

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN
TOWNSHIP BOARD REGULAR MEETING - **APPROVED** -
5151 Marsh Road, Okemos, MI 48864-1198
853-4000, Town Hall Room
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2015 **6:00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Supervisor LeGoff, Clerk Dreyfus, Treasurer Brixie, Trustees Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Wilson
ABSENT: None
STAFF: Township Manager Frank Walsh, Assistant Township Manager/Director of Public Works Derek Perry, Police Chief David Hall, Fire Chief Fred Cowper, Human Resources Director Joyce Marx, Principal Planner Gail Oranchak, Associate Planner Peter Menser

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER
Supervisor LeGoff called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/INTRODUCTIONS
Supervisor LeGoff led the Pledge of Allegiance.
3. ROLL CALL
The secretary called the roll of the Board.
4. PRESENTATION
Police Chief Hall introduced Meridian Township's newest police officer, Aaron McConaughy.
5. PUBLIC REMARKS
Supervisor LeGoff opened Public Remarks.

William Seck, 5717 Carlton Street, Haslett, spoke in support of railroad quiet zones, believing it to be a quality of life issue.

Patience Drake-Rosenbaum, 1368 Hickory Island, Haslett, spoke in support of railroad quiet zones, stating the train horns wake residents multiple times. She indicated with the ambient noise level at night so low, the horns can be heard through multiple crossings. Ms. Drake-Rosenbaum spoke to the health effects of interrupted sleep.

M. J. Aronoff, 1320 Hickory Island Drive, Haslett, spoke in support of railroad quiet zones, discussing his experience with consistent interrupted sleep. He addressed sleep deprivation from train horns as a serious health problem.

Ann Alchin, 5972 Cypress, Haslett, believed individuals get used to train horns when they live near railroad tracks.

Ghulam Sumbal, 1998 Jolly Road, Okemos, offered a brief history on the rationale for his rezoning request, Rezoning #15030.

Doris Schwartz, 2209 Kent Street, Okemos, spoke to the need for the Board to engage with the public more in its goal setting process, suggesting more of a roundtable atmosphere during the meeting. She thanked the Board for the new Heritage street signs in the Cedar Bend Heights Historic Neighborhood. Ms. Schwartz handed out a map of Cedar Bend Heights, addressing the need for road repairs on Ardmore, Hillcrest, Grandview and Kenmore Avenues and the abandoned homes on those roads.

Leonard Provencher, 5824 Buena Parkway, Haslett, stated Aldi still has not paved the section of pathway in front of its new Marsh Road store scheduled to open November 12th. He requested the Township announce that the Board's goal setting meeting has been changed to 1:00 P.M. on November 16th, using all communication forms possible.

Supervisor LeGoff closed Public Remarks.

6. TOWNSHIP MANAGER REPORT

Manager Walsh reported on the following:

- Central fire station is near completion
- Follow up meeting this week with the Municipal Employees Retirement System (MERS) regarding strategies to address long term legacy costs
- The M3 Group was selected to work with the Township on its branding efforts
- Meeting tomorrow on development of the former central fire station and Meridian Area Resource Center (MARC) property on Okemos Road
- Goals and objectives meeting has been changed from 10:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. on November 16th
- Meeting this week on health care costs, with more information to be shared in the coming weeks
- Meridian Leadership Group will meet this Friday

7. BOARD COMMENTS AND REPORTS

Trustee Veenstra thanked ITC holdings for its \$5,000 grant which allowed 23 trees to be planted on the grounds of the Meridian Municipal Complex. He addressed the timeline regarding potential increased Redi-Ride service contained in the letter from Sandra Dragoo, Director of Capital Area Transportation Authority. Trustee Veenstra inquired about allegations contained in a letter from Mike McCurdy regarding court appearance(s) over his keeping of pygmy goats on RAAA property.

Township Manager Walsh clarified the issue of Mr. McCurdy's goats for Trustee Veenstra and the general public.

Trustee Scales reported the Redi-Ride subcommittee met on October 27th to begin vetting the issue of better Redi-Ride service. He indicated the next step will be to appoint members from the public who will serve on the subcommittee, and several scenarios were offered to guarantee proper and fair representation of the citizenry.

In response to earlier public comment, Clerk Dreyfus suggested the annual town hall meeting is a good venue to provide citizen input to the Board which the Board, in turn, can use during its goal setting process. He suggested the Township do a better job of promoting the town hall concept in 2016. Clerk Dreyfus reported the Governor has just signed new civil asset forfeiture laws which will require more transparency and increase the burden of proof required to keep confiscated property. He announced the Meridian Cares Team, in conjunction with the Community Resources Commission (CRC), is organizing a second Emergency Needs Fundraiser for residents in the Township who are in need of assistance by selling raffle tickets. He added the tickets are available for purchase through the East Lansing Meridian Lions Club, in Township offices and at participating businesses.

Clerk Dreyfus reminded the Board it adopted through an official motion the starting time of its goal setting meeting on November 16, 2015 at 10:00 a.m., adding that any change will need to be discussed and voted on.

Trustee Styka announced a blood drive will be held in the Town Hall Room on November 19th. He reported his attendance, along with Trustees Scales and Veenstra, at the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) Transportation Seminar on October 22nd. Trustee Styka also reported his attendance at the Wolverine Caucus, where the topic of discussion was the Great Lakes and water basin in Michigan. He announced a Thanksgiving Farmers' Market will be held on Wednesday, November 25th from 10:00 a.m. until 2:00 P.M.

Trustee Veenstra noted a letter contained in the Board packet from Liaison for Inter-Neighborhood Cooperation (LINC) objecting to the boundaries of the proposed Corridor Improvement Authority (CIA), pointing out some of the parcels are zoned residential and should be omitted.

8. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Treasurer Brixie moved to approve the agenda. Seconded by Trustee Styka.

The maker moved to add Consent Agenda Item #9G: Board Goals Meeting at 1:00 P.M. on November 16, 2015. Seconded by Trustee Styka.

Board discussion:

- Board member preference for this issue to be placed on the agenda as an action item
- Any Board member has the right to “pull” an item off the consent agenda

Treasurer Brixie withdrew her motion.

Treasurer Brixie moved to add Action Agenda Item #12F: Set the Board Goals Meeting for 1:00 P.M. on November 16, 2015. Seconded by Trustee Styka.

