek legal advice from its Township Attorney relative to requesting Board members disclose potential conflict of interest or perceptions of a conflict prior to discussion. He maintained it must be prior to discussion versus prior to voting on an issue. He addressed the Treasurer's position on the Board as well as a member of the CATA Board, noting she must vote freely, without bias and without undue influence from CATA.

John Wolenberg, 2459 Barnsbury Road, East Lansing, stated he attended tonight's meeting to listen to discussion on an amendment to the PA 108 Agreement with East Lansing. He stated he lives behind the subject property, and preferred a berm and trees as landscaping to avoid looking at a building like they currently do with Rite-Aid. Mr. Wolenberg expressed his desire for the Township to ensure East Lansing and the developer are held to its landscaping commitment.

Supervisor Pro Tem Styka closed Public Remarks.

A. PA 108 Agreement-Amendment (COSTCO)

Manager Walsh summarized the PA 108 Urban Cooperation Agreement was not a true annexation as the Township receive revenues and will have input on the project. He stated staff and the Township Attorney are working closely with the developer and East Lansing and protecting residents' rights.

Township Attorney Stephen Schultz offered the following update on the status of project:

- Prior to Costco's interest, the PA 108 Agreement stipulated zoning for this property would fall within certain zoning classifications unless the Township provided written approval for something different

- Proposal by Costco requires a different type of zoning, B-2 under the City's Zoning Ordinance
- Township must give its consent to make the zoning change in order for the development to move forward
- In giving the consent, the discussion should focus on concerns the Township has which need to be addressed as part of the consent-giving process
- To date, the discussion has consisted of questions regarding:
 - Zoning and site plan review and the conditions which would be associated with them
 - Whether the length of the agreement (currently set to expire in 2035) should be extended
 - Resolution passed which approved the annexation did not provide for exceptions to which the Township could consent and would need to be amended to allow for the proper zoning for the subject parcel if the Costco development moves forward
- Township attorney has been exchanging drafts with East Lansing's City Attorney to address the change in zoning and the conditions attached to the zoning change
- Township attorney has been working with the Director of Community Planning and Development on planning concerns
- There is conceptual agreement that in granting consent to change the zoning designation for this property the wetland protection, outdoor lighting, commercial building development, off-street parking and landscaping requirements would be followed by whichever community's ordinance is the "most protective"
- Acknowledgment that in some of the aforementioned areas, the specific standards are left to the Director of Community Planning and Development to work with the developer to achieve acceptable terms and conditions
- Conceptual agreement to extend the term of the agreement for an additional four (4) years during which the Township would continue to recover its current 5 mills until the end of 2039
- Amendment to the annexation resolution will be drafted to be consistent with the Urban Cooperation Agreement

Board discussion:

- Costco separates itself from other big boxes and did not want to be included in a category with other big box stores
- During meetings, Costco made a comment that it did not want to pay for the sins of other big boxes
- Concern with Costco going through the dark store idea of assessing and seek a refund in the revaluation the property in spite of their assertion at the community meeting they do not do that as it is not their business model
- Research showed there are appeals in other communities where Costco is seeking refunds, including a community which contains a four (4) year old store (Pittsfield Township)

Inclusion of language which would require an absence of a deed restriction: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #10))

- Q. Is there any way for us to incorporate into this agreement some sort of condition which would require an absence of a deed restriction for the future use of the site, because, of course, if a

big box comes in and puts a restriction on the property so that it can't be used for a, b, c, d, and e if and when it leaves, it really creates a blight in the community. I understand that their main concern is there number one competitor (Sam's). I personally think it would be reasonable for them to have some kind of deed restriction that said Sam's could not come in if they left, but I don't think it should be open ended like most of these current deed restrictions are for the big boxes. If there is any way we can get some kind of protection from the appeal, I would love to see that, because the tax sharing is not worth much if we aren't getting anything because they get a reduction in their assessment.

The second question which is kind of related to the taxes that they're going to be paying would be that when I read the agreement, it didn't sound to me like recovered brownfields or other types of tax capture in the agreements. If there were a brownfield on the site then in effect, we would not get our 5 mills because it would be captured. They, perhaps, may have the authority to grant a brownfield denying us our 5 mill sharing.

