



ACME TOWNSHIP REGULAR BOARD MEETING

ACME TOWNSHIP HALL

6042 Acme Road, Williamsburg MI 49690

Tuesday, January 8, 2013, 7:00 p.m.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER WITH THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AT 7:00 p.m.

Members present: C. Bassett, C. Collett, A. Jenema, G. LaPointe, P. Scott, D. White, J. Zollinger

Members excused: None

Staff present: S. Vreeland, Township Manager/Recording Secretary

J. Jocks, Township Counsel

- A. PUBLIC OPEN DISCUSSION** - Open dialogue with board about community interest issues: This type of opportunity will be provided approximately every other month.

Charlene Abernethy, 4312 Westridge Dr. appreciated the concept of providing the time.

- B. LIMITED PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Ms. Abernethy expressed concerns about the future direction of the community. She read from a prepared statement. She mentioned the township's natural resources and activities undertaken to preserve them by previous administrations through farmland and shoreline preservation. She mentioned how this will create an environment where small businesses, visitors and new residents will want to be. She has read the campaign literature of the new elected officials and she has questions about whether non-local commercial interests will be promoted over local commercial interests and individual residents. She spoke about the history of the Village at Grand Traverse/Meijer issues of the past decade.

Noelle Knopf, 3585 Lookout Point in East Bay Township, East Bay Township, feels that past history should be left in the past. She perceives the new officials as being supportive of the township as a whole and not any one economic sector.

- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** LaPointe asked to add several items to New Business, discussion of Shoreline and Farmland Fund balances, and an update of the status of the Bates Crossing/Immanuel LLC Escrow balance and bankruptcy litigation. Jenema asked to add to New Business a potential special meeting with office staff to set up a structure. Collett asked to discuss LochenHeath. **Motion by LaPointe, support by White to approve the agenda as amended to include four new items under New Business. Motion carried unanimously.**

- D. INQUIRY AS TO CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:** None noted

- E. CONSENT CALENDAR:** **Motion by Collett, support by Jenema to approve the Consent Calendar as amended to remove the Treasurer's Report and the Northflight Statistics for further discussion, including:**

- 1. RECEIVE AND FILE:**

- a. [Treasurer's Report](#) as of November 2012
- b. [Clerk's Report](#) as of 01/02/13
- c. Draft Unapproved Meeting Minutes:
 - 1. Planning Commission [12/17/12](#)
- d. [Parks and Maintenance Report](#) – Tom Henkel
- e. [The Metro Insider Newsletter December 2012](#)
- f. [Planning, Zoning & Administrative Activity Report](#)
- g. [Northflight Statistics – 11/2012](#)

2. ACTION – Consider approval:

- a. Township Board meeting minutes of [12/04/12](#)
- b. [Accounts Payable](#) of \$112,494.50 through 01/02/13 (recommend approval: Bassett)

Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

F. ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. [Treasurer's Report](#) as of November 2012: LaPointe asked that the Treasurer's Report show the balances in each Escrow accounts in the future.
2. [Northflight Statistics – 11/2012](#): LaPointe noted that some of the calls for service answered by Station 8 are outside of Acme. Many are also cancelled. It appears to him that the number of actual calls occurring and completed in Acme per month is minimal. He supports having the ambulance service but feels it important to keep an eye on utilization. Scott observed that many people leave the township in the winter, and perhaps the calls for service will be lower in the winter than in the summer. Perhaps a running total or summary would be helpful in interpreting the data. The Board would appreciate having a Northflight representative come to a future meeting to explain the report and the service codes in more detail.

Motion by LaPointe, support by Scott to receive and file the Treasurer's Report and the Northflight statistics for November 2012. Motion carried unanimously.