Board discussion:

- Board member preference for the title of the agenda item to be Setting the time for the Board Goal Setting Meeting and not include the time

Trustee Veenstra offered the following friendly amendment:

- **Title of Action Agenda Item #12 F should read: Setting the time for the Board Goal Setting Meeting**

The amendment was accepted by the maker of the main motion.

Treasurer Brixie moved to amend the agenda as follows:

- **Move Discussion Agenda Item #13F: Corridor Improvement Authority (CIA) to Action Agenda Item #12G**

Board discussion:

- Next step for the Board with the CIA process is to set a public hearing with a commensurate publication of the notice of intent
- Planning Department must finalize the legal description
- Moving to action will allow the Board to agree on the map so the legal description can be written
- Boundaries for the CIA need to be discussed
- Concerns expressed by LINC and the Planning Commission regarding the boundary

Treasurer Brixie withdrew her motion.

VOICE VOTE: Motion 7-0.

9. CONSENT AGENDA

Supervisor LeGoff reviewed the consent agenda.

Trustee Wilson moved to adopt the Consent Agenda. Seconded by Clerk Dreyfus.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Wilson, Supervisor LeGoff,
Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus

NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

A. Communications

(1) Board Deliberations (BD)

BD 12D-1 Patrick England, 3670 Stagecoach Drive, Okemos; RE: Forsberg Drive Abandonment

BD 12D-2 Nick Gavrilides, 3627 Stagecoach Drive, Okemos and Owner/Member, The Soup Spoon Café; RE: Forsberg Road

- BD 12D-3 Dana Gavrilides, 3627 Stagecoach Drive, Okemos; Re: Forsberg Drive Abandonment
- BD 12D-4 Marcia Tanner, 3562 Stagecoach Drive, Okemos; RE: Forsberg Drive Abandonment
- BD 12D-5 Thomas W. Repaskey, Cardinal Financial Consultants, LLC, 4295 Okemos Road, #120, Okemos; RE: Abandonment of Forsberg Drive
- BD 12D-6 Mark Hopper, 3653 Stagecoach Drive, Okemos; RE: Forsberg Drive – Ponderosa Neighborhood
- BD 12D-7 Warren D’Zouza, 3598 Stagecoach Drive, Okemos; RE: Support for Abandonment of Forsberg Drive
- BD 12D-8 Neil and Tammy Story, 3537 Ponderosa Drive, Okemos; RE: Petition to Abandon Forsberg Drive
- BD 12D-9 Kyle MacMillan, 3609 Stagecoach Drive, Okemos; RE: Abandonment of Forsberg Drive

(2) Board Information (BI)

- BI-1 Trustee Angela Wilson; Re: Taxi Authority Updates
- BI-2 Neil R. Bowlby, President, Liaison for Inter-Neighborhood Cooperation, PO Box 40, Okemos; RE: Proposed Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority
- BI-3 Eric W. Ederer, 4446 Seneca, Okemos; RE: Making Sidewalks and Trails Safe for the Blind
- BI-4 Ginger Yang, Owner, LotusVoice Integrative Therapies, LLC, 4994 Park Lake Road, East Lansing; RE: Zoning Amendment #15070 & The Corridor Improvement Authority Initiative

(3) Regional Linkage (RL)

- RL-1 Sandra L. Dragoo, CEO/Executive Director, Capital Area Transportation Authority, 4615 Tranter Street, Lansing; RE: Meridian Redi-Ride Service

(4) Staff Communication

- SC-1 Mark Kieselbach, Director of Community Planning & Development; RE: ITC Holdings Tree Grant completion

(5) On File in the Clerk’s Office (OF)

- Material submitted at the October 20, 2015 Board Meeting
Ronald Calhoun, 1427 W. Saginaw, East Lansing; RE: Letter of support from the Greater Lansing Housing Coalition for inclusion of affordable housing in MUPUD #15034 (Red Cedar Flats)
- Beth Bechtel, 1165 Cliffdale, Haslett; RE: Article produced by SmartMeter EducationNetwork.com regarding negative health effects of smart utility meters

Trustee Wilson 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 Clerk Dreyfus.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Wilson, Supervisor LeGoff, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: None
Motion carried unanimously.

B. Minutes

Trustee Wilson moved to approve and ratify the minutes of the October 20, 2015 Regular Meeting. Seconded by Clerk Dreyfus.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Wilson, Supervisor LeGoff,
Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: None
Motion carried unanimously.

C. Bills

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

Common Cash	\$ 279,941.17
Public Works	\$ 22,264.14
Retainage	
Check #2007 – Great Lakes Fusion/Pathways	\$ 4,485.38
Check #2006 – Toebe Construction/Pedestrian Bridge	\$ 32,797.70
Total Checks	\$ 339,488.39
Credit Card Transactions	\$ 11,223.19
Total Purchases	<u>\$ 350,711.58</u>
ACH Payments	<u>\$ 441,244.87</u>

Seconded by Clerk Dreyfus.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Wilson, Supervisor LeGoff,
Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: None
Motion carried unanimously.

(Bill list in Official Minute Book)

D. Transfers to the Tax Roll

Trustee Wilson moved to assess the charges identified in the staff memorandum with parcel identification available in the Treasurer's Office dated October 29, 2015 for Delinquent Special Assessments, Utility Bills, False Alarms, Nuisance, Lot Mowing/Code Violation, Snow Removal and Misc. Fees as a tax lien against the subject properties as authorized by Michigan Compiled Laws (MCL) 41.727, 41.728 and Meridian Township Ordinance Code Sections 58-32, 58-33, 78-98, 78-155, 46-5, 82-27, 18-1 and 18.15. Seconded by Clerk Dreyfus.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Wilson, Supervisor LeGoff,
Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: None
Motion carried unanimously.

E. Resolution to Add a Financial Institution

Trustee Wilson moved to adopt a resolution entitled "Authority to Open an Account" at The Private Bank. Seconded by Clerk Dreyfus.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Wilson, Supervisor LeGoff,
Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: None
Motion carried unanimously.

F. Ratification of Part-Time Paramedic/Firefighter Appointment

Trustee Wilson moved to ratify the appointment of Joseph Pontack to the position of part-time paramedic/firefighter. Seconded by Clerk Dreyfus.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Wilson, Supervisor LeGoff,
Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus
NAYS: None
Motion carried unanimously.

