



**ACME TOWNSHIP REGULAR BOARD MEETING
ACME TOWNSHIP HALL
6042 Acme Road, Williamsburg MI 49690
Tuesday, February 5, 2008 6:30 p.m.**

CALL TO ORDER WITH PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AT 6:32 p.m.

Members present: D. Dunville, R. Hardin, W. Kladder, P. Scott, E. Takayama, F. Zarafonitis
Members excused: B. Boltres
Staff present: S. Vreeland, Township Manager/Recording Secretary
J. Hull, Zoning Administrator
C. Bzdok, Legal Counsel

Motion by Takayama, support by Dunville to enter closed session to discuss pending litigation in CCAT v. Acme Township v. The Village at Grand Traverse LLC and Meijer Inc., and in Meijer Inc. v. Acme Township because discussion in open session could have a detrimental impact on the financial interests of the township. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

Regular meeting recessed at 6:34 p.m.

Motion by Takayama, support by Zarafonitis to reconvene the public meeting at 7:17 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Bzdok stated that today he executed dismissals on behalf of the township prepared by Meijer's new lawyers for all pending appeals in all lawsuits currently between Meijer Inc. and Acme Township. This includes all Supreme Court and Court of Appeals matters and constitutionality of conditions placed on the approved Lautner Commons development. He believes the township, Meijer and counsel for the Village at Grand Traverse (VGT) have all signed, and that when the orders are signed by the judges all lawsuits will be at an end. Kladder stated a desire to move beyond the conflict and likely illegal actions of the past few years for the betterment of the community.

INQUIRY AS TO CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: None noted

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Motion by Dunville, support by Scott to approve the agenda as amended to add item G3, appoint committee to negotiate relative to the shoreline preservation project. All other new business items will be renumbered accordingly. Motion carried unanimously.

A. CONSENT CALENDAR:

Motion by Zarafonitis, support by Takayama to approve the Consent Calendar as presented, including:

RECEIVE AND FILE:

1. **Treasurer's Report** as of 12/31/07
2. **Clerk's Report** as of 01/29/08
3. Draft Unapproved Meeting Minutes:
 - a. **01/28/08 Planning Commission**
 - b. **01/09/08 Shoreline Preservation Advisory**
 - c. **01/23/08 Joint meeting of Shoreline and Parks & Recreation Advisory**
 - d. **01/28/08 Joint meeting of Shoreline and Parks & Recreation Advisory**
4. **2007 Grand Traverse County Drain Commissioner's Report**
5. **GT County DPW Sewer & Water Committee Draft Meeting Minutes 01-14-08**

ACTION:

6. Consider approval of the **01/08/08** Township Board meeting minutes

7. Consider approval: **Accounts Payable** of \$201,833.12 through 01/29/08
8. Adopt **Resolution #R-2008-03** establishing Acme Township 2008 Board of Review meeting start date

Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

B. LIMITED PUBLIC COMMENT:

Kladder stated that he will accept public comment regarding proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment #141 during that agenda item.

Doug Mansfield, Mansfield & Associates is representing Immanuel LLC regarding the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment. He asked if he will be able to make a presentation in response to the findings of fact prepared; he may.

C. CORRESPONDENCE (all received and filed):

1. Faxed letter from **Gene Veliquette received 01/22/08**
2. Cherry Capital Cable Council Final Accounting Status:
 - a. **01/21/08 letter** from Richard W. Ford
 - b. **01/18/08 letter** from Richard I. Lewis, City Manager
3. **Various letters received** regarding the Immanuel LLC rezoning request
4. **Undated letter** from Wilfred and Marilyn Smith, Arrowhead Estates, opposing Immanuel LLC rezoning request

D. SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS: None

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None

F. OLD BUSINESS:

1. Consider approval: **Zoning Ordinance Amendment #141**, request by Immanuel LLC to rezone approximately 90 acres west of Bates Road and south of the railroad tracks from R-1MH, Mobile Home Park to R-3, Urban Residential: The finding of fact authorized by the Board last month and prepared by John Iacoangeli from Beckett & Raeder was available. Mr. Mansfield introduced the site, 92 acres south of the railroad tracks and west of Bates Road. It was rezoned in 1995 to R-1MH, which allows only mobile home parks and mobile home subdivisions. The site encompasses a grade change of approximately 150', and in some areas has slopes of approximately 50%. Mr. Mansfield asserted that as currently zoned he could create up to 700 mobile home lots, but under the requested R-3 zoning he stated that a maximum of 261 housing units could be created, which he characterized as a "significant downzoning." He also cited the possibility for flexibility in terms of mixed uses and housing variety under R-3 which is not available under R-1MH.