G. REPORTS:

1. [Sheriff's Report – Deputy Jason Roelofs](#):
2. **County Commissioner's Report – Larry Inman:** Acme and the County, and sometimes Whitewater Township, meet from time to time with the Tribe. One ongoing issue for the County has been the process by which the 2% Tribal Grants are awarded, which has not historically strictly followed the requirements of the Engler Stipulation. Theoretically all of the money is supposed to go to local governments to allocate to replace property taxes on lands in federal trust. In practice the Tribal Council has decided how to award the funds. The County has learned that it could receive the funds and contract with local community agencies to provide services on its behalf. Going back to 2008 there have been attempts to negotiate signing of a memorandum of understanding with the Tribe that would guarantee payments to replace tax revenues lost on lands placed in trust, but periodic changes in Tribal Council membership has disrupted the process. Within the past few weeks, the Tribe sent to the County and Acme a proposed MOU that would create an ongoing committee to discuss a variety of issues including funding. Inman stated that the County Commission will review the document at a meeting tomorrow evening, and it is likely they would approve it. Zollinger has consulted with Jocks about the language of the proposed MOU and the township might or might not want to suggest some changes to the language. Acme has asked Tribal representatives why the proposed MOU did not also include Whitewater Township, and Inman thought that their inclusion might be a good idea since most of the land in trust at Turtle Creek is in that jurisdiction. He also expressed that the County is concerned about the increased acquisition of land between Turtle Creek and the Grand Traverse Resort, and the potential that if the two areas became contiguous that the Tribe might seek to place the Resort in federal trust. This would represent a damaging loss to the township tax rolls. The County also has concerns about the type of development which might occur on trust lands, which are exempt from local zoning. It is noted that the Tribe is also due to renegotiate its gaming compact with the state in 2013. Inman believes that local governments have a better relationship overall with the Tribe than is experienced in most similar situations in the state or nation. Inman stated that the County does not want to appear anti-Tribe, but they do want to encourage discussions towards some agreements to move forward.

The County's post-election organizational meeting was held. Herb Lemcool is the new Chair and Sonny Wheelock the new Vice-Chair. The first issue-based meeting will be held

tomorrow and will include discussion about the library district agreement. The library board has 7 members. Currently 4 are appointed by the City and 3 by the County; with the new agreement the City would appoint 2 and the County 5. The County would seek to diversify representation geographically. The Commission in December generally opposed the increase in the per-gallon cost for taking waste to the Septage Treatment plant, being concerned that the cost increase will cause fewer landowners to pump, causing an overall decrease in revenues rather than an increase and making meeting the debt payments more challenging.

H. SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSIONS:

1. **The GT Regional Land Conservancy within and in partnership with Acme Township –** Megan Olds: Olds' goal for the evening to familiarize the new Board members with the Conservancy's mission and activities and how it has partnered with the township in the past. She provided copies of general brochures and a summary of land protection and stewardship activities in the township. She also provided an updated shoreline preservation project map.

The Conservancy was founded in 1991 to advance land stewardship in a five-county area. They have helped to protect over 34,000 acres of land and 100 miles of shoreline. They have a four-point strategy: protect about 1,000 acres of land per year; manage and restore protected properties; enhance access to nature and recreation; and connect more people to the land, their work and their mission. Land protection tools include voluntary permanent conservation easements on privately-owned land; Conservancy ownership of land; working with local units of government to create publicly-owned parklands; ongoing land stewardship and restoration; and trail building.

Olds commended the township for its past preservation efforts. She noted that the Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund has invested approximately \$18 million in Acme Township throughout the years, and some of the largest grant awards have been made here.

Looking to the future, the Conservancy worked with the County to submit a blight elimination grant which includes a request for funding for deconstruction on Acme shoreline properties. The grant awards will be announced on February 15. She suggested meeting in February to discuss how to proceed with a deconstruction partnership. A \$50,000 gift to the shoreline project was made to the Conservancy in December.

The Conservancy owns property at Maple Bay in the township. They have been trimming trees and are re-roofing a house on the west side of US 31 N. on the property. They have been inviting potential partners to submit proposals for future uses of the property. In the near term they will be working with Cherryland Middle School, which will hold some classes on site.

During Summer 2012 the Conservancy and TART partnered to survey the public about trail needs along the US 31 corridor from Three Mile to Elk Rapids. They learned that many people are unaware of the public parklands available along this corridor, so one key future mission will be working with the township to understand how together we can promote park awareness, use and connectivity.

2. **Acme Twp. Farmland PDR Program History and Status –** Brian Bourdages: Bourdages has provided several pieces of information about the history of the township's farmland preservation program. He also provided a list of projects completed to date. 5 conservation easements covering over 500 acres of farmland have been purchased. We have obtained nearly 1:1 grant and bargain sale dollar matching for township millage funds. Many of the farmers have made bargain sales of their easements to the township, for which they in turn can receive charitable deductions. One federal grant has been obtained, and it will soon be time to discuss potential application to the next round of that program.