10. QUESTIONS FOR THE ATTORNEY (See Agenda Items #12C, #12D, #13A, #13BL)

11. HEARINGS

A. Kansas Street Sanitary Sewer, Special Assessment District (SAD) No. 52

Supervisor LeGoff opened the public hearing at 6:51 P.M.

Margaret Szum-Lupa, property owner of 3575 Kansas Road, Okemos, spoke in support of the sanitary sewer special assessment district as they will be building a home on the property in the near future.

Piotr Lupa, 3575 Kansas Road, Okemos, spoke to improvements he is making on his lot in order to build a home. He noted he was told by the Ingham County Health Department he needed a new septic system in order to build a home at this location and preliminary estimates were in the \$25,000 range. Mr. Lupa believed sewers would greatly improve the neighborhood and spoke in support of the proposed project.

Ghulam Sumbal, 1998 Jolly Road, Okemos, spoke in support of bringing sewer to Kansas Street.

Steven Freemire, 3622 Kansas Road, Okemos, and circulator of the petition, spoke to inaccurate information contained in several forms letters signed by residents on Kansas Street who are in opposition to the SAD. He noted there are three (3) properties on Kansas Road which are in need of a sewer system. Mr. Freemire explained that most of the homes on Kansas Road were built in the 1930s and 1940s and have aging septic systems. He stated he is aware of six (6) properties on Kansas Road he believed would not pass septic inspection if the owners decided to sell based on improvements made to the square footage. Mr. Freemire clarified that Suresh Muringathery has stated his opposition to the Kansas Street SAD, but he does not have frontage on Kansas Street and would not, therefore, be assessed. He stated that Mr. Muringathery is already hooked up to the sewer which runs north from The Sanctuary. Mr. Freemire also noted Mark Wisniewski expressed opposition to the SAD, but has no frontage on Kansas Street and would receive no assessment. He expressed a desire that the road be paved once the sewer is installed, as both actions would increase property values. He requested the board extend the assessment to 15 years for residents who connect.

Neil Bowlby, 6020 Beechwood Drive, Haslett, displayed a map and offered narrative regarding lots contained within the proposed Kansas Street Sanitary Sewer SAD. He stated he spoke with several residents on Kansas Street who do not want sewer hookup. He reminded Board members they do not have to approve the proposed SAD, adding that six (6) different property owners are in favor of the sewer installation and six (6) different property owners are opposed to it.

Carlene Hooker, 3663 Kansas Road, Okemos, voiced opposition to the Kansas Sanitary Sewer SAD, as it will place a financial burden on the sick and elderly who live there. She stated the property owners who signed the petition, except one (1) resident, do not live on Kansas Street. Ms. Hooker noted the proposed assessment does not take into account the additional cost of hookup.

Assistant Township Manager/Director of Public Works and Engineering Derek Perry summarized the Kansas Street Sanitary Sewer Special Assessment District as outlined in staff memorandum dated October 29, 2015. He outlined the Township process used for creation of a sewer special assessment district once a valid petition is submitted.

Supervisor LeGoff closed the public hearing at 7:07 P.M.

12. ACTION ITEMS

Supervisor LeGoff opened Public Remarks.

Nick Gavrilides, 3627 Stagecoach Drive, Okemos, urged the Board to abandon Forsberg Road as a connection between Ember Oaks and Ponderosa subdivisions.

Charles Barbieri, Foster Swift, 313 S. Washington Avenue, Lansing, and attorney for The Ponds Cooperative Homes, Inc., requested the Board act on the petition for the Daniels Drain and set a public hearing.

Deb Nolan, 4329 Heartwood Road, Okemos, Ingham County Board of Commissioners for District #12, spoke in support of the abandonment of Forsberg Road.

Supervisor LeGoff closed Public Remarks.

A. Rezoning #15050 (Stockwell) – **Final Adoption**

Trustee Veenstra moved [and read into the record] NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN hereby FINALLY ADOPTS Ordinance No. 2015-06, entitled “Ordinance Amending the Zoning District Map of Meridian Township Pursuant to Rezoning Petition #15050” from PO (Professional and Office) to C-2 (Commercial).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of the Charter Township of Meridian is directed to publish the Ordinance in the form in which it is finally adopted at least once prior to the next regular meeting of the Township Board. Seconded by Trustee Scales.

Board discussion:

- Planning Commission recommended the property be rezoned to C-2, although the applicant originally requested C-3, which is the Township’s commercial core
- Grand River is a major arterial and C-2 is an appropriate zoning designation
- Many unused PO parcels in the Township

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Wilson, Supervisor LeGoff,
Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus

NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

B. Rezoning #00150 (St. King) – **Introduction**

Trustee Veenstra moved [and read into the record] NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN hereby INTRODUCES FOR PUBLICATION AND SUBSEQUENT ADOPTION Ordinance No. _____, entitled “Ordinance Amending the Zoning District Map of Meridian Township Pursuant to Rezoning Petition #00150” from RC (Multiple Family-Medium Density to PO (Professional and Office).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of the Charter Township of Meridian is directed to publish the Ordinance in the form in which it is introduced at least once prior to the next regular meeting of the Township Board. Seconded by Trustee Styka.

Board discussion:

- Owner desires to rent out the remainder of the building

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Wilson, Supervisor LeGoff,
Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus

NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

C. Daniels Drain Improvements

Trustee Wilson moved [and read into the record] NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN, MICHIGAN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Pursuant to Section 489a(109a) of the Michigan drain code, as soon as practical following this meeting, the Township Clerk shall forward to the Ingham County Drain Commissioner via registered mail a copy of this Resolution and the Township's Notice of Intent to File Petition under Section 463 of the Michigan Drain Code.

Section 2. The Township shall notice and the Township Board shall conduct a meeting to hear objections to the proposed drain project or special assessment in compliance with the provisions of Section 489a of the Michigan Drain Code.

Section 3. Following the meeting held by the Township Board, the Township Clerk shall bring the matter back before the Township Board.

Seconded by Trustee Veenstra.

