

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLUSHING
6524 N. SEYMOUR ROAD
FLUSHING, MICHIGAN 48433
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

DATE: OCTOBER 12, 2006 **TIME: 7:00 P.M.**
PHONE: 810-659-0800 **FAX 810-659-4212**
WEB PAGE: <http://www.flushingtowship.com>

ADMINISTRATION MEMBERS

SUPERVISOR: Andrew Trotogot
CLERK: Julia A. Morford
TREASURER: Carl G. Liepmann

TRUSTEES

Ann L. Fotenakes
Scott Minaudo
Barry Pratt
Ida M. Reed

TOWNSHIP ATTORNEY:

Steven Moulton of
Cooley Moulton & Smith
Attorneys at Law

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER at 7:00 by **SUPERVISOR TROTOGOT** with roll call and the pledge to the American Flag.

ROLL CALL: Trotogot, Morford, Fotenakes, Minaudo, Pratt, Reed, and Attorney Steve Moulton
MEMBERS ABSENT: Liepmann

OTHERS PRESENT: Pat Drozdowski, Lee St. John, Ted Edick, Beverly Edick, Chief Doug Kennedy of the Flushing Township Police Department, Joan Pajtas, Tom Enright, Flushing Township Park Manager

TROTOGOT requested to add additional items to the Agenda: 1) "Unfinished Business", Number 3, Consumer Tax Appeal by Attorney Steve Moulton and 2) "New Business", Number 2, City of Flushing/Flushing Township - Parks and Recreation Authority by Andy Trotogot.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA: FOTENAKES MOVED, seconded by Minaudo to adopt the Agenda with the additions of 1) "Unfinished Business", Number 3, Consumer Tax Appeal by Attorney Steve Moulton and 2) "New Business", Number 2, City of Flushing/Flushing Township - Parks and Recreation Authority by Andy Trotogot. **MOTION CARRIED.**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 14, 2006: REED MOVED, seconded by Pratt to approve the Minutes of September 14, 2006 as printed. **MOTION CARRIED.**

APPROVAL OF BILLS: FOTENAKES MOVED, seconded by Reed to pay the bills as presented.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Fotenakes, Minaudo, Pratt, Reed, Morford, and Trotogot

NAYS: 0 **MOTION CARRIED.**

**PUBLIC HEARING – Truth in Budgeting – Marilyn Schmoak,
Bookkeeper for the Charter Township of Flushing**

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 7:03 P.M.

(A) MARILYN SCHMOAK read the **Truth in Budgeting Publication** which appeared in the Flushing Observer.

The Charter Township of Flushing Board of Trustees will hold a Public Hearing on the proposed township budget for fiscal year 2006/2007 at the Flushing Township Hall, 6524 N. Seymour Road, Flushing, on October 12, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. ***THE PROPERTY TAX MILLAGE RATE**

PROPOSED TO BE LEVIED TO SUPPORT THE PROPOSED BUDGET WILL BE A SUBJECT OF THIS HEARING. A copy of the budget and the tax calculations will be available for public inspection at the above location during normal working hours. This notice complies with state statutes MCL 141.436 and MCL 211.24E.

GENERAL FUND BUDGET:

SCHMOAK reviewed the **GENERAL BUDGET** and stated there were no major changes in the budget. The only real change in the General Fund, which **LIEPMANN** has been made aware of, is that the State is going to mandate in a few years that the Township become fully funded for the pension. (Review the Audit from the Audit Report given by Plante & Moran). There is a provision in the Budget listed under Township Board "Pension Funding (01 Non Union) to put an amount in the Pension plus the monthly payments.