As easements were acquired from applicants to the first round of the program, more and more

letters were received from farm families expressing interest in a second application round. The lands offered to the second application process are shown on the updated farmland preservation map in beige. If all of these properties were placed under easement, nearly 50% of township lands north of Brackett Road could permanently preserved.

LaPointe asked if option agreements are in place on any properties. One property owned by the Veliquette property near the Shoreline Fruit plant had a basic option agreement in place, but it has been found that the landowners do not own the mineral rights on the land, and that those rights are owned by multiple other parties. Putting this property under conservation easement in the township's program therefore appears impractical. One other property was prohibited from entering into an option agreement for a 10-year period, but that period has ended and there are talks underway with that landowner.

LaPointe also asked how much money will be generated through the end of the initial millage that could potentially be spent on additional easement purchases. A figure of approximately \$600,000 has been estimated. We would continue to seek matching grant and bargain sale funds to leverage these millage dollars.

White asked if farmers putting their property under conservation easement can still lease their mineral rights. He is hearing from others in the farming community that mineral rights issues have slowed some easement completion processes. Jocks stated that the requirements of the recent federal grant matching money used are more stringent than the township's requirements and those of the IRS. Many local farmlands are leased to more than one mineral rights developer, some of which are local and some are from far away. To use the federal money these leases had to be subordinated to the federal grant program. This took a while to accomplish but in the end it was accomplished. Even if federal grant money is not used to purchase an easement, many farmers are giving a 25% bargain sale donation to close their deals. To obtain the tax benefits from doing so, the IRS has specific requirements for the easements, including "limited localized impacts" from mineral lease development. Again this requires subordination of the mineral leases to the conservation easement. Jocks summarized that this does not prevent farmers from exercising mineral rights, and that the requirements are no more restrictive than state requirements for mineral rights development. Many mineral developers are very familiar with the situation and know that it won't negatively impact them, and work with us. It takes more time to educate the others and obtain their assistance.

LaPointe asked when the Board should begin discussing whether or not to ask for a millage renewal and when to schedule the millage vote. The existing millage will be collected for the last time with the December 2013 tax bills. Zollinger suggested that the Board will look to the Farmland Preservation Advisory for recommendations in this regard.

3. **Metro Emergency Services Authority (MESA) – Assistant Chief Brian Belcher:**
 - a. **Consider resolution supporting local responsibility for fireworks retailer inspections:** The proposed resolution would allow MESA to perform required inspection of local fireworks retail facilities, rather than having the state perform the inspections. If any violations are found the state continues to enforce them. The state charges \$800 to permanent facilities for the inspections; if performed locally MESA would receive 80%. The fee for inspections of temporary locations is \$450. Each MESA township must adopt a resolution, because each has a separate fire prevention ordinance.

Motion by Scott, support by Jenema to adopt Resolution R-2013-01 as presented. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

3. **b. Consider approval of new fire truck purchase:** Purchase of a new fire truck has been budgeted by MESA. Bids were solicited on December 21 and are due back on January 14. They are expected to come in at a certain price range, but if the price

were higher this resolution would not apply and this Board would reconsider its approval. LaPointe asked if the potential cooperation between MESA and the City fire department might mean that the purchase is not necessary, and whether purchase of a used vehicle has been considered. Scott, who is one of Acme's representatives to the MESA board, stated that this expense was planned for in the original 2013 budget. Belcher stated that once an engine reaches 20 years old repairs become expensive. The engine that would be replaced is at Station 8, and would be placed in reserve status to use if another engine is out of service for repairs. MESA has capital expenditures long-term plan/schedule for replacing equipment as it ages, with replacement planning starting when new equipment is purchased. He also stated that any discussions with the City are unlikely to have an impact, as the city equipment would still be needed to cover city area. Zollinger stated that discussions with the city so far indicate that neither party would be bringing redundant equipment to a joint venture. Belcher added that some of the city equipment is older and deemed in need of replacement, which has been a concern in the joint venture discussions. Station 8 has only one engine, and if we purchase a new one now, our station would be due for a new engine again in about 20 years. Belcher noted that MESA tends to replace a major vehicle every 1-2 years somewhere in the system. Zollinger added that the entire MESA board and the member boards all have to approve each truck purchase, regardless of where the equipment will ultimately be physically housed. No additional contribution is required of the townships beyond what they are already contributing through the annual special assessments. White observed that sometimes new equipment might not function as well as expected. In this case, there is a reserve engine that was in an accident and it has never functioned properly despite repeated repairs and is a newer engine. The older Station 8 engine would replace it in reserve and the new purchase would be placed at Station 8. LaPointe appreciated the idea of advance capital improvement planning, but coming from a manufacturing business they didn't replace equipment just because it reached a certain age if it was still functional; it was replaced when it failed. Belcher appreciated this point, but if an engine is unreliable this can cause a major safety concern to firefighters or the public.