Board discussion:

- Board has concerns about the unspecified cost which cannot be obtained until the petition is filed
- This issue is a public health and safety concern for residents at The Ponds who live near the drain

Petition Language: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #10))

- Q. There has been some talk of the petition wording and why it seems so cumbersome at our discussion. I was wondering if Stacy Hissong could come and talk about why the petition is worded the way it is, because it is a matter of state regulation and it's not something we could "tweak."
- A. I believe you'll see the same type of wording in the Smith Drain petition later on in the agenda. That is the myriad of activities that can take place under a petition for the Drain Code. It does not mean that any of those or all of those will take place under the petition, but it is the listing of those needed sections, so it is commonplace to list all of those items in the petition language itself. It does not require a specific scope by listing it, and it would not necessarily be prudent to adjust that language.

Continued Board discussion:

- Board member preference for a benefit derived assessment once the cost and scope of the project are known
- Moving through the process now and bidding in the winter will likely result in cost savings
- Board member urging to have all residents and affected property owners contact the Board
- Public hearing will be placed on the Township website and advertised through social media for maximum coverage

Trustee Veenstra offered the following friendly amendment:

- **Amend the second WHEREAS clause by deleting "flow" and inserting "water"**

ATTORNEY COMMENT: The resolution language mirrors the language in the statute; so, if it it's unartfully written, you can talk to the legislature with regard to that. I'm sure they've heard a lot about the unartful writing of the Drain Code. I believe, when you look at Chapter 20, it talks about the purification of flow.

The friendly amendment was not accepted by the maker.

Trustee Veenstra offered the following friendly amendment:

- **Amend the third WHERAS clause by deleting “a portion” and inserting “all”**

ATTORNEY COMMENT: All of the lands in the Township are not benefitted; only a portion of the lands in the Township. That is why it's worded that way. I am very comfortable with the way it is worded. If you take out the words “a portion” it says “the lands in the Township” which would infer that all of the lands in the entire Township would be benefitted which is not true.

The friendly amendment was not accepted by the maker.

Trustee Veenstra offered the following friendly amendment:

- **Amend the fourth WHERAS clause by deleting “may” and inserting “will”**

ATTORNEY COMMENT: And, again, the wording is “may” rather than “will” because we don't know for sure whether this will move forward or not. I believe the statute also talks about that it may be...and again, it is not a certainty that this project will move forward; thus, the “may” instead of “will.” Again, I am very comfortable with the way this is drafted.

The friendly amendment was not accepted by the maker.

Trustee Veenstra offered the following friendly amendment:

- **Amend Section 2. By deleting the word “meeting” and inserting the words “public hearing”**

ATTORNEY COMMENT: The rationale is under Section 489a § 3: “The legislative body shall hold a meeting”. Again, it uses the phrase “meeting” rather than “public hearing”; thus, the specific language in the resolution. I am comfortable with it as drafted.

The friendly amendment was not accepted by the maker.

Continued Board and staff discussion:

- Grave concerns with the unknown cost of the project
- Preliminary engineering estimates were procured by The Ponds Cooperative and were within a range of \$700,000 - \$1.2 million
- Statement by the Drain Commissioner that the figures are “meaningless” and this could be a much more expensive project
- Board member concern there will not be a cost effective fix which would satisfy the needs of the residents of The Ponds
- Board member belief The Ponds condo owners are the chief beneficiaries and should bear the major portion of the cost of the project
- Board member preference the proposed assessments to the affected property owners in the Forest Hills subdivision be minimized
- Township and residents will have “a seat at the table” during all steps of this project
- Confidence in staff to oversee this issue through all of its phases

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Wilson, Supervisor LeGoff,
Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus

NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

D. Ember Oaks/Ponderosa Connection

Trustee Scales moved [and read into the record] NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN hereby supports the petition for abandonment of the public road right-of-way known as Forsberg Drive located in The Ponderosa subdivision.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of the Charter Township of Meridian is directed to forward a signed copy of this resolution to the Ingham County Board of Commissioners and the Ingham County Road Department prior to the public hearing scheduled for November 24, 2015. Seconded by Clerk Dreyfus.

Board discussion:

- Board should support the residents in the Ponderosa subdivision in their quest to abandon Forsberg Drive
- While it is good public policy to connect adjacent neighborhoods, the exception to connecting Ember Oaks and Ponderosa through Forsberg Drive is warranted
- Neighborhoods still need to be connected through installation of a pedestrian/bicycle pathway
- Majority of Board members desire a pedestrian/bicycle pathway connection
- Board member preference for emergency vehicle access through the use of bollards

Payment of connection costs: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #10))

Q. If this is no longer a right-of-way, how do we get the developer to pay for the connection, or would the Township, then, be incurring the cost of that connection. I don't think the Township should bear that cost, as it is the cost of development.

A. You raise an interesting point that I was speaking with the Planning staff about. What the county is doing, and what we are doing here is, basically, expressing an intent that we're not going to open a public street, but it is not changing the plat. The plat will still show the public way and those lands are still dedicated to the public. Forsberg Drive will continue to exist on the plat and it will not belong to the adjacent property owners. The issue then becomes, as a public way but not a public street, who is responsible for that? It is still going to be dedicated and either the Township or the county are going to be responsible for that. I don't know if the county has addressed the issue of retaining additional rights over that platted street or not. I have not been involved in those discussions. Certainly now is the time, rather than later, to discuss the question of emergency access and public access or a public way at the time the county is taking up the issue. They can still determine that they're not accepting the dedication for purposes of a county road, but that platted public way is still going to be there and we are still going to have to address who is responsible for it.

Q. For the resolution that we have before us, should we put a WHEREAS in here that says we desire construction of an emergency access and pathway to Forsberg Drive? Remember, we are communicating this with Ingham County. Or, do we put in here that we ask them to support the petitioner's request for the abandonment after Ember Oaks constructs its emergency access.

A. You're really dealing with Forsberg Drive in the Ponderosa subdivision. This resolution doesn't address the other side, the other plat that you are going to have in front of you where the two are going to connect. What you might consider is whether you want to ask the county to abandon it subject to retaining emergency and pedestrian access; something of that nature. Really, what you have in front of you is a resolution simply supporting the county. It's not the Township abandoning anything; you're simply stating your position on behalf of the neighborhood. Then it comes down to the county to take that issue up in light of the fact that there is still a platted public way which is going to exist in this subdivision.