- A. Let me address that one because we have had some discussions about that. If there was a tax capture associated with the brownfield, that capture is levied proportionally on both communities. For purposes of illustration, there's 15 mills paid on this property and we are then given five (5) of those and East Lansing covers ten (10) of those. If there is a tax capture, East Lansing would bear two-thirds of the capture; we would bear one-third of the capture. In other words, it applies proportionally. So yes, there would be the potential for some reduction; it's a greater reduction for East Lansing than it is for us.

I think that is also one of the....we don't know whether there will be a brownfield or not, we don't know the term of the brownfield, but certainly if we extend the term of this agreement in terms of revenue sharing for an additional four (4) years, if there is a brownfield, it gives us an opportunity to recapture some of that revenue as it extends out for an additional four (4) years. To my knowledge, I have not been involved in any discussion about whether there will or will not be a brownfield, to what extent it will be, and what the term of years will be where there might be a recapture or a capture millage to pay for the brownfield. We certainly can look into that; my only observation is East Lansing will bear more of the cost than we will.

Q. And the deed restriction?

- A. There are ways to do that; I think that's a discussion that has to happen with Costco as to how to do that and what restrictions can apply. Certainly, a municipality can have an interest in preventing blight and making sure that buildings are repurposed if they are not used by the original builder. I think we can explore some language on that. We do not have an agreement, in principle, on that issue with the City of East Lansing, as we have really been focusing on the zoning issues to this point.

Board discussion:

- Board member conversation with Costco during which Costco suggested the deed restriction issue would have to be considered at the corporate level
- Costco suggested the attorneys for the municipalities draft language for them to look at
- Viewshed will be important for adjacent neighbors as their homes were built looking at the golf course and marketed for that view
- Mitigation and permanent protection for the buffer will be valuable and important

- Through conversations one Board member had with residents in the area prior to the community meeting, most of them were in favor of the development
- Some adjacent neighbors expressed concern with truck deliveries times of 4:30 AM
- A brownfield is a significant concern as previously the City of East Lansing's garage for motor vehicles was located across the street
- During the community conversation Costco was asked if it would be seeking any Tax Increment Financing (TIF) and they responded they looked into it and found it may qualify for a \$9 million brownfield, but would likely ask for approximately \$1 million
- Board member preference to obtain ½ of the \$200,000 building permit fee
- Need for the Township to protect itself relative to the brownfield or the four (4) year agreement extension will mean nothing
- Township must weigh the benefit of the Costco store as Park Lake Road will need to be widened and who will pay for it
- North/south roadway east of US-127 is poor, so store traffic will use Park Lake Road from Haslett and Grand River Avenue
- Board member statement that neither governmental unit should be required to pay for the widening of Park Lake Road
- Board member concern with the outlots on Saginaw and south of the service station on Park Lake Road
- Board member belief there is a need to apply the most stringent ordinance standards among the two municipalities relative to screening, landscaping and setbacks as this project will start the "creep" down Park Lake Road
- The map lines of the parcel to be annexed contained in the Board packet appear to be different than the map shown by Costco during its presentation
- Concern with the status of the corner lot to the south which is zoned residential and for sale
- Corner lot is not part of the Costco project
- "Trust and verify" is owed to the citizens of Meridian Township
- Need for the Township to secure everything in writing to protect the Township
- Board member belief the most important issue is for Costco to pay its fair share of taxes and not ask for a reduced assessment based on the dark store theory

Number of years involved for the agreement extension: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #10))

- Q. Our counsel referred to getting this agreement extended for four (4) more years where we get the 5 mill tax sharing. I would certainly support doing that, but why only four (4) years. Why not ten (10)?
- A. I'm not deciding the number of years. That is a discussion between the principals of the two communities. That was simply a discussion that was had initially was somewhere in the neighborhood of four (4) years, but nothing has been signed off; nothing has been agreed upon. That is a discussion you all need to have.

Continued Board and staff discussion:

- Original agreement was for 34 years which expires on January 1, 2035
- Township staff is working to obtain everything they can possibly get in order to protect the neighborhood, bring in high paying jobs and not have a major residential development on the subject parcel
- Township assessor has contacted communities which have a Costco and researched the assessment issues
- There is a fine line which the Township must walk in order for this amended agreement to be successful

Term of the agreement: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #10))

- Q. Specifically, clause 11 says the term of agreement is for 34 years, terminating on December 30, 2036. I'm reading from page 5.
- A. That's actually a mistake if you think about where the start date is, because it started on January 1, 2002. Well, somebody just did math instead of actually thinking about it, because they went from the beginning of one year to the end of the end year, which is actually 35 years. When we say four (4) years, it would go to December 30th of 2039. It actually should have read December 30, 2035 if it was including 34 years.