**Proposed Budget
03/31/08**

REVENUES	\$1,144,600	
EXPENSES		
Township Board	\$171,900	
Supervisor	68,075	
Elections	2,500	
Bookkeeping	77,200	
Assessor	82,800	
Clerk	67,900	
Clerical	21,650	
Treasurer	125,550	
Township Hall	49,700	
Code Enforcement Officer	N/A	
Public Service	402,000	
Hall Rental Exp	2,350	
Clerical Water Dept	39,600	
TOTAL EXPENSES	1,111,225	
Beg Fund Bal 04/01/07		\$278,226
Fund Bal 03/31/08		\$311,571
DENTAL FUND		
Revenues	21,200	
Expenditures	21,000	
Beg Fund Bal 04/01/07		\$399
Ending Fund Bal		\$599
VISION FUND		
Revenues	3,800	
Expenditures	3,000	
Beg Fund Bal 04/01/07		\$2,647
Ending Fund Bal		\$2,847
PARKS & RECREATION		
Revenues	95,900	
Expenditures	88,050	
Beg Fund Bal 04/01/07		\$21,586
Ending Fund Bal		\$29,436
POLICE FUND		
Revenues	1,090,700	
Expenditures	1,173,711	

Beg Fund Bal 04/01/07		\$174,061
Ending Fund Bal		\$91,050
DRUG ENFORCEMENT		
Revenues	35	
Expenditures	5	
Beg Fund Bal 04/01/07		\$2,033
Ending Fund Bal		\$2,063
BUILDING DEPARTMENT		
Revenues	82,150	
Building Inspector	81,550	
Beg Fund Bal 04/01/07		\$2,293
Ending Fund Bal		\$2,893
SOLID WASTE FUND		
Revenues	463,400	
Expenditures	480,500	
Beg Fund Bal 04/01/07		\$516,371
Ending Fund Bal		\$499,271

ADDITIONAL NOTES ABOUT THE BUDGET:

1. The Code Enforcement Officer will be taken care of by the end of 2006 so there will not be any additional expenses.
2. The Clerical-Water Department Wages is kept in the General Fund but is reimbursed by the Water Fund every year.
3. The expenditure for the Parks and Recreation Fund included a Michigan Natural Resources Trust Grant.

PRATT MOVED, seconded by Reed to accept the budget as proposed.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Minaudo, Pratt, Reed, Morford, Fotenakes and Trogotog

NAYS: 0 MOTION CARRIED.

ABSENT: Liepmann

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 7:24 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR TRUTH IN BUDGETING TAX CALCULATIONS OPENED AT 7:24 P.M.

MARILYN SCHMOAK read the **Truth In Budgeting Tax Calculations:**

THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLUSHING WILL HOLD A PUBLIC HEARING TO RETURN ITS GENERAL FUND OPERATING LEVY TO .5000 (1/2) MILL FROM .4807 MILL, THE RATE ROLLED BACK BY GENESEE COUNTY EQUALIZATION. THE .4807 MILL IS LESS THAN THE .5000 MILL LEVIED IN 2005 AND THE DIFFERENCE REPRESENTS A 4.01% OR .0193 MILL INCREASE AND RETURNS OUR AUTHORIZED MILL TO .5000 (1/2) MILL. THE TOWNSHIP IS AUTHORIZED TO LEVY 1.0400 MILLS.

THE TOWNSHIP PROPOSES TO LEVY .8064 MILLS ON THE AUTHORIZED .9085 MILLS APPROVED FOR POLICE OPERATIONS. THE PRESENT RATE OF .7807 MILLS, AS ROLLED BACK BY GENESEE COUNTY EQUALIZATION, IF RETURNED TO .8064 MILLS WILL REPRESENT AN INCREASE OF 3.29%. THE TOWNSHIP ALSO PROPOSES TO LEVY 2.1171 MILLS FROM AN APPROVED 2.1692 MILLS OF ADDITIONAL POLICE MILLAGE. THE CURRENT RATE IS 2.0496 AS ROLLED BACK BY GENESEE

COUNTY EQUALIZATION. IF RETURNED TO 2.1171 MILL THE INCREASE WILL BE 3.29%.

THERE IS ALSO A PROPOSAL TO LEVY .4879 MILL FROM AN APPROVED .5000 ADDITIONAL POLICE MILLAGE. THE CURRENT RATE OF .4723 MILL, AS ROLLED BACK BY GENESEE COUNTY EQUALIZATION, IF RETURNED TO .4879 MILL WILL SHOW AN INCREASE OF 3.30%.

THE TRUTH IN TAXATION HEARING WILL BE HELD AT THE REGULAR TOWNSHIP BOARD MEETING ON OCTOBER 12, 2006 AT 7:00 P.M. TO BE HELD AT THE FLUSHING TOWNSHIP HALL, LOCATED AT 6524 N. SEYMOUR ROAD.