Q. Say it again...abandon the drive subject to....?

A. Subject to reservation of pedestrian and emergency access; something of that nature.

Treasurer Brixie offered the following friendly amendment:

- **Amend the 4th WHEREAS clause after Forsberg Drive" by adding "subject to reservation of pedestrian and emergency pathway connection.**

The friendly amendment was not accepted by the maker.

Treasurer Brixie offered the following amendment:

- **Amend the 4th WHEREAS clause after Forsberg Drive” by adding “subject to reservation of pedestrian/bicycle pathway and emergency vehicle pathway connection.**

Seconded by Trustee Veenstra.

Board discussion:

- The Board is still attempting to construct a motorized road in this subdivision, while the Township does not have sufficient funds to maintain existing roads
- Board member belief there is no need to run an emergency vehicle between the two subdivisions, as there is an ingress/egress in each of the subdivisions
- Northern connection shown on the plat does not exist and there are no plans for it to be constructed
- Northern connection shown on the plat to prevent the subdivision from being “landlocked”
- Concern with the cost of widening the connection to allow access for emergency vehicles

Emergency vehicle access on the non-motorized pathway: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #10))

- Q. If we don't have support for the non-motorized pathway to be able to support emergency vehicle access as well, would it be prudent to include the motion Treasurer Brixie just offered to include in our resolution the desire to have the non-motorized pathway?
- A. As I understand what's before the Board right now, you have the main motion to approve the resolution as was in the packet. You now have Treasurer Brixie's motion to amend it to include emergency pedestrian and non-motorized pathway. That is a motion that has to be resolved first before you then vote on the main motion. If that fails, then you could go back and try another motion to simply add the pathway issue without the emergency access. Then you would have the main motion as moved by Trustee Scales.

Continued Board and staff discussion:

- Both Ponderosa and Bonanza subdivisions have two potential access points off of Jolly Road
- Ember Oaks has multiple access points
- Emergency vehicle access is not necessary as there are other adequate accesses
- Northern cul-de-sac on Stagecoach Drive is not usable for emergency services
- Stagecoach dead ends and does not connect to the east side of Ponderosa
- Option is to build the end of the cul-de-sac large enough so the biggest fire truck can turn around or reduce the size and build a “hammerhead (stub portion of the street to allow emergency vehicles to back up in order to turn around)
- Emergency vehicles need 50 feet (per Fire Code) to travel from Stagecoach to Ember Oaks with 20 feet in width
- Longest fire truck is 40 feet in length
- Width of a fire truck is approximately nine (9) feet
- Board action tonight is only to support the petition before the Ingham County Road Department
- Reminder that nothing changes with the abandonment of Forsberg Drive relative to fire protection
- Board can't make all of the decisions which impact the health and safety of residents of both neighborhoods in a vacuum until it is shown the plans of both subdivisions
- Appropriateness of communicating with the county the importance of protecting the safety of the community
- Importance of a non-motorized connection to join both neighborhoods
- Suggestion to bring the residents together with the Fire Chief to effectuate fire truck access while protecting the neighborhood from vehicular traffic on Forsberg Drive
- Board member belief the pathway needs to be paved, while the emergency vehicle access only needs a firm surface
- Board member's interpretation of the Fire Chief's statement is that there is not a need for the emergency vehicles to have through access, but only sufficient space to turn the fire truck around

- Board member's vision of a seven (7) foot pervious bicycle/pedestrian pathway with an area for emergency vehicles to turn around
- Current configuration allows the fire truck to back into the area in order to turn around

Nexus between emergency vehicle clause and payment of maintenance: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #10))

Q. Is the emergency vehicle "clause" integral to who is paying for maintenance?

A. The statute that the county is operating under simply speaks to abandonment. It doesn't speak to all of the other terms. If we have concerns or conditions, we ought to express them to the county so that in the context of taking up abandonment (which is what the statute speaks to), they will take these other issues into consideration if there is something that we want them to consider. The statute they are operating under is once sentence in one section which grants the county the right to abandon a county road. That is different than the platting process. For instance, when this street was platted, there was probably discussion of a whole host of issues that would be taken into account as to why it was put there in the first place (e.g., connection, public safety, whatever). My recommendation would be that if you have conditions that you are concerned about, you ought to tell the county about them. Then the county will take it up, they will have a public hearing and the Manager can work with the neighborhood and take those issues to the county and handle it that way.

Q. If the county commissioners agree and this is abandoned, what happens in terms of the concerns we have over the cost or the maintenance of that. Or, are they separate issues, currently? Just be signaling intent, does that mean later we can signal intent as well?

A. I'm not quite sure what you're asking, but let me put it this way. The request to the county and what I believe the county will take up is abandoning this road. By abandoning this road, they're declining the jurisdiction over the road; meaning, they're declining the expenses (the maintenance, the opening and the closing of the road all together). This would leave the issue of who has rights over that platted street to the Township and the Township would decide what it wants to do with that platted street. If you want something less than complete and utter abandonment by the county, you ought to say so.

Q. You're suggesting that if we add that clause in there, that might allow them to abandon it, but the county would still maintain some management or oversight of the road.

A. The county's still going to do whatever it wants to do. Remember, this is a motion to make a recommendation to the county; they don't have to follow it. I think what the Manager has indicated is he will work with the neighborhood and he'll work with the county and they will come up with a solution.

Board and staff discussion:

- Need to use common sense and allow staff to work with the county and residents to provide a solution which meets the needs of the county, the directive of the Board, the needs of the fire department and the desire of the residents who have attended all these meetings

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Styka, Veenstra, Wilson, Supervisor LeGoff, Treasurer Brixie

NAYS: Trustee Scales, Clerk Dreyfus
Motion carried 5-2.

Board discussion:

- Stagecoach Drive is a low traffic road with no sidewalks
- Homeowners along Stagecoach Drive do not want an increase in traffic

Owner of "title" to Forsberg Drive: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #10))

Q. If the county abandons Forsberg Drive, does that mean the county abandons title to that right of way?

A. It's an issue the Planning Department and I have discussed at some length. Essentially, what the county will be doing is disclaiming any interest in opening that street. That does not mean that there won't be a platted street still there that belongs to the public that is still available. The issue will come if the county somewhere changes its mind and decides it now wants to open the street after having abandoned it. Or, if a later Board asks that the street be opened by the county. The platted street is still going to be there, it's still going to exist in the plat, its still going to be dedicated to the public even though the county has disclaimed any interest in accepting that platted street.