Continued Board discussion:

- Board member preference for the eastern 30 acres Costco intends to designate as a conservancy to become part of the Township's Land Preservation Program
- Board member suggestion for the Township to obtain funds to endow the maintenance of that 30 acres
- Board member preference for the Costco development to be connected to pathways from Park Lake and Haslett Roads
- East Lansing may already have an ordinance regarding delivery times

ATTORNEY COMMENT: Just to add to that, we've had that discussion and I believe East Lansing and the Township are on the same page on those kinds of issues. I share a quote from Ronald Regan of "trust but verify."

Continued Board discussion:

- Reminder the Township is negotiating with East Lansing and East Lansing is negotiating with Costco
- Meridian Township will not be negotiating with Costco

Legality of the conservancy becoming part of the Meridian Township Land Preservation Program: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #10))

- Q. Trustee Veenstra had this interesting idea of this becoming Meridian Land Preservation Property. Is that legally possible since it's within now technically the City of East Lansing.
- A. I would have to look into that because this is the City of East Lansing property, so we can take a look at how that might or might not be possible.

Continued Board discussion:

- Board member preference not to look at the eastern 30 acres becoming Land Preservation property as there are costs associated with maintaining the land
- Board member belief it is in the best fiscal interest of the Township to have the long term maintenance of the land stay with East Lansing
- Criteria of the 30 acres should be to have the best possible protection for the neighboring homes to the east in Everett Farms
- Property cannot be rezoned without Township approval
- Inquiry if Costco has applied for a rezoning for this parcel
- Costco will not submit anything to East Lansing until they know if there will be an agreement between the Township and East Lansing

ATTORNEY COMMENT: Let me come at it a little differently. We're not going to be the party that approves or denies the rezoning. Under this agreement we will grant our consent or withhold our consent for a use that's other than the zoning districts that are listed in the document right now. That is why our consent has to be granted or withheld as they need a zoning classification that's different than what's in this Urban Cooperation Agreement.

We have to give our consent to a rezoning, but the issue Manager Walsh mentioned is that Costco is not going to go very much farther until they know what the terms of the deal are; what the terms of the game are. That is why it's going to be incumbent upon East Lansing and the Township to come to an agreement on what are the conditions under which a rezoning would be approved and then Costco will go forward from there.

Continued Board discussion:

- East Lansing can come to agreement with the Township if they know whether Costco will accept what we are going to agree to
- Township's focus is to make the best agreement it can with East Lansing
- Board consensus it wants the Costco project, but has a priority of issues which need to be addressed

ATTORNEY COMMENT: It is very helpful to me, in terms of understanding the priorities. As I mentioned at the outset, the devil is in the details. It is the issue of how we write this to memorialize our agreement in a way that both parties understand what the agreement is. A lot of zoning is left to discretion; it's left to reviewing the site plan; it's looking at whether a LED light is feasible or not feasible under a particular circumstance. That can't be decided until you actually get the site plan and the building plans and you know what's going on. The difficulty for us will be sorting out those kinds of details in advance, making sure everybody is on the same page and then putting that into an agreement that both you and the City of East Lansing can approve. Then Costco will go forward from there. It's going to be a little tricky, but I think we can get there.

Submission of items Board members do not want: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #10))

Q. Do you also want to hear what we don't want?

A. I want to hear what your concerns are.

Continued Board discussion:

- Board member belief the number one concern is protection for the neighbors
- Board member belief the first priority is for Costco to pay their fair share of property taxes
- Need for making the Township's consent valuable as it previously received nothing for the exchange of the land
- Board member belief the focus should be on improvements which need to occur in that area and who will pay for those improvements
- Board member preference to fix Park Lake Road without affecting the neighbors
- Concerns raised by residents regarding turning into Costco from Saginaw and other traffic issues need to be addressed and need data and/or a traffic study to work with

ATTORNEY COMMENT: That's something that Mr. Kieselbach and I will be looking at. I have taken a brief look at the city's zoning ordinance and it does require traffic studies and things of that nature. Their ordinance is very close to ours in terms of requiring an analysis of those traffic impacts. Again, those are the kinds of things that I think there's probably going to be more similarities than dissimilarities on a lot of the factors. We want to make sure that the standards that are set forth in our ordinance, if they're more stringent, are complied with.

