

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CLINTON**  
**REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**  
**MONDAY, MARCH 25<sup>TH</sup>, 2019**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	<b>ROBERT J. CANNON</b>	<b>SUPERVISOR</b>
	<b>KIM MELTZER</b>	<b>CLERK</b>
	<b>PAUL GIELEGHEM</b>	<b>TREASURER</b>
	<b>JOE A. ARAGONA</b>	<b>TRUSTEE</b>
	<b>MIKE KEYS</b>	<b>TRUSTEE</b>
	<b>KENNETH PEARL</b>	<b>TRUSTEE</b>
	<b>JENIFER WEST</b>	<b>TRUSTEE</b>

**ABSENT: NONE**

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 and there are two add-ons as follows:

26. Request Approval to Purchase Tree Truck for DPW
27. Approval of Amendment to Non-Represented Employee Pay and Benefits Policy

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Mr. Keys, to approve the agenda as amended, with the addition of Items #26 and #27. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Keys, West, Cannon, Aragona, Gieleghem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

**PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENT**

Ms. Meltzer announced that there have been a lot of changes on upcoming elections with the passage of Proposal 3, and she would like to provide periodic updates on which changes took place in the last gubernatorial election. She informed that Proposal 3 added several voting policies to the Michigan Constitution, and although some of these voting policies existed in the State Statute, they were not included in the State Constitution. She explained they now have “No Reason” absentee voting, and Clinton Township residents will be

receiving a card or brochure in the mail in the near future advising that they can now apply for an absentee ballot and do not have to list a reason to do so. There will be a box for interested residents to check off, and in addition, there will be two other checkmark opportunities, one to provide an email address and the other a telephone number. She stressed the high cost for elections comes in mailing out information, and the information mailed is often delayed, so they are developing an email and text system in order to provide voters up-to-date information on elections, polling location changes, and other necessary information. She urged residents to watch for this information, and she indicated she will be bringing forward more information on some of the other changes that have become part of the State's Constitution and part of their practice going forward.

**1. REQUEST TO DECLARE THE MONTH OF APRIL “SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS” MONTH**

Ms. Karan Bates-Gasior, of Turning Point, explained she is here representing Turning Point for another item on tonight's agenda, but she emphasized they are requesting the Township recognize the month of April as “Sexual Assault Awareness” month. She noted that someone will be providing the Board with teal-colored ribbons to signify “Sexual Assault Awareness”. She stressed that if anyone needs the services of Turning Point, they can call their crisis line or come and visit them at their Mount Clemens office.

Nancy, a survivor of a sexual assault and part of Turning Point's Survivor Speaker Board. She explained that her sexual assault traumatized her, but through support, education, healing and sharing her story, it will never define her. She explained April is recognized across the country as “Sexual Assault Awareness Month”, and sadly, every 98 seconds, someone in the United States is sexually assaulted. She provided information and statistics, noting that last year, Turning Point provided services to 322 survivors who reside in Clinton Township. She stressed it is important that survivors know and understand that the assault was not their fault, they are not alone and help is available, and they can get help through Turning Point's 24-hour crisis line. She outlined some of the services their organization offers, all for free, thanks to the members of this community and others in Macomb County who volunteer and support them through donations, grants and fundraisers. They are committed to educating the community about violence prevention, the impact of sexual violence and the society's role in perpetuating it. She explained their training sessions, and added that last year, their prevention education program presented 320 educational sessions to 5,039 students, school, staff and youth survivors. She hoped more people will stand up against sexual violence by speaking up and wearing a teal ribbon for the month of April.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Ms. Meltzer, to receive and file the letter dated February 4<sup>th</sup>, 2019 from Ms. Phyllis Vaughan, of Turning Point Inc., and declare the month of April as "Sexual Assault Awareness Month". Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Meltzer, West, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegem. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

## **2. APPOINTMENT TO THE CLINTON TOWNSHIP BUILDING AUTHORITY**

Mr. Cannon noted these people need to be in place to make a determination in the relatively near future.

Mr. Pearl explained the Heritage Estates title has been transferred from the Building Authority to the Township since the bonds will be paid off.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Mr. Gielegem, to receive and file the letter dated March 8<sup>th</sup>, 2019 from the Administrative Assistant to the Trustees, and reappoint Mr. James L. Nichols, Mr. Henry Sommerstorfer and Ms. Pamela Schlaff to the Clinton Township Building Authority, each for another six-month term. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Gielegem, West, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

## **3. REQUEST TEMPORARY TENT APPROVAL IN CHIPPEWA VALLEY SHOPPING CENTER, HALL ROAD, TO HOST THE 8<sup>TH</sup> ANNUAL CINCO DE MAYO PARTY ON SUNDAY, MAY 5<sup>TH</sup>, 2019**

Mr. Cannon stated that neither the Police Department nor the Building Department have had problems with this establishment.

Mr. Gielegem recalled that Mr. Abdallah has come before this Board before for this event, and one of the biggest holdups in previous years was the rule that money could not be taken in the tent. This rule was put in place in order to prevent makeshift operations from "popping up" and doing street vending. He informed that rule was changed last year, so brick-and-mortar businesses can now take money outside, although they still have to make that request. He questioned how that worked for the applicant at last year's event and whether they had any issues.

Mr. Kevin Abdallah, applicant, claimed that was the best thing the Township did, and he would officially like to request permission to do the same this year. It prevented people from having to walk into their restaurant to purchase tickets so they could use them in the tent, so there was much less chaos and frustration. He indicated he contacted the Police Department and they sent one of their police officers over to end it nicely. He added that it worked out perfectly, and he indicated there is a retired Clinton Township police officer who he contracts to provide security at the event.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Ms. West, to receive and file the letter dated February 28th, 2019 from Mr. Kevin Abdallah, Juan Miguel's Authentic Mexican Restaurant & Spirits, and approve the request for a temporary tent in the Chippewa Valley Shopping Center to host their 8th Annual Cinco de Mayo party on Sunday, May 5th, 2019, as outlined in the correspondence. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, West, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Mr. Abdallah thanked the Board, and extended invitation to all of them to attend the event.

**4. REQUEST TEMPORARY TENT APPROVAL FOR ART VAN SUMMER TENT SALES (MAY 2<sup>ND</sup> THROUGH MAY 13<sup>TH</sup>, 2019) – 33801 GRATIOT AVENUE**

Mr. Cannon commented that neither the Police Department nor Building Department have had any trouble on this site.

Motion by Mr. Aragona, seconded by Ms. West, to receive and file the letter dated March 9th, 2019 from Mr. Todd Stewart, Store Manager of the Art Van located at 33801 Gratiot Avenue, and approve the request for an outdoor tent from May 2nd through 13th, 2019 for a tent sale, as outlined in the correspondence, with no cash exchanged outside of their building.

Mr. Gielegem pointed out the letter of record specifies they do not want to accept cash in the tent.

Mr. Todd Stewart, petitioner, replied that their location will not be taking cash in the tent so they will not request permission for the exchange of cash outside of their building.

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

**5. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN: FIFTH THIRD BANK – 1.22 ACRE OF LAND FRONTING THE WEST LINE OF GRATIOT AVENUE, NORTH OF 15 MILE ROAD, ADDRESSED AS 35275 GRATIOT AVENUE (SECTION 27)**

Mr. Cannon stated this building meets all of the requirements, the area is zoned properly and the developers are going above and beyond what is required. He added it is a very attractive building and they are pleased to have it at this location.

Mr. Pearl stated this was approved in 2010, and the Board of Appeals once again approved the necessary variance. He indicated they are happy to have them in the community.

Mr. Jack Marshall, with BDG Architects out of Birmingham, Alabama, was present and offered to answer questions.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Mr. Keys, to receive, file and concur with the letter dated March 19th, 2019 from the Secretary of the Clinton Township Planning Commission, and, in consideration of grant of variance by the Clinton Township Board of Appeals at their meeting on March 20th, 2019, approve the site development plans for Fifth Third Bank, to be located on 1.22 acre of land fronting the west line of Gratiot Avenue, north of 15 Mile Road (Parcel #16-11-27-403-010), as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Keys, West, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

**6. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN: HALL ROAD EAST SELF-STORAGE (AKA 1-800-SELF-STORAGE.COM) – 2.27 ACRES OF VACANT LAND FRONTING THE SOUTH LINE OF HALL ROAD (M-59), EAST OF MADDELEIN, ADDRESSED AS 22480 HALL ROAD (SECTION 2 – PARCEL #16-11-02-129-012)**

Mr. Cannon stated the Planning Director has indicated that the petitioners have gone above and beyond in providing screening and in meeting their requirements, and that is much appreciated.

Mr. Joe Latozas, of Designhaus Architecture, 301 Walnut Boulevard, Rochester, Michigan 48307, offered to answer questions. He explained the details on the design board, noting at the Planning Commission there were questions from the residents as to what they would be looking at in terms of a screening wall. He showed an artist rendering of what the wall will look like from their backyards, noting they will be planting fifty trees on the subject property, behind the masonry wall. He also presented a board showing samples of the materials that will be used, noting they are proposing to use a “c-brick” product of a dark gray color for the masonry wall and façade of the building facing the residential area and also facing Hall Road. The internal facades of the building will be a prefinished metal.

Mr. Keys talked with the Planning Director about this development a couple of weeks ago and he felt the proposed wall looks much better than a chain-link fence. He hoped when they have similar developments in the future, they will be able to point to this development as an example of how they want things done in Clinton Township. He thanked the petitioner.

Mr. Aragona noted at the Planning Commission meeting, they discussed they will have lighting on the property 24/7.

Mr. Latozas confirmed there will be security lighting within the development, but he assured none of it will reach the residents, nor does any of it face the residents.

Mr. Aragona commented that the artist's rendering of the view of the wall from the residents' homes looks good, but he noted it depicts trees on the residents' side of the wall, and he noted the trees in the rendering appear to be full-sized. He confirmed that the petitioners will not be planting trees on the residential properties, and he questioned how long they anticipate before the trees will be full-sized.

Mr. Latozas confirmed the trees are only proposed to be planted on their own property. He replied to further inquiry that they will not be planting fully-grown trees but will be planting trees measuring 2-1/2-inches in diameter, so he anticipated the neighbors will be seeing that type of foliage in three to five years.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Ms. Meltzer, to receive, file and concur with the letter dated March 19th, 2019 from the Secretary of the Clinton Township Planning Commission, and approve the site development plans for Hall Road East Self-Storage (aka 1-800-Self-Storage.com), to be located on 2.27 acres of vacant land fronting the south side of Hall Road, east of Maddelein, addressed as 22480 Hall Road (Parcel #16-11-02-129-012), as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Meltzer, West, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegem. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

**7. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN: VERUS DEVELOPMENT / 18 MILE & GARFIELD PHASE II RESIDENTIAL – 7.12 ACRES OF VACANT LAND FRONTING THE WEST LINE OF GARFIELD AND THE NORTH LINE OF 18 MILE ROAD (SECTION 7 – PARCEL #16-11-07-476-003)**

Mr. Reed Cooksey, representing Mr. Arcori with Stonefield Engineering, offered to answer questions.

Mr. Pearl recalled when this first came before the Zoning Board of Appeals, they had some issues with the site plan. He noted that, while the residents to the west were not in objection, the variances as requested would have impacted the residents moving in to the new development by having narrower streets, no off-site parking and no exits to Garfield. Those issues have been rectified with the redesign of the plans, and he felt the developer has come a long way in working closely with the Planning Director and meeting the Township's requirements. He thanked the developers for their cooperation.

Mr. Aragona thanked Mr. Cooksey for being present this evening and recalled he spoke at the Planning Commission meeting. He questioned whether there have

been any changes to the exit onto Garfield since the time it went before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Cooksey replied they are still considering their options as to whether they want to install speed bumps. At this point, they intend for it to be a full-moving driveway, but they are taking into consideration the suggestions raised at the Planning Commission meeting to look at speed bumps. He assured they want to control cut-through traffic, adding it is not something they want, yet they want their residents to have the ability to use that drive.