Mr. Mansfield observed that his clients welcomed the findings of fact, which were not prepared by the Planning Commission although they recommended approval of the request. The County Planning Commission also supported the request. Mr. Mansfield highlighted some portions of the finding of fact, such as the statement that the nearby B-4 industrial zoning is stated in the ordinance to be incompatible with housing.

Mr. Mansfield discussed the zoning table on page 3 of the report. He stated a belief that there is an error in it, where it says that one goal of the R-1 district is to "minimize undue congestion or other adverse effects on adjacent districts." He asserted that this language pertains to the B-3 district and not the R-1 district. He noted that under the B-4 category a statement is made that public services are "required," yet there is no public water or sanitary service to the B-4 district currently.

A statement in the first paragraph below the table states that the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) calls for this area of the township to include low to medium density housing, which

Mr. Mansfield feels compatible with the goals of the R-3 designation but not the current R-1MH designation. At the top of page 4 a Master Plan call for clustered housing or open space development in this area is cited, which Mr. Mansfield again believes is more compatible with R-3 designation rather than R-1MH designation.

Mr. Mansfield pointed to the second paragraph on page 4 under “Industrial” where it says that the industrial category provides for the possibility of mixed use and residential uses, but two pages earlier the report indicates a point of view that industrial and residential uses are not compatible.

Mr. Mansfield stated that a “scare” was raised at the last Board meeting that if the township rezoned this parcel away from R-1MH there would be no other areas indicated for this use in the township and would therefore leave the community open to mobile home park uses anywhere in the township. He asserted that this is not the case, in part due to Master Plan statements that indicate that such uses should be confined to high-density, urban areas.

Mr. Mansfield agreed that the current zoning designation is reasonable; however, he feels that the proposed rezoning is more reasonable in terms of reaching current township goals and objectives, particularly for natural features preservation. He does not believe a mistake was made when the property was originally rezoned; however he believes that perhaps it was not a deeply thoughtful process either. As to whether there are changed circumstances over the past 12 years since the rezoning occurred, he asserted that there have been significant changes in terms of additional development at Highpointe Golf Course and Turtle Creek Casino, as well as in the industrial park. He believes that the current zoning does not promote the township’s public health, safety and welfare interests because it does not provide for flexibility in housing design and natural features protection. He believes that there are many ways to meet affordable housing needs beyond mobile home parks. Mr. Mansfield stated that his firm and the applicant have expressed interest in working with the township on mutually favorable design for the site. He asserted that a zoning designation that would permit a maximum of half the current density would reduce future potential traffic on Bates Road and on M-72, and would reduce needs for water and sanitary treatment facilities. Mr. Mansfield was confused by what seems to be an assertion by Iacoangeli that the proposed rezoning would be more urban-seeming than development of a mobile home park. The property is part of a parcel where a shopping center is proposed, so the area already is not developing in a rural pattern. Mr. Mansfield stated being “upset” by the report, which he characterizes as being full of errors. He expressed the idea that the report was prepared by a “hired gun” who was retained to find a way to oppose the project, even after it gained support from the Planning Commission and the County Planning Commission, and that opposition only arose to this request after the Cherries R Us rezoning request to change a parcel on Brackett Road from A-1 Agricultural to R-1MH was presented.

Hardin asked Hull if mobile home developments are only allowed in the R-1MH district. Hull replied that in the R-1MH district the only listed uses are mobile home parks and mobile home subdivisions. A mobile home may be placed on any parcel in the township where no deed restriction exists as long as the home meets minimum dimensional requirements. There is one other parcel of land in the township zoned R-1MH which is currently owned by the state and was the site of a former landfill. If this rezoning is allowed, the question is raised as to where else in the township a mobile home park might be developed. A mobile home park developer would gain an advantage in seeking to locate a project in any zoning district – not a guarantee but a possibility. Mr. Mansfield stated that the language that accompanies the FLUM indicates that areas that are characterized as “urban residential” can include mobile home parks – even if the current zoning would not provide other places specifically for mobile home parks, the FLUM would seem to provide a clear indication of areas where they might be permitted and areas where they should not be.