LAYMAN'S TERMS OF THE TRUTH IN BUDGETING TAX CALCULATIONS:

SCHMOAK stated the millage had been discussed at the September 14, 2006 Board of Trustees Meeting; the Board did not want to roll down the .5 mill down to .4807. The Board of Trustees would be agreeing to keep the .5 mill levy for the December 1, 2006 property taxes. Each paragraph of the Truth in Budgeting Tax Calculations related to each line of the L-4029.

2006 TAX RATE REQUEST FORM (L-4029)

SCHMOAK stated Headlee stated the township had to collect the same amount of taxes each year. As the taxable value goes up, the taxes have to be rolled down so as to stay at the same amount.

- a. In paragraph 1 it mentions there would be an increase, actually there would not be an increase; the levy would still be .5 mills. According to Headlee, the property taxes would be increased. The most that could be levied would be the 1.04 mill, which was voted on many years ago, but because of Headlee, the maximum that could be levied would be .8385 mills. The Board had decided to maintain the .5 mill.
- b. Column 4 of the Tax Rate Request, would be the maximum amount that could be levied.
- c. Column 9, indicated if the Board wanted to collect the millage it would have to be rolled back to the figure in Column 9. If the Board did not want to roll back from .8385, the Board would be overriding Headlee.

DISCUSSION FROM THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES:

- **FOTENAKES** stated that what has been proposed would be the same issues that were discussed at the September 14, 2006 Board of Trustees Meeting. **FOTENAKES** was concerned about having enough money without having to raise taxes; if the Township could not continue to operate as in the past, there needed to be an increase in taxes. If the township could continue to operate and maintain business the way it is currently handled, it would be good not to raise the taxes.
- **REED** stated the issues had been discussed at the last meeting and had assured **LIEPMANN** that the Board was comfortable with the .5 mill.
- **FOTENAKES** stated the Board had to make sure there was enough money; Flushing Township does not need or want to become like some other cities. We have to scrutinize the budget to make sure the money is there. **LIEPMANN** had stated at the September 14, 2006 Board of Trustees Meeting, there would be an additional \$35 per hundred state equalized value and it would only bring in \$95,000. At the September 14th meeting, it was recommended the \$95,000 be used for ditching.
- **TROTOGOT** stated that for the time being, if the Board decided on the extra millage, the money be put in the General Fund and not earmark for anything particular.
- **FOTENAKES** stated with the situation of the budget and what had been presented by **SCHMOAK**, the Board needed to be careful and not overspend and do things that, in the end, would hurt the township.

- **REED** stated with the situation in Michigan, the Board should not increase the millage at the current time.
- **FOTENAKES** stated she has seen so many foreclosures on homes; she does not want to see the increase of taxes. If the township needed the increase, it should be done.

ATTORNEY STEVE MOULTON stated there had been a question as to the Truth In Budgeting Publication without the millage rates being shown. Per Michigan Townships Association (MTA) the publication that had been published in the Flushing Observer was appropriate with the current statute. The Truth and Budgeting Notice and the Truth in Taxation Notice as published were authorized by the statute. Since numbers are not mentioned in the existing notice; the township board has the discretion to adjust the millage rates to the maximum amounts permitted under the original legislative enactment as rolled back by Headlee. The presentation by **SCHMOAK** reflects that the Board would be overriding Headlee to the extent which the law allowed with regards to last year's millage rate. If nothing is done, the rollback is automatic pursuant to the statute. If the Board would like to override the Headlee Rollback and keep the millage rate at .5 mills as opposed to .4807, there would need to be a resolution which is being discussed at present.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

- **TROTOGOT** stated his preference would be to go with the .5 mills because there had been so many people that had wanted their roads fixed this year. The Board approved some of the repairs which "ate" into the fund balance. By going with the .5 mill it would build up the fund balance.
- **FOTENAKES** stated her only concern had been that some of the roads, like McKinley Road, should not have been done. **TROTOGOT** stated Genesee County Road Commission had done the work on McKinley Road; the township had not paid for the repair.
- **TROTOGOT** stated that nine (9) dirt roads had limestone placed on them.
- **FOTENAKES** stated that with the economy as bad as it was, people should not worry about the roads as much as maintaining systems such as trash pickup, lighting, etc.