Mr. Aragona urged them to continue looking into it. He assured he likes the plan with the exception of having the exit to Garfield and also to 18 Mile Road, and expressed concern that in two or three years, there may be residents living in this development complaining about cars cutting through.

Mr. Cooksey noted that they originally had one entrance only, and that was off of 18 Mile Road, but they worked with the Township to provide two access points, one off of Garfield Road, in order to alleviate traffic at 18 Mile and Garfield intersection. He assured they are trying to do what is best for their residents and also what is best for the Township.

Mr. Aragona stated he will need to meet with the Macomb County Department of Roads, and he appreciated the petitioner's cooperation. He indicated the residents in the area were very appreciative of the petitioner's willingness to work with them and keeping them in the loop. He commended the petitioners on their cooperation.

Mr. Cooksey stated it is very important to them as well.

Mr. Gielegghem inquired as to how many units are proposed for this development.

Mr. Cooksey replied there are 56 units proposed. He replied to further inquiry that they will be 1-1/2 stories with a height of 18 feet. He showed a rendering of the elevations, noting there will be some units with only one floor, while others will have the option of adding one room upstairs. He assured that the addition of the upstairs room will not alter the height of the building.

Mr. Gielegghem inquired as to whether the perspective buyers have the option of the additional room.

Mr. Cooksey replied that there will be certain units in the plan that will allow for the additional bedroom.

Mr. Gielegghem commented they are finding that, although these developments provide attached garages, very few people park in the garages, opting to use

them for storage. He noted they need more storage facilities similar to the one just approved on Hall Road, offering people the option of storing their belongings. He questioned how many cars can park in the driveways and how many guest parking spaces are being provided.

Mr. Cooksey replied they have twelve off-street parking spaces. The widening of the road from the original plan will also allow for some on-street parking as well, depending upon the location. They also account for driveway parking.

Mr. Cannon stated he has heard only good things from the residents in the area about what this petitioner has done to work with the surrounding area and the Township, and he was appreciative.

Mr. Cannon opened the floor for comments from the general public, but no one from the audience spoke.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Ms. West, to receive, file and concur with the letter dated March 20<sup>th</sup>, 2019 from the Secretary of the Clinton Township Planning Commission, and, in consideration of grant of variance by the Clinton Township Board of Appeals on February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2019, approve the site development plans for Verus Development / 18 Mile & Garfield - Phase II Residential, to be located on 7.42 acres of vacant land fronting the west side of Garfield and the north side of 18 Mile Road (Parcel #16-11-07-476-003). Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, West, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegghem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

## **8. PUBLIC HEARING FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT CONSOLIDATED PLAN AND 2019-2020 ANNUAL ACTION PLAN**

Mr. Matt Wallace, Assistant Director of the Department of Planning and Community Development, stated he talked about the Five-Year Consolidated Plan and its future direction at the Board meeting on February 25<sup>th</sup>, and tonight he is here to speak more specifically about the 2019/2020 Annual Action Plan. He noted they are still taking comments on the Five-Year Consolidated Plan, but they have to get more specific on the Annual Plan. He explained the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) is in place to help the low/moderate income residents. The Township has been advised to plan for the same amount they received last year, although the budget has not yet been approved to determine the exact amount. Last year's allocation was \$561,325.

Mr. Pearl stated that 5% of revenues from Heritage Estates Senior Housing, owned by the Charter Township of Clinton, will be transferred to the CDBG Fund now and in the future. He noted it used to be reversed, where the CDBG Fund helped to subsidize projects at Heritage Estates.



Mr. Wallace replied he is aware of the 5% that will be coming in, which will be considered program income and will be spent at the Township's discretion. It can either be rolled back into that development or it can be treated as general CDBG Funds, eligible for any other activities as the other funds. He broke down the anticipated \$561,325, noting that 20% can be spent on administrative costs, 15% can be spent on public services that are grant-eligible, although he clarified they do not have to spend exactly that percentage but that is how it has historically been spent. Mr. Wallace explained the remainder is open for suggestions, and it traditionally goes for items such as infrastructure, park improvements, sidewalk improvements, handicap ramps and the housing rehab program. Requests have gone out to the Senior Center, DPW and Parks and Recreation for project suggestions, which will be considered along with suggestions made here today, and they will all be considered by the Budget/Ways & Means Committee on April 9<sup>th</sup>. He indicated he will be coming back before this Board on April 22<sup>nd</sup> with a draft Action Plan.

Mr. Cannon invited any community groups to speak.

Mr. Francis Marella highly endorsed the application from Turning Point, noting the organization he represents, CARE House, often works side-by-side with them. He stated they work with all ages, and they have been in the business for over twenty years. He thanked the Police Chief for following the protocols for the work they do at CARE House. He stated he previously served as Chair and Secretary over the years, and they started out dealing with children. It has expanded to teenagers and entire families. He explained the Advocacy Center in Mount Clemens addresses physical and sexual abuse of children, and their goal is to minimize the trauma for the child victims while helping the children and attending family members through the investigation and prosecution phases. They collaborate with a number of agencies in the County, specifically law enforcement, the FBI, Homeland Security, Immigration, ICE, Children's Protective Services (CPS), Macomb County Prosecutor's Office, mental health facilities and other children's welfare agencies determined by case need. He provided statistics of the numbers and types of cases. Over 90% of child victims know their abuser, who can be a friend or relative. He outlined the services provided to meet their goal of sparing the abuse, emotional stress and trauma of going through not only the acts of abuse but also the investigative process, which is what their forensic interviews do. He emphasized that families are never charged for services, and they provide services to all referred children, their non-offending family members, and according to their latest financial reporting, 86 cents of every dollar is used to provide services to the children. They opened a satellite office in Warren this year, and their Mount Clemens office has been open for 22 years. Since 1996, they have conducted over 7,000 child forensic interviews, with 602 of these children residing in Clinton

Township, at a cost to CARE House of \$370,000. For the fiscal years they have been operating in Clinton Township, he informed the Township has contributed \$33,354.04, which is about 10% of the actual cost. He expressed concern that the President has indicated the Block Grant funds may no longer be available. He assured they are very grateful for the funding they have received from the Township, and respectfully request continued support in the amount of \$12,000 for this fiscal year, which covers about 24 cases at \$500 each. He recommended those wanting further information to visit their website at [www.mccarehouse.org](http://www.mccarehouse.org). He thanked the Board for their past services and offered to answer questions.

Mr. Cannon stated he belongs to SEMCOG and they go to Washington D.C. each year and lobby the lawmakers to make sure they do not get rid of the CDBG Funds, noting they can pinpoint the value of every dollar they receive.

Mr. Marella stated so far this year, they have already accepted 17 cases from Clinton Township residents.

Mr. Keys thanked Mr. Marella for coming in front of the Board this evening, recalling that since he has been a Trustee on this Board, the one constant is Mr. Marella coming before this Board to advocate for the agency he cares so much about. He knows CARE House is now looking for summer interns, and recommended those interested should pursue that opportunity, noting it is a great organization to reach out to.

Mr. Gieleghem thanked Mr. Marella for providing a lot of information, and he felt the most impressive is the brochure indicating what used to happen before CARE House stepped in, noting child victims would be subjected to multiple interviews by police, social workers, school officials, counselors and lawyers, and that now happens in one place with everyone able to observe. Those conducting the interviews are trained, and although this is a sad service to have to provide, it is extremely important.

Mr. Marella agreed, noting that when the children used to have to go through so many interviews, by the time they were done, they were so traumatized that they could not give the proper information in order to prosecute the perpetrator. CARE House has been able to eliminate a number of steps in a professional manner, eliminating the trauma phase of prosecuting the case.

Mr. Cannon and the Board members thanked Mr. Marella for attending tonight's meeting.

Ms. Karan Bates-Gasior, representing Turning Point, gave a lot of credit to the CARE House organization for the great work they do, noting they work

side-by side with them. She is seeking shelter support from the CDBG funds, noting they run a full-service emergency shelter for victims of domestic violence and some sexual assault. Over the last fiscal year, they had 42 shelter clients that were from Clinton Township, and she added that Clinton Township is one of their biggest users. These women and children stayed a total of 1,382 bed nights, so they had an average of three individuals from Clinton Township in their shelter every single night of the year. They had 280 non-shelter clients, and those are people in counseling, court advocacy, or had a forensic exam as a result of a sexual assault. They are working with the Clinton Township Police Department on a new pilot program in regard to strangulation and legality, and they are appreciative for that opportunity. She agreed the CDBG funds are crucial for the communities, and it is only for low- and moderate-income. She clarified that 100% of those who stay in their shelter fall in the low/moderate-income level. She offered to take the Board members on a tour of their shelter, adding it is not what they expect. She plugged an event next month, “Stepping Out with the Stars”, which is a dance fundraiser on April 26<sup>th</sup> at the Wyndham Gardens. She reiterated they are seeking shelter funds and thanked the Board for their consideration and continued support. She noted Mr. Cannon took part in this in the past, and she thanked him for his participation.

Mr. Cannon is aware that Mr. Wallace has reached out to all the organizations that the Township has serviced in the past and will continue to accept any information anyone wants to send in so he can look at it all and make the best recommendation possible. He acknowledged there is not enough to go around, but he assured they will do their best and try to be as fair as they can. He thanked Mr. Wallace for actively reaching out to everyone.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Mr. Aragona, to close the Public Hearing for the Community Development Block Grant Consolidated Plan and 2019-20 Annual Action Plan, and receive and file the report and comments. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Aragona, West, Keys, Cannon, Gielegghem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

## **9. APPROVAL OF THE 2019-2020 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET**

Mr. Cannon announced this is the approval of the 2019-2020 Fiscal Year Budget, which starts on April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019. He provided highlights of the budget, including the General, Police and Fire Fund budgets, which reflect a 3.25% increase in property tax revenues, as well as two additional full-time staff persons budgeted in the General Fund, with an addition of one-half of an Office Clerk position in both Clerk’s and Building Department, and an additional Office Clerk in the Senior Department. The Police Fund budget reflects two additional officers, increasing the number of sworn officers from 93 to 95 to provide two additional

school liaison officers. Chippewa Valley has already partnered with their second officer and they are waiting for Clintondale to commit to their partnership with the Township. He explained the Fire Fund budget reflects the continuation of staffing levels, including 75 Fire personnel, and in the 2018/2019 budget year, the Board approved an increase of lieutenants by three and a reduction of firefighters by three, which left the total number of Fire personnel unchanged. Mr. Cannon stated the retiree health care contribution is 23.14% of payroll, which is lower than the prior year. This budget also includes the additional contribution of retiree health care fund equivalent to the required contribution for all funds, as well as additional contributions to the MERS pension, a system equivalent to the required contributions for all funds. Transfers from the General Fund to the Capital Improvement Fund totaled \$3,548,000, budgeted for sidewalk improvement and to fund the Township's participation with the Macomb County Department of Road's and paving projects along Little Mack, Garfield and Kelly Roads. A \$300,000 transfer from the Fire Fund to the Fire Vehicle and Equipment Replacement Fund is budgeted to provide funding for current and future capital purchases. Capital outlay has been budgeted across all funds for various vehicles, equipment, technology, land and building improvements, as well as improvements to various park properties throughout the entire Township. Improvements to water and sewer lines, booster station upgrades and lift station maintenance projects, have been budgeted in the Water and Sewer Fund in the amount of over \$18 million. He concluded his summary by stating that this budget, while conservative, allows them to maintain all of their current service levels.