It was the consensus of the Board to continue discussion on this issue at the next Board meeting.

- Q. Mr. Schultz, I would very much like you to address the baseless attack that I have been subjected to repeatedly by male members of this Board and primarily by male members of the public that I, a female Treasurer for Meridian Township who happens to be the representative for CATA, is somehow doing something improper and that is a conflict of interest. Two previous Treasurers, both of them men, have represented Meridian Township on the CATA. Two recent Mayors of East Lansing, both of them men, have represented their community on the CATA Board, and yet I continue to be subjected to insinuations that I am committing some sort of an ethics breach by representing Meridian Township on the CATA Board. I would like you to give your opinion on that.
- A. Let me just offer this comment without, frankly, looking into a whole lot. I think the answer is fairly straight forward. In terms of conflict of interest and ethics, the State of Michigan is woefully inadequate as a matter of law in terms of adopting any kinds of statutes or any kinds of rule of law to try and codify conflict of interest. Unless there is a direct pecuniary interest or indirect pecuniary interest, a conflict of interest is not a legal issue. It's a matter of policy for a Board. In terms of there being something "illegal" about serving on two different Boards, it's not a legal issue; it's a policy issue unless there is an incompatibility of office. Incompatibility of office only arises if there is the potential for one office to be superior to the other such that you can't serve both at the same time.

With respect to the CATA Board and this Board, I know of nothing that establishes an incompatibility of office between serving on both at the same time. In fact, many communities appoint representatives to the CATA Board so I don't know of anything that would make it incompatible for a member of this Board, whoever it might be, to serve on the CATA Board and on this Board at the same time.

Board discussion:

- Issue surrounds how this particular individual is representing the interest of the Township and the Township Board and whose loyalty this position is serving
- The question is if the person the Township Board designated as the CATA representative (i.e., Treasurer) is adequately representing the views of the Board (which should reflect the views of the Township) or is that designee representing the interest of CATA in selling the community and the Board on her view of how we should move forward on projects involving CATA
- Board has not directed the Treasurer on how to vote at CATA, and it needs to establish the position they want their representative to take
- Nothing should be derogatory towards the Treasurer for serving on the CATA Board as the Township's representative if we don't know the position we want her to represent
- Board member belief the citizens feel there is not a balance between the comments they bring to the Board and her expressed opinion on the BRT
- Concern the only information being exchanged between the Board representative and CATA is what is necessary to protect the view of the CATA representative herself
- Board appointments imply a trust that the representative will reflect the views of the Board
- Board has not taken an official action on its position regarding the BRT since it passed a resolution several years ago in favor of it
- Importance of citizen perceptions and viewpoints

B. Redi-Ride Recommendations

Trustee Scales summarized the three (3) recommendations from the Redi-Ride Review Committee (RRRC) as outlined in his memorandum dated June 2, 2016.

Board discussion:

- Universal consensus there are not enough rides available through the Redi-Ride
- Board member preference for a question to be placed on the ballot which would enable the Township to fund more rides
- Requiring cancellations to be made prior to 5:00 P.M. on the previous day will, in effect, allow for more rides as CATA builds its ride schedule in the evening for the next day
- CATA may need to address late cancellations in the event a rider becomes ill
- CATA need for the Township to officially make the three (3) recommended changes to proceed in becoming more efficient and hopefully have more capacity

Trustee Scales moved to suspend the rules. Seconded by Supervisor Pro Tem Styka.

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried 5-0.

Treasurer Brixie moved to approve these three recommendations to CATA to implement as soon as feasible. Seconded by Trustee Scales.

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried 5-0.

C. Land Preservation Donation-Tank Trust

Treasurer Brixie summarized the proposed donation of property known as The Edward Felton Tank Revocable Trust as outlined in staff memorandum dated June 2, 2016.

Board discussion:

- Property is 2-½ acres of wetland at the southeast corner of Lake Lansing
- Land Preservation Advisory Board has passed a resolution recommending the Township accept this donation

Trustee Veenstra moved to suspend the rules. Seconded by Trustee Scales.

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried 5-0.