REED MOVED, seconded by Pratt for the Board of Trustees to adopt a resolution implementing an override of the Headlee Rollbacks so that the four (4) Millage Rates would be as follows: 1) General Millage Rate would be .5 mill; 2) the Millage Rate with regards to the Police would be .8064; 2.1171; and .4879 so that none of the rates would be rolled back but would continue as their existing millage rates.

- **MORFORD** was very concerned about the budget and wanted to know if the township could function on the .5 mill.
- **REED** stated there were other areas from which to obtain money such as charging for leaf pickup, implementing charges for street lights, etc.
- **FOTENAKES** mentioned the franchise cable and tower fees that were directed to the Nature Park.
- **REED** stated there was the possibility of having a co-pay on the pensions. **CHIEF DOUG KENNEDY** of the Flushing Township Police Department stated the Police Officers paid a portion of their pensions. **FOTENAKES** wanted to know if the non-union had a co-pay; **SCHMOAK** stated the non-union did not pay into the pensions.
- **SCHMOAK** stated when the township had their audit, the beginning General Fund Balance was \$395,000; there was six (6) months worth of revenue – at the end of six (6) months there was a zero balance. It is proposed at the end of this year there will be a Fund Balance of \$278,000; it would be \$117,000 less than what was budgeted for last year.

- a. **SCHMOAK** stated it was too late to go to the lighting system this year because the money won't come in until 2008.
- b. Millage on property taxes would be the only thing available to go after for more funds.
- c. Previously, **LIEPMANN** had discussed the possibility of levying everyone in the township a certain number of dollars each year.
- d. The millage rate of .8385 would give the township \$95,000 more bringing the balance up to \$373,344. Within two (2) years it would help raise the funds. The amount per parcel would be less than \$100.00.
- e. **PRATT** wanted to know what would the ending projected balance be at the end of the year if the township used the .8385 mills; \$278,000 plus \$95,000.
- f. With the proposed budget there would be no extras for the township.
- g. **FOTENAKES** stated with the average increase of \$100, it would only be \$8.00 per month added on to mortgages.
- h. **REED** stated she thought she heard the increase would be approximately \$35.00 for \$100,000 state equalized value.
- i. **SCHMOAK** stated it would be the difference between \$83.85 per parcel as opposed to \$50.00, which would be \$32.95.
- j. It was determined the money for the roads had greatly affected the budget.

REED WITHDREW HER PRIOR MOTION.

REED MOVED, seconded by (None) to collect the maximum allowable millage levied for operation for .8385 mills instead of the .5 mills collected last year.

DISCUSSION:

- **ATTORNEY MOULTON**, speaking personally and not as the township attorney, stated that because the Police Department budget has been in the deficit mode for several years, if the township intended to override the Headlee Rollbacks so the existing millage rates with regards to the three (3) Police Millages the same, they would not be rolled back. The number that would be viewed on the Police Millage rates would be mentioned in column 11 on the 2006 Tax Rate Request form. As far as the General Operating Millage, the motion on the table would be more than an override of the Headlee Rollback, it would increase the millage rate up from .5 to the .8385 mills.

IT WAS DECIDED THERE WOULD BE TWO (2) DIFFERENT MOTIONS.

1) FOTENAKES MOVED, seconded by Morford that instead of obtaining the .5 mills that was originally discussed at the last meeting (September 14, 2006), the township would increase the mills to .8385 mills which would give the township approximately \$95,000 additional funds for operating in the General Fund.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Pratt, Reed, Morford, Fotenakes, Minaudo, and Trotogot

NAYS: 0 MOTION CARRIED.

ABSENT: Liepmann

2) FOTENAKES MOVED, seconded by Minaudo that the Township Board adopt a resolution; the millage rates to be levied December 1, 2006 shall be the amounts stated in column 11 of the 2006 Tax Rate Request which are with respect to the Police Millages .8064, 2.1171,

and .4879. The resolution could also indicate that with respect to the General Operating millage the amount to be stated in column 11 is going to be .8385.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Reed, Morford, Fotenakes, Minaudo, Pratt and Trogot

NAYS: 0 MOTION CARRIED.