Q. So the county will still have title to the right-of-way?

A. The public will still have title to the right-of-way. That could be the county, that could be the Township, that could be whoever takes over jurisdiction of the streets in the Township. Right now it would be the county; if for some reason this Township became a city, then it would become us because we would take over jurisdiction of the streets. Right now, Forsberg Drive is dedicated to the public as a street.

Q. I'm trying to find out who the public is. The staff memo said if the county abandons Forsberg Drive, the Township has first priority to retain the road, which I assume is the right-of-way. I, again, ask if the County Board of Commissioners (after this hearing on November 24th) votes to abandon Forsberg Drive, do they still maintain the title to the right-of-way of Forsberg Drive?

A. There is no such thing as a title which somebody holds and they can transfer. There is a dedication that it's public land. There are jurisdictions (the county, the Township) that have the right to utilize that public land. It is not as if there is a deed out there that we can pass back and forth between municipalities or private parties.

Continued Board discussion:

- Excerpt from letter sent to the Board by Neil Story that in 1992, the Township, developer and neighbors agreed to a street configuration (i.e., Forsberg "curve") which would have made it unlikely that street traffic from Ember Oaks would spill over into Stagecoach and Ponderos
- Agreement was memorialized in the 2000 final preliminary plat
- Board member belief agreements from 23 years ago should not be overturned without a compelling reason to do so
- Forsberg curve was a 180 degree curve so no cut through traffic would use it to get to Stagecoach as a short cut to Jolly Road
- Board member suggestion for interested citizens to attend the November 24th public hearing at the county

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Scales, Styka, Wilson, Supervisor LeGoff, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus

NAYS: Trustee Veenstra

Motion carried 6-1.

E. 2016 Township Board Meeting Schedule

Treasurer Brixie moved to adopt the 2016 Township Board Meeting Schedule Resolution. Seconded by Trustee Wilson.

Board and staff discussion:

- No election currently scheduled for May 3rd
- Joint Meeting with School Districts and Local Governments scheduled on a Thursday to encourage local government attendance as most municipalities have meetings on Tuesdays

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Scales, Styka, Veenstra, Wilson, Supervisor LeGoff, Treasurer Brixie, Clerk Dreyfus

NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

Steven Freemire, 3622 Kansas Road, Okemos, reiterated Suresh Muringathery and Mark Wisniewski, who sent letters in opposition to the Kansas Road Sanitary Sewer SAD, do not have frontage on Kansas Road and will not be assessed. He added owners of 57% of the affected property signed the petition.

Piotr Lupa, 3575 Kansas Road, Okemos, spoke in support of the Kansas Street Sanitary Sewer SAD. He stated he had a test performed on the well water located on his vacant land, and it did not pass the water quality standards. Mr. Lupa questioned spending \$25,000 on a septic system which contributes pollution to the groundwater.

Milly Gilin, 5891 E. Lake Drive, Haslett, encouraged the Board to look at the possibility of railroad quiet zones in Meridian Township. She spoke in support of exploration of this issue.

Supervisor LeGoff closed Public Remarks.

- A. Kansas Street Sanitary Sewer, Special Assessment District No. 52
Director Perry availed himself for Board questions on the proposed SAD.

Board discussion:

- Three (3) residents want to hookup immediately to municipal sewer
- Six (6) property owners have filed written objections
- Board member suggestion to move forward with the Township paying for the sewer, where residents would not be charged until they hookup
- Money would not come from the General Fund, but from the Sewer Fund
- Request for information on the condition of the soils in the area due to septic system issues
- Township has not investigated the soils, but responded to a valid filed petition
- Citizens have filed a valid petition and they have met the standard
- Affected area also has drainage problems
- Board member belief the existing homes would not be able to be built according to today's standards relative to septic systems
- There are human health impacts to this situation
- Negative to septic systems is that need for maintenance is not readily apparent
- Point of Sale law helps address the quality of the septic system
- Concern with the possibility of a Township payback district
- Staff explanation of the petition process
- Citizen driven petitions require the names of the recorded property owners as signatories who own more than 50% of the area's acreage
- SAD v. sewer payback district
- Difference between a citizen driven petition and a Township initiated SAD
- Township installs the sewer and the lateral
- Cost of hookup to the lateral for each property owner may change during subsequent budget processes
- Township has no way of knowing the condition of the existing septic systems in the area
- Ingham County Health Department oversees the septic system program and notifies the Township when one fails

Board requirements in response to submission of a valid petition: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #10))

Q. Because a valid petition was filed, what is this Board required to do?

A. Consider the petition.

Q. So we are not required to go forward and put in the sewer?

A. That is correct.

Continued Board and staff discussion:

- Board member preference for the Township to finance sewer installation estimated to cost approximately \$100,000 after three (3) residents hookup
- Sewer Fund is not currently healthy
- Concern with the precedent set with the Township “frontloading” special assessment districts
- Board practice has been to make residents pay when infrastructure is constructed
- Board flexibility in designating the payback period
- Board member preference for a ten (10) year payback period
- Township Board has the discretion to set the period of time to pay back the assessment
- Township has a Township Improvement Revolving Fund (TIRF), a special assessment fund which allows these types of projects while keeping the TIRF whole
- Health of the TIRF in the event the Board chooses to extend the payback to 15 years
- Ten (10) years for pay back was set by the Board
- Staff to provide information on the length of assessment districts
- This is a normal scenario for people in an SAD where some want immediate use and some will not use for several years
- History experienced by the Township Manager in his career that when there is an immediate use, it is a shorter duration of time (10 years) and when there is a combination, they are usually spread over 15 years
- Board member preference for a longer period of time than ten (10) years so as not to burden those who have limited funds
- Board has the discretion to participate in the cost of the project if it so chooses
- Board member suggestion for the Township to assess half of the cost immediately and then require the other half when hookup occurs
- Request for a rough estimate on the cost of annual maintenance for septic systems
- Board member belief the longer the pay back, the more likely the expense of maintaining a septic system increases over time and the net cost to each property owner will decrease
- Board member understanding the rule of thumb is to have the septic tank pumped every three (3) years
- Board member suggestion to have the Township loan the sewer fund money from the general fund similar to what the Board did for the road fund

It was the consensus of the Board to place this item on for action at its November 17, 2015 Board meeting.