Hardin has been trying to understand the limitations that terrain might place on creation of a

mobile home park. He has interviewed local mobile home sales companies, which have said a mobile home may be located anywhere a stick-built home may be located. So, why would it be necessary to flatten the hill on the property to develop a mobile home park? Mr. Mansfield replied that many projects have involved flattening hills: Oleson's on Cedar Run Road, Best Buy, and others. He stated that the state exempts mobile home parks from local codes for roads and other infrastructure for fire safety and other issues. Developers around here tend to flatten development sites to make it possible to squeeze every last bit of density from them. He would hate to see this site flattened for this cause.

Hull noted that the FLUM is not a zoning map. If the township is uncertain about whether the FLUM provides sufficient leverage to deal with an exclusionary zoning claim, it should consult legal counsel. The Planning Commission discussed the potential exclusionary zoning issue and determined they didn't feel it was a major issue. Whether or not the Board agrees may be a different matter. Hull stated that on 90 acres an OSD could be developed with up to 360 units under an extreme example preserving 90% of the land as open space, a scenario not contemplated by Mr. Mansfield's assertion that under R-3 zoning there could be a maximum of 261 homesites. Under current R-1MH zoning we allow a maximum development of 250 units on no less than 15 acres and no more than that required to contain 250 homesites plus required appurtenances. Whether or not this provision will be in the revised ordinance text the township is working on remains to be seen. Hull also noted that the landowner could use land division to divide the parcel into several smaller parcels and build each to a maximum number of home sites, and redivide larger parcels again every 10 years. Hardin posed a scenario where more than one mobile home park might be developed to maximum density on one parcel of land, but Hull was not persuaded this could legally occur.

Kladder verified that the Planning Commission discussed exclusionary zoning issues without regard to the Cherries R Us application. Some people felt the risk was greater than others. Hardin noted that the vote was divided 6-3. Those that supported the proposal noted that there have not been any mobile home park applications and it seemed unlikely that it would happen. The decision was made without regard to the Cherries R Us application. Mr. Mansfield stated that the FLUM discusses mobile home parks in urban residential areas.

Kladder asked Hull where the township references the need for mobile home parks to hook to water and sewer systems. Hull replied that there would have to be some sort of common systems in place. He read from the ordinance that a water supply could be from single or community sources, and that sewer disposal would be by means of a community system, with an on-site system serving no more than 50 homes if it is a soil absorption system and providing at least a secondary treatment level providing treatment equal to that of a regional system. There could be multiple soil absorption systems on the property.

Takayama asked about the possibility to create multiple family housing in the R-3 districts, which Hull confirmed. The key constraint to number of units on an R-3 property is meeting maximum impervious surface requirements with housing and required parking spaces. Takayama observed that R-3 zoning would open the door to forms of housing other than single family houses on 1/3 to 1/2 acre lots.

Kladder believes that the value of the property might increase if the rezoning takes place. Hull tends to agree, saying that the people he has spoken to who are looking to develop mobile home parks feel that this particular property is not suitable for a profitable development of that type. The current zoning designation restricts use to one particular type, whereas rezoning would open the property to a wider range of possibilities and would likely generate an immediate increase in value.

Bzdok stated that his firm's advice all along has been that if this property is rezoned the township is exposed to an exclusionary zoning risk. Exclusionary zoning is discussed in the zoning acts and not the planning acts. The zoning ordinance is a zoning document and the

Master Plan, including the FLUM, is a planning document. For this reason he would not be prepared to say that the FLUM text would provide an adequate protection. His firm advised the Planning Commission to seek assistance in preparing a formal finding of fact; they declined. He urged the Board to do so, and they did. Neither township nor legal counsel provided direction to the planner other than to provide the questions to be answered. The FLUM calls for this parcel to be rural residential so perhaps a rezoning of R-1 would match the FLUM better, but he cannot advise the township to downzone the property beyond what the applicant requests. Exclusionary zoning is not the only factor in the rezoning decision, but it is a real one.

