

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CLINTON**  
**REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**  
**MONDAY, MARCH 5<sup>TH</sup>, 2018**

**PRESENT:   ROBERT J. CANNON       SUPERVISOR**  
              **KIM MELTZER                   CLERK**  
              **PAUL GIELEGHEM           TREASURER**

**JOE A. ARAGONA           TRUSTEE**  
              **MIKE KEYS                   TRUSTEE**  
              **KENNETH PEARL           TRUSTEE**

**ABSENT:    JENIFER WEST               TRUSTEE (EXCUSED)**

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees was called to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Township Board Chambers, Clinton Township Civic Center. Also in attendance was Mr. Jack Dolan, Township Attorney. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Ms. Meltzer stated there are no deletions from tonight's agenda.

Ms. Meltzer stated there is one addition to tonight's agenda:

21. Request Approval for Clinton Township Police Department to Display Two (2) Banners

Ms. Meltzer recommended, taking into consideration the budget presentation and public hearing generally takes some time and there are a number of people present tonight for the Special Assessment Public Hearings, that Item #7 – Public Hearing for the 2018-2019 Budget be moved to Item #15A.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, supported by Mr. Gieleghem, to approve tonight's agenda with the addition of Item #21 and moving Item #7 to Item #15A. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Gieleghem, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Mr. Cannon stated that he will continue to provide a little Clinton Township history at each Board meeting in honor of its 200<sup>th</sup> anniversary this year. He provided historical information on Clinton Township cemeteries, noting that in the Clinton Grove Cemetery, there is a veteran buried for every war this country has

ever fought, and a walk through any of the cemeteries is like taking a step back into history, with each marker having its own unique story.

**1. RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE 50<sup>TH</sup> ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (SEMCOG)**

Motion by Mr. Gieleghem, supported by Mr. Aragona, to adopt the Resolution Recognizing the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments, as presented. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Gieleghem stated the Board is here to represent the interest of Clinton Township, but there are a lot of decisions that go beyond the local community and functioning as a region provides them with the ability to look at issues from a wider perspective. He stated SEMCOG is the organization that provides that ability with their reports and research, and he added that the federal government relies on the studies they do. He felt they are a tremendous asset.

Roll Call: Ayes – Gieleghem, Aragona, Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

**2. REQUEST TO OBSERVE “NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER” ON MAY 3<sup>RD</sup>, 2018**

Mr. Cannon stated that his office will provide the podium for this event, and he added that this is always a nice ceremony.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, supported by Mr. Aragona, to receive and file the letter dated February 6<sup>th</sup>, 2018, from Pastor Mark Reynolds, of Bethany Baptist Church, and approve the request to observe National Day of Prayer on Thursday, May 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2018, to be held on the steps of the Township Offices, as outlined in the correspondence. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Aragona, Keys, Cannon, Gieleghem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

**3. CLINTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF APPEALS ANNUAL 2017 REPORT**

Motion by Mr. Pearl, supported by Mr. Keys, to receive and file the letter dated February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018 and Board of Appeals 2017 Annual Report from the Vice-Chairperson of the Clinton Township Board of Appeals, as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Gieleghem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

**4. APPOINTMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

Mr. Cannon stated there are three excellent candidates for the Economic Development Corporation, and he is recommending the appointment of Ms. Tiffany Taylor to fill the term to expire on July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018, and Dr. Rodney Tolbert to fill the term to expire on July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

Motion by Mr. Cannon, supported by Mr. Pearl, to receive and file the letter dated February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2018 from the Administrative Aide, and appoint Ms. Tiffany Taylor and Dr. Rodney Tolbert to the Economic Development Corporation, with Ms. Taylor's term to expire on July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018, and Dr. Tolbert's term to expire on July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019. Roll Call: Ayes – Cannon, Pearl, Keys, Aragona, Gielegghem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

**5. REQUEST APPROVAL OF TRANSFER OF STOCK IN 2017 CLASS C, SDM AND BREW-PUB LICENSED CORPORATION WITH SUNDAY SALES PERMIT (PM), DANCE-ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT AND OUTDOOR SERVICE (1 AREA) – BARABOO INC., 35905 UTICA ROAD**

Mr. Pearl inquired as to whether this is a change in ownership and whether the same people are running the business.

Ms. Meltzer explained that the same people will be running the business, but there is a change in the stock option. The State of Michigan requires any changes or transfers of any liquor licensing must be obtained through the State of Michigan, and the Township ordinance requires the recognition of that as well.

Mr. Pearl felt they are doing a good job.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, supported by Mr. Gielegghem, to receive and file the letter dated March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018 from the Township Clerk, and approve the request for transfer of all stock interest in the 2017 licensing year for Baraboo, Inc., 35905 Utica Road, by dropping existing stockholder Helen Kourelis Trust, Helen Kourelis Trustee, and as a result, new stockholder Mary Bricolas will hold 1,500 shares of stock in conjunction with the 2017 Class C, SDM and Brew-Pub Licensed Corporation with Sunday Sales Permit (PM), Dance-Entertainment Permit and Outdoor Service (1 Area). Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Gielegghem, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

**6. REQUEST APPROVAL OF CLASS C AND SDM LIQUOR LICENSE TRANSFER WITH SUNDAY SALES AND OUTDOOR SERVICE – COOPER'S HAWK, 17440 HALL ROAD**

Ms. Meltzer explained they are in the process of building their location, so the letters from Fire and Building indicate this would be approved upon Certificate of Occupancy.

Mr. Keys noted that the letter referred to a search of the manager, and he inquired as to whether that is standard procedure to do the background check on the manager.

Police Chief Posavetz replied they are doing the background check on the licensee.

Ms. Meltzer clarified that generally the applicant is an individual, but in this case, it is a corporation, so it is not an individual name. The Township's applications request an applicant name, which is a corporation. In this case, the police will conduct a background check on the people who will be operating this facility on behalf of that corporation.

Mr. Keys stated after having worked in restaurants much of his life, he pointed out that there is a large turnover of managers; however, a general manager usually stays with the restaurant. He inquired as to whether this individual is considered the general manager.

Ms. Meltzer replied affirmative. She replied to further inquiry that "negative results" reflect that means no results, and all checked out well.

Mr. Aragona recalled Cooper's Hawk gave a fantastic presentation a couple of months ago, and he is excited to approve what they are putting in at The Mall at Partridge Creek.

Motion by Mr. Aragona, supported by Mr. Keys, to receive and file the letter dated March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018 from the Township Clerk, and approve the Transfer of Class C Liquor License to Cooper's Hawk LLC, located at 17400 Hall Road. Roll Call: Ayes – Aragona, Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Gielegghem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

**7. PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE 2018-2019 BUDGET**

This item was moved to Item #15A.

**8. PUBLIC HEARING #1 – SPECIAL ASSESSMENT PROJECT P-2007  
THORNTON STREET PAVING**

Mr. Dolan explained the Township has always followed a process on special assessments providing for full participation and consideration of the residents and allowing democracy in action through the needs of the people being met on petitions that they file. He emphasized that the Township does not have jurisdiction over the public roads, which includes the pavement portions of the road as well as the construction and/or reconstruction of the roads. The roads of the Township fall under two categories: roads that are under the control of the Macomb County Department of Roads (formerly known as the Macomb County Road Commission), and roads under control of the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT). He added there may be a few private roads as well. Mr. Dolan explained that as a Township, and not having jurisdiction over the roads, they do not participate in Act 51 funding, which is the gas tax everyone pays to go towards roads. That is administered and distributed at the state level to local road agencies, including the County. There is a section in that law that specifies the County cannot construct roads unless they have a match from another source. He explained this places townships in a difficult situation because they do not receive gas tax money, they do not have direct jurisdiction over the roads, yet they must be responsible for sourcing those funds to meet the requirements of Act 51. Through this Special Assessment process, they are trying to get the County to participate in an equal match with the Township, which they are hopeful will occur. He stated Act 188 of 1958 is a statute referred to as the Township Special Improvement Act. This case involves a road in which they are authorized to use that process to acquire the funds to improve the road. He explained the two ways in which the Special Assessment process can be initiated: it can be initiated through the Township, if they would desire, and the only way it could be stopped is if the people went out and circulated a petition of objection to what the Township is proposing, and they would have to accumulate signatures of over 20% of the owners of the area for which the development is proposed. He stated the Township has never followed that process because they have felt the most democratic way for a Special Assessment to work is for the residents to circulate the petition. When the residents initiate the petition, by front footage for road improvements, over 50% of the persons within the district have to execute the petition to get the ball rolling. Once the process starts in the Township on a Special Assessment for roads, the process involves two public hearings and the Township passing a total of five resolutions. The first resolution, which has already been passed, is to accept the petition and direct the plans to be prepared. The second resolution, which has occurred, is scheduling the meeting which is occurring tonight. He clarified that tonight's public hearing is to tentatively approve the district and to continue to the next process, which is scheduling another public hearing, and then assessing the properties. He advised that anywhere along this process of the two public hearings and five resolutions, up to the point where the Board is to act on

Resolution #5, which is the special assessment, the Township could choose to discontinue the project. He explained it is not essential to be stopped this evening, which is at the stage of the first public hearing and the third Resolution. Mr. Dolan advised that if this Resolution passes tonight after the public hearing, they will have to wait some time to get additional information back from the Department of Roads. They will then pass Resolution #4, which will schedule a second public hearing, and a letter notice will be mailed to everyone in the district, and the second public hearing notice will be published. He advised that will be another public hearing and if the vote would occur, providing the other Resolutions passed, the properties would be assessed.