Dennis Stadel, 3518 Kennedy Place, appreciated the questions being asked by the Board. He also asked if a bid has been solicited from a Michigan manufacturer; Belcher believes that this company makes components that other companies use to assemble the completed truck.

Collett asked what liability is created for the township by signing the resolution. Belcher replied that if MESA were dissolved, dividing up the assets and debt of the organization would be a question.

Motion by Scott, support by Collett, to adopt Resolution R-2013-03, as amended to correct the date bids are due to January 14, 2013, approving purchase and zero-interest financing of a new fire truck by MESA at a cost not to exceed \$650,000. Motion carried by a vote of 6 in favor (Bassett, Collett, Jenema, Scott, White, Zollinger) and 1 opposed (LaPointe.)

I. CORRESPONDENCE:

1. [Proposed Memorandum of Understanding](#) between Acme Twp., G.T. County, & GT Band of Ottawa & Chippewa Indians: discussed previously during County Commissioner's Report.
2. [12/18/12 Michigan Strategic Fund Letter](#) approving modified APRZ for Shoreline Fruit
3. [01/08/203 e-mail from Virginia Tegel](#) supporting proposed office/meeting chair purchases

J. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None

K. NEW BUSINESS:

1. Discuss [potential office equipment expenditures](#): Vreeland summarized the memo provided. Collett felt that the chairs or locks could be beneficial, but the township might have more urgent needs. LaPointe believes that at a minimum the building should be re-keyed after 8 years and numerous missing keys. He believes that the full-time staff does need new chairs, but that the meeting room chairs are not used as often and might not need to be replaced. Collett also observed that there is a wide variety in bodies and what chairs are comfortable to what people. There was discussion about all of the options for changing the locks.

Motion by Collett, support by LaPointe to purchase 5 new office chairs for full time staff. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

Motion by Collett to do nothing about the township door locks. Motion failed for lack of support.

Motion by LaPointe, support by Scott to change the township door locks using a master key system, with all keys to be numbered and tracking to whom they are issued, and a \$25.00 refundable deposit charge for keys loaned for meetings. Motion carried by a vote of 6 in favor (Bassett, Collett, Jenema, LaPointe, Scott, White) and 1 opposed (Zollinger.)

The cost of the new locks will be taken from funds already budgeted for township hall repairs and maintenance.

2. Proposed [4th Amendment to 2012-13 Budget](#):

Motion by LaPointe, support by Scott to adopt Resolution R-2013-02 as amended to appropriate \$1,000 to Township Hall Capital Improvements for chairs and \$19,493 to General Fund Contingency. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

The Chair declared a recess from 9:11 p.m. – 9:19 p.m.

3. **Preliminary discussion – meeting township public water service needs:** Growth and development pressures drive a need for public water. Recent redevelopment projects including the transition of the Gold Coast Inn to an assisted living facility and a former office to a Goodwill retail store have required costly improvements to provide water for adequate fire suppression. The township could consider providing water service by developing its own wells, and/or it could purchase water from neighboring systems to provide through a township utility, or it could allow other water systems franchises to serve township properties. Acme Township has already provided a franchise to East Bay Township to serve certain properties, and the Tribal water system serves or will serve housing in condominium associations associated with the Resort, The Cottages at Windward Ridge, TraVino restaurant and the Village at Grand Traverse. Geography and development patterns relative to geography can be an issue when considering where to put needed infrastructure such as standpipes. Zollinger noted a typo in his materials; the initial connection to the Tribal water system may cost approximately \$1,500. Zollinger asked whether the Board believes that the township should consider starting its own water utility, or if we should instead investigate bringing one or more other service providers into the township.

Jenema wondered if the first step would be to talk to the existing systems and understand what their interest would be in serving broader areas of the township. If the township is going to encourage high density development in key central areas, water for fire protection is important. LaPointe would prefer to pursue existing viable options rather than starting a new township system.