ABSENT: Liepmann

7:55 P.M. - PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Consumers Energy Tax Appeal

ATTORNEY MOULTON stated that at the beginning of the 1997 tax year, Consumers Energy (Consumers) filed an Appeal with the Michigan Tax Tribunal regarding the valuation of its utilities facilities located in Flushing Township and almost every other township in the State of Michigan. The Appeal was amended to include 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001.

Consumers does not go out and check every telephone pole and piece of telephone wire every year to determine property value for purposes of taxation. The State Tax Commission is charged with getting the unit factors together; the Commission was bogged down and didn't get around to promulgating those factors until 2000. Consumers has used the new unit factors and is entering into settlements with townships and cities.

Flushing Township has received a proposed "Stipulation and Consent Order" from the attorneys representing Consumers. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** has discussed the matter with Dennis Bow of the City of Flushing, Carl Liepmann of the Flushing Township, the Michigan Townships Association (MTA), and a couple of other township attorneys. It is not that common to have a situation where there is a significant amount of refund due to a large commercial tax payer.

Consumers has proposed that the 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2001 tax values would remain unchanged; whatever Consumers was assessed, they paid the taxes and have been willing to relinquish any claim which they might have in the pending appeal in regards to the four (4) tax requests. With regards to the year 2000, using the valuation that resulted from the unit factors that were eventually put together by the State Tax Commission, their taxable property value for the 2000 tax year, which was originally \$4,319,700 would be reduced to \$3,189,000. The affect of the reduction is Consumers is entitled to a refund of \$47,886.03. (The figure was determined by Carl Liepmann, Treasurer of the Charter Township of Flushing).

The proposed Stipulation and Consent Order states:

1. the four (4) years remain unchanged.
2. the valuation has changed with regards to the year 2000 as has been indicated.
3. the Stipulation originally had a line that agreed the refund would be paid by October 1; **ATTORNEY MOULTON** discussed the matter with the attorney from Consumers and indicated the matter could not be implemented that quickly. The line of October 1, 2006 would be taken out of the proposed Stipulation.

ATTORNEY MOULTON stated the Township collected most of the taxes it received from other governmental entities. Out of the \$47,886.03, the total amount that went to Flushing Township, the Township's obligation to refund would be \$4,500. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** has drafted a letter to be signed by **LIEPMANN** that has indicated the amount that would be due from seven (7) other entities.

ATTORNEY MOULTON also discussed the matter with Michigan Townships Association as to: 1) whether the Township was obligated to up-front the refund amount? **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the answer was "yes" because taxpayers are not

required to deal with anyone other than the taxing unit. Consumers only has to deal with the taxing unit, which in the particular case would be Flushing Township. The ultimate responsibility for refunding taxes would be upon those who received the money and were not entitled to it which would be the seven (7) municipalities. If the seven (7) municipalities would not voluntarily pay their portion of the refund what would happen? Legal proceedings would follow.

ATTORNEY MOULTON is seeking permission from the Flushing Township Board of Trustees to give him (Attorney Moulton) authority to sign the Stipulation and Consent Order on behalf of the township. The Resolution would be sent to Consumers which in turn would be signed off and sent to the State Tribunal. Once the order has been signed by the Tax Tribunal, the allegation on the part of the township to make the refund would come into existence.

FOTENAKES MOVED, seconded by Reed to allow **ATTORNEY STEVE MOULTON** to sign the Stipulation and Consent Order to Consumers Energy on behalf of the Charter Township of Flushing.

**PUBLIC HEARING – Community Development Block Grant – Tom Enright
8:05 P.M. OPENED TO THE PUBLIC**

FLUSHING NATURE PARK MANAGER, TOM ENRIGHT (ENRIGHT) and TOWNSHIP TREASURER CARL LIEPMANN recently attending a meeting with the Genesee County Planning Commission regarding the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Fund Program. **ENRIGHT** gave an overview of some of the facts obtained at that meeting:

- Flushing Township could only receive fifteen (15%) percent from Genesee County because of the lack of residents that are low to moderate income in the township.
- In the past, the Flushing Township CDBG funds have been used for the Youth Employment Program.
- This year Genesee County has agreed to give Flushing Township the maximum which would be \$68,268, over the course of three (3) years. It would amount to approximately \$24,000 per year.
- **ENRIGHT** mentioned there are Public Programs and Special Events where employees would be trained to assist the Park Manager with programs which are offered throughout the year, some may be seasonal.
- Some of the programs that are geared to individuals who come from both low and moderate income families.
 - a. Native Plant Sale
 - b. Fishing Tackle Exchange Program
 - c. Start a Rain Garden
 - d. Create a Prairie
 - e. Maple Syrup Pioneer Days
 - f. Earth Day Celebration
- There are programs that could be created and implemented with additional funding:
 - a. the Nature Book Club
 - b. Educational Programs for People with Special Needs
 - c. Volunteer Coordinator

TROTOGOT stated there have been so many stipulations placed on Community Development Block Grant Funds. **ENRIGHT** stated Flushing Township is a very unique community because of the Township Nature Park. **TROTOGOT** stated that many times the seasonal workers have worked in other positions as well as with the park services. **TROTOGOT** stated there are a lot of things the students could do, but there are a lot of things the County would not approve.

FOTENAKES inquired if the overview was a proposed CDBG that had not been obtained but would be submitted. **FOTENAKES** felt the program would be a great idea for the township. **ENRIGHT** wanted to know if the Board had any other recommendations for uses with the CDBG funds. The Board would adopt the proposed recommendations or programs they chose at the November 9, 2006 Board of Trustees Meeting.

REED stated she had saw an article in the paper, a few days before **LIEPMANN** and **ENRIGHT** had went to the CDBG Meeting, where all public schools would receive warning radios which would be similar to the Reverse 9-1-1 radios. **REED** suggested the radios would be a good thing for senior citizens. **TROTOGOT** stated that several communities have requested the radios. **ENRIGHT** stated that because the Senior Citizen Committee proposal had been approved, they were not sure what the issues would involve. **ENRIGHT** stated that, all townships represented at the CDBG Meeting, were waiting to see what the Proposed Senior Center Committee would come up with.

PRATT felt there were good programs mentioned. **ENRIGHT** stated with the additional funding, he would be able to get high school or college students who were working toward a biology degree.

8:15 P.M. – CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

UNFINISHED BUSINESS - CONTINUED

1. Review of Janitorial Bids for the Township Offices

TROTOGOT stated that everyone that had submitted a resume or bid to the township for the Janitorial Services had been sent by the Township, a letter giving the exact criteria that was needed for all to bid on the same items; the same specifications would make it fair for everyone involved to bid. The low bidder had been Affordable Building Cleaning from Davison, Michigan. **FOTENAKES MOVED**, seconded by Minaudo to allow the Supervisor make the decision for the Affordable Building Cleaning as long as all the criteria has been established, background checks have been completed, and employee are bonded. MOTION CARRIED.

2. Resolution from the Genesee County Drain Commissioners Office regarding the Maintenance of the Freeman Drain.

Nothing has been received from the Genesee County Drain Commissioners Office.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Approval for Attendance at the 2007 Michigan Townships Association Conference – Detroit, Michigan – January 23-26, 2007

The 2007 Michigan Townships Association Conference will be held at the Detroit Marriott Renaissance Center on Tuesday, January 23, through Friday, January 26, 2007.

REED stated that perhaps the township should not attend the 2007 Conference.

FOTENAKES stated the money had already been budgeted. **PRATT** felt that if the money was in the budget, the Board should approve the issue, but if classes weren't offered for certain positions, it would be the discretion of the person as to whether he/she should attend. **FOTENAKES MOVED**, seconded by Reed to allow the Board of Trustees and Deputy Supervisor to attend the 2007 MTA Conference in Detroit, Michigan.

DISCUSSION:

- **PRATT** stated there had been excellent Planning Commission Seminars this past year so by not attending the Conference it would not have any affect on issues coming up in the future.
- **TROTOGOT** stated after reviewing the classes to be held at the Conference, he didn't see anything that actually pertained to the Planning Commission.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Morford, Fotenakes, Minaudo, Pratt, Reed, and Trotogot

NAYS: 0 MOTION CARRIED.