Mr. Dolan explained that at the second public hearing, either at the hearing or prior to it, by appearing or through a representative, anyone on the proposed assessment can object to the assessment and they are then preserving their right to appeal to the Tax Tribunal within thirty days. Mr. Dolan clarified he is here tonight as a Township attorney on behalf of the Township Board, but there are different processes for appeals if a resident does not feel they have a fair assessment. To establish that, the resident must show there was no reasonable economic benefit to their parcel from the improvement. He explained that the Township's full-time engineer, who is also the department head for Public Services, along with Mr. Scott Chabot, a licensed civil engineer from Giffels-Webster, have both analyzed the road and initially made the recommendations on establishing the district.

Mr. Dolan summarized the process that has occurred up to this point and advised this is the first public hearing. Following this public hearing this evening, the Township Board will be voting on Resolution #3. If they vote to approve, there will still be two more resolutions passed: Resolution #4 schedules the hearing which imposes the Special Assessment, adopts the roll and liens the properties. The public hearing on Resolution #4 would occur, and if the Township votes favorably following that public hearing, Resolution #5 would be passed. He explained they are midway in the process tonight, and he stated this is the basic and most elementary form of democracy in the Township, where people can, by going door to door, get a project underway and presented to the Township. He clarified that the cost is an estimate at this time. He reminded that the roads are not under the jurisdiction of the Township, so by statute, the actual vetting of the contract is done by the Department of Roads, who has the jurisdiction over the road. They also do the engineering work related to the road, and that must be paid, so they will not have that cost until additional processes take place, so there will be some time between tonight and when Resolution #4 is passed. He advised at that time, everyone involved will be receiving another letter.

Ms. Bednar clarified the cost on the petition was computed based on each individual road and the improvement that would be done, whether it includes drainage, milling or a complete reconstruction, and that is an estimated cost.

She emphasized that the project must come within 10% of that estimated cost; otherwise, they have to get signatures again. The signatures on the current petitions were based on the estimated costs, but prior to coming back for Public Hearing #2, they will have to have the actual costs. She explained the estimated amount is a good number for now, but it cannot exceed that by more than 10% or they must start over.

Ms. Meltzer stated the initiation of the Special Assessment District (SAD) occurs at the Clerk's office, and she explained a person does not have to live in the district to create an SAD. It only takes a short time to fill it out, and it is then sent to the Director of the Department of Public Services. She gets the cost and demographics together. She advised that the Township is required by Public Act 188 to give notice within ten days of any of the hearings, and that did occur. This was posted in the Fraser-Clinton Chronicle on February 21<sup>st</sup>, as well as the Journal, which was 12 days prior in one publication, and 13 days prior in the other, so that requirement has been met. She assured that no one has been treated any different than any other SAD in terms of notification. Ms. Meltzer indicated she has been receiving many telephone calls and commented on a lot of items that were not interpreted correctly, so she was confident that they will get more information and questions answered this evening.

Mr. Pearl inquired as to whether the prices quoted to the residents was without County participation.

Ms. Bednar replied affirmatively, that the prices were quoted without County participation, and in all four cases, the County has notified the Township, indicating they are willing to pay 50% of the cost.

Mr. Pearl stated that the estimated assessments will be half of the original price quoted to each resident because the County is participating 50% in each of these SAD's.

Mr. Cannon opened the public hearing for Project P-2007 Thornton Street Paving. He explained how the public hearing will be held and stressed that heckling and outbursts will not be permitted. He pointed out that there are four projects tonight for which the County has agreed to participate, and up until two years ago, the County did not participate financially in any of them. The Township has been very fortunate the last three years to get most road projects on the County's books. He cautioned if any of these projects are not followed through, they will most likely not get back on the County's books this year, and they do not know if the County will be participating in a project like this in subsequent years.

Mr. Bob Feyers, 36719 Tessens, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, read a letter he had sent to the Township, indicating he is in opposition to this

Special Assessment. He claimed he is representing the sentiment of most of the property owners on Tessens and Marston. He complained about having only a day-and-a-half to decide whether to sign the first petition at a neighborhood block meeting on September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017 because there was a rush to get it submitted. He claimed Tessens and Marston do not need repairs like Thornton. He claimed eleven of the thirteen homes that make up the Tessens portion of this SAD have signed and submitted a petition to the Township requesting that Tessens be removed from the project. He claimed at the meeting where they signed the petition, it was not made clear that there would be a lien placed on each home that would have to be paid off before those properties could be sold. He complained that, for a homeowner with an 80-foot frontage, which includes most homes in that district, the cost is around \$17,439.61, or \$145.33 a month for ten years. Mr. Feyers informed that an objection letter was sent to Ms. Bednar on October 4<sup>th</sup>, rejecting Tessens and Marston. He agreed that Thornton is in bad shape, but he claimed Tessens and Marston are no worse than any other street in that subdivision and should not be included in the SAD. He acknowledged that the intersection of Tessens and Marston is the only bad area. He claimed that the eleven signatures on the petition to remove Tessens make up 20% of the Special Assessment District, and he further claimed that, even with the withdrawal of all signatures of those on Tessens and Marston, they still have the required signatures, and he did not feel it is fair to continue to include them in the district. He pointed out that some of his neighbors cannot afford this, and one resident is currently in foreclosure now.

Mr. Dolan inquired as to whether Mr. Feyers felt he had to present his objection tonight to stop the proceeding, based on the way he interpreted the statute.

Mr. Feyers replied that is correct.

Mr. Dolan urged Mr. Feyers to look at the statute again, because the portion to which he is referring deals with the process being initiated by the Township, and if that is the case, then by the first public hearing, which is tonight, the residents would have had to have collected at least 20% in signatures to present at the meeting. He clarified this is not a Township-initiated special assessment, so that process of having a decision made tonight to end the proceedings involves where the Township would initiate a special assessment, and that did not occur. This was a petition-initiated assessment. He noted that the Township has all the way up to adopting Resolution #5 to abandon a special assessment.

Mr. Feyers argued that he submitted 20% of the signatures in opposition that the Township should consider.

Mr. Dolan informed that is only if the Township initiated the special assessment and the signatures were submitted, they could still proceed, but they would have to change it into a resident-initiated assessment. If this was Township-initiated and 20% objected, the Township could abandon it or opt to see if the residents want to go and circulate a petition. If they got 50%, then the project could still go forward. He reiterated the Township starts with resident-initiated petitions because it has always been the Township's feeling that it should be what the residents want, and the residents' votes count the most.

Mr. Feyers complained that the process started 1-1/2 days prior to the residents in opposition turning in their petition.

Mr. Cannon explained that if 50% or more in the entire district remove their name, they would have to start over. He replied to inquiry that the residents cannot redefine the district unless 50% or more remove their names from the petition. He stated they currently have over 60% who have indicated they want to proceed with the project.

Mr. Feyers challenged that the initial district was incorrect.

Mr. Cannon stated that is Mr. Feyers' opinion, but this is a public hearing to hear comments. He reiterated the only way to start over and redefine a district is to have more than 50% of the signers of the original petition removing their name.

Mr. Feyers complained that is not fair because that would require people on Thornton removing their names, and they would "lose" as well because they want the repairs to their street.

Further discussion took place on this issue.

Mr. Gielegghem stated there has been a question of the interest rate on the lien, and he explained that rate has not yet been defined because it is based on the prime rate and administrative costs that must be added. The interest rate depends upon when the district is established, the project is bid and scheduled for completion. They cannot bill for work that has not been done. The estimated 4.5% interest rate is not definite at this point, but the estimate was based on the last SAD. He noted it is generally the case that the lien must be paid off at the time of sale, and anyone wanting to sell their home when there is still a balance due can enter into negotiations with the potential buyer of the home, but it would be considered a private transaction.

Mr. Feyers inquired as to whether the interest rate could end up being higher than projected.

Mr. Gielegghem assured he will try to keep it as low as possible.