Mr. Pearl requested consideration of the Board to put the funding back into the Clerk's overtime column to return the money for the stenographer to continue to provide the minutes in the same character and detail that they have been provided over the years. He noted that the overtime column now reflects \$4,000, so he inquired as to whether they would go back to the \$17,305 figure.

Ms. Meltzer stated she does not know the exact amount because she thought they were going to have a discussion. She explained the intent of the new agenda management software is not to eliminate minutes, but to provide "action minutes", which include the motion and the support. She indicated there can also be summary, but she felt a reduction in ink, with less "back-and-forth" conversation that may or may not benefit the actual work of the Board, can be accomplished. Ms. Meltzer claimed that, according to the Open Meetings Act, all they are required to do is let the public know the work they do. She further claimed that the minutes are not required to reflect all that was said, and although that information can be included, the intent of the Open Meetings Act is for the Board to show the public what they have done. She admitted it is important to know where people are on issues, but because of technology, a lot of that conversation can be viewed on video. She added if it is the Board's wishes for more in the minutes, they can do that, but she felt they can save some

money while still remaining compliant with the Open Meetings Act, and they can go above and beyond the Open Meetings Act by adding summaries. She felt the additional “back-and-forth” dialog in the minutes can become political, and the intent of what this Board is elected to do is lost.

Mr. Pearl assured he has no disrespect for Ms. Meltzer’s position as Clerk, and he understands what she is saying, but he is asking for the additional \$13,000 to be placed back in that line item so they can continue to receive the minutes exactly as they have been prepared. He felt that would augment the agenda management system but would like the same amount of detail in the minutes.

Mr. Gielegem inquired as to whether that amount would be \$13,305.

Mr. Pearl replied affirmatively.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Mr. Keys, to return the money into the "Overtime" line item for the Clerk's office, in the amount of \$13,305, with additional for pension and FICA, for the purpose of having the stenographer continue to produce the Township Board minutes in the same character and detail as they have been over the years. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Cannon assured he understands both points of view and that Ms. Meltzer is trying to streamline the minutes, but he understood Mr. Pearl’s point that if they were to revise the minutes to “action” minutes, it would be a drastic change. He felt there may be an easier way to ease into over a period of time. He commented that what Ms. Meltzer is trying to do is good, but he admitted they are used to getting all of the minutes.

Ms. Meltzer questioned whether that amount can come from the Trustee’s budget if they want the detailed minutes to continue.

Mr. Pearl assured that they are not going to hold Ms. Meltzer responsible for that amount in her budget, and he pointed out they have never withheld money from her fund. By this motion, the Board is requesting the money be put back in, and he clarified Ms. Meltzer is not requesting it.

Ms. Lauretti requested clarification, noting they are adding \$13,305 to the Clerk’s overtime budget for the minutes of the Board meetings.

Mr. Pearl verified that is correct.

Ms. Lauretti advised there will be additional pension and FICA as well.

Mr. Pearl agreed.

Mr. Gieleghem noted the 2017/2018 budget had a line item in the amount of \$12,048, the 2018/2019 budget was \$11,000, yet the projected activity in 2018/2019 was \$17,305. He understands they have not had an opportunity to look at it closely, but it appears as though they were over budget. He questioned why they would have been over budget in that line item, possibly more meetings.

It was suggested that the length of the meetings may have been longer, with more discussion to be covered in the minutes.

Mr. Gieleghem supports the move to technology, and with the Laserfiche and the new agenda management system, he does not know whether the interfaces are fully in place. He supports the move to continue the minutes until they all become more comfortable with the technology and how they know how to make it work better for them.

Mr. Bob Hogan, 36755 Barr Street, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, questioned why the Board is proposing to put an extra \$13,000 onto the Clerk's budget when she does not want it.

Mr. Gieleghem explained the budget is reflecting a change, which is eliminating a function they currently have. Mr. Pearl is restoring that function so they get the minutes the way they have in the past, which is the way the Board members and the general public have been accustomed to.

Mr. Hogan questioned whether the Board can add to someone's budget without their agreement.

Mr. Gieleghem explained if he was proposing to eliminate a service that was available to the public and Board members, and the Board felt they did not want him to eliminate that service, they would put that money back into the budget and would instruct him to continue with the way it had been done.

Ms. Meltzer explained that the Board members have expressed a concern about not being comfortable with the new technology that she has spearheaded. She stated they are moving forward with the new technology at an accelerated rate in the Clerk's office, and some of the Board members would like additional time to get used to it. She explained investing in technology was not just for the purpose of saving money, but she added it can save money. The technology is to make things more transparent and accessible, and to give the public a new tool to access. If the public wants more, the Board is here to serve the public, but they have to be willing to pay more for it, and this Board is voting to do that. She felt this proposal does not take anything away from the public because they still have access to those minutes through the videos, and they will get a summary of those minutes. Ms. Meltzer stressed she has to comply with the Open Meetings Act, which requires her to give motions and actions, as well as a summary, but

not to the extent they have. She explained the stenographer goes above and beyond to make it happen, working weekends, reviewing video to make sure the minutes are accurate, and verifying names and other information. She indicated that is not required by law and it costs the taxpayers more money, adding that anyone interested could look up that information themselves. She added it is a different philosophy.

Mr. Dolan explained that what is being proposed for the minutes is the motion maker's motion, the support, and the decision. Anything that happened preceding the motion or in discussion on the motion will not be in the minutes. He stated he is the attorney on behalf of the Township, and there are some decisions the Board makes, such as Special Land Use, where that is examined as a record and acted on as a record if challenged in court. He must have available to him conclusions by the Board that are supported by facts, and those facts generally appear in some form of discussion in the minutes. It is important to him, with certain agenda items, that they have detail. He stressed he cannot rely on "bare bones" minutes but must have minutes that provide a sufficient factual background so that the motions made and the facts supporting them are evident in the record. He emphasized that the minutes are the record of the Township, and when the Board votes at each meeting to approve the minutes from the previous meeting, they are approving the record. Detail in the minutes provides much more information than just having the motion, the second and the outcome. He agreed with Ms. Meltzer that anyone interested can go back and view the video, but as far as the official record of the Township, it is the minutes, so it is important to have some detail in those minutes. He felt there is a balanced approach being taken that can serve as a pathway for the Township.

Mr. Hogan felt Mr. Pearl would have approached Ms. Meltzer prior to the meeting to work this out.

Ms. Meltzer clarified that she did speak with Mr. Pearl about it prior to this meeting, but not in detail. She felt Mr. Dolan's assessment of what she had explained was not accurate, noting she did not say there would be no summary, but not to the extent of verbatim minutes. She also claimed she was told by another legal counsel that a judge in a case does not look at commentary but they look at the motion, although it is something they can discuss later.

Mr. Sam Bushell, 18546 Whalen, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, felt that this is money well spent, noting people go back and read the minutes but they will not necessarily go back and watch hours of video. He cited instances he is aware of this past week where people referred to minutes of previous meetings.

Ms. Cheri Eaton, 19544 N. Highlite Drive, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, felt it is money wasted to spend it on the minutes. She pointed out

they purchased a new program, and that money should be spent helping the seniors or others use that new program.

Mr. Cannon called for a roll call on the amendment to the budget.

Ms. Meltzer clarified this is a vote on the amendment, and they will then vote on the budget.

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

Motion by Mr. Aragona, seconded by Mr. Gielegthem, to adopt the 2019/2020 Budget as amended. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Hogan apologized that he was not present at the last meeting to ask this question, but he inquired as to how much money was spent in the current year on negotiated or lost lawsuits.

Mr. Cannon stated he does not have that figure.

Mr. Dolan stated there are reports that can be looked at but he does not have that information tonight. He indicated they exercise prudent risk management processes within the Township, and at the time cases are undertaken, there are reserve analysis in trying to predict the outcome of the case. They have self-insured retention and have insurance above that to cover defense costs and indemnity. That information is available through public records, but he reiterated he does not have that information this evening.

Mr. Hogan inquired as to whether the Township budgets for anticipated lawsuits and the dollar figure for that item.

Discussion took place regarding Mr. Hogan's question.

Mr. Dolan clarified that the current pending lawsuits underway, as well as some that are threatening and likely to be underway, they have some estimates as to their exposure, they are not listed within the budget. They are accounted for in the budget because different departments have expenditures that relate to those lawsuit expenses. He indicated there is more information at the Township that sets it out more clearly, although it is not in the budget document.

Mr. Cannon clarified the language to be included in the motion on the floor.

Mr. Aragona agreed to **amend his motion**, and Mr. Gielegthem **concurred with the amendment to the motion**, as follows:

To adopt the amended March 31, 2020 budget as well as the estimated March



31, 2019 Amended Budget, to include the proposal for additional retiree health care and MERS contributions as presented, and to include approval of a 2% raise for Heritage Estates payroll beginning April 1, 2019.

Mr. Gieleghem recalled when they came out of the 2008 global economic crisis, they had indicated it would be 15 to 20 years before local government funding stabilized. He explained the reasons for this, based on two provisions in the State Constitution, either adopted by the courts or by the voters. One of those is the Headlee Amendment and the other is Proposal A, and he explained those in detail. He noted the increase in taxes is capped at the rate of inflation, which this year is 2.4%, although prior to that it was 2.1%, and in years before that was at a rate lower than 1%. He recalled Ms. Lauretti characterized this budget in a way that indicates they are no longer in a structural deficit. He noted the expense line is still bigger than the revenue line but pointed out they are putting money aside to meet unfunded liabilities for retiree health care and pensions, setting aside double what they are required to put away. He also noted they have to address some of the needs for capital expenditures because it will cost them more if they wait too long. He pointed out that even though the Township receives zero dollars for roads, they have to depend on the County and compete with all other communities in competition for those same dollars to upgrade their older, deteriorating roads, so they are making the significant contribution of \$3.2 million General Fund dollars into roads so they can use that as match money to gain more money from the federal, state and county governments for road improvements.

Roll Call (on amended motion): Ayes – Aragona, Gieleghem, West, Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

#### **10. BID AWARD: WATER BILLS AND ENVELOPES**

Mr. Keys noted when he was first elected to the Board, he noticed that American Graphics was current vendor and he was proud because they are a Clinton Township business, but in looking at the pricing on the quotes, it appears the new company has a much lower price. He inquired as to whether Ms. Bednar has any concern in the price difference. He noticed Ms. Bednar had talked with the County and received positive feedback.

Ms. Bednar stated the Board had wanted them to reach out to printers in Clinton Township, as well as in Macomb County. She assured that, although this bid was on MITN (Michigan Inter-governmental Trade Network), the Township also let the current vendor know so they would have an opportunity to bid on it. She explained they went out for bid because they had contacted American Graphics, asking if they could hold the same prices. American Graphics had indicated they had held their prices for many years but would not be able to hold them at the same levels any longer. She stated the new vendor does a lot of business with

Macomb County and McLaren and have assured they will deliver whatever the Township needs to get their bills out in time.

Motion by Mr. Keys, seconded by Ms. West, to receive and file the letter dated March 21st, 2019 from the Director of the Department of Public Services, and award the bid for Water bill paper and envelopes to Hatteras in the amount of \$12,881.00 for the 2019 cost of a one-year supply (325,000 each of bill paper, #9 envelopes and #10 custom window envelopes to meet U.S. Postal requirements), and the 2020 cost of \$13,396.50 for the same amount in the second year, as outlined in the correspondence. Roll Call: Ayes – Keys, West, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

#### **11. PUBLIC HEARING FOR MNRTF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT – GEORGE GEORGE PARKING LOT IMPROVEMENTS & CANOE LAUNCH**

Mr. Cannon opened the public hearing for the 2019 Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund (MNRTF) Development Project for George George Parking Lot Improvements and Canoe Launch.