Zarafonitis asked for Bzdok's opinion about Mr. Mansfield's opinions about the findings of fact. Bzdok stated he is not a planner and is not familiar with details of the site. He cannot suppose what Iacoangeli's counterpoints might be were he here.

Hardin clarified again that the current ordinance limits mobile home park size to 250 units per parcels. Hull stated the property could be divided into multiple parcels and generate multiple 250 unit-maximum mobile home parks. The same could be true under a different zoning designation. High density development would be subject to the special use permit review process including water and sanitary issues. Mr. Mansfield added that there would also be environmental review issues, noting that the applicant would be placing itself under the township's very stringent review process – he knows from experience with the Hedden project on Kay Ray Road. Hull noted that the Hedden project was developed under the OSD ordinance, which specifically encompasses more conservation and preservation analysis than most SUP processes. Hardin took this to heart, noting that he has been keeping in mind that a rezoning should not be judged by a proposed project. The property could be the subject of an application for a variety of uses under a variety of mechanisms, and they might not include ones with a strong conservation review process.

Kladder invited public comment. Pat Salathiel, 4888 Five Mile Road expressed strong concerns about the proposal. If a mobile home park could be placed on any R-3 property? Bzdok stated firmly that this is incorrect assertion. If this property is rezoned, someone could decide to create a mobile home park, pick any site in the township and in his opinion the township would be hard pressed to prevent the use from being allowed. The language in the FLUM does not allow mobile home parks in areas shows as urban residential; rather, if someone wanted to rezone a parcel to R-1MH in an area designated urban residential on the FLUM this would be one factor supporting the rezoning request. Mrs. Salathiel stated that this has become a personal concern for her because she lives in a fairly urbanized area but has some privacy and a view of the bay that could be disturbed. Traffic on Five Mile Road could increase drastically.

Takayama complimented Mr. Mansfield on his skills as a planner based on past experience. He asked about the current housing market and how slowly homes are selling or being constructed on lots such as those in the township's R-3 zoning district, so why would it be desirable to rezone to that designation now? Mr. Mansfield stated that the applicant seeks to provide a versatile grouping of workforce housing near what it perceives to have become a service corridor. They don't necessarily want to create a mobile home park; they are not doing well in the very low mortgage rate environment. Generations Management has formed a construction business; they are doing their first housing project at Chrystal Ridge at Four Mile and Hammond Roads.

Takayama noted that today's mobile homes can be very attractive as well as affordable. He believes that the property as zoned could be developed on this parcel and be close to the jobs residents might work at, providing diversity to the housing market and could be designed to fit with the character of the land. Mr. Mansfield replied that he has worked closely with funding opportunities for lower income people. Housing funding sources such as HUD or MSHDA tend not to prefer mobile homes for them, feeling that they could be helped into

homes with more current and potential future value. Instead they help with mortgages that are well below market rates and below what mobile home rates would be. Stick built projects that provide a range of housing types are seen as the best housing subsidy funding opportunity. He would love for the Board to talk to Bill Merry and Homestretch about affordable housing opportunities. Traditions on Roush Road is a Homestretch project. Bay Ridge is a MSHDA housing project. Projects can be build on hilly areas, but over 30% slope is an area to avoid. The fire department and Road Commission only allow 5% to 7% road grades, so introducing any sort of residential development on steep hillsides can be difficult or prohibitive. He also stated that mobile home parks only allow temporary foundations – the wheels stay on a mobile home. Mobile Home subdivisions allow permanent foundations. Either could occur in the R-1MH district.

Takayama also noted that the FLUM is not a zoning map, but it should be seriously considered when deliberating a rezoning request. It is a view to the future, as was discussed repeatedly during the FLUM creation process. He does not want to take property or development rights away from people, but the FLUM must be consulted as part of the decision process.