Mr. Feyers questioned why someone would purchase his house and pay \$20,000 more on a lien when they can go two blocks away and get the same house without that \$20,000 lien.

Mr. Gieleghem replied that is a market decision.

Mr. Feyers inquired as to the warranty on the road work.

Mr. Cannon explained the work is bid through the County, and the Township acts as a conduit. He assured the County has standards that will have to be met by the contractor.

Mr. Feyers inquired as to how overages are handled, noting that many projects go over budget, and he inquired as to who will have to absorb the additional cost, if any.

Ms. Bednar replied that the overages would get charged to the Township or to the Department of Roads, but she assured once the roll has been established and the final Resolution is adopted, they cannot put additional costs back on the residents.

Mr. Richard Shaffer, 23741 Thornton, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, on behalf of Ms. Lois Kelly, initiator of the petition, explained he worked with Ms. Kelly on this petition. He admitted they did obtain the signatures in a day-and-a-half, but when they got the petitions, they were made aware of a grant where the County would pay a portion, and the deadline for submitting that was October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017. They held a meeting at his house, and he confirmed that Mr. Feyers was present and was asked to sign, but at that point he did not want to sign. Mr. Shaffer explained he tried to get this SAD a couple of times over the last six or seven years. The first time, the Township decided to include Theodore, Tessens and Thornton, and the people on Theodore would not talk to him because their road was in good condition. That SAD was shut down, but at that time, they were given an estimate of about \$8,600 per residence. About two years later, he attempted once again, and when the assessment came back, it was \$27,000 per residence. He stated no one was interested in paying that amount, so the initiative went down. He was unaware that Ms. Kelly had started another petition, and when he talked with Ms. Bednar about an obstruction of a water line in the area that was never repaired, Ms. Bednar informed him about Ms. Kelly's desire to move the petition forward. He contacted her, and that is how the process started. He informed that he paid \$1,800 out of his own pocket to fix his corner last year. He assured that he had nothing to do with Tessens being added, and he did not believe Marston was included. He explained that the

Township created the district, and he and Ms. Kelly circulated a petition for signatures. He stated he has a neighbor who is an assessor and did inspections of homes, and he validated everything they said. They referred to it as a tax assessment, and he confirmed he did not use the word “lien” or a “loan”, but he did mention there was a 4.5-percent interest rate. Mr. Shaffer stressed that there never used to be matching grants from Macomb County. He assured this is extremely difficult for him to ask people to pay more taxes, but this is the first time that “Macomb County is offering to give us our money back”. He pointed out this is the only way they can get the money that they pay at the gas pump. With the main roads as bad as they are, he did not anticipate that the Department of Roads will be paving subdivision roads soon. He complained about the condition of not only the roads, but also the sidewalks in his neighborhood. He compared the streets to a “war zone”, claiming they are unsafe and unsightly, negatively affecting property values. He has heard that fixing the curb appeal could have a 20% positive improvement in the value of a home, and not fixing the roads could have the adverse effect. He apologized to the property owners on Tessens, but emphasized he is here to represent the people on Thornton, adding that nearly 80% of the residences on that street signed the petition in favor, and they got 68% overall who agreed with the SAD. He stated he would like to request that the properties on Tessens be removed from the SAD, but he knows that is not how SAD’s work. He was aware that there are senior citizens who are concerned about paying this on a fixed income, and they are worried about the warranty and how they are maintained after the project is complete. He explained that someone pointed out that the County uses giant trucks to plow the snow when they come through the subdivision.

Mr. Cannon inquired as to what a resident can do if they are elderly and cannot afford the SAD.

Ms. Bednar explained there is a process where they can defer the payment until the sale of the home, transfer of the home or a death of the homeowner, but there are qualifying requirements. She stated she does not have them in front of her, but Mr. Dolan will address that issue.

Mr. Dolan stated there is some provision regarding this in the General Property Code, but he clarified it is not just for people over 65 years of age, but also people with disabilities. He noted the income limit is fairly low and varies year to year. Mr. Dolan recalled that when the Act was originally adopted, the limit was around \$12,000, adding that it has gone up some since that time. There is a process, but he cautioned the threshold for qualifying requires a very low income.

Mr. Shaffer thanked Ms. Bednar and Mr. Dolan for that information and felt that may help two individual homeowners. There was some discussion

about the different subdivisions and what they are having done. He was with the understanding that they are getting a total repair, including drainage. He inquired as to the scope of the project.

Ms. Bednar read the language that was on the petition, which included the proposed work to be done, and it is on all the Resolutions, including the following improvements: full depth road reconstruction, related road drainage improvements, replacement of all driveway approaches and all other required incidental work for approximately 2,650 lineal feet of 27-foot-wide asphalt road with concrete curbs. It explains the portions of the road, and she noted the curbing in some areas would be asphalt that will be replaced with concrete curbing. The approaches will be reworked so they have proper drainage and all the drains will be addressed. Any storm sewer that needs to be replaced will all be part of the project.

Mr. Shaffer inquired as to whether the good portions of Tessens will remain intact. He indicated it was not long ago when the east side of the road had new approaches and curbs when they relined the sewers.

Ms. Bednar replied that will depend upon the topographical survey, and the overall design will be looked at to assure proper drainage.

Mr. Shaffer thanked the Board for allowing the residents to speak. He appreciated the work Ms. Bednar and Mr. Chabot have done, and pointed out he, as a resident, could not have accomplished this on his own. He appreciated the frustration of some of the residents who feel their roads are not bad, but he also stressed his frustration of the deteriorating street he has experienced over the last seven years. He urged the residents to keep in mind that this is the first time and may be the last time the residents have the opportunity to get their gas tax back from the County, and if this process is stopped, they may be giving their money away. He stated he worked extremely hard to get the signatures.

Mr. Shawn Matics, 23904 Marston, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, complained that whoever came up with this district “needs to go back to high school”. He felt some of the roads are not bad and should be repaved rather than torn up and redone. He complained that he has paid property taxes at this location for 17 years, and his street has never been in good enough shape to roller blade on.

Mr. Cannon explained the Township does not have any funds to repave.

Mr. Matics felt they should raise everyone’s taxes rather than assessing certain people. He urged the Township to set up a toll booth on his corner because he claimed the people using the roads do not live on those

streets. He complained that he is on the assessment roll and does not feel he should be included because he is on Marston.

Ms. Bednar pointed out that Mr. Matics lives on the corner of Marston and Tessens and that is why he is in the district.

Mr. Matics complained that everyone on Marston should be assessed if he has to pay.

Mr. Cannon pointed out to Mr. Matics that, while his house may face Marston, his driveway is on Tessens.

Mr. Robert Stephens, 23675 Thornton, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, was confident that no one on their street will complain about receiving a 50% discount on the cost. He stated he is in favor of the SAD and felt they will not only be saving 50% of the cost, but it will increase their property values.

Mr. Brett Stemen, 23691 Thornton, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, explained he always dreamt of owning his own house, and when his parents passed away, he was able to purchase his home. He agreed his street is in very bad shape, and although he does not understand a lot of the SAD process, he understands it will cost him, but he urged the Board to help the residents to get their street repaved so their neighborhood stays safe. He emphasized that this is a good neighborhood with great people living in it, and he is grateful to them for keeping it a nice safe neighborhood. He acknowledged that some want this repair and others do not, but he indicated he is in favor of it.

Mr. Bob Hogan, 36755 Barr Street, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, was under the impression the proposed SAD was for Thornton only. He inquired as to why his house is not included in this, and why they do not select entire streets for the district.

Mr. Cannon replied those were engineering decisions made to ensure this is a better project, and multiple considerations were given, such as pavement condition, drainage, elevations, etc. He stated their engineering consulting firm, as well as the chief engineer of the Township, make that decision.

Mr. Hogan inquired as to when Thornton was last repaved.

Ms. Bednar replied she did not know when that was last paved. She indicated she has been here seventeen years and does not know if it was done prior to her coming to the Township.

An unnamed resident replied that Thornton was repaved at least one time. He stated he bought his house in 1985, and it was done three to four years prior to that. He recalled buying the house and having to pay off the lien.

Mr. Hogan inquired as to the life expectancy of the new paving.

Mr. Cannon replied he has been told that, in the State of Michigan, the average life expectancy of roads is between twenty and twenty-five years.

Mr. Will Wiggins, 23802 Thornton, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated his house is at the corner of Thornton and Tessens. He expressed confusion about the district line. He felt bad that others are involved in this, but he stressed that his street is “like a minefield”, and they experience constant problems with water and drainage. He complained that something must be done because the lack of drainage has created “a lake” on their street. He added if there is any way they can redistrict to eliminate Marston and possibly Tessens from the SAD, that would be acceptable to him, but he is anxious to get this project done this year when the County as agreed to pay 50%. He questioned what it would take for someone to come in and redo Thornton only.