Mr. Scott Chabot provided an overview of the project and explained that the Trust Fund is a grant fund that is derived from the royalties in the sale/lease of state-owned oil, gas and mineral rights, and since 1976, the Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund (MNRTF) has been a funding source for the public acquisition of land for resource protection and public outdoor recreation. In 1984, the fund was expanded to allow for development projects. The grants have been administrated through the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and since the creation of the trust fund, the oil and gas industry has contributed over \$1.1 billion in Michigan's state and local parks, waterways, trails, and nature preserves. He provided some background on this year's application, noting that last year they applied for land acquisition at 21150 Bellview, which was consistent with the goals of the Clinton Township's Parks and Recreation Master Plan. They received notification late last year that those land acquisition grants were approved through the DNR Trust Fund. They are currently working with the property owner on moving forward with that land acquisition process. Based on the high attendance levels at Woodrow Woody and George George Parks, there is need for additional parking, which is consistent with what is in the Parks & Recreation Master Plan. There has also been parking off-site, which has become a safety concern. He clarified that all of the parcels identified in the public hearing are part of the Woodrow Woody Park, so all of the improvements shown here, minus the Bellview parcel he mentioned, are part of the Woodrow Woody Park, which is adjacent to George George Park. Another part of this is to install a bioretention area between the two separate parking aisles, which will help with the filtration of the storm water and meets the goals of the Trust Fund. This project also includes the installation of a canoe and kayak launch along the

Clinton River, and he pointed out the location on the slide. He added that is also consistent with one of the priorities listed in the Trust Fund grant for this year because it is a water trail project. He added that this project closely parallels a lot of the efforts that are outlined in the Clinton River Watershed Council's Water Town's program, the SEMCOG Water Resources Plan and also the Macomb County Blue Water Strategic Plan. They are now looking for funding for these projects, and this DNR Trust Fund grant allows for requests up to \$300,000. It is noted in his correspondence that the total cost is \$600,000, so based on that, they can provide a match of about 50% through this grant. Also included in that amount is the cost to remove the house from the property once it is acquired. Public input is one of the key components of the grant requirement, so he invited any questions or comments from the public as they relate to this project through the DNR Trust Fund.

Mr. Cannon invited comments from the public.

There were no comments from anyone in the audience.

Ms. Meltzer stated it appears, through the letter, that there is a minimum match of 25%, but it appears they are proposing a match of 50%. She understood that, based on the competitiveness of this grant, they felt this would be the best way to maximize the opportunity to receive it.

Mr. Chabot explained the maximum they can receive is \$300,000, so by default, they are at a 50% match for a project that costs \$600,000. He clarified that the higher the match offered by the community, the higher they receive when it comes to the scoring portion of the grant submittal.

Ms. Meltzer commented that the previous legislature approved the funding for this and the appropriations for it, and this legislature will award it. She understood they are waiting on the Senate to get the land acquisition. She felt it sounds backwards to come up with a plan first and then try to acquire the land, but she is aware there is a strategy behind this.

Mr. Chabot replied it is a proactive approach.

Ms. Meltzer stated she is confident the steps Mr. Chabot is taking to make this happen is great.

Mr. Chabot informed the application is due by April 1<sup>st</sup>, and they are working with Ms. Bednar to get that put together.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Ms. West, to receive and file the letter dated March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2019 from the Director of the Department of Public Services and close the Public Hearing for the 2019 Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund

(MNRTF) Development Grant for Woodrow Woody Park. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, West, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

**12. RESOLUTION TO COMMIT MATCHING FUNDS FOR MNRTF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT – GEORGE GEORGE PARKING LOT IMPROVEMENTS & CANOE LAUNCH**

Motion by Mr. Gielegem, seconded by Mr. Aragona, to adopt the Resolution of Authorization for Local Unit of Government Match Without Donated Funds for the 2019 Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund (MNRTF) Development Grant for Woodrow Woody Park, and resolve to make available its financial obligation amount of \$300,000.00, which is 50% of a total \$600,000 project cost during the 2020 fiscal year. Roll Call: Ayes – Gielegem, Aragona, West, Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

**13. PUBLIC HEARING FOR LAND & WATER CONSERVATION FUND PROJECT – GEORGE GEORGE PARKING LOT IMPROVEMENTS & CANOE LAUNCH**

Mr. Cannon noted this is a little confusing because it involves the same project.

Ms. Bednar explained that they have the opportunity to apply for two different state grants for the same project. What will occur is that they both have an April 1<sup>st</sup> deadline, so they will score those projects and the State will advise if one or both are qualified for approval. If that is the case, the State will advise them as to which one they want the Township to move forward with, and which one they should drop. She clarified this allows them two chances to get the money from one of two sources.

Mr. Cannon emphasized they are not trying to “double-dip” but will have two chances to get one or the other. He opened the floor for the public hearing, inviting the public to offer comments or ask questions.

There were no comments or questions from anyone in the audience.

Motion by Mr. Keys, seconded by Mr. Aragona, to receive and file the letter dated March 21st, 2019 from the Director of the Department of Public Services, and close the public hearing for the 2019 Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) for Woodrow Woody Park. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Chabot provided some background differences between the DNR Trust Fund and the Land & Water Conservation Fund. He explained the latter is a federal grant, whereas the prior grant application was through the State of Michigan, although the funding from both is coming from the oil and gas industry. This fund

was created by Congress in 1964 to focus on the development of trails, community recreation, green technology, coordination and communication with universally-accessible recreational activities. They have a similar layout for this grant application as they did for the application through the DNR Trust Fund, but they cannot apply for this grant unless they have control of the property at the time of application. Since the property at 21150 Bellview has not been acquired by the Township, they are proposing to submit an application with a layout on Township-owned property on the Woodrow Woody Park property. Other than that difference, he indicated they have the same amenities and components, including the universal design canoe/kayak launch, the parking lot and the green infrastructure. The other key component he mentioned in his cover letter is the match, noting this grant has a required match of 50%. The projected estimates for this project are coincidentally about \$600,000, so by default they are at a 50% match.

Mr. Cannon pointed out, with the two different diagrams, is the house, which, if purchased by the Township, will be removed and will become a different type of parking lot. If they cannot reach an agreement with the homeowner as to a selling price, they will be putting a third parking lot on the other side of that home. They have an auxiliary parking lot they would like to expand, the homeowners have expressed an interest in selling, and the Township's Planning Director, along with advice from the Township Attorney, is in negotiations with the homeowner so the Township can acquire the property, remove the home and have contiguous parking. If that cannot be worked out, the plan is to leave the house in the middle and have parking on both sides.

Mr. Chabot clarified that this is all within the Woodrow Woody Park.

Mr. Pearl inquired as to how they can commit to both amounts of match money.

Mr. Chabot explained the state will look at the preliminary scoring. He noted they spoke with the grant coordinator prior to moving forward with these options, and they were actually encouraged to apply for both grants. It also depends upon funding ability and competition.

Mr. Pearl questioned what happens if both are available, and he questioned whether they have committed to match both.

Ms. Bednar replied no, indicating what will happen is the State will come back to let them know if they qualify, and they will move forward with only one of the two grant applications.

Roll Call (on closing the public hearing): Ayes – Keys, Aragona, West, Pearl, Cannon, Gielegem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

**14. RESOLUTION TO COMMIT MATCHING FUNDS FOR LAND & WATER CONSERVATION FUND PROJECT – GEORGE GEORGE PARKING LOT IMPROVEMENTS & CANOE LAUNCH**

Motion by Ms. Meltzer, seconded by Mr. Keys, to adopt the Resolution of Authorization for Local Unit of Government Match Without Donated Funds for the 2019 Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) for Woodrow Woody Park, and resolve to make available its financial obligation amount of \$300,000.00, which is 50% of a total \$600,000 project cost during the 2020 fiscal year. Roll Call: Ayes – Meltzer, Keys, West, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegthem. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

**15. RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT – GRANT APPLICATION FOR SEMCOG GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM – NORMANDY PARK IMPROVEMENTS**

Mr. Cannon stated this is known as “urban ecology”, by taking an urban area, making a butterfly garden out of it by bringing in greener infrastructure.

Ms. Bednar stated she had a resident of that neighborhood approach her about a year ago, stating they would like to see more benches, garbage cans and flowers along this pathway, adding that it is a beautiful park but it is “just green grass”. As they were looking at capital improvement projects, they felt the parking lot and pathway were both in dire need of replacement. In looking at it for SEMCOG’s Green Infrastructure Program, they decided to reduce the size of the parking lot, assuring that it would still be plenty big enough for birthday parties, etc., and they still have parking available on the street. By reducing the size of the parking lot, they can put in a bioretention basin which they will plant with butterfly plants to bring in butterflies and pollinators to this part of the Township. The pathway will be changed from asphalt to crushed stone similar to the Arboretum, although she assured that wheelchairs and bicycles can still go on it, and she has heard from bicyclists that they prefer the crushed stone. She noted that more rain gardens and butterfly-type plants will be added throughout. She noted there is a pathway that goes out to the south side of the park to a gate that does not open, so that pathway will be removed to remove the carbon footprint going forward.

Mr. Chabot showed an overview of the park and its improvements. He noted 55% of the trail would become crushed stone.

Ms. Bednar clarified they are leaving the asphalt up to the pavilion because people are pulling items up to that pavilion in wagons.

Ms. West requested clarification as to whether this surface will allow maneuverability for wheelchairs, even if the person is maneuvering their own wheelchair as opposed to having it pushed.

Ms. Bednar replied affirmatively. She explained that, because of the Arboretum having a similar surface, they have the ability to grade it and will be out there on a regular basis for maintenance.

Ms. Meltzer noted this is the third project in the Township where they are beautifying and serving the Township in this way. She thanked those responsible, especially Ms. Bednar, for putting the Township in the forefront by seeking these types of grants and opportunities to pay for these projects. She also thanked Mr. Chabot for his proactiveness and for working together with Ms. Bednar. She felt this is an opportunity for celebration because tonight alone they are approving three projects that will greatly benefit this community.

Motion by Ms. Meltzer, seconded by Mr. Keys, to receive and file the letter dated March 21st, 2019 from the Director of the Department of Public Services, and adopt a Resolution of Support for application of the maximum no-match grant offered through the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) in the amount of \$50,000 for the SEMCOG Green Infrastructure Implementation Program Grant for Normandy Park Improvements. Roll Call: Ayes – Meltzer, Keys, West, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegghem. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Ms. Kathy Voss, 20215 Webster, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated as one of the neighbors of Normandy Park, she appreciated what is being proposed, and she thanked the Township and the Board for what they have done. She noted the area has been cleaned up and is enjoyed by families. It is a nice park, and she felt this will be fantastic. She thanked the Township once again.

#### **16. GEOTECHNICAL SOIL BORINGS AND SOIL INVESTIGATION SERVICES FOR CLINTON TOWNSHIP CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS**

Motion by Mr. Gielegghem, seconded by Ms. West, to receive and file the letter dated March 21st, 2019 from Mr. Scott J. Chabot, PE, Senior Project Engineer, of Anderson, Eckstein & Westrick, Inc., and approve the geotechnical services work for upcoming projects to be performed by McDowell & Associates, Inc., located at 21355 Hatcher Avenue, Ferndale, Michigan 48220, and to allow the use of this firm for the next three years if they agree to hold similar pricing for these professional services, as outlined in the correspondence. Roll Call: Ayes – Gielegghem, West, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – Pearl. Motion carried.

#### **17. THIRD PARTY ENGINEERING REVIEW PROCESS**

Ms. Bednar explained they reached out to Hubbell, Roth & Clark (HRC) because when they went through the RFP process, they were the second company of consideration. They have two representatives here tonight from HRC. She also noted that her son works for HRC, so she wanted to disclose that information.

Mr. Cannon stated he is well aware that Ms. Bednar's son will have no contact with any project in Clinton Township.

Mr. Keys questioned when there is a conflict, they will reach out to Ms. Bednar, and the Township will not be paying for Anderson, Eckstein & Westrick's (AEW's) services at that point but will pay the new firm AEW's rates.

