



ACME TOWNSHIP SPECIAL BOARD MEETING
ACME TOWNSHIP HALL
6042 Acme Road, Williamsburg MI 49690
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 29, 2007 7:00 p.m.

Meeting called to Order with the Pledge of Allegiance at 7:02 p.m.

Members present: B. Boltres, D. Dunville, W. Kladder, P. Scott, E. Takayama (7:03 p.m.), F. Zarafonitis
Members excused: None
Staff present: S. Corpe, Township Manager/Recording Secretary
C. Bzdok, Legal Counsel

INQUIRY AS TO CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: Kladder stated a conflict of interest with agenda item D, discussing the application process for the Supervisor position.

A. APPOINT MODERATOR TO CONDUCT MEETING:
Motion by Dunville, support by Boltres to appoint Scott to moderate the meeting. Motion carried by a vote of 5 in favor (Boltres, Dunville, Kladder, Takayama, Zarafonitis), 0 opposed and 1 abstaining (Scott).

B. LIMITED PUBLIC COMMENT
Andy Andres Sr., M-72 East, stated that he understands that 10 people applied for the position. Not all are present this evening. He suggested that candidates not in attendance be dropped from consideration, as this may be an indication of their future attendance habits.

C. CORRESPONDENCE
1. Letter from Lewis Griffith, 5181 Lautner Road dated August 27, 2007: Read into the record by Scott, who noted this has been addressed.

D. ESTABLISH PROCEDURE FOR REMAINING PORTIONS OF SUPERVISOR SELECTION PROCESS/DISCUSS APPLICATIONS RECEIVED AND CANDIDATES TO BE INTERVIEWED: Kladder moved from the Board table to the audience due to conflict of interest. Scott asked Bzdok to discuss options for how to proceed with filling the Supervisor position. Bzdok stated that there are several options: interview all people who applied or only some of them. Lengths of interviews and how they are conducted, and how to decide which candidates to be interviewed can be deliberated. All of these decisions are completely at the Board's discretion. If only a subset of candidates are to be interviewed, each Board member could indicate their choices in writing with their name on the page; the pages then to be read aloud to ensure that all voting is conducted entirely in public.

Motion by Scott, support by Dunville to interview all individuals who applied for the position. Interviews would consist of a five minute personal statement by the candidate and the asking and answering of one or two questions from each Board member.

Takayama has read through the applications and done some research regarding the candidates. He does not feel that all of the applicants are qualified, and that it would be a waste of time to interview unqualified individuals. He also feels it would be inappropriate to interview candidates involved in the attempt to recall the Board, as it seems unlikely that a positive working relationship could be established with them. He would prefer not to interview everyone just for the sake of "political correctness," but to select four or five more qualified individuals to focus on. Zarafonitis supported Takayama's statements.

Michael Srdjak, 5221 US 31 North asked if it is appropriate for the moderator to make motions; Bzdok stated that it is permissible.

Motion failed by a vote of 2 in favor (Dunville, Scott) and 3 opposed (Boltres, Takayama, Zarafonitis).

Motion by Takayama, support by Zarafonitis to interview a maximum of four of the most qualified candidates as selected through Board discussion. Motion carried by a vote of 4 in favor (Dunville, Scott, Takayama, Zarafonitis) and 1 opposed (Boltres).

Discussion turned to how to select the four candidates to be interviewed. Bzdok suggested that each Board member list four names, in no particular order, of the candidates they would like to interview, along with the Board member's name. The votes would be read into the record, and things would proceed from there. There may be four people who clearly lead the voting, or there could be many tied with a few votes requiring further discussion.

Scott noted that Zarafonitis has been out of town and asked if he has had sufficient time to review the applications. Zarafonitis has read them but would appreciate more time to review them. Consensus was to have each Board member consider their choices and cast their votes for who to interview as part of the September 4 Board meeting.

Motion by Scott, support by Dunville that the Board members consider which candidates should be interviewed in preparation to cast their votes in public on September 4 at the regular Board meeting for 4 individuals to interview on September 12. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

E. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Noelle Knopf, 5795 US 31 N complimented Scott on the way he moderated the meeting this evening. She expressed disappointment that the Board is not going to interview all of the people who took time to apply. She realizes that there are uncomfortable relationships, but regrets the loss of a potential opportunity to see if some better connections could be made.

James Edward Schmidt, an 11th applicant, asked for the opportunity to read the resume he submitted to the Board, and was permitted to proceed.

Mr. Srdjak asked for a copy of a job description and was told that a copy of the statutory duties of the position is available through the office. He asked if the questions would be standardized for all candidates. Bzdok stated that there can be identical question sets, completely differing question sets or a mixture of standard and customized questions. Mr. Srdjak noted Bzdok's prior comments that Board lists should not be prepared in advance of the meeting, nor should there be discussion between Board members regarding their choices prior to the public meeting.

Takayama asked if he could ask Mr. Schmidt a question about where he resides. Bzdok suggested that the motion this evening was to make decisions about who to interview at the next meeting, and that questions should be reserved for candidates who are selected for interview. Any Board member is free to individually call a candidate and ask questions of them between meetings. Mr. Schmidt stated that he intends to attend the September 4 meeting.

Dunville stated appreciation for the effort put into the applications received.

Meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.