Rob Evina, Woodland Creek Furniture, asked how the water costs in the information provided compare to other communities. There was a general perception that these costs might be very inexpensive.

Collett observed that between the two neighboring systems, it seems likely that most of the key high density development areas of the township would be covered.

Zollinger will proceed on a consensus understanding that franchising to the existing water services would be preferable at this time to creating a township owned and operated system.

Mr. Stadel asked if the new board is planning to perform an audit on the township's books to ensure that nothing untoward happened in the prior administration. LaPointe indicated he wanted to address this later in the agenda.

4. **Shoreline and Farmland Preservation Fund Balances:** The township's general fund revenues are approximately \$750,000 annually. Many more dollars flow through the township relative to the shoreline and farmland programs, and one of his first personal priorities has been to examine these special funds. Money has flowed in and out from millages, grants, bonds, and interfund loans. LaPointe perceives that the recordkeeping has been "amateurish" at best. He consulted the township's auditors and received a response this week indicating that no money is owed from one fund to another, but when he looks at the spreadsheets he draws a different conclusion. He would like to bring Dennis, Gartland & Niergarth in and have them go through the spreadsheets and take another look at where the township stands to ensure that the new administration has not inherited a problem. He has spent hours reviewing the information but is puzzled. He is willing to assume that it was done correctly but has been documented poorly.

Collett asked LaPointe to look at the accounts because she perceived discrepancies. To her the Clerk's and Treasurer's records seem to match each other, but they don't seem to match the audit. Collett asserted that it is inappropriate for the Farmland Fund to have loaned money to the Shoreline Fund. Vreeland stated that it would be inappropriate for Farmland millage funds to be used for purpose other than farmland preservation, but that any money loaned from the Farmland fund to the Shoreline Fund was from the 2011 Capital Improvement bond that was issued for the purpose of both the Farmland and Shoreline Funds, and did not inappropriately come from the millage funds.

Collett and LaPointe recommend hiring audit services to clarify the situation. Collett reported that the annual auditors said they had a hard time tracking the transactions when they performed the annual audit during the fall of 2012. Collett believes that an audit sufficient to resolve these questions could be performed for about \$5,000. She is concerned about end of year adjustments to the books of significant dollar amounts.

Motion by Jenema, support by White to have the Treasurer have an entry audit done by an audit firm as of November 20, 2012 at a cost not to exceed \$5,000. The Manager is to provide what detailed information she can about the transactions in question to the Treasurer in a timely manner.

Collett advocates for using an auditor other than Dennis, Gartland & Niergarth, while LaPointe suggested working with them first. Collett urged a different auditor strongly.

Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

5. **Bates Crossing/Immanuel LLC Escrow balance and bankruptcy litigation:** LaPointe recalled that Immanuel LLC applied for a special use permit for a shopping center near Bates Road at M-72. The township has expended funds towards this process that policy indicates are reimbursable by the developer, but have not been reimbursed to date. How much money,

what is the status of the litigation, and how did the situation occur?

Jocks replied that developers are required to provide funds for the actual cost of processing their SUP applications. He recalls that the dollar amount outstanding is in the neighborhood of \$65,000. The applicant corporation declared bankruptcy about 3 years ago. The bankruptcy trustee discovered that they had tried to retain assets that might otherwise have covered their debts prior to declaring bankruptcy by transferring them to other related corporate entities, and is seeking recovery of those assets. The bankruptcy proceeding is on hold while the trustee attempts to reverse the prior property transfers. Another hearing could occur in early April.

LaPointe stated that the township has an ordinance to prevent the township from being saddled with extensive costs, and asked how it occurred anyway. Vreeland mentioned that technically the SUP application in question is still active and pending. It was active when Immanuel LLC declared bankruptcy, and as a creditor the township could not take an "adverse" action during the bankruptcy. The township's fee escrow policy requires SUP applicants to deposit an initial amount of \$800 with the township towards the actual processing costs for their application, which can include legal and/or consultant services, staff time, legal notice mailing and publication costs, copying costs and per diem payments for Planning Commissioners. The \$800 figure was established in 2004 by analyzing actual costs for processing a standard SUP application, which averaged \$1,200. The idea was to request an initial deposit somewhat less than this amount, and to bill for actual costs and require replenishment of the account as the process moved along. Vreeland has been performing this function.