Ms. Bednar explained that in the contract that was signed with AEW, it was agreed upon that they could keep any private development they had already undertaken before getting the engineering consulting services. She cited the example of Montclair, where there are several phases, and they would have to go out and find a new engineer. When those plans come in for an engineering review, the Township would then hire HRC to be able to do the review so they know it is impartial. She explained that engineering costs are 1.4% of the construction costs, and HRC has agreed to that same percentage. She added it would also apply to county jobs if there is a conflict, and she indicated there is an entire page included of perceived conflicts, but AEW would still be required to let the Township know ahead of starting the project. Ms. Bednar replied to further inquiry that HRC is the recommended bidder.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Mr. Gielegem, to receive and file the letter dated March 21st, 2019 from the Director of the Department of Public Services, and approve a third-party engineering review process, whereby Hubbell, Roth & Clark (HRC) has agreed to perform third-party review of any projects as outlined in the contract on the Township's behalf, at the rate structure approved in the AEW contract, and as outlined in the correspondence. Roll Call: Ayes – Pearl, Gielegem, West, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

**18. REQUEST APPROVAL TO PURCHASE ELEVEN (11) KNOX BOX KEY SAFES FOR THE FIRE DEPARTMENT VEHICLES**

Mr. Cannon stated there has been a surge in residents purchasing these Knox Boxes for their homes. It has a key for the Fire Department to use to get into their home in case there is no one home when there is an alarm at their house, or someone calls, so it serves as a nice safeguard. He clarified these are the boxes that will be on the Fire Department's rigs to keep their keys safe. Mr. Cannon replied to inquiry that anyone interested in purchasing a Knox Box can contact the Fire Department through any one of the Township's fire halls, and they will be happy to assist.



Motion by Mr. Keys, seconded by Mr. Pearl, to receive and file the letter dated March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2019 from the Fire Chief and approve the purchase of eleven (11) new Knox Boxes to be used to safe keep the Knox Keys housed in the Fire Department Apparatus, in the amount of \$11,703.00, with funding for this purchase available from the Fire Department's "computer costs" line item. Roll Call: Ayes – Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegghem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – West. Motion carried.

**19. REQUEST APPROVAL TO ATTEND THE 2019 GREAT LAKES HOMELAND SECURITY CONFERENCE TO BE HELD MAY 7<sup>TH</sup> THROUGH 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2019**

Motion by Mr. Keys, seconded by Mr. Aragona, to receive and file the letter dated March 18<sup>th</sup>, 2019 from the Fire Chief and authorize Fire Chief Tim Duncan, Chief of Training Tom Stuck, EMS Chief John Gallagher, Battalion Chief Art Jones and Battalion Chief Paul Brouwer to the 2019 Great Lakes Homeland Security Conference to be held from May 6<sup>th</sup> through 9<sup>th</sup> in Grand Rapids, with the total budgeted cost to the Fire Department of \$1,474.00, as outlined in the correspondence. Roll Call: Ayes – Keys, Aragona, Pearl, Cannon, Gielegghem, Meltzer, West. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

**20. REQUEST APPROVAL TO ATTEND THE MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE SUMMER CONFERENCE – JUNE 23<sup>RD</sup> THROUGH 26<sup>TH</sup>, 2019**

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Ms. West, to receive and file the letter dated March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2019 from the Police Chief and approve his request to attend the budgeted 2019 Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police Summer Training Conference, to be held June 23<sup>rd</sup> through 26<sup>th</sup>, 2019 at Boyne Highlands in Harbor Springs, Michigan, as outlined in the correspondence. Discussion ensued.

Chief Posavetz replied to inquiry the cost is approximately \$1,000.

Ms. Meltzer noted if it is under \$1,000, it would not need Board approval. She noted since the amount is close, she appreciated the Chief bringing this forward.

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

**21. APPROVAL OF 2019 SCHOOL TAX COLLECTION AGREEMENTS**

Mr. Gielegghem summarized the agreements the Township has with the local school districts to collect taxes on their behalf, functioning as a service provider

for the schools. If they did not do it, someone would have to provide this service. The Township has a statutory obligation to collect for other taxing authorities, so since they are already doing it, they negotiated with the school districts to charge a per-parcel fee, and it saves property owners from receiving separate bills from two different taxing authorities. He specified when the summer taxes come in, it is his job to collect them, but he emphasized they do not keep any of that money but distribute 100% of that summer collection to the various taxing authorities through statute and these agreements.

Motion by Mr. Keys, seconded by Ms. West, to receive and file the letter dated March 14th, 2019 from the Township Treasurer, and approve the 2019 Tax Collection and Distribution Agreements with Clintondale Community Schools, Chippewa Valley Schools, Fraser Public Schools, L'Anse Creuse Public Schools, Mount Clemens Community Schools, Macomb Intermediate School District, and Macomb Community College, as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – Keys, West, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

## **22. REQUEST APPROVAL TO JOIN THE STERLING HEIGHTS REGIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE**

Ms. West informed that the Gratiot Avenue Chamber of Commerce includes Clinton Township automatically as a member, and there is no charge for that membership.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Ms. West, to receive and file the letter dated March 6th, 2019 from the Township Supervisor and approve his request to submit the membership application and annual dues in the amount of \$299 for Clinton Township to join the Sterling Heights Regional Chamber of Commerce, as outlined in the correspondence. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Keys questioned how many businesses in Clinton Township are part of the Sterling Heights Regional Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Cannon replied he does not know the exact number.

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

## **23. APPROVAL OF ETHICS POLICY**

Mr. Cannon explained they started this process some months ago and had four meetings of the Budget/Ways & Means Committee. They ended up with a policy they put on line and distributed to the Board, and he noted it has been modified, even as late as noon today, with input from four of the members, including all of

the Budget/Ways & Means Committee members. He stated they all have the copy in front of them, and he asked the Board to approve this policy, which he felt is better than the County's policy and that of the City of Birmingham, which were two of the models they used to put this together.

Mr. Gieleghem questioned whether he would like the policy moved to put it on the floor. He had contacted Mr. Cannon's office earlier today because he found some changes that he considered "non-controversial" and suggested they may be able to be adopted this evening as well. He offered to go through them and hoped they could be part of a "friendly amendment".

Mr. Cannon appreciated all of Mr. Gieleghem's comments, noting they incorporated almost all of them.

Motion by Mr. Pearl, seconded by Ms. West, to approve the Ethics Policy as presented, including the friendly amendments. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Gieleghem stated he would like to make a motion to include some friendly amendments to the policy as presented.

[Editor's note: Each amendment presented to the Board and voted on, regardless of whether it passes or fails, is assigned a subsequent amendment number for reference purposes].

Motion by Mr. Gieleghem, seconded by Mr. Pearl, to approve **Amendment 1** as follows: Page 3 (under definition for "Service provider"): Remove the comma after "other party that is doing", and also remove the words "having done or seeking to do", so it will read as follows: "Service provider" includes, but is not limited to, any person, corporation or other party that is doing business with, regulated by, or has interests before the Board or the Township, including anyone who is known or should be known to be an agent or acting on behalf of such a party.; Page 8: With the strikeouts made, Item "2" becomes "3". Also, under what is now "3-a", insert the word "ballot" before the word "initiative"; Page 9: Under "3-b", insert the word "ballot" before the word "initiative"; Page 16: Under "Township Official Mandatory Disclosures", "2-c", following "All entities for which the Township Official serves as an officer, director, member, or partner", add "and receives compensation". Discussion ensued.

Mr. Gieleghem explained his reasoning for the changes, noting he proposed removing the words "having done or seeking to do" because it would be very difficult for him to know who has worked in the Township prior to his start with the Township, nor do they know who may be "seeking" in the future. He felt the word "ballot" needs to be inserted before "initiative" so it makes it clear it is a "ballot initiative", which is regulated by the State. He noted he is proposing to add "and receives compensation" because disclosing being a member of a church group,

for example, would not necessarily require disclosure, unless there is compensation involved.

Roll Call (**on Amendment 1**): Ayes – Gielegghem, Pearl, West, Keys, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Ms. Meltzer clarified that Budget/Ways & Means Committee members consisted of Supervisor Cannon, Treasurer Gielegghem, Clerk Meltzer, the Human Resources Director and the Township Attorney.

Mr. Keys thanked Mr. Dolan, because with the Trustees not being able to sit in on the Budget/Ways & Means Committee meetings, he was able to communicate with them and take their ideas to the Committee. He also thanked Mr. Gielegghem because he was able to get with him about some of the changes made this morning, and he was able to communicate some of his suggestions to Mr. Gielegghem as well, noting most of them were incorporated.

Motion by Mr. Keys, seconded by Mr. Gielegghem, to approve **Amendment 2**, as follows: Page 4, under "B", "Disclosure" - In the last paragraph, immediately following "In addition to the disclosures required above, each Township official shall disclose his or her and any related party's financial interest in any business proposing to engage in a transaction with the Township", add the following: "in writing to the IT Department for placement on the Ethics page of the Township's website", which would then be followed with the remainder of the sentence "prior to any official act by the Board or Township official on such transaction". Discussion ensued.

Mr. Keys explained his reasoning for the change, noting it would give a little more notice to Board members and the public to think about and contemplate the conflict, whereas when it is brought up at the meeting, it is often the first time anyone is hearing of it. He indicated the proposed revision would require it to be submitted ahead of time in writing to the IT Department for placement on the Ethics page.

Mr. Cannon stated he has no problem with it as long as the person who has the potential conflict knows of that conflict.

Mr. Keys explained they would be the one to disclose it.

Mr. Pearl requested clarification.

Mr. Cannon cited the conflict Mr. Pearl had some time ago with a Special Assessment on his road, and he had requested to not vote on it. All he would do with this new policy is to request recusal ahead of time in writing to the IT

Department and state the reason, which in that specific case was the fact that he lives on that road.

Mr. Gieleghem explained this policy develops a webpage where conflicts can be posted, and the public would be aware of disclosures. He replied to inquiry the proposed revision is an addition of language, not a replacement.

Roll Call (**on Amendment 2**): Ayes – Keys, Gieleghem, West, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Mr. Gieleghem distributed the pages containing the proposed amendments so they can discuss each one separately.

Mr. Gieleghem proposed, on Page 9, under Section V, Subsection D – Political Activities, Item 3-b-(4), to add “or employee” following “From any subordinate Township Official”.

Ms. Meltzer questioned who is a “subordinate Township Official or employee”.

Mr. Gieleghem replied they have to go to the definitions, and a “Township Official” is defined as “elected officials and committee members”. He then stated he has another amendment on Page 10, under Section 5, Subsection D – Political Activities, and proposed adding Item 3-b-(6) as follows: “From any organizations that contracts to provide goods and services to the Township for compensation”.

Mr. Cannon stated he has no problem with adding “or employee” under Item 3-b-(4) under Section V, Subsection D. He added he has a problem with the addition of adding (6), as proposed, and he would be voting no on that.

Mr. Pearl agreed with Mr. Cannon.

Mr. Keys stated he would be willing to support the addition of “or employee” and suggested they could vote on that motion.

Mr. Gieleghem emphasized that he would like them both adopted, so he felt a motion to separate would be in order.

Discussion took place regarding whether a motion to separate would be in order, but it was pointed out that there is not a motion on the floor that ties the two together.

Ms. West inquired as to what portion Mr. Cannon objects to.

Mr. Cannon explained there are campaign laws in the State of Michigan, to which he fully agrees to abide to, and he stressed he always has abided to those laws; however, this is not part of the statewide policy and that is why he is opposed to it.

Motion by Mr. Gielegghem, seconded by Mr. Keys, to approve **Amendment 3**, as follows: Page 9, under Section V, Subsection D-Political Activities, Item 3-b-(4), following "From any subordinate Township Official", add "or employee". Roll Call: Ayes – Gielegghem, Keys, West, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Ms. West questioned whether there is a way they could word the amendment in contention that would be congruent with the campaign finance laws.