B. Smith Drain Study Results

Deputy Drain Commissioner Carla Clos introduced James Ensign from Spicer Group, who outlined the thought process between the two different cost estimates. He emphasized the estimates are for the cost of construction contract only, and does not include the design, permitting, land acquisition (if necessary), construction administration, materials, testing and inspections. Mr. Ensign added the total project cost is typically double the contract cost. He indicated the draft assessment roll is based on runoff only as the Drain Commissioner will prepare a final assessment roll based on benefit derived, noting five (5) at-larges (Meridian Township, Alaiedon Township, City of Lansing, Ingham County and the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT)).

Board Drain Commissioner’s representative discussion:

- Meridian Township’s portion of land within the Smith Drain is approximately 44%
- 1,185 parcels in the district are non-exempt
- 25 parcels in the district are exempt (i.e., parcels owned by the Township, school district and Alaiedon)
- Board of Determination would make a decision whether any or all municipalities were subject to an at large (public health) assessment, but does not assign a percentage

- Generally, if there is a flooding problem, there are public health issues and the municipalities would be assessed
- ICRD and MDOT would be subject to an assessment for benefit of the highway

ATTORNEY COMMENT: This is a Chapter 4 Drain, so it is a different animal, so to speak, than the Daniels Drains which we had before. You have different entities that can be assessed, so the Township cannot be assessed for properties that it owns, but it can be assessed at large as can Alaiedon Township and the City of Lansing. Then MDOT only for benefit to state highways, and there is a specific calculation that they do to determine that; the county only for benefit to county roads, and there is a specific calculation that is used for that.

The at large assessment to each Township isn't a blow-by-blow as to where flooding is in Alaiedon v. Meridian Township, it's more after the project scope is determined, a more holistic look at where the benefit for public health was. It's normally a general percentage to each of the communities. Because the pro rata share between the Townships are so similar, it's probably going to be very close to the same between the two Townships.

The Deputy Drain Commissioner was correct; the Board of Determination decides whether there is an at large at all to the Township. I have never seen a Board say no, so I wouldn't go in with any thought that the Board of Determination is going to find no finding of public health, especially with road flooding. But that is the determination they make. They don't set the percentage, they don't set the scope of the project, they just say yes, there should be an at large assessment, and that isn't really determined until after bids are taken and they see where everything flushes out with regard to the ultimate assessments between each of the entities that are assessed.

Determiner of the at large assessment percentage: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #10))

- Q. The chart says an at large assessment can be from 10-25% of the project. Who determines whether the at large assessment is 10% or 25% or whatever?
- A. For MDOT, it is pretty clear, except if there is a specific thing that they want, and there is a specific set of calculations for MDOT and the county.
- Q. I understand that the assessment for MDOT is kind of based on the area of the road; same with the county road department.
- A. And the second part of my answer was to the Townships and the cities, the Drain Commissioner determines that. There are no set calculations for that.

Continued Board and Drain Commissioner's representative discussion:

- Initially when the drain study was reviewed by the ICDC, Meridian Township's Assistant Manager as well as the Township's chief engineer, the Drain Commissioner did not see this project as the type where there is "a lot" of public health benefit unlike Towar Gardens
- In consolidation, all properties benefit from a more economical and efficient administration of the drainage district
- Parking lots of properties in Alaiedon Township on the south side of Jolly Road, east of Okemos Road, currently provide detention when flooding occurs in the area
- ICDC has also met with Alaiedon Township, City of Lansing, Ingham County and MDOT regarding this issue and all municipalities will be involved in figuring out the best plan for all concerned
- A 5% interest rate was used for ease of calculating
- Annual Estimated Principal Payment chart assumes a 20 year bond at 5% and does not include interest
- Clarification that 44% of all the property within the Smith Drainage District is within the jurisdiction of Meridian Township, but does not mean that Meridian's assessment will be 44%

ATTORNEY COMMENT: I think there is a little bit of confusion. The Deputy Drain Commissioner is giving you the runoff coefficient percentages and that really has nothing to do with the 44% and 43% and 12% to the City of Lansing. That does not include a breakout to MDOT and it doesn't include a breakout of the county road acreage within each municipality. It also does not take into consideration the land use in each of those communities. So while the City of Lansing may have a smaller percentage, that land use runoff coefficient, in general, is going to be higher because of Jackson National Life, and so the percentage for their property owners is going to be higher than that regular percentage. I think the Drain Commissioner's Office is just giving you that 44%-43% as a very rough estimate of the raw land acreages between the two, but you should not use that number to try to calculate what the differences in costs of apportionments are going to be, because they have no relation to one another. It doesn't take into consideration road acreage, MDOT acreage or land use.

The only thing I would say that would be out of the norm with this petition is the consolidation part of it. I want to make sure when you are reviewing this for consideration in future meetings, the consolidation part of it. I want to make sure the Board understands what that means.

Each of the drains that are listed to be consolidated as part of what would be all one Smith Drain, are each tributaries to the Smith Drain right now. They are already within the Smith Drain watershed. As an example, you have the Sunwind Branch of the Smith Drain; that's a special assessment district within the overall special assessment district. Those properties would be assessed for that tributary plus the Smith Drain. I think the point the Deputy Drain Commissioner was making is in the administrative costs, you pay the legal notification and everything else for both districts when they are part of the same system. When you are doing a petition like this, I think it has become more common practice to look at what tributaries (which were established throughout time in piecemeal fashion) should be part of the whole system when you are addressing it, and reduce the number of these sub districts so that property owners are paying one assessment and not multiple ones for the same watershed. Therefore, you are not paying for duplicative notices, bond fees and things like that. That is why these drains are included and why the discussion with the Assistant Manager was to also include those in the petition. That is what that's about.

Attorney opinion on the consolidation process: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #10))

- Q. Do you recommend the consolidation process and are you satisfied with what's been presented by the Drain Commissioner's Office for us regarding the consolidated districts?
- A. I think it is part of the same system and where I see frustration by property owners is when they are in nested districts for the same watershed. I think it is easier administratively and there is cost effectiveness to consolidation in these types of circumstances. It doesn't always make sense, but for small tributaries, in my opinion, it makes sense.