Trustee Veenstra moved [and read into the record] NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN, INGHAM COUNTY, MICHIGAN, as follows:

To approve acceptance of a 2.51 acre property donation, parcel number Number 33-02-02-11-177-008 from The Edward Felton Tank Revocable Trust into the Land Preservation Program.

Seconded by Clerk Dreyfus.

Board discussion:

- 2-½ acres is not contiguous to Lake Lansing, but within 500 feet of the lake
- Parcel is protected and regulated under the State Wetland Act as well as the Township
- Any development on the parcel would need to go through the wetland use permit process
- Resolution would remove the parcel from the tax roll
- If the parcel was left on the tax roll, the Township would be able to collect taxes yet it would be unbuildable without going through the permitting process
- Current taxes of approximately \$20

- Two Land Preservation Board members were interested in acquiring this parcel as there are opportunities to improve fish habitat and remove invasive species to prevent their spread into other areas

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustee Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: None
Motion carried 5-0.

14. FINAL PUBLIC REMARKS

Supervisor Pro Tem Styka opened Public Remarks.

Ody Norkin, 3803 Sandlewood, Okemos expressed his disappointment that issues raised by citizens is somehow “shifted and spun” as an attack on the Treasurer due to her gender. He thanked Board members for their service to and hard work for the Township.

Supervisor Pro Tem Styka closed Public Remarks.

15. FINAL BOARD MEMBER COMMENT

Trustee Scales thanked members for their donations which allowed him to take members of the Haslett High School Black Student Union on a trip this year to the Motown Museum in Detroit.

Trustee Veenstra stated the Board will need to take up the issue at a future meeting of placing a proposal on the November, 2016 ballot to reauthorize the Redi-Ride program to remove the language using CATA as the sole source provider. He stated his position that while he is a strong supporter of mass transit, he believes the BRT is a badly flawed project, noting hostility to the BRT is going to spill over into hostility to CATA in general. Trustee Veenstra reported his attendance at the May 25th regular meeting of the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission where a presentation was given on historic steel truss bridges and their ability for reuse.

Clerk Dreyfus reported his attendance at the June 2nd Economic Development Corporation meeting where the following items were discussed:

- Walnut Hills golf course sale and what that would mean to the area
- Potential Costco development and action at the Board level
- Membership for the Corridor Improvement Authority and its scope of purpose and bylaws
- Upcoming meeting at New Hope Church with Haslett business owners and members of the community

He reported his attendance at the following:

- Breakfast meeting convened by the Ingham County Clerk to discuss upcoming election issues
- Neighborhood meeting along with other local officials to discuss the future of Walnut Hills and plans for the site

He reported the roundabout on Burcham and Park Lake Road has a hidden river new rain garden thanks to volunteers and the Mid-Michigan Action Council.

Treasurer Brixie reported the following:

- Special assessment notices were mailed out June 1st and are due at the end of month
- Attended the grand opening of the Orlando Park Story Walk
- Attended the Haslett American Legion Memorial Service
- Is an advocate for the BRT system as it would have a traffic calming effect on the Grand River Corridor and provide safety for users

- Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) has been removing left turn movement and installing a Michigan turn for safety improvements
- Support for long range regional planning and improving movement of people throughout the Tri-County area
- Need to think about pedestrians, bicyclists and those who rely on public transit in building a walkable community for all demographics
- BRT will offer a safer way to board the bus with center running lanes

Supervisor Pro Ten Styka reported his attendance, along with Trustee Scales, at a meeting with School Superintendent Duda, Ingham County Road Department Director Bill Conkin, Police Chief Hall, and Director Perry to discuss safety in front of Haslett High School. He noted a suggestion was made to have the Township find funds to conduct a traffic study to see if a traffic light or some other mechanism will help this situation.

Township Manager Walsh added if it is the Board’s desire to move forward on it, the Township will find the money to fund the traffic study and begin immediately. He noted this issue seems to shadow what the Board and Okemos Public Schools worked on relative to Kinawa Middle School.

Supervisor Pro Tem Styka stated this issue will be placed on the agenda for the June 21, 2016 Board meeting.

Trustee Scales moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Clerk Dreyfus.

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried 5-0.

16. ADJOURNMENT

Supervisor Pro Tem Styka adjourned the meeting at 11:54 P.M.

RON STYKA
TOWNSHIP SUPERVISOR PRO TEM

BRETT DREYFUS
TOWNSHIP CLERK

Sandra K. Otto, Secretary