Mr. Mansfield stated that a discovery that he has made is that if the applicant and the township are at an “impasse,” what could happen if R-3 uses were allowed in the R-1MH district. It would broaden their options for the property without eliminating the R-1MH zoning, and require a simple zoning ordinance amendment. Bzdok stated that if a text amendment to the R-1MH district allowing R-3 uses, and if then a use other than a mobile home park is instituted on the property, the exclusionary zoning issue would rear its head again the same as if the property had been rezoned. The jeopardy would occur once a project had been approved and not immediately. It was discussed that the R-3 district could be amended to permit mobile home parks, or divided into two subdistricts such that mobile home parks were allowed in an R-3A district and not in an R-3B district. The idea was also raised to split the existing parcel and rezone only one, leaving the other zoned R-1MH. This would avoid the exclusionary zoning issue as long as the parcel left in that zoning was an appropriate size and character for mobile home park use.

Hardin feels that the applications should be sent back to the Planning Commission so they can view the Beckett & Raeder report. Dunville appreciated the idea of splitting the property and requesting a rezoning on only part of it. Zarafonitis agreed with sending the application back to the Planning Commission. He felt that the number of a potential 700 units was phrased almost as a threat, and doesn't know why the parcel hasn't been developed as zoned to now but would like to help the applicant. He would support the idea of splitting the property and having the application only rezone part of it. Takayama would like the applicant to be able to use their property profitable, in conjunction with the township FLUM and ordinances and satisfying the need for a variety of housing options. He believes there should be some R-1MH zoning in that area in some size or shape.

Motion by Zarafonitis, support by Dunville to send Zoning Ordinance Amendment #141 back to the Planning Commission for exploration of an option whereby the property might be divided and only partially rezoned.

Bzdok noted that if discussions at the Planning Commission level are fruitful the existing application could be amended accordingly. Mr. Mansfield stated that Immanuel LLC is amenable to exploring this option.

Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

2. Receive **draft updated Parks & Recreation Plan**; announce public hearing in March 2008: Acme Township is performing a five-year update of its Parks & Recreation Plan, which will help maintain eligibility for DNR Trust Fund grant applications. Vreeland stated

that the draft plan is available to the public on-line or through the office, as is a public input survey. A public hearing has been published for the March 4 Board meeting. Kladder encourage the Board to submit comments for compilation prior to the public hearing to Vreeland and encouraged the public to participate in the process.

G. NEW BUSINESS:

1. **Consider approval: Major SUP Amendment/Site Plan Approval #2007-07P to SUP #95-6P for Northland Contractors to add an oil change service to the car wash located at 4200 M-72 East:** Dusty Christiansen from R. Clark Associates presented a Powerpoint regarding the application. The request is to add two oil-change bays to the north side of the existing car wash bays. All uses are allowable by SUP in the B-2 zoning district. The building would increase in size by 1,000 sq. ft. but no increase in impervious surface would occur because the addition would be atop an existing paved area. Access to M-72 would remain unchanged. Additional landscaping would be added along M-72 to bring the site into compliance with current ordinance standards. Some tree species were changed as requested by the Planning Commission. The northernmost hand wash bay would be removed to facilitate addition of the oil change bays. Sealed tanks would contain fluids from the oil change process and be pumped as needed with waste hauled by licensed haulers.

Takayama asked if the used oil storage tanks are above or underground; they are within the lower level of the building which is constructed of poured concrete and sealed to contain any leaks. He also asked if groundwater might be encountered when a basement is dug; the applicant does not believe so. Hardin asked where the truck that pumps the tanks would be located during pumping; Mr. Christiansen didn't know but he suspects outside the bay with a hose than runs into it. Hardin recalled a situation where a hose accidentally disconnected from a petroleum product truck during servicing and there was a scramble to prevent the product from reaching the bay. How would such an accident be contained on this site? Mr. Christiansen stated that the on-site water retention basins would likely catch the spill short-term but other than that he did not know. Hull reports that this industry is heavily state regulated and the DEQ has reviewed the project and granted approval. Kladder asked if vegetation in the retention basin could help with bioremediation in case of a spill, as he is aware that there are certain types known to be useful in particular situations. If there was a large volume spill plants would not be up to the task; phytoremediation is generally used in situations where contamination occurred in the past and there is an attempt to leach it from the environment. Because no additional impervious surface is being created no additional water retention features are required; in fact instead of a preliminary review as would be customary at this point the applicant has received a Soil Erosion permit from the County.