During the time period in question, multiple other challenging projects were also in process, including Village at Grand Traverse applications. Keeping billings and collections up to date is an important function, but the workflow volume and priority mix caused them to fall behind during overwhelming times. An additional factor was that Immanuel LLC objected to being billed for work performed by the township's planning consultant on this project because they did not care for the nature of his advice to the township, and frequently disputed the billings and indicated an unwillingness to pay despite having signed the escrow agreement committing them to payment. The amount due built up over time.

The township paid billings for this project to its service providers from the General Fund absent receiving the payments. The resulting amount due at this point of approximately \$65,000 is being carried on the township's General Fund books as a receivable. Each year during the audit process a decision is made as to whether to continue to carry this amount as a receivable because we believe there is still a chance of collecting some or all, or whether to write it off. The Board has been aware of the existence and scope of the situation, as confirmed by Scott. Jocks offered that if all of the fraudulent property transfers are recovered by the bankruptcy, there is good likelihood of full recovery of all debts from the bankruptcy.

This situation is the genesis of LaPointe's request for detailed information about the status of the escrow accounts. Vreeland, Collett and Bassett will work together on the escrow account billing system to see how it can function the most efficiently.

- 6. Potential special meeting with office staff to set up a structure:** Jenema suggested it would be helpful for the Board to meet with all of the staffers to get a better understanding of what each does and how they work together and interact. Then the Board will know who to approach with which questions or tasks, and have a better understanding of how to increase efficiencies and make sure tasks are allocated appropriately. This would have to be done as an open meeting if the full Board is invited, and could be scheduled during the work day when the staff is normally present. Several other Board members felt this would be beneficial. LaPointe recommended creating procedure manuals as well. Bassett was asked to coordinate the scheduling. It was anticipated that the meeting might last approximately 2

hours. Existing job descriptions will be circulated in a packet prior to the meeting.

7. **LochenHeath:** Collett has been contacted by LochenHeath about informing the new board about the history of the development. There are questions about their water and sewer system, and some funds held in escrow. She would like to understand what's going on, and perhaps others would as well. Zollinger has been working on this issue, which has been ongoing for more than a decade. When LochenHeath was originally approved, the SUP required that the water and sanitary sewer systems, after constructed must be turned over to the township for operation and maintenance. This has never occurred. The original developers went bankrupt and the systems were never turned over to the township. Property owners have paid for connections to the systems, but never paid any usage fees. The township has expended funds over the years to operate and maintain the system. The on-site sanitary system permit was discontinued several years ago, and the township ended any operation and maintenance of that system. Correspondence was received from the state a few weeks ago stating that the water system had been reclassified from Type I to Type III. Among other things, the water no longer needs to be tested monthly. At one time LochenHeath wanted to connect to the Tribal water system, and in 2007 the township signed a document agreeing to release its interest in the system to the Tribe. Jocks and Zollinger have been reviewing the recent state correspondence. At this point, Zollinger is looking at options for providing the LochenHeath homeowner's association with a document indicating that the township is relinquishing all rights in and responsibility for the system.

LaPointe asked what will happen when the development reaches 16 homes and the water and sewer system permit classifications much change. At this point in time, state law allows a private entity to seek and hold permits for public water and sanitary systems. Jocks observed that if a person purchases the remainder of the developer's interest out of bankruptcy, that person could become legally the "developer" of the remainder and say that they want to abide by the original agreement between the township and the developer and have the township own and operate the systems. Both the original SUPs for LochenHeath and the agreement between the township and developer required the systems to be turned over to the township. To allow a private entity to own and operate the system long-term, the SUP would need to be modified.

Some work towards an eventual connection of LochenHeath to the township's sanitary sewer system has been performed, but permits are not in place for its usage at this time.

L. OLD BUSINESS:

1. **Sewer Repair Update:** In 2010 the oldest portion of the township's sanitary sewer system was cleaned and televised to inspect its condition. Several areas where repairs are needed were identified. Very few people perform this type of work. We have planned to perform this work for several years. The estimated cost is \$15,525, which Zollinger has authorized to be performed. The sooner it is done, the sooner we can eliminate potential problems. One of the problem areas is under one of the golf courses at the Resort, and it would be best to repair this outside of the golfing season.

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

Belcher stated that when there are new elections MESA invites new board members from all three member townships to a meeting to learn more about MESA and how it operates. An invitation should be forthcoming soon.

Meeting adjourned at 10:33 p.m. on a motion by Jenema with support from LaPointe.