Mr. Cannon replied there is no way to exclude a street from the district. He explained anyone in the proposed district has the right to remove their names from the petition, and if the number of signatures dips below 50%, then the residents can try to start over with petitions for a new district.

Mr. Eric Dougherty, 23905 Marston, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, questioned that if this is approved, what will happen in two years when Marston needs to get redone. He questioned whether he will get “double-taxed”.

Ms. Bednar confirmed that Mr. Dougherty’s driveway is on Tessens, so he would not be part of the Marston Street SAD. She replied to further inquiry it has to do with the location of their driveway and their accessibility.

Mr. Dougherty stated there are two ways into the subdivision, and they have a high amount of traffic. He has a two-year-old, and he complained that motorists speed up and down the road all day. He could not understand why the rest of the subdivision is not getting assessed.

Mr. Cannon confirmed Mr. Dougherty is part of the district because of the location of his driveway.

Mr. Darwin Roche, 36611 Tessens, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, understood how difficult this is for the Township to put this together, and he understood the SAD has been formed, and he will be forced to pay whatever amount is determined. He stated he has an eight-year-old, and he complained this Special Assessment will be “taking food off” of his table and out of his eight-year-old’s mouth. He complained that they will be paying on this assessment for ten years, so his son will be eighteen years old by the time he pays this off. He felt they all agree Thornton needs to be repaired, but he could not see where Tessens is in that state of disrepair. For the residents to be forced to pay more than \$100 per month for ten years for a street he claims they do not need to redo is not what he considers “democratic”. He urged the Board not to do this to his family.

Mr. Matthew Schindler, 36600 Tessens, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated he has three little boys, and he agreed with Mr. Roche that this assessment will “take food out of their mouths” as well. He stressed he would like Tessens removed from the district. He questioned why Clinton Township is plowing the road with a 35,000-pound scraper, which is tearing up the asphalt and making it worse. He felt that Clinton Township should not be using that heavy equipment when they have no funds to contribute to the repair.

Ms. Bednar confirmed that the Township did not plow Mr. Schindler’s street. She stated they do not have a piece of equipment that size, so it would have had to have been a County vehicle. He explained they help the Department of Roads plow some of the local neighborhood roads when asked.

Mr. Schindler maintained that they were Township vehicles because he saw their logo on the side of the truck.

Ms. Bednar confirmed they have vehicles that can handle snow removal from Township-owned properties, and they only do so when requested by the Macomb County Department of Roads, adding that she verified this information from their foreman.

Mr. Schindler complained that if he is going to have to pay \$20,000 for a road in front of his house, he should have a say in the type of equipment they are using to maintain it.

Mr. Pearl stated he does not know about the plows, but the heavy garbage trucks do a lot of damage to roads, and that is why they now try to put a base down under the roads. He stated he is a builder, and the garbage trucks have ruined all their apartment complexes and their buildings, but with a better base that they have been putting in, the roads hold up much better. He explained he is in a

Special Assessment District, and although they have not yet done his road, they have completed the adjacent road, and it is beautiful. The residents pay for it, as they will on his street, but the difference is unbelievable once it is complete.

Mr. Schindler stated he is a builder as well and admitted that a garbage truck weighs about the same as a scraper, but the weight of the garbage truck is distributed over 14 wheels and that makes a big difference. He also complained that a scraper is pressing down on the surface and is meant to tear up the road. He questioned why the residents have to pay for the infrastructure of sewers, and why the Township does not have the funding for sewers.

Ms. Bednar clarified that this project does not include sewers or water main. The sewers were lined recently, and the water main was also addressed. The storm sewer related to drainage and the concerns the residents have had regarding ponding are being addressed, but she informed that is part of the infrastructure that falls within the responsibility of the Department of Roads. She stated it is not under Township jurisdiction.

Mr. Schindler inquired as to what his taxes pay for if they do not cover sewers or roads.

Mr. Cannon clarified that the taxes of Township residents do not pay for the roads.

Ms. Bednar stated the storm sewer is part of the road drainage, which is part of the road structure and is therefore addressed during road construction.

Mr. Dolan stated he thought he made it clear earlier that, on the construction of local roads, the Act 51 statute mandates that on local roads, the County must get an equal match or better. He pointed out they are doing the best they can by getting 50% from them. If the Township does not come up with the 50% or better, the road does not get done. He understood the frustration to have to pay, but not to have control because it is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Roads.

Mr. Schindler looked at the plot plan with the assessment of frontage, and he is on a cul-de-sac, so he has about 45 feet of frontage, yet according to his plot plan, his frontage is measured at about 80 feet and he is on a pie-shaped lot.

Ms. Bednar explained there was a policy established many years ago that tries to equate frontage to be equal. They live in a “birds eye”, where there is more concrete, so they try to take an offset, so if they are pie-shaped and skinny in the

front, they offset it 30 feet. If their property is “fatter” in front, they would offset it further. She looked at Mr. Schindler’s assessment, noting he would be paying for 70.39 feet, so he is paying less, even though they offset it.

Discussion took place regarding the measurements.

Mr. Cannon stated they have standards and policy they work with, and he assured they have all been addressed in this project, and anyone has the right to appeal if they feel they have not been assessed properly.

Ms. Denise Goodman, 36610 Tessens, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated she understands Thornton is bad, but she claimed her encroach and curb are beautiful, and it does not make sense to her to rip up her beautiful pavement and make her pay at least \$14,000. She claimed she has no water issues like they do at the other end of her street. She requested whoever engineered this to eliminate the homes on Marston and Tessens from the district.

Mr. Pearl inquired as to whether anything has changed regarding the percentage of signatures they now have on the petition.

Ms. Meltzer replied that they are still over 50%.

Ms. Bednar calculated that they are at 61.5%

Ms. Dee Gore, 23642 Thornton, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated her road needs to be redone. She noted that her daughter lives on Santa Barbara, and although the work has not yet started, they will be going ahead with it. She claimed that Santa Barbara is ten times worse than Thornton, yet she questioned why the prices that the Thornton residents will be paying are much higher than those assessed for the Santa Barbara district.

Mr. Cannon stated there will be a lot less work done on Santa Barbara because they have no curbs. Santa Barbara will be nice when it is done, but he reiterated they are not having as much work done.

Ms. Gore claimed the residents on Santa Barbara did not get the 50% match from the Department of Roads.

Mr. Cannon stated the residents on Santa Barbara did get the 50% match from the Department of Roads and advised that Ms. Gore’s daughter should double-check her paperwork.

Ms. Gore stated her biggest fear is to have to make the decision about this amount of money, because she and her husband are both retired and living on a budgeted income. She added that not knowing an exact cost scares her.

Mr. Cannon stated she will know how much before this process is completed.

Mr. Dolan explained if the Resolution #3 passes, the next time the Township Board will get together to vote, they will be establishing a date for a public hearing. Resolution #4 will be passed to set that date, and the Clerk will be directed to send out notices by mail to everyone, and it will be published in the paper. The public hearing will be held, and people can come before the Board. He indicated at that time they will know the price, and the actual assessment for each property will be calculated. It is at that meeting where, if homeowners want to preserve their rights, they must appear, have a representative appear, or provide proper notice in accordance with the statute in writing before the meeting, and they have a right to appeal within thirty days. He replied to further inquiry that when the notice goes out, she will have those figures on the notice, and she has the right to show up at the meeting and object to the process if she so desires, which would reserve her right to appeal within thirty days.

Ms. Meltzer questioned whether a resident can remove their name from the petition at that time.

Mr. Dolan replied that, in the past, they have allowed people to withdraw up until Resolution #5, but that is at the discretion of the Board.

Mr. Pearl asked the engineers why Tessens was included, and he was told that it was engineered that way because of the corners. He did not know if Thornton will work out on its own, but if the residents of Thornton opt to pull out on behalf of the other people, he does not know if the project will work. He noted it will be a question in the future whether the match from the Department of Roads will be available if they reapply. He sympathized for the people on Tessens, but he did not feel the Board can make the decision to say no at this point. He does not want to kill a project that still has 61% of the people in favor of it. He stated he drove it and it appeared Thornton was worse than the other streets, but the Township's consulting engineering firm assured it is necessary to include these other areas.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, supported by Mr. Gielegghem, to close Public Hearing #1 on Special Assessment Project P-2007 Thornton Street Paving. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Gielegghem stated Mr. Dolan mentioned this, but he reminded that the sole source of funding for roads is the gas tax and car registrations. There was a proposal to increase the gas tax to give them the dollars they needed, but that

proposal failed. The money was not there, and the County claims they are not getting enough money to address all the road projects coming in. Cities receive road dollars, and those can be combined with a millage to fix the roads; however, he pointed out Townships do not receive road dollars and their roads are covered by the County. Clinton Township is the most populated Township in the State of Michigan, and they have neighborhoods that are seventy years old, yet they are in competition for the same dollars that the Department of Roads is having to use to buy rights-of-way to turn two-lane roads into five-lane roads. The Township's argument to the Department of Roads is that they are just trying to maintain their neighborhoods and are not turning farm fields into subdivisions and expanding the roads. Mr. Gielegghem explained the question came up by a resident regarding what their taxes pay for, and he asked the custodian to go into his office and obtain some flyers, which are now on the back table for anyone interested. He explained the brochure explains that summer taxes all go to the schools and county, and the Township receives their taxes in the winter tax collection, and that includes police, fire and general fund. He pointed out that everything not related to police, fire, water and sewer is covered by 1 mil, which is Headlee-reduced to about 0.82 mil. He explained he has put this insert into the tax bills because it is important for residents to know where their taxes go, and he urged residents to pick up one tonight from the back table.

Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Gielegghem, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

**9. ADOPT RESOLUTION #3 – SPECIAL ASSESSMENT PROJECT P-2007 THORNTON STREET PAVING: PREPARE ASSESSMENT ROLL**

Motion by Mr. Cannon, supported by Mr. Aragona, to adopt Resolution #3 for Special Assessment Project P-2007 Thornton Street Paving, as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – Cannon, Aragona, Keys, Pearl, Gielegghem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

**10. PUBLIC HEARING #1 – SPECIAL ASSESSMENT PROJECT P-2015 LAKEWOOD STREET PAVING**

Mr. Cannon stated this is a public hearing for Special Assessment Project P-2015 Lakewood Street Paving.

Ms. Christine Wysong, 23431 Lakewood, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, explained that she initiated the proposal. She has been a resident on Lakewood for twenty years, and a small portion of the road has been deteriorating steadily to the point where it is now undriveable. She complained that many of the residents on her street have to drive down Harvard Shore and cut over. She is pleased that this provides an opportunity for residents to get 50% of that cost paid, which is a win-win.

She was confident the residents on Harvard Shore will also be pleased because they will have a lot less traffic on their street once Lakewood is redone. She thanked Ms. Bednar and Ms. Meltzer for their help on this, and she claimed the residents have a right to be able to drive on their own street.

Mr. Gerald Eggart, 23256 Lakewood, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, thanked the Board for holding this public hearing. He stated he has talked to several people who came out to conduct the surveys, as well as contractors who took the measurements for the drainage. He commended the Township on the good people they have working on this, and he appreciated Ms. Wysong initiating this petition, but he noted that she, along with much of the neighborhood, have no vested interest in this financially because none of them have frontage that is being assessed, and they are not participating in the cost. He questioned whether it is 50% of the persons that have to support the petition for it to go forward.

Mr. Cannon clarified it is 50% of the ownership of front footage.

Mr. Eggart stated the road is 750 feet based on what is being proposed, so he would assume the lineal footage would be 1,500 feet because there are two sides of the road.

Ms. Bednar confirmed the total footage is 1,512.37 linear feet.

Mr. Eggart stated he personally represents 250 feet of that road, and he questioned what is being done.

Ms. Bednar read the description from Resolution #3.

Mr. Eggart requested clarification on curbs being added.

Ms. Bednar confirmed no curbs are being added.

Mr. Eggart questioned driveway approaches, noting that his driveway approach is currently mud, although most homes have gravel approaches.

Mr. Chabot replied that the cost estimate includes the approaches up to the right-of-way.

Mr. Eggart inquired as to whether those approaches will be blacktop.

Mr. Chabot replied they will be concrete to meet the requirements of the County's Department of Roads.

Mr. Eggart stated he is pleased to hear they will be concrete. He explained the road is about one mile in length, and his home is about two or three lots off Harper, and one lot is wooded. The drainage on the road runs east to west, and his westernmost property line is at the edge of Tebo Creek. He stated the water goes in at that point, flows behind the residences on his side of the street, and back out to Lake St. Clair. He claimed the first 250 feet of drainage in Tebo Creek is a submerged buried pipe, which is most likely sixty to seventy percent occluded. When they get a heavy rain, the opening floods to the level of the current roadway but it does not exceed it. He understood part of this improvement will be cleaning out the ditches and increasing the amount of rainwater that is going into that drain. He asked the engineer and the consulting engineer if there was any evaluation of that underground drain to have it cleaned out because he was concerned it could end up flooding his street as well as Harper Avenue.

Ms. Bednar believed that has been considered.

Mr. Chabot replied they are in the process of looking at the engineering plans, and all drainage considerations are underway. He anticipated within a week or two they will have a firm idea of what they are going to do. He assured all those items would have to be addressed to meet the design requirements of the County.

Mr. Gielegem inquired as to whether this would involve the County's Public Works Department.

Mr. Chabot replied it could involve them.

Mr. Eggart wants to assure that Harper will not flood and there will eventually be more cost to fix that issue. He questioned whether bankruptcy releases liability on a special assessment.

Mr. Cannon replied this is a lien on the property.

Mr. Eggart questioned what happens if a property owner is not in financial hardship when this assessment is made, but their situation changes down the road which places them in the position of a financial hardship. He inquired as to whether they can apply for relief at that time.

Mr. Dolan replied he does not know the answer to that question now, but he suggested Mr. Eggart contact him tomorrow and he will have the answer for him.

Mr. Eggart stated he is fine with receiving the answer at the next meeting when this is being addressed. He questioned who is loaning the money to the property owners for this assessment.

Mr. Cannon replied the Township is loaning the money for the Special Assessment.

Mr. Gielegghem noted the Department of Roads wants their payment up front, so the Township fronts the dollars.

Discussion took place regarding whether the interest paid is deductible for income tax purposes.

Mr. Gielegghem clarified that interest paid on Special Assessments is non-deductible. He indicated some people obtain a home equity loan and use that to pay off the amount, so they are not paying the Township's interest rate but paying whatever interest rate they can get from a lender, but they can then claim the interest they pay.

Mr. Pearl stated the tax laws have changed and that cannot be deducted.

Mr. Gielegghem stated they can still deduct under \$10,000.

Mr. Eggart questioned whether this can be arranged so he can get a separate tax bill for this assessment. He noted that the tax bill he receives now goes to his mortgage company and is paid through them.

Mr. Gielegghem stated it will be mailed on the tax bill, but he has the option of paying it in one lump sum each year. He can contact his lender and request to have the Special Assessment broken out, although he would still have to pay the annual assessment

Mr. Eggart stated that, as owner of 23256 Lakewood, he is in favor of moving forward to the next step in this process.

Mr. Salvatore Russo, 23389 Lakewood, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, agreed that the road is bad, and he thanked Ms. Wysong for bringing this forward. He stated he has a four-wheel drive truck and he will not drive it on his street anymore, so he has to drive down Harvard Shore to avoid the bad portion of his street. He complained that it is on a school route and should be fixed. He felt that a 50% match by the County is a great deal for those who must pay, and although he sympathized with those being assessed, he felt all the residents have a right to drive on their street to Harper. He was concerned that if they do not take advantage of

the 50% match, the residents may be stuck paying the whole bill in the future.

Mr. Kirt Lang, 23225 Harvard Shore, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated he and his neighbors have had to endure all the Lakewood residents driving on their street, sometimes a little too fast. He likes the idea that this will be completed.

Ms. Jessica Finch, 23303 Lakewood, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated her property is included in this Special Assessment District. She pointed out there is a lot of support for this from the other end of the street where they have no financial interest. She stressed this is a huge financial impact and would love a new road, but as a collective group included in the Special Assessment District, it is their decision and they will make it judiciously.

Mr. Nicholas Kane, 23277 Lakewood, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated he is the only resident who has a driveway that extends right down to the road. He commented that this is the second driveway he has put in. He questioned whether they will be tearing out the approach. He explained he had it designed in a way that would withstand extra weight, and he would like it replaced that way.

Mr. Chabot replied the replacement will be based on the County's specifications, which is six-inch concrete on a six-inch aggregate base. He replied to inquiry that if it was a permitted installation of the driveway approach, it would have been installed this way.

Mr. Kane stated he has a drain that goes underneath his driveway, and they had to reroute it to guarantee it would not crack again. The special design he had was the only way it would work so it would not crack again.

Mr. Chabot replied they are still going through the design process. He assured they will be taking that into consideration.

Mr. Kane believed he is the only house that has a drainage ditch in front of it. He questioned whether there is any way for him to opt in to get it covered while this work is being done.

Mr. Cannon replied no.

Ms. Bednar explained Mr. Kane can obtain a permit through the Department of Roads and pay for it to be done.