Hardin reported that the Planning Commission had no objections to the project and unanimously recommended approval to the Board. Hull's report was provided; in his mind the proposed change to the existing SUP approval are fairly minor. MDOT did not even require review of the site access provisions. He recalls that the underground oil tanks proposed for the Meijer gas station were more of an issue than an above ground motor oil spill would be on this site. The gas tanks would have been floating in the groundwater and containing gasoline which integrates into water more quickly than the motor oil, which would be above ground. Scott asked if the state requirements call for an attendant to the pumping operation; Hull does not specifically recall but seems reasonable to him that someone would be monitoring and managing the process. Hardin noted a difference between this situation and the Meijer situation because gas delivery to an underground tank is pumping out and down rather than this situation where oil is being vacuum pumped from a tank. If a problem occurs only what is in the line at the time would be spilled.

Motion by Zarafonitis, support by Scott to approve SUP Amendment #2007-07P. Motion carried unanimously.

2. **Consider proposed Resolution #R-2008-04 regarding Metro Fire Station 8 staffing and utility expenses:** Kladder reported that as of January 1 the township and Metro's arrangements changed, with Metro paying all the bills and performing the maintenance on Station 8. Tom Henkel is no longer spending 30% of his time or salary on station maintenance; his time is fully dedicated to general township parks and maintenance now. Kladder had understood that as of January 1 there would be a full-time staff member in the fire station, funded by a SAFER grant which has not yet come through, so the staffer is not there yet. There has also been discussion about how much of the common utility bills for the building will be paid by Metro Fire. Kladder is concerned that without personnel maintaining the station that public health, safety and welfare will be negatively impacted. He therefore proposed the resolution provided, which he discussed with Assistant Chief Terry Flynn in Chief Pat Parker's absence. As an initial response Metro has posted a duty crew schedule making 12 paid hours per week at \$12.50/hour available at the station. Kladder believes this resolution will keep the process of obtaining a full-time fire staffer moving along as well as opening negotiations about payment for utilities and maintenance costs.

Motion by Scott, support by Takayama to adopt Resolution #R-2008-04 as presented. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

3. **Discuss formation of a committee to conduct negotiations relative to the Shoreline Preservation Project:** Kladder and Shoreline Preservation Advisory Co-Chair Pat Salathiel have discussed formation of a committee that would be empowered by the Board to negotiate with willing shoreline property landowners towards potential land purchase option agreements. Kladder proposes that the committee consist of himself. It is permissible to discuss negotiations and terms of property purchases in closed session. The committee would meet in posted open session according to the Open Meetings Act and then go into closed session. They would ultimately make a recommendation to the Board, which could also go into closed session to discuss the offer, but must make a decision in open session. Meetings with the landowner could not occur in closed session. Only once a price and terms are accepted must this be done in open session.

Motion by Zarafonitis support by Takayama to form an ad-hoc Shoreline Preservation Negotiating committee to consist of: the Supervisor, Manager and one co-chair of the Shoreline Preservation Advisory. Motion carried unanimously.

4. **Discuss Hoch Road Sewage Treatment Plant Study:** Kladder noted that we are providing Sewer and Water Committee meeting minutes to the Board; the sewer system belongs to the township and not the DPW so we need to be aware of what's going on. Acme Township is committed to participating in a study as what will be necessary to upgrade sewage treatment capacity to meet growing needs. Acme's share of the anticipated study costs will be approximately \$19,000. The study is expected to take about a year and a half. If the township contributes \$20,000 towards the study in mid-July 2008 our fund would be depleted in November 2009 based on the model assumptions rather than December 2009.

5. **Playground equipment evaluation and update project/grant funding opportunity:** Vreeland explained Henkel's memo. The Board gave consensus to pursue the project and the current Zonta grant cycle.

6. **Fiscal Year 2007-08 Budget Status Update:**

Motion by Takayama, support by Zarafonitis to approve Resolution #R-2008-05, budget amendment to the Cemetery Fund. Motion carried unanimously.