Continued Board discussion:

- Board member's insistence on definite cost figures is premature
- Staff recommendation for the project to move forward
- Forsberg family is a large landowner in this drainage district and has not voiced an objection
- Forsberg family is aware of the project and they have met with the ICDC throughout this process

Possible disincentives to consolidation: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #10))

- Q. Can you come up with any reasons that are disincentives to consolidate? What do we give up by consolidation?

A. I think there are some instances where it gets too big; they're trying to consolidate too many things together to make a bigger watershed. In this instance, it's the same watershed, but nested. The difference would be if you're just working on that one little tributary, and it wasn't consolidated, only those people pay for that. You can consider that either a pro or a con. That's also part of the system, and what you do on that may affect this outlet. I think with little tributaries, the cost savings makes a lot of sense and not having all these very specific special assessment districts makes a lot of sense. I've seen where they've taken huge districts and try to merge the two together, and then you have a massive thing where work on one side doesn't have anything to do on the other. That's a situation where I don't know that consolidation makes the most sense. That's not what you have today.

Q. If we didn't go the route of consolidation, could the necessary work still be done in a different manner?

A. Basically, what the Drain Commissioner has proposed is taking two separate processes and merging them together to save the cost of it. If you decided you didn't think consolidation was appropriate, you could remove the Chapter 19 portion of the language from the petition, and just move forward with the improvement project. If you decided later to do consolidation, you could do it separately, but basically it's the same cost to do them both together. If you are going to do consolidation, you should do them together.

Q. There's no cost savings for doing it separately or trying to decide certain portions of the system would not get worked on and we would only work on some portions of the Smith Drain?

A. It would be the opposite; it would probably be more expensive to piecemeal them rather than to do it together.

Continued Board discussion:

- Board member support for consolidating the six (6) drainage districts into one to reduce administrative costs
- ICDC has proposed taking two separate processes and merging them together for cost savings
- Need for replacement of the collapsed pipe under Jolly Road, a major arterial

Trustee Scales moved to take up Agenda Items #13D and #13E after 10:00 P.M. and amend the agenda as follows:

- **Remove Agenda Items #13C and #13 F and place them on the next Board meeting agenda**

Seconded by Trustee Veenstra.

Board and staff discussion:

- Board member inquiry if the Draft Personnel Policy is time sensitive relative to contract negotiations
- Board member suggestion to limit Board member comments to once on each item
- Staff has been waiting several hours to address both of the agenda items requested to be removed

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Scales, Veenstra, Supervisor LeGoff, Clerk Dreyfus

NAYS: Trustees Styka, Wilson, Treasurer Brixie

Motion carried 4-3.

C. ~~Personnel Policy Manual—Draft~~

D. Rezoning #15030 (Sumbal)

Principal Planner Oranchak summarized the rezoning request as outlined in staff memorandum dated October 29, 2015.

Board, staff and applicant discussion:

- Pathway should be a safe route to Hiawatha Elementary School
- Condemnation has been previously discussed for this property in order to complete the pathway

- Property owner is requesting an increase in density while upzoning the property
- Owner has not given the Township an easement across the front of the property for the pathway
- Township has installed a temporary asphalt connection between the two concrete pathway ends on the east and west right next to the curb
- Need for the Board to separate the pathway easement from the rezoning request and not make one contingent upon the other
- Property owner has agreed to donate five (5) feet so the pathway can be pulled back from the road
- Necessity of the second home being hooked up to public water and sewer prior to being inhabited
- This rezoning action is part of the process in order for the second home to be hooked up to water and sewer
- If the property reverts back to RR because the variance is not approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA), it would not be usable for a residence
- Applicant indicated he would demolish the second home if the variance from the ZBA for the shared driveway is not granted
- Conditions must be voluntarily offered by the applicant
- Public Works and Engineering Department has had discussions with the applicant about the Township's preference for improvements to the sidewalk in front of the home
- Concern with snow being plowed off Jolly Road onto the temporary pathway
- Board member preference for the applicant to donate ten (10) feet in order to have adequate setback from the curb plus the seven (7) foot pathway
- Donating ten (10) feet would make the front yard too small
- Two homes have been on this parcel since 1955 and Board member preference for them to be grandfathered
- Existing drive comes off Jolly Road
- Structure in the rear was not always occupied as a residence
- Both structures have been residences since the applicant purchased the property three (3) years ago
- Applicant has indicated the driveway must be a shared one in order for the second home to have egress

It was the consensus of the Board to place this item on for action at the November 17, 2015 Board meeting.

E. Railroad Quiet Zone

Clerk Dreyfus summarized the railroad quiet zone issue as outlined in staff memorandum dated October 29, 2015.

Board discussion:

- Federal approval will not be given without complying with the mandated safety measures
- Cost of \$80,000 for Canadian National constant warning railroad crossing circuitry
- Request for Board members to keep their fellow Board members apprised of issues as they surface during Board member comment
- 2006 memo contained in the Board packet was written to the Director of Community Planning and Development at his request
- There were 42 citizens in favor and three (3) citizens opposed to railroad quiet zones
- Board member belief this is a quality of life issue (noise pollution)
- ICRD needs to be involved as it will effect redesign of some roads

It was the consensus of the Board to place this item on for continued discussion at the November 17, 2015 Board meeting.

~~F. Corridor Improvement Authority (CIA)~~

14. FINAL PUBLIC REMARKS

Supervisor LeGoff opened and closed Public Remarks.

15. FINAL BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Treasurer Brixie reported that at the last CATA meeting it was announced Spec-Tran will be undergoing some changes to its scheduling program through the use of negotiated ride scheduling.

Trustee Scales reported his fundraiser birthday party resulted in \$1,935 for the Haslett Black Student Union. He thanked several Board members and staff for their generous contributions.

16. ADJOURNMENT

Supervisor LeGoff adjourned the meeting at 11:06 P.M.

ELIZABETH LEGOFF
TOWNSHIP SUPERVISOR

BRETT DREYFUS, CMMC
TOWNSHIP CLERK

Sandra K. Otto, Secretary