Ms. Lenore Lentz, 23233 Harvard Shore, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated they had their street done, and she felt it has greatly added to the value of her home. She sympathized with the people on Lakewood but pointed out they are eligible for a 50% match from the County, which is great. She indicated they did not have that benefit. She complained about the speeding on her street, although she admitted there are probably some Harvard Shore residents speeding as well as the Lakewood residents who are using their street as a cut-through.

Mr. Cannon pointed out that the cost of materials continues to rise, and the price quoted the first time was less for the entire project than the 50% share that will be assessed to the property owners this time.

Ms. Ewa Rogalski, 23311 Lakewood, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, complained that the road has been in bad condition for twenty years, and she sympathized with the owners of three or four lots, indicating it will be expensive for them. She added that she has been using Harvard Shore.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, supported by Mr. Keys, to close Public Hearing #1 on Special Assessment Project P-2015 Lakewood Street Paving. Roll Call: Ayes - Pearl, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

**11. ADOPT RESOLUTION #3 – SPECIAL ASSESSMENT PROJECT P-2015 LAKEWOOD STREET PAVING: PREPARE ASSESSMENT ROLL**

Motion by Mr. Pearl, supported by Mr. Aragona, to adopt Resolution #3 for Special Assessment Project P-2015 Lakewood Street Paving, as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Aragona, Keys, Cannon, Gielegem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

**12. PUBLIC HEARING #1 – SPECIAL ASSESSMENT PROJECT P-2018 ABELA STREET PAVING**

Mr. Cannon stated this is the public hearing for Special Assessment Project P-2018 Abela Street Paving.

Mr. Kenneth Frey, 16426 Abela, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated that many of his questions have already been answered this evening. He is a long-time resident of Clinton Township and lives at the west end of Abela, and he and many of his neighbors have installed an additional three feet of concrete onto their driveway and extending to the street. He explained they did it because there were originally going to be culverts; however, the builder put in a storm sewer pipe. They graded it and put in additional cement, so they would have the additional parking

space and they had the advantage of a curb-less curb. He questioned whether that will be replaced.

Mr. Cannon replied he did not believe that will be replaced.

Ms. Bednar explained they are required to design to meet the standards of the County's Department of Roads. She explained that is not a permitted use of the approach and will not be replaced.

Mr. Frey stated that does not address the additional three feet of cement they have added.

Mr. Chabot clarified that the concrete will be removed but not replaced. He replied to further inquiry that they will end up with an additional three feet of grass, and the County will seed it.

Mr. Frey inquired as to whether they would consider prohibiting parking on their street or, at the very least, limiting it to one side of the street. He cited instances where the residents had large gatherings, making it impossible for emergency vehicle access on the remainder of the street.

Police Chief Posavetz replied to inquiry that requests such as this must be directed to the Department of Roads.

Mr. Keys advised that the Department of Roads has a request form on their website.

Mr. Frey inquired as to whether that would require a petition.

Mr. Cannon replied it does not require a petition, and if they receive a request, they will look at it and determine whether they will allow it.

Mr. Frey claimed the administrative cost for this SAD appears to be about 25%, which he thought was high.

Ms. Maria Bourlier, 16601 Abela, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated their house was built in 1976 and the street has never been repaved. She complained about the potholes, and added she has gravel in front of her house so there is no way she can drive her antique cars. She stated she is in favor of the Special Assessment District and would have loved to have it ten years ago. She appreciated the Board's consideration of this project.

Ms. Donna Westby, 35665 Marty, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated she lives on an odd-shaped parcel. She added that, while she

wants the road to be done, she feels as though she is being assessed for 30 feet more than her frontage. She stated she can appeal but is concerned she will have to establish that there is no benefit to her property.

Mr. Cannon advised that Ms. Westby can voice her objection at the next meeting, so she reserves her right to appeal.

Mr. Dolan clarified the basis of relief is before the tax tribunal, and the burden is on the petitioner to prove the case. They have to prove there is a disproportionate benefit compared to the amount they are paying.

Ms. Westby stated she hopes the drainage is being addressed because she claimed the drainage pipe has broken.

Mr. Cannon stressed the drain is just as important as the road, but her comments have been heard this evening by the engineers.

Ms. Westby is glad this is being addressed, but her main concern is that she and her husband are getting stuck with a higher bill.

Ms. Shirley Brown, 16643 Abela, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated since they do not have sidewalks with curbs, everyone has done something different to arrange for parking in front of their homes. She explained they were advised the aprons leading to the driveways would be replaced, and she inquired as to whether this will also occur on Abela.

Mr. Cannon replied affirmatively.

Ms. Brown indicated she signed the petition in favor of this Special Assessment.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, supported by Mr. Keys, to close Public Hearing #1 on Special Assessment Project P-2018 Abela Street Paving. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegghem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

**13. ADOPT RESOLUTION #3 – SPECIAL ASSESSMENT PROJECT P-2018 ABELA STREET PAVING: PREPARE ASSESSMENT ROLL**

Motion by Mr. Aragona, supported by Mr. Gielegghem, to adopt Resolution #3 for the Special Assessment Project P-2018 Abela Street Paving, as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – Aragona, Gielegghem, Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

**14. PUBLIC HEARING #1 – SPECIAL ASSESSMENT PROJECT P-2019  
PICTON COURT PAVING**

Mr. Cannon stated this is the public hearing for Special Assessment Project P-2019 Picton Court Paving.

Ms. Andrea Goudie, 16296 Picton Court, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, explained that she is the petitioner for this project. She claimed the consensus is that their street is one of the worst streets in Clinton Township. She noted that motorists would have to drive on lawns to avoid the bad condition of the road, and almost everyone has had to rip out their curbs. She explained that she is a first-time homeowner and bought her home six months ago. She indicated that if it were not for the location of the house, they never would have purchased it because the street is so bad. She stated she had a difficult time obtaining signatures because there was an attempt at establishing an SAD ten years ago, and it was “screwed up by the Township”, with the price going up by \$20,000 per house.

Mr. Cannon corrected that two years ago, there was an attempt, and due to a County error, the prices changed by more than 10% so the project had to be aborted.

Ms. Goudie stated she has a two-year-old, as well as a four-year-old who has special needs and is picked up in front of her house. She claimed the bus driver has even asked her what is wrong with the street, so she hoped it will be approved. She noted they are taking a huge loss in their home values due to the condition of the street.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, supported by Ms. Meltzer, to close Public Hearing #1 on Special Assessment Project P-2019 Picton Court Paving. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Meltzer, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegem. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

**15. ADOPT RESOLUTION #3 – SPECIAL ASSESSMENT PROJECT P-2019  
PICTON COURT PAVING – PREPARE ASSESSMENT ROLL**

Motion by Ms. Meltzer, supported by Mr. Aragona, to adopt Resolution #3 for the Special Assessment Project P-2019 Picton Court Paving, as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – Meltzer, Aragona, Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Gielegem. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

The meeting recessed at 8:58 p.m. and reconvened at 9:04 p.m.

**15A. PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE 2018-2019 BUDGET (formerly Item #7)**

Ms. Donna Lauretti, Finance Director, presented the proposed 2018-2019 Budget regarding the General Fund, Police and Fire Funds, Capital Improvement Fund, Sanitation Fund, and Senior Housing Fund, including revenues and expenditures, as well as projections.

Ms. Hein followed with a presentation of the Water & Sewer Fund, including revenues and expenditures, projections and breakdowns of the projects. She then proceeded to entertain questions from the Board.

Mr. Gielegghem noted that the assumed rate of tax growth, based on tonight's presentation, is 3%, yet he heard the Consumer Price Index (CPI) is about 2.1%. He questioned how they are getting 3%.

Ms. Lauretti explained that last year it was 0.9 and it ended being a 2.8% increase.

Mr. James Elrod, Assessor, explained that new construction and uncapping, take place, and some of that is a heavy rollback, but they feel comfortable with the new construction, which does not roll back.

Ms. Lauretti reiterated that last year, they had a 0.9% CPI increase, but still experienced a 2.8% overall tax revenue increase, so when they saw the CPI is 2.1%, they felt comfortable with an estimation of 3% in a tax revenue increase.

Mr. Gielegghem inquired as to the basis for the increases in revenue-sharing.

Ms. Lauretti replied those are based on estimates provided by the State Department of Treasury, noting they have on-line estimates.

Mr. Gielegghem recalled they got significantly more last year.

Ms. Lauretti stated she had to adjust the current year's figures because they came in higher than the previous year by around 2.8%, and their projections are showing another 1.2% increase in the upcoming year.

Mr. Gielegghem stated he is familiar with changes to the State law on health care and pension liabilities. He noted that MERS (Michigan Employees Retirement System) changed the way they factored life expectancy tables, etc. He questioned whether they came through and changed the rate of funding, in spite of the fact that there was no dollar change in the funding.