Mr. Cannon replied no.

Mr. Gielegghem explained the campaign finance laws are mute on these issues, so they are going above and beyond on the standards that are created in the Michigan Campaign Finance Act.

Mr. Cannon stated he is ok with anything anyone chooses to do that is over and above their policy.

Lengthy discussion took place regarding whether to entertain a motion to approve Amendment 4 or a motion to deny Amendment 4, and further discussion took place as to which motion was made first.

Motion by Mr. Gielegghem, seconded by Mr. Keys, to approve **Amendment 4**, as follows: Page 10, under Section 5, Subsection D-Political Activities, add Item 3-b-(6), "From any organizations that contracts to provide goods and services to the Township for compensation". Roll Call: Ayes – Gielegghem, Keys, West. Nays – Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Absent – None. Motion failed for lack of votes.

Motion by Mr. Keys, seconded by Ms. West, to approve **Amendment 5**, as follows: Pages 10-11, under "E", "Gifts" - eliminate "2-a" through "2-m", and replace "2-a" with the following: "Accept any goods, opportunities, benefits and services that are available on the same conditions as for the general public". Discussion ensued.

Mr. Keys explained his reasoning for the change, noting that there are a number of exemptions he felt confuse the issue. He stressed there are specific issues the Board wants to accomplish with this policy, and he felt by saying they cannot accept anything unless it is available to the general public is a great way, and a

simple way, to specify what they can accept, instead of including a whole list of exemptions.

Mr. Cannon recognized that verbiage as something that is in the County's Ethics policy.

Mr. Keys confirmed it is also in the County's policy and recalled that Mr. Cannon had indicated he felt the proposed Township policy is better than that of the County and the City of Birmingham.

Mr. Cannon commented that they had incorporated portions they felt were the best of the County policy.

Mr. Keys agreed and felt this is one item that should be included.

Mr. Cannon stated he disagreed but indicated they will vote on it.

Mr. Gielegem noted the first part addresses what they cannot do, while the second part addresses what they can do. He pointed out what they "shall not do" takes up about one-third of a page, whereas what they "can do" takes up about three-and-a-half pages. He felt it needs to be clearer and they need to set the bar.

Ms. Meltzer felt it is clear because it is delineated.

Mr. Cannon stated he will allow a brief public comment, but reminded that, although this is a public Board meeting, the seven Board members have not had a chance to all work together to put together a final policy on which to vote.

Mr. Bob Hogan inquired as to whether there are public comments allowed on each individual amendment.

Mr. Cannon replied no, indicating they are trying to put together a document that will be voted on, and at that time, the general public will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Dolan confirmed that once the document is in final form, the Township Supervisor will invite comments from the general public.

Ms. West felt there is so much verbiage in the proposed policy which states what is allowed, and she felt it will be confusing. She added that if they can change it to accept what the general public can get, it will simplify it, and that is why she seconded the motion.

Roll Call (**on Amendment 5**): Ayes – Keys, West, Gielegem. Nays – Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Absent – None. Motion failed for lack of votes.

Motion by Ms. West, seconded by Mr. Gielegem, to approve **Amendment 6**, as follows: Page 15, under Section VI - Prohibited Conduct & Disclosures, revise "E" as follows: Change the title "Hiring of Relatives" to "Nepotism", and following the words "...such a relationship to the Township", eliminate the words "...as early in the evaluation and selection process as is reasonably possible." and replace those words with "by completing a nepotism disclosure form for any current relatives employed by the Township and for any prospective employees during the evaluation and selection process. Such forms will be made available to all Board members, appointing agencies, and made publicly available on the Ethics Webpage prior to Board appointments". Discussion took place.

Mr. Cannon stated he is opposed to the word "nepotism" because it has a negative connotation, but hiring relatives through Civil Service is something that is done in a proper way, and he cited the example where they would not have been able to hire Clinton Township Firefighter Paul Brouwer Jr. if they had not allowed him to take a Civil Service test. He also noted that Firefighter Brouwer's daughter is also hoping to become a firefighter, so he questioned whether she would be excluded based on not being able to take the Civil Service test that everyone else is allowed to take and being scored on a fair basis. He stated "hiring of relatives" is exactly what it states, but "nepotism" is giving someone an unfair advantage in hiring, promotion or anything.

Mr. Pearl inquired as to whether they can take out the word "nepotism" but retain the rest of the proposed amendment.

Ms. West stressed she definitely wants to keep the rest of the amendment.

Mr. Cannon inquired as to the purpose for this amendment. He understood the concern for "hiring of relatives" but he pointed out it is almost impossible with Civil Service in place.

Ms. West replied the purpose is for disclosure. She pointed out if someone were being hired and is related to someone already working here, it would be disclosed up front. The employee could also disclose that a relative applied for a position.

Ms. Meltzer agreed with the intent, because it would then be disclosed and everyone would know that information. If some were aware of the relationship and others were not, it would be unfair. She agreed with the concern of using the word "nepotism", agreeing with the perception that Mr. Cannon presented that the individual is "getting an unfair advantage" because of their relationship, even if they have no qualifications for the specific job. She questioned, however, if her



son wanted to apply for a job and had excellent qualifications for that job and provide an opportunity that would benefit this Township, why he could not compete with other candidates for a particular position. She felt it is more clarifying if they use the term “hiring of relatives”. She agreed with the intent of the amendment other than the use of the word “nepotism”.

Mr. Keys reminded this policy only applies to the Township officials, not the employees, so it would be the seven Board members and committee members.

Ms. West felt the concern with “nepotism” is if they are actually favoring someone if the person has no qualifications, applies and is given the job because they are related. She felt putting this section in makes it known that the person is a relative, but if that person is the best qualified for the job, they should definitely be considered.

Considerable discussion took place regarding the connotation of the word “nepotism”.

Mr. Gielegghem stated he did not want to belabor the point of “nepotism” versus “hiring of relatives” but to suggest that felt that they are opposed to the word “nepotism” because “it prevents something” is not true. It requires the officials to take a proactive stance and they have an extra responsibility to disclose a relative of theirs is competing for a position. He felt it is the avoidance of nepotism.

Mr. Pearl suggested it could state “disclosure will be made and be publicly available on the ethics webpage prior to Board appointments”.

Ms. Meltzer stated it appears as though that has already been added.

Further discussion took place regarding who fills out the document.

Mr. Cannon stated he is not in favor of using the word “nepotism”.

Ms. West emphasized that by having the word “nepotism” included in the policy, and requiring disclosures, it shows they are not doing that. They are hiring them because they are skilled.

Roll Call (**on Amendment 6**): Ayes – West, Gielegghem, Keys. Nays – Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Absent – None. Motion failed for lack of votes.

Mr. Gielegghem stated he would offer an amendment that would be the same as the last amendment voted on, with the exception of keeping the title “Hiring of Relatives” and adding the additional language.

Motion by Mr. Gielegem, seconded by Mr. Keys, to approve **Amendment 7**, as follows: Page 15, under Section VI - Prohibited Conduct & Disclosures, revise "E" as follows: Keeping the title "Hiring of Relatives", and following the words "...such a relationship to the Township", eliminate the words "...as early in the evaluation and selection process as is reasonably possible." and replace those words with "by completing a nepotism disclosure form for any current relatives employed by the Township and for any prospective employees during the evaluation and selection process. Such forms will be made available to all Board members, appointing agencies, and made publicly available on the Ethics Webpage prior to Board appointments".

Mr. Cannon stated he is opposed to the entire concept.

Ms. Meltzer suggested eliminating "nepotism disclosure form", replacing that with "relative disclosure form".

Mr. Gielegem and Mr. Keys accepted the inclusion of Ms. Meltzer's suggestion as a **friendly amendment to Amendment 7**, so the motion reads as follows:

To approve **Amendment 7**, as follows: Page 15, under Section VI - Prohibited Conduct & Disclosures, revise "E" as follows: Keeping the title "Hiring of Relatives", and following the words "...such a relationship to the Township", eliminate the words "...as early in the evaluation and selection process as is reasonably possible." and replace those words with "by completing a **relative disclosure form** for any current relatives employed by the Township and for any prospective employees during the evaluation and selection process. Such forms will be made available to all Board members, appointing agencies, and made publicly available on the Ethics Webpage prior to Board appointments".

Roll Call (**on Amendment 7, as revised by friendly amendment**): Ayes – Gielegem, Keys, West, Meltzer. Nays – Pearl, Cannon, Aragona. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Motion by Mr. Gielegem, seconded by Mr. Keys, to approve **Amendment 8**, as follows: Pages 16, under Section VI, Prohibited Conduct & Disclosures, Subsection F, Township Official Mandatory Disclosures, eliminating the language under 2-b, which currently states "All current employers other than the Township", and replace it with "All sources of income, property interests and assets for themselves and their spouse;"; further, eliminating F-2-d through F-2-g. Discussion took place.

Mr. Gielegem explained his reasons for the amendment, noting it is the language the State is also calling for, and it is less than the standards put in place by Congress, because Congress requires disclosure of amounts of those investments or ownership interest within certain parameters.

Mr. Cannon stated that is an invasion of privacy and he did not feel that is anyone else's business other than that of their own families.

Ms. West stated if her husband works for a business that comes before the Township for a tax abatement or other request, she stressed she should be abstaining from that vote. She pointed out it reflects that it is a source of income coming into her house, but it does not specify amounts. She felt it is important to have that in place and indicated she will be voting yes.

Mr. Cannon pointed out it is not in the County policy, is not in the Birmingham policy, and he felt it should not be in their policy.

Ms. West claimed it is in both the state and federal policy.

Ms. Meltzer pointed out that if that situation came up, the Board member involved would recuse himself/herself. She noted that state law only requires they recuse themselves from voting on issues of financial interest, but when she recused herself from voting on an IFT for a family member, she assured she had no financial interest in that company, but she recused herself because of that perception.

Ms. West stressed an ethics policy is all about perception.

Mr. Pearl stated his kids have to do that because they are certified financial planners, and their spouses are also required to list everything because it is required by federal law. This Board should not have to be required to go to that depth.

Mr. Keys felt it is important to do this. They are trying to streamline this, and he felt it is not intrusive into their lives, pointing out they do not have to disclose amounts. He recognized that financial planners are required to disclose all of that because they are entrusted by the public to take money and invest it into a retirement fund. He compared it to the similar trust the voters place in them when they elect them into office. He felt they should not have to wait for the Board to tell them about their conflicts at a Board meeting right before a vote, but they want a process that allows the Board to fill out a form, place it on the Township's website, and let the residents look at it at their convenience.

Mr. Cannon welcomed anyone wishing to do so to go ahead, but he felt it is an invasion of privacy. He indicated they have a difference of opinion, so they can vote on it.

Ms. West claimed part of the creation of an ethics policy came from an investigation of Mr. Santia. She felt a disclosure form that would have been

required would have shown if he had another business. She felt it is counterintuitive to have taken the employees out of this.

Mr. Pearl stated the employees are still included.

Mr. Cannon stated it is there, and indicated it was in his contract and he knew about it because he negotiated the contract.

Roll Call (**on Amendment 8**): Ayes – Gielegem, Keys, West. Nays – Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Absent – None. Motion failed for lack of votes.

Mr. Keys stated the next amendment he is going to propose is one of his favorite pieces of text out of this policy. He initially submitted it to the Board, and he was surprised and thankful to see the Budget/Ways & Means members had kept it in the document. In the most recent version, he noted it was removed.