7. **Discuss township office hours and staffing schedules:** Zarafonitis reported that the Personnel Policy, consisting of himself, Kladder and Boltres, has been reviewing a proposed comprehensive personnel policy. In the interim, they have discussed changing the current

work schedule for Vreeland and Hull, who currently work four 10-hour days per week. They would be moved back to an 8-hour five day workweek, with adjustments as needed due to night meetings. Kladder noted that the current schedule was voted first as a temporary measure and then made permanent after a trial period. He has been surprised how many people have commented to him about this issue, including Board members, Planning Commissioners, members of the general public and developer representatives. The township is a service business and staff needs to be available during customary business hours to assist the public.

Hardin opposes the change back. He calls the township several times a week to discuss issues as they occur to him. Generally the person he needs is in a meeting or otherwise assisting others. He can get more information from a brief conversation with Hull or Vreeland if he stops by after 5:00 than through any other avenue such as over the phone during normal business hours when they are very busy. He generally covers several different issues at once. He thinks the hours as they exist currently are a benefit to him, and that reverting to the other schedule will make it harder for him to obtain the service he needs.

Takayama asked if it would be possible to have five day work weeks but still offer extended hours to 6:00 p.m. He can see how extended hours benefit people who work during the day. Zarafonitis called around and found no townships generally open past 5:30 p.m. Kladder noted that the township also has to interface with other governmental agencies, and they seem surprised when someone isn't here to work with them on a common schedule.

Scott asked if each staffer's schedule is predictable; it is. Vreeland has been working Tuesday – Friday and Hull Monday – Thursday. Often the staff skips lunch hours. The Personnel Committee will be suggesting general office hours of 8-5 with an unpaid hour of lunch.

Takayama is inclined to follow Kladder's recommendation, and that of the Clerk and Treasurer because they are most aware of the needs of the situation. Scott concurred. People shouldn't be upset if there is a predictable schedule to communicate to them. He sees merits to either system. Dunville dislikes having to tell someone that the person they need to speak to is unavailable. Boltres has expressed a strong feeling that the schedule should be five 8-hour days. Zarafonitis believes in such as schedule; his only reluctance was to take away something that was given to staff.

Motion by Zarafonitis, support by Scott to move the office staff to an 8 hour/day, 5 day week standard schedule within the next two weeks. Motion carried by a vote of 5 in favor (Dunville, Kladder, Scott, Takayama, Zarafonitis) and 1 opposed (Hardin).

H. REPORTS

1. **County Commissioner's Reports** – Larry Inman: County Commission meetings have been televised on Channel 99 for a month now. Townships have received the television schedule, which is also available on the County website. A meeting regarding solid waste goals scheduled for March 20 is being rescheduled so as not to conflict with Grand Vision meetings. Two seats on the Brownfield Authority will be filled by the City, and an agreement for how to make up the board past the end of 2008 will be discussed. A rough draft of accomplishments for 2007 and goals for 2008 is being prepared by Dennis Aloia and will be published on the county website. David Bennett, the consultant regarding the jail study 5 years ago has reviewed jail data and alternatives again. Currently the jail contains 40 beds and things are generally not as overcrowded as they were but a long-term solution has not yet been reached. In March a meeting will be held to finalize goals for 2009 so that a rolling two-year plan is in effect. There continues to be discussion about the Road Commission; consensus leans towards expansion of their board to 5 members from 3 and redefining their compensation package to more closely align with the County Board. Their goal is to try to have Acme, Peninsula and Garfield well represented. At this time it appears the board would continue to be appointed, but if the state legislature would allow elected road commissioners

by district, the same way county commissioners are apportioned, then they would favor moving to electing road commissioners by district. Inman stated that he very much has enjoyed representing Acme and his other townships and has filed to run for his seat again.

2. **Parks and Maintenance** – Tom Henkel: received and filed.

3. **Sheriff's Deputy** – Mike Matteucci: received and filed.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT & OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY COME BEFORE THE BOARD:

Nels Veliquette asked for verification about correspondence item C-3, which was labeled as correspondence about the Cherries R Us rezoning request but is actually mostly about the Immanuel LLC rezoning request.

Kladder stated that very soon there will be some media pieces regarding the shoreline preservation project.

Meeting adjourned at 10:15.