Ms. Lauretti informed that one of the two major assumptions that affected the funding rate were the mortality tables, which assumes people are living longer. That automatically increased the Township's accrued liability. She added the second of the two major assumptions was that they had an assumed rate of return on investments, and they were using 8%. They reduced that down to 7.75%, so the assumption going forward is that they do not feel the communities will earn as much, so the liability is higher because they have to make up for that amount. She replied to further inquiry that they did the same thing in Police and Fire as was done in MERS.

Mr. Gielegem stated if they were to estimate total required contribution for MERS, Police, Fire and health care, and are doing double contributions for the extra, he inquired as to what that total will be.

Ms. Lauretti replied that the regular contribution for retiree health care is \$5.2 million. With the addition of another \$5.2 million, they will be contributing \$10.4 million into the retiree health care system in April 2018. She stated the regular contribution for MERS is \$2.6 million, so they will add another \$2.6 million for a total contribution of \$5.2 million going into MERS. She replied to further inquiry that Police and Fire is about 80% funded at this point, so her recommendation is to keep watching it and see what happens. If it trends downward, they may have to address it.

Mr. Gielegem inquired as to the required contribution for Police and Fire.

Ms. Lauretti explained that is included in each individual budget. She noted the contribution to Police Pension Fund is approximately \$2.2 million, and the contribution to Fire Pension Fund is approximately \$2.7 million. The two together is their annual required contribution, which totals \$4.9 million.

Mr. Gielegem noted that the Fire Fund balance is "within the ballpark", but toward the end of the projections they are close to the low limit.

Ms. Lauretti pointed out the following year the \$750 thousand comes into play.

Mr. Gielegem inquired as to whether that is the net result of the large capital expenses they have.

Ms. Lauretti replied that it is just the way the fund progressed, and how the revenues came in and were expended. She admitted there was quite a few capital expenditures, with several million dollars spent on vehicles.

Mr. Gielegem questioned whether the \$700 thousand annual bond payment coming off in 2023 should get them back on an upward trajectory.

Ms. Lauretti replied affirmatively, noting that is what they are anticipating. She replied to further inquiry that they have the bond schedules in their office but do not have them here tonight. She noted all other debt besides water and sewer is very minimal.

Mr. Gieleghem inquired as to whether they have a total road projection.

Ms. Lauretti replied they have nothing in the current budget for roads. That happens as they get those numbers, but they do not have any numbers yet.

Mr. Cannon noted the projects mentioned in his letter.

Mr. Gieleghem noted the dollars talked about for the various projects were budgeted last year as changes to the budget.

Ms. Lauretti confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Gieleghem inquired as to whether road projects that come up will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Lauretti replied affirmatively.

Mr. Gieleghem inquired as to budget rate increases for water and sewer and inquired as to what they are anticipating.

Ms. Hein replied that the water increase is preliminary. There were two scenarios they were looking at and did not come up with a final number. She assumed 4.7% increase for water, and 7.5% for sewer.

Mr. Gieleghem questioned whether that is an increase of approximately 7.5%.

Ms. Bednar clarified that water is approximately one-third of the bill, sewer is approximately two-thirds of the bill and the rest is for rubbish.

Ms. Hein stated the overall increase would be at some point in between, which would be about 6.5%. She cautioned that is preliminary, especially the amount for sewer, because she has received nothing in writing from them.

Mr. Gieleghem commented that the water rates are “reaching a tipping point”. He hears complaints every day as people come to his office to pay their bills. He understands that infrastructure is their biggest concern, and he also understands there is a lot for which they do not have control and involves what the Great Lakes Water Authority (GLWA) is passing on to the Township. He felt they need to be aware of the public’s concern. He thanked Ms. Lauretti and Ms. Hein for their presentation.

Mr. Cannon stated this is a starting point, and they know they will be making changes throughout the year. He felt this is a good starting point.

Mr. Bob Hogan, 36755 Barr, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, questioned the \$160 thousand under the “Drug Forfeiture Revenues” line item. He questioned whether that is cash.

Ms. Laretti confirmed that is cash, and it results from the sale of any assets the Township owns and sells.

Mr. Hogan questioned “Contributions for Sidewalks” and inquired as to whether they are replacing sidewalks in the Township. He noted that there has not been any activity in years past for this item.

Ms. Laretti explained the Township just revived the Sidewalk Program. She stated that the Township had a Sidewalk Program years ago, but they went many years without one, so it is now being revived.

Ms. Bednar stated they went out to bid and are looking at one neighborhood at a time, looking at the sidewalks in those neighborhoods. She stated another component of sidewalks is determining those that exceed their trip hazard requirements by law, so they are looking at those as well. They are hoping to bring this back each year, so they can move on to the next neighborhood and eventually get ahead of it. She commented that they have not been doing this program since the recession.

Mr. Hogan thought the homeowner is responsible for his/her own sidewalk.

Ms. Bednar clarified they are bidding it out and have a competitive bid, but it is being assessed to the homeowners and they have five years to pay it off, or they can pay it in full at the time of repair/replacement.

Mr. Pearl stated he would make a motion to approve this budget, but it had been pointed out to him that in the last ten years, the budget has never been approved on the night of the public hearing when it was first presented, and they have always waited to the next meeting to approve it. He indicated it is up to the Board.

Ms. Laretti and Ms. Hein recalled it has occurred in the past where approval was made on the night of the public hearing.

Motion by Mr. Cannon, supported by Ms. Meltzer, to receive and file the budget presentation, and adopt the 2018-2019 Fiscal Year Township Budget as

presented this evening; further, to adopt the “Year Ending 3/31/18 Estimated” column as the “2017-2018 Amended Budget”; further, to include the proposal for the additional retiree health care and MERS contributions as presented. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Gieleghem explained that, when considering the adoption of Ordinances and amendments, the law requires the Board to hold a public hearing and adopt it at the next meeting. He stated he has advocated for this in the past because he felt it is important to have a public discussion and then a subsequent meeting where it is adopted. He admitted he would like to see this done so they can move forward, but he felt it is important to honor the same way they handle ordinances and the way they have handled the budget in the past.

Mr. Cannon commented that the budget has been handled both ways in the past.

Mr. Gieleghem believed the Board has adopted the budget on the night of the public hearing only once in the last ten years. He reiterated that it is important for everyone to hear the budget and have the opportunity to come back to the next meeting with any questions they have thought of.

Mr. Cannon stated he will not be at the next meeting, and pointed out that, since it is a Supervisor’s budget, he would like to be able to vote on it.

Mr. Gieleghem felt Mr. Cannon’s voice is being heard in the budget because it is his budget.

Mr. Cannon pointed out that the Board members have had the budget to review for at least three weeks.

Mr. Gieleghem acknowledged that they have had it for a while, and he expressed his appreciation for having that much time to review it.

Mr. Cannon reminded the budget is a “roadmap” that can be changed, and he was sure there will be changes as they go along.

Mr. Keys echoed Mr. Gieleghem’s sentiments about waiting two weeks to adopt the budget. He stated they have had the proposed budget for three weeks and he has spoken to many residents in that time, explaining to them the process that the budget will be presented at this meeting, and adopted at the next, based on what they have done in the past and what was done last year. He explained he would feel bad if it is approved at the public hearing, and he could not see a reason to adopt it tonight. He understood Mr. Cannon’s concern about not being here at the next meeting to vote on it, but he was confident that Mr. Cannon’s views are well-pointed out in the budget. He felt, out of respect to the residents who may have been watching this meeting for over three hours, and expecting

them to digest all of this, they may have questions and will want to reach out to the Supervisor's office or individual trustees. Mr. Keys reiterated that he would like to vote on the budget at the next meeting, which is what this Board did last year.

Roll Call (to adopt the budget): Ayes – Cannon, Meltzer, Aragona. Nays – Keys, Pearl, Gielegghem. Absent – West. The motion failed for lack of votes.

Motion by Mr. Keys, supported by Mr. Pearl, to receive and file the budget presentation for the proposed 2018-2019 Fiscal Year Township Budget. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Gielegghem recommended that this be placed on the next agenda for adoption.

Mr. Cannon stated it will have to be placed on the next agenda; otherwise, the Township will not have a budget prior to the start of the next fiscal year.