Motion by Mr. Keys, seconded by Ms. West, to approve **Amendment 9**, as follows: Page 16, under Section VI, Prohibited Conduct & Disclosures, Subsection F, Township Official Mandatory Disclosures, add "5" as follows: "Taxpayer Expense Disclosure: all materials printed, designed, produced or distributed using Township resources which include either the name, photo or image or any of the above of an elected official shall include a prominent readable disclaimer "provided at taxpayers' expense". Discussion ensued.

Mr. Cannon questioned whether this includes tax bills and business cards.

Mr. Keys replied affirmatively.

Mr. Cannon stated that will take up a lot of room on a business card to have that prominent readable disclaimer included.

Mr. Keys claimed his business cards state "Proudly printed in Clinton Township", in addition to a union bug, with the website and Nixle on the back of his card. He felt there is plenty of room to promote themselves and programs. He felt if Mr. Cannon wants to make an exemption, he would be happy to talk about documents that could be exempt.

Mr. Cannon did not feel that anyone would think a tax bill, an absentee ballot or a business card was not paid for at taxpayer expense. Mr. Cannon stated he could see no reason for this amendment.

Mr. Keys inquired as to whether Mr. Cannon would like to exempt tax bills, absentee ballots and business cards.

Mr. Cannon stated he has not thought of all of the items, adding he did not see this until tonight.

Mr. Keys disagreed, claiming he submitted it last August, and it was included in every version of the draft policy other than the copy of the policy they received today. He felt it was a surprise that it was removed from the document.

Mr. Cannon stated they are going over the list of items that Mr. Keys indicated he wanted included in the policy, and he noted that quite a few of them were incorporated into the draft policy.

Mr. Keys stated he would like to hear from the members of the Budget/Ways & Means Committee as to why that was removed after being approved by Budget/Ways & Means with it included.

Discussion took place regarding the removal of the item from the Ethics Policy draft.

Mr. Keys claimed it was in the minutes of the Budget/Ways & Means Committee meeting, and he indicated someone must have removed it without the knowledge of the Committee.

Mr. Cannon stated he removed a lot today, although he replied to further inquiry that he did not believe this was one of the items he removed. He added that he included a lot today as well.

Ms. Meltzer stated there was a lot she cleaned up today in preparation for this presentation, but she could not recall removing it.

Mr. Cannon stated he does not want it in and will be voting no on it.

Mr. Keys stated when elected officials put their name on something and pass it out in the community, he felt it is important that residents know who is paying for that. It does not mean it is not worthwhile to send it out, but residents should know how they are spending the taxpayer's money.

Mr. Cannon reminded that if it is a political piece, a disclaimer is required to be added.

Ms. West recalled this came up last summer with some of the pieces that were put out on the Police and Fire millage.

Mr. Gieleghem provided a brief example of the Conservation Committee, who is supporting the Green Macomb Initiative through the County. They have fantastic prices, and the Committee did a flyer. The names of the Conservation

Committee members were included, so they wanted to make clear to the public that this document was produced in house by the Township on behalf of the Conservation Committee so they could get plants for the people who want to beautify their yards. They felt it is in the best interest of the community.

Ms. Meltzer questioned why the committee member's names need to be on that document.

Mr. Gielegem replied their names are on because they are making the effort to pass out this information.

Ms. Meltzer felt that politicians could be using that to put their names out there.

Mr. Pearl cautioned that if this is approved, every single thing on cable and the webpage would have to have that disclaimer included. He felt it is covered under campaign finance laws and goes a little too far.

Roll Call (**on Amendment 9**): Ayes – Keys, West, Gielegem. Nays – Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Absent – None. Motion failed for lack of votes.

Ms. West stated that she was not at the Budget/Ways & Means Committee meeting, and she understands the moratorium is for election time. She felt it should be in effect 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. She could see no reason for a moratorium.

Motion by Ms. West, seconded by Mr. Gielegem, to approve **Amendment 10**, as follows: Pages 18 and 19, under Section VII, Enforcement and Implementation, eliminate Subsection D - Moratorium. Discussion followed.

Mr. Keys recalled when he was first elected to the Board, there was a big debate about the Cable TV policy, with the 60-day rule. It has been changed to the 30-day rule, allowing the incumbents to have more face time and a perfect example of giving favoritism to the incumbent, allowing them to go out and interact and communicate with the public even closer to the election using Township resources. This would place a moratorium on bringing any complaints forward during an election time so they are silencing those in an election period that would want to bring up a complaint and have their concern heard.

Mr. Cannon stated that, now that they will have a group evaluating any complaints, he has no problem with this. It eliminates a lot of false accusations brought to the Board at the last minute. He does not disagree with this.

Ms. Meltzer cautioned that during election time, there are all kinds of political "games" and people send out literature with false accusations. She thought this

was first brought forward to mitigate false accusations that tend to come up just prior to the elections.

Mr. Gieleghem felt they have a system of “innocent until proven guilty”, although it may not always apply to people in public office. This is the incumbency protection rule in the Ethics Policy. He felt the burden is on them to say they do not feel anything occurred wrong, and they could be required to meet on it right away. He felt, on one hand, to reduce the 60-day rule to the 30-day rule to get more airtime, but then try to shield themselves from criticism is “talking out of both sides of their mouth”.

Discussion took place regarding who supported the motion.

Mr. Pearl indicated when he indicated he “supported” the motion, he was referring to being in favor of it.

Ms. Meltzer clarified that when a motion is made, the proper term is for someone to “second” the motion, not “support” the motion. She explained this is specified in Robert’s Rules of Order.

Mr. Gieleghem stated he had seconded the motion.

Roll Call (**on Amendment 10**): Ayes – West, Gieleghem, Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona. Nays – Meltzer. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Motion by Mr. Keys, seconded by Mr. Gieleghem, to approve **Amendment 11**, as follows: At the end of the document, the following language is to be added: "As soon as practicable and in concurrence with bargaining contracts the provisions of the gift ban, conflict of interest disclosure, hiring of relatives, and ethics training shall apply to all employees". Discussion took place.

Mr. Dolan felt it would be appropriate for Mr. Smith to comment on this since it is a labor relations matter.

Mr. Smith explained they have contracts with many bargaining units, and such a policy would have to be renegotiated with each of the twelve bargaining units in terms of how the policy would apply to each of those individual bargaining units, so theoretically they could end up with twelve different Ethics Policies.

Mr. Keys pointed out that technically at this point, they have twelve different contracts so they have twelve different ethics policies.

Mr. Smith replied that they are similar but they do vary.

Mr. Gieleghem felt this is helping them fix what they never should have done, which was to take everyone out of the policy other than the Township elected officials and those who serve on committees. He noted when he worked at the County, there were twenty-seven different bargaining units and their policy applied to everyone. He felt they are putting a burden on the HR Director and on themselves to say that this policy has to be put into every contract.

Mr. Cannon stated the employees he talked to would be incensed if the Board were to pass this. They have no problem working with Mr. Smith on their individual contracts but they are opposed to having this policy apply to them.

Mr. Gieleghem clarified there are only four provisions in the contract that would apply to them. He stated as soon as they can get it negotiated, it will apply.

Ms. Meltzer stated she does not mind this, but it seems as though Mr. Smith will have to bring this to each negotiation every time.

Mr. Smith stated he would have to go to each bargaining unit and discuss it with them individually, noting the policy itself is negotiated. It is the same way they have the Civil Service system, but if they look at each of the ways that those individual bargaining units interact within that Civil Service system, it varies, based on certain provisions that override that particular statute. It is not necessarily uniform. The Ethics Policy would follow the same pattern, and there are variations based on individual patterns within those bargaining units.

Ms. Meltzer commented that this could apply to some bargaining units and not others.

Mr. Smith replied affirmatively, in various forms.

Mr. Keys stated what they are looking for is, as soon as humanly possible, to put in a policy stating their employees cannot take gifts from businesses that have a contract with the Township, they are provided a Conflict of Interest disclosure form and given the resources to let the Township know about their conflicts of interest, they will have the Hiring of Relatives policy, and will have Ethics training and have a policy to know what is right and what is wrong.

Mr. Pearl understood that the County Charter considers all employees the same. The Board made a motion months ago to do this very thing, and as soon as this policy is adopted, they would direct the Human Resources Director to negotiate this policy with all bargaining units.

Mr. Gieleghem questioned where that was made clear, and if it was in the minutes.



Ms. West replied affirmatively.

Mr. Gieleghem felt it should be included in the policy.

Ms. West stated wherever she has worked, if something needs to be globally done, they go on line and take the training. She felt they are asking for an ethics training that they and the employees do annually and sign off on it.

Ms. Meltzer questioned how much an on-line training program would cost.

Mr. Smith replied there would be a cost associated with it because it is a software package that has to be designed specifically. He replied to further inquiry that the cost would vary tremendously depending upon the package they buy and what they want to do.

Ms. Meltzer stated the County has something similar but she questioned whether they implement it.

Mr. Smith replied the County has a system they use now to varying degrees but they are going out to bid now for another system. He replied he does not want to quote costs, but it is an amount of money. He questioned how much the Novus System cost.

Ms. Meltzer replied the annual cost is \$12,000, and the initial cost was \$23,000.

Mr. Smith noted that would be a similar-type system where data is entered and they go on line.

Mr. Keys stated he has been at the County for three years, and during his first year, he took the ethics training. He felt an ethics training program would not be as much money as an agenda management program and would most likely not have the ongoing costs.

Mr. Smith stated it depends upon the nature of the software and what the training provides.

Mr. Keys felt ethics is a priority, and he stressed it is important to give the employees the tools to make the right decisions, as well as having a policy on paper so they know they have done everything “up to par”.

Mr. Smith stated that typically those types of systems can be designed to offer different training as well, so it would not be for ethics training only. He stated they got a price for providing their field personnel with email addresses because they do not have access to that type of system. To provide email access for the 50+ personnel in the field, including Water & Sewer and DPW, it would be about

\$5,000 per year to add them, and that would be separate from any software cost for training.

Roll Call (**on Amendment 11**): Ayes – Keys, Gielegghem, West. Nays – Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Absent – None. Motion failed for lack of votes.

Mr. Gielegghem stated the concept of having an Ethics Board came on late, and he was not able to draft a policy for this, but he did not see how the board members of the Ethics Board would be appointed.

Mr. Cannon stated he took Mr. Gielegghem's advice and took it directly from Birmingham's policy, although they did not have it listed. He explained if this passes tonight, he intends to contact Birmingham and find out their process for appointment. He envisioned that the Administrative Assistant will post in the same manner as for all other boards and commissions, those interested will submit their applications, and the Board will vote on the three-member board.

Mr. Gielegghem questioned whether they would like to vote on the amendment this evening, stating that the positions will be posted for thirty (30) days like all other boards and committees.

Mr. Cannon replied they can add that in tonight.

Mr. Dolan inquired as to whether that would include the process of the applicants having the opportunity to introduce themselves to the Board before there is an actual vote.

Mr. Cannon replied affirmatively, noting it would be like every other committee.

Mr. Gielegghem stated he will defer to Mr. Dolan for the correct language but indicated it will be done in the same manner as for all other board and committee appointments.

Motion by Mr. Gielegghem, seconded by Ms. Meltzer, to approve **Amendment 12**, which states the process for selecting the Ethics Committee members, which is similar to the process for appointing all other committee members, whereby the positions are posted, applications are accepted, the applicants have an opportunity to introduce themselves to the Board at a Board meeting, and they will be voted on by the Board at a subsequent Board meeting. Roll Call: Ayes – Gielegghem, Meltzer, West, Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Mr. Cannon indicated they now have an Ethics Policy to vote on, which includes the amendments that were passed tonight.

Ms. West stated that that, prior to discussion of the amendments, she seconded the motion to approve the Ethics Policy. That motion is on the floor, and she indicated she would like to withdraw her second of the motion on the floor to approve the Ethics Policy because she will no longer be voting in favor of it.

Discussion took place regarding whether the original motion failed because there is not second to the motion.