Roll Call (to receive and file): Ayes – Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegghem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

#### **16. WORK SCOPE CHANGE FOR THE FY 2018 SEWER CCTV AND CLEANING PROJECT**

Motion by Mr. Pearl, supported by Ms. Meltzer, to receive and file the letter dated March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018 from Mr. Scott J. Chabot, PE, Senior Project Manager, Giffels Webster, and approve the work scope change for the ACO sewer investigations on Mulberry, Wendell and North Nunneley area as part of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 Sanitary Sewer Trunkline CCTV & Cleaning, with a net increase in the project budget of \$57,512.99, which will amend the project budget from the previously approved budget amount of \$376,961.25 to \$434,474.24 for this additional ACO sewer investigation work. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Meltzer, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegghem. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

#### **17. BID AWARD – ZONE 6 MANHOLE REHABILITATION**

Motion by Mr. Keys, supported by Mr. Gielegghem, to receive and file the letter dated February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2018 from Mr. Scott J. Chabot, PE, Senior Project Manager, Giffels Webster, and award the bid for the Zone 6 Manhole Rehabilitation Project to the low bidder, D.V.M. Utilities, Inc., in the amount of \$149,690.00, as outlined in the correspondence. Roll Call: Ayes – Keys, Gielegghem, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

**18. REQUEST APPROVAL FOR TAP (TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM) GRANT SUBMISSION FOR PATHWAY AND BRIDGE OVER CLINTON RIVER ALONG CASS AVENUE**

Mr. Pearl inquired as to whether this is “all or nothing” and whether they are submitting this all as one request.

Ms. Bednar confirmed that this is all one project.

Ms. Meltzer noted they prioritize percentage of matching funds, up to 35%; however, she felt it is prudent to see what they can get with a 20% match. She appreciated the work that Mr. Cannon, Ms. Bednar, Mr. Santia and Mr. Pizzo have done on this. She felt it is a great project and hoped they will be awarded a grant.

Mr. Cannon stated they will soon be announcing a surprise of another \$2 million grant they received.

Mr. Keys thanked them for the map they put together, and he added he would love to see a similar project that connects the Metro Parkway Bike/Hike path to George George Park so that those residents living in the south end of the Township can ride their bikes to that park. He added he is excited about this, noting that walkability was very evident in the surveys put out through Parks & Recreation.

Mr. Cannon agreed with Mr. Keys, and stated he would be very excited about a path that would connect the Metro Parkway Bike/Hike path to George George Park.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, supported by Mr. Keys, to receive and file the letter dated March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018 from the Township Supervisor, Director of Public Services, Director of Planning and Director of Parks and Recreation, and approve the grant submittal for a Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Grant to assist in the costs of a proposed shared use pathway along Clinton River Road, Cass Avenue and Clinton River Road, along with a bridge over the Clinton River as part of this grant application, as outlined in the correspondence. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

**19. INTRODUCTION OF TOWNSHIP ORDINANCE #441: REGULATION OF COLLECTION BOXES**

Mr. Cannon stated he talked with Mr. Miller and Mr. Santia because some of the wording is not reflective of their intent. He noted some of the fees will be looked

at to be adjusted downward. He explained this is the introduction of this ordinance, and it will be presented in two weeks.

Mr. Gieleghem stated when this went to Budget/Ways & Means, it was explained that these are collection boxes run by charities and placed in vacant parking lots, as well as church and school parking lots. He noted that many times, these boxes are filled up, not emptied, and debris is scattered all around them, so this is an ordinance to control that issue. He inquired as to whether they did any checking on how this industry is structured and why the Township is doing this.

Mr. Barry Miller, Superintendent of the Building Department, explained that these bins are put in place by the owner of the bin. They go to each of the locations and ask the owner or operator of that location if they can place their bin on that property. He is not sure if they always receive permission, especially in the cases where the bins are placed on vacant parcels. Mr. Miller stated he reached out to four different owners who were localized, and they are not receiving any rent from them. He commented the gentleman he spoke with from Value Center was very happy this ordinance is going forward because he is having problems with the people who have placed the bins on his property. He does not know how to get rid of them because he felt he is causing problems for the people doing this for charity, but he noted his employees are having to clean up the mess in the front. This ordinance will reduce the number of bins from four to two, and he can select the two he wants. Mr. Miller noted the former K-Mart and Kroger locations have become dumping grounds, and this ordinance will help that situation.

Mr. Gieleghem shared the sentiments of the owner of Value Center, pointing out the Township does not want to be viewed as “clamping down” on charities’ ability to secure these items, but they need to make sure these bins are maintained. He questioned who maintains the bins, and whether the charities maintain them.

Mr. Miller did not receive response from them. He pointed out the bins for St. Vincent de Paul and DAV maintain their own. Some of them are well-managed and cared for, but this is an ordinance to help the Township chase down the people responsible for creating a blight situation. It does not always apply to the churches and schools, noting they provide a good service for the people who are there, and they often help the people in the community, which is why they want to continue. Allowing them to be in a residential district at a school or church, where they are well-maintained by their staff, is a good thing.

Mr. Gieleghem thanked Mr. Miller for his additional research on this issue.

Mr. Keys thanked Mr. Miller for speaking with him on this issue. He also thanked Budget/Ways and Means Committee for taking the time to look at this thoroughly.

He recalled his first complaints to the Building Department were on these bins, and the unkept bins make the businesses look bad.

Mr. Miller stated that the Department of Public Services will be working with the Building Department, and the owners will have to supply information to the Township, so they will have more avenues to get these cleaned up.

Mr. Keys indicated Mr. Miller will provide a list so people interested in donating to some of these charities will know where these boxes are located, and he thanked Mr. Miller for doing this.

Motion by Mr. Keys, supported by Mr. Pearl, to receive, file and concur with the letter dated February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2018 from the Chairperson of the Budget/Ways & Means Committee, and introduce and publish Township Ordinance #441 – Regulation of Collection Boxes, with the intent to adopt at the next meeting, subject to some minor revisions. Roll Call: Ayes – Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

#### **20. REQUEST CLOSED SESSION TO DISCUSS CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS**

Mr. Cannon stated the Board will be coming out of Closed Session.

Motion by Ms. Meltzer, supported by Mr. Keys, to schedule a Closed Session immediately following the last item on tonight's agenda for the purpose of discussing contract negotiations. Roll Call: Ayes – Meltzer, Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegem. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

#### **21. REQUEST APPROVAL FOR CLINTON TOWNSHIP POLICE DEPARTMENT TO DISPLAY TWO (2) BANNERS**

Motion by Mr. Pearl, supported by Mr. Gielegem, to receive and file the letter dated February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2018 from the Township Supervisor, and approve the request from the Police Department, to display two (2) banners advertising their annual Spaghetti Dinner Fundraiser on March 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018 at The Mirage Banquet Hall, as outlined in the correspondence. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Gielegem, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2018 REGULAR TOWNSHIP BOARD MEETING**

Motion by Mr. Gielegem, supported by Mr. Keys, to approve the minutes of the February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2018 Regular Township Board Meeting with the changes as noted. Discussion ensued.

Ms. Meltzer stated she does not have the changes.

Mr. Gielegghem explained the changes he has requested. He noted that, regarding the discussion on the Item #22 – Treasurer’s Report, on Page 25, it indicated the investments exceeded private industry standards, but he clarified the Cash Flow Analysis is what exceeded private industry standards. He also noted on Page 26, the minutes reflected “they realized gains of 310% in December”, but he clarified that should read “they realized gains of just under 200% for the fiscal year”.

Roll Call: Ayes – Gielegghem, Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

### **APPROVAL OF BILLS**

Motion by Mr. Gielegghem, supported by Mr. Cannon, to approve the bills as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – Gielegghem, Cannon, Keys, Pearl, Aragona, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Mr. Cannon stated that there were no requests received for public comments this evening.

### **ADJOURNMENT INTO CLOSED SESSION**

The meeting adjourned into Closed Session at 10:17 p.m. and reconvened at 10:29 p.m.

### **20. CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS**

Mr. William Smith, Human Resources Director, recommended the ratification of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Charter Township of Clinton and AFSCME 1103.12 Custodians and Public Works Employees, as presented.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, supported by Mr. Gielegghem, to approve the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Charter Township of Clinton and AFSCME 1103.12 Custodians and Public Works Employees, as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Gielegghem, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

Mr. Smith recommended the ratification of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Charter Township of Clinton and AFSCME 1917.30 Building Inspectors, as presented.

Motion by Mr. Gieleghem, supported by Ms. Meltzer, to approve the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Charter Township of Clinton and AFSCME 1917.30 Building Inspectors, as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – Gieleghem, Meltzer, Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

Mr. Smith recommended the ratification of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Charter Township of Clinton and AFSCME 1103.13 Property Appraisers, as presented.

Motion by Mr. Cannon, supported by Mr. Pearl, to approve the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Charter Township of Clinton and AFSCME 1103.13 Property Appraisers, as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – Cannon, Pearl, Keys, Aragona, Gieleghem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Mr. Keys, supported by Mr. Aragona, to adjourn the meeting. Roll Call: Ayes – Keys, Aragona, Pearl, Cannon, Gieleghem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 10:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

KIM MELTZER, CLERK  
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CLINTON