Mr. Cannon stated he will second the motion to approve the Ethics Policy as presented, including the amendments that were approved this evening. He opened the floor for public comments.

Mr. Sam Bushell, 18546 Whalen, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, felt this Ethics Policy is overdue, and he was glad to see some of the Board members recognized that last year during the Fire and Police millage, this Board was paying for all types of advertising without any notice that the taxpayers were paying for it. He claimed if this had been in place when Mr. Santia was at the Township, they would not be paying a pension for him. He questioned why the Township is not paying back the citizens for the advertising he claimed was not handled properly.

Mr. Bob Hogan, 36755 Barr Street, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, noted the mention that this is copied off of the Macomb County policy, but he felt there is a lot of scandal in the County, so he felt that does not mean much. He commented it is very unlikely that everyone understands all of the amendments made tonight. He felt they should take two weeks to understand it before they vote on it. Mr. Hogan claimed ethics has been absent in Clinton Township for years, and he felt this policy will not change that. He expressed his opposition to the proposed Ethics policy, claiming it is “useless”. He felt it should be posted in a local newspaper before it is posted so all can review it, and he felt all seven Board members should support an honest ethics policy. He insisted an ethics policy is important and should not be passed by the slimmest of margins. He cited several portions of the proposed policy that he felt should be eliminated and voiced his objections.

Mr. James Nowc, 20761 Marvindale, Clinton Township, Michigan, came tonight to hear about the ethics policy, and he is pleased they are moving forward. He expressed some dismay that the Budget/Ways & Means Committee, comprised of three elected officials, the HR Director and the attorney put this together. He felt businesses do not let their employees set the rules, and in this case, he felt there should have been some taxpayer input because the taxpayers are their employers. He hoped the Ethics Board has people of good character to make sure the Ethics Policy is followed to the letter.

Ms. Susan Diliberti, 41202 Worthington, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, commented it is difficult for citizens to respond to this entire policy, trying to remember the items. She would like to read the entire policy before it is approved. She felt it is imperative that their sources of income be revealed because they are public officials and they work for the taxpayers.

Mr. Keys stated he will be voting against this policy. He felt it is imperative that there are four points, including the gift ban, real financial disclosure, a real political donation ban, and the taxpayer expense disclosure. He felt they are crucial, so he will be voting no on the proposed policy.

Mr. Cannon reminded that a difference of opinion does not necessarily mean a difference of principal. He stated he will respect Mr. Keys' opinion, as he hoped Mr. Keys would respect his opinion. He felt this is a good policy, and he stressed he does not need a policy to tell him how to be ethical, noting he learned that when he was a child. He felt strongly that a policy in place such as this would not have stopped Mr. Reynolds from doing what he did.

Ms. Meltzer emphasized that this document is "fluid" and is subject to revisions. As things change and are put into place, items can be added or taken away. She read a portion of her letter to the Board regarding the Ethics Policy which stated "It is important to note that this document is subject to revisions by the Board of Trustees. As time evolves so may the needs to administer additional language, delete language or change language that is appropriate to address new issues."

Mr. Cannon stated the County is currently on their third revision.

Ms. Kathy Voss, 20215 Webster, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated her feeling that an ethics policy is needed. She indicated there are others that are being looked at in the County. She could see no problem with having an ethics policy. She pointed out that if she is filling out an application for a job, her credit is checked and her information needs to be provided. She stressed they are not asking for monetary information, but interests should be revealed. Whether the incidents that occurred in the Township would have happened with an ethics policy in place is something they do not know, but they would not be walking away with a pension.

Mr. Gielegem reviewed some of the background on how they got to this point with the ethics policy, noting that last August, they sent a letter outlining the components of an ethics policy. A generic form was also submitted and the idea was to try to merge the two and vote on the points of difference. They did not do that, but went to Budget/Ways & Means Committee, and the Board voted at least

three times to say it should not be done in Budget/Ways & Means but either through a separate committee, or through the Board. He noted this process took a little over an hour this evening, and he claimed he has never seen a local government deal with an issue of this magnitude and all of the different amendments like they dealt with tonight, so he gave credit to the Board for working through this tonight. He felt they could have done this last August. They could not agree in Budget/Ways & Means and this is not the policy they agreed upon, so they had a split vote. Some of the elements he would have liked to have seen are not included. He will not be supporting the policy and will be asking the Board to continue working on it. He assured he respects opinions and different points of view, along with the fact they will not always agree, and assured they can do that respectfully. He noted they will be doing that through their vote this evening.

Ms. West noted that Mr. Cannon quoted Mr. Aragona on a comment he had made about how he learned ethics in kindergarten. She stressed the people on this Board have been lucky to have had parents and others who taught them ethics as children. She assured she is not insinuating that the employees of the Township were not taught the same thing when they were children, but she felt there is always one who could slip through the cracks and may not have learned it. She assured they are not bashing employees saying they are not ethical but are saying there is a level playing field and they have to work within those standards.

Roll Call (on motion to approve the ethics policy with amendments as approved this evening): Ayes – Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Nays – West, Keys, Gielegghem. Absent – None. Motion carried.

#### **24. REQUEST ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DEFERRED COMPENSATION PLAN COMMITTEE**

Motion by Mr. Keys, seconded by Mr. Gielegghem, to receive and file the letter dated March 18th, 2019 from the Human Resources Director, and approve the establishment of the Deferred Compensation Plan Committee, comprised of the Finance Director, Assistant Finance Director and Human Resources Director, as recommended by Plante Moran Financial Advisors (PMFA), and the scope of the Committee's duties shall consist of reviewing providers, services, participant fees, investment offerings, administrative fees as well as plan document development. Roll Call: Ayes – Keys, Gielegghem, West, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

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

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

Motion by Mr. Aragona, seconded 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 – Aragona, Keys, West, Pearl, Cannon, Gielegghem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

**26. REQUEST APPROVAL TO PURCHASE TREE TRUCK FOR DPW**

Motion by Mr. Keys, seconded by Ms. Meltzer, to receive and file the letter dated March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2019 from the Director of Public Services and approve the purchase of one (1) Altec Model LR7-60E70 Forestry Truck in the amount of \$170,830, which will be purchased from Altec Industries through the State of Michigan MiDeal Contract #071B7700167; further, this purchase has been approved in the 2019/2020 Capital Outlay budget. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Aragona noted he had discussed this briefly with Ms. Bednar, and he recalled Ms. Bednar had indicated they cannot have the old truck certified.

Ms. Bednar replied that is correct. She indicated they have taken it to try to get it certified.

Mr. Aragona questioned whether the new truck will actually come in under that price because of the core charge.

Ms. Bednar explained they will try to trade it with this vendor but they do not yet have a price. If the Board approves this amount, they can work with that, and if they get a trade-in price, the amount will be less. She replied to further inquiry that, because it has not been certified, she is not sure of the value of the current truck.

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

**27. APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO NON-REPRESENTED EMPLOYEE PAY AND BENEFITS POLICY**

Motion by Mr. Aragona, seconded by Mr. Gielegghem, to receive and file the letter dated March 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2019 from the Human Resources Director and approve the amendment to the Non-Represented Employees Pay and Benefit Policy to include Election Coordinator to Article II - Coverage and Appendix A, and that the Election Coordinator position be removed from the UAW Local 56 bargaining unit, per their agreement with the Township. Discussion took place.

Mr. Keys stated he did not receive this until Friday afternoon, so he apologized for not being able to contact Ms. Meltzer or Mr. Smith with his questions, but he questioned why they are moving the position from bargaining to non-represented.

Ms. Meltzer was told that the union does not represent the duties specified in this job description any longer.

Mr. Smith clarified when the position was originally incorporated into the bargaining unit, it was an Election Clerk position. Over the years, the responsibilities and title have continually evolved and the bargaining unit felt it evolved past their community of work. He explained that as a Coordinator, that person would have some supervisory responsibilities, and that is no longer in the purview of the bargaining unit.

Mr. Keys inquired as to whether the union came to Mr. Smith with this request.

Mr. Smith replied he had a conversation with them to initiate the conversation with them outside of negotiations.

Mr. Keys stated he is always a little leery when they are changing positions to a point where the union determines it does not fall into their category. He felt they need to consider that before they change the positions. He noted he is “up in the air” on this request.

Mr. Smith clarified it used to be part of the non-represented pay and benefits policy until approximately 2013. It went from Election Clerk to Election Specialist, then went to Election Coordinator about a year ago. He replied to inquiry that, prior to 2013, the position was not in a union bargaining unit.

Ms. Meltzer clarified she had requested it be a union position but job has evolved over the years. She stated about a year ago, she thought about questioning whether the union would be willing to remove this position from their bargaining unit but she did not anticipate they would agree to it. She explained it is very important to have this position filled, and when the Elections Specialist moved on, it was very hard to find a replacement. She added she was in the middle of an election at that time, which is another reason why she felt it is not good to have this position in a union.

Mr. Smith reminded that this is still a Civil Service position, so it is still classified, but it is non-represented.

Mr. Gielegem pointed out there is a Supervisor’s union, so if that position does not fit into the particular bargaining unit, it may fit into another union.

Mr. Smith explained if any of those bargaining units petition to have that position moved into their bargaining unit, they would have to look at it at that point.

Mr. Gielegem felt this should be worked out, and he stated he is withdrawing his second of the motion on the floor.

Mr. Cannon stated he will second the motion.

Roll Call (**on the motion on the floor that is now being seconded by Mr. Cannon after Mr. Gielegem withdrew his second**): Ayes – Aragona, Cannon, Pearl, Meltzer. Nays – West, Keys, Gielegem. Absent – None. Motion carried.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 11<sup>TH</sup>, 2019 REGULAR TOWNSHIP BOARD MEETING**

Motion by Mr. Keys, seconded by Ms. West, to approve the minutes of the March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2019 Regular Township Board Meeting as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – Keys, West, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona, Gielegem, Meltzer. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

### **APPROVAL OF BILLS**

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

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There was one public comment:

Mr. Sam Bushell spoke on the Governor's proposed 45-cent-per-gallon gas tax. He sent emails to his State Representative, State Senator, Governor and Attorney General, and he claimed none of them want to ask for an Attorney General's opinion. He requested this Board ask the State Representative, State Senator and Governor to request an opinion from the Attorney General as to whether this tax, per the Headlee Amendment, would have to go to a vote of the citizens of the State of Michigan before it can be imposed. He claimed the Attorney General only answers to public officials, so that is why he is making this request to the Township Board.

### **ADJOURNMENT INTO CLOSED SESSION**

The meeting adjourned into Closed Session at 10:27 p.m. and reconvened at 10:37 p.m.



**25. CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS (FROM CLOSED SESSION)**

Mr. Cannon stated they held a Closed Session discussion regarding contract negotiations.

Mr. Smith recommended the Board approve the labor agreement between the Township and UAW Local 412 Unit 52 Technical Office Professionals, which is a five-year contract with a 2% cost of living adjustment each year.

Motion by Ms. West, seconded by Mr. Aragona, to approve the labor agreement between the Township and UAW Local 412 Unit 52 Technical Office Professionals, as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – West, Aragona, Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Gielegem, Meltzer. Nays – None.

Mr. Smith recommended the Board approve the labor agreement between the Township and UAW Local 412 Unit 76 Professional Water Workers, which is a four-year contract with a 2.25% the first year, and 2% each year thereafter.

Motion by Ms. Meltzer, seconded by Mr. Gielegem, to approve the labor agreement between the Township and UAW Local 412 Unit 76 Professional Water Workers, as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – Meltzer, Gielegem, West, Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Aragona. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Ms. West, seconded by Mr. Aragona, to adjourn the meeting. Roll Call: Ayes – West, Aragona, Keys, Pearl, Cannon, Gielegem, Meltzer. Nays - None. Absent – None. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 10:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

KIM MELTZER, CLERK  
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CLINTON