ABSENT: Liepmann

2. City of Flushing/Flushing Township – Proposed Parks and Recreation Authority

TROTOGOT requested permission to sign the Proposed Parks and Recreation Authority Agreement between the City of Flushing, Flushing Township, and any municipality that would like to join. **FOTENAKES MOVED**, seconded by Reed to allow the Supervisor to sign the Agreement between the Park, Township, City and Schools for the Park and Recreational Authority.

DISCUSSION:

- **TROTOGOT** stated that if the Authority should find they wanted to build a recreational center in the Flushing Area, the issue would then have to be placed on the ballot and would need the vote of everyone involved with the Flushing School District including Flint Township, Mt. Morris Township, Clayton Township, Flushing Township and the City of Flushing.
- **FOTENAKES** stated the township would receive revenues as the tax payers would help pay for the center.
- **TROTOGOT** stated that sometimes there is the availability of name rights to receive money for a project. Examples have been Nike, Wal-Mart, etc.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

None

REPORTS:

1. **Building Inspector’s Report:** Reviewed and Accepted.

BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED:

NEW HOMES	2
ACCESSORY BUILDINGS	6
DECKS	4
REMODELING	0
ADDITIONS	1
GARAGES	0
FENCE PERMITS	2
ROOF REPAIR	0
POOL	0
COMMERCIAL	0
SIGN	0
TOTAL PERMITS ISSUED	
	15
PERMIT VALUATION FOR SEPTEMBER 2005	\$ 1,014,087
PERMIT VALUATION FOR SEPTEMBER 2006	657,190
PERMIT FEES COLLECTED FOR SEPTEMBER 2006	
	\$ 3,467
TRAILER INSPECTIONS	100
TRASH AND RECYCLING CHARGES	0
SPECIAL USE PERMIT	0

HOME OCCUPATION PERMIT	0
EARTH REMOVAL PERMIT	0
VARIANCE REQUEST	0
REZONING REQUEST	0
CODE BOOKS	0
FOR A TOTAL OF	\$ 3,567
CONSTRUCTION TO DATE SEPTEMBER 2005	8,721,124
CONSTRUCTION TO DATE SEPTEMBER 2006	5,671,791
FOR A DECREASE OF	\$ 3,050,000

PUBLIC COMMENTS:**8:30 P.M. – OPENED TO THE PUBLIC**

1. **Ted Edick, 8425 Wesley, Flushing, Michigan** – “there is a serious health problem in Flushing Township; it has been scientifically proven that cigarette smoke in any form or amount is deadly – outside burning carries the same risk. The township is paying for services to pick up household garbage, lawn waste and recycle items so there isn’t any need for outside burning. Different neighbors are burning different items which leave so much soot and ash and in the meantime there are deadly gases that are stinking up the area for hours. It is impossible to do anything outside especially during warm weather months; the central air has to be turned on. There are a lot of youth and seniors that have allergies and deserve the chance to breathe air that is not polluted by smoke. Mr. Edick felt the Township needed to pass a no-burn ordinance to prevent health problems. If needed there could be a “burn time” two (2) times a year – the first week of April and the first week of November.

2. Nature Park Manager **TOM ENRIGHT** stated there would be a “Nature’s Halloween” at the Flushing Township Nature Park on Saturday, October 28, 2006 from 12:00 Noon to 8:00 p.m.

8:35 P.M. – CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC**BOARD COMMENTS:**

1. **FOTENAKES** wanted to know when the “leaf pickup” signs would be located throughout the Flushing Subdivisions. There are so many leaves on Chickasaw Trail. **TROTOGOT** stated last year there were so many leaves still there in the spring that the last pickup was scheduled later in the year. **FOTENAKES** recommended putting an article in the Flushing Observer suggesting the residents not put leaves in the street until after Halloween.

2. “It was recommended, from a resident in the audience, that everyone bag their leaves.”

3. **Beverly Edick, 8425 Wesley, Flushing, Michigan** – “if everyone would mow their lawn with the leaves on, then place the mowed leaves in a bag, it would only take up about one-third (1/3) of the bags.”

4. **FOTENAKES** stated she saw an article in the Michigan Township News entitled “State Offers Grant Resources for Townships” which had to do with environmental issues. **FOTENAKES** will give the article to Flushing Township Nature Park Manager **TOM ENRIGHT**.

5. **MINAUDO** stated the Flushing Township Police Department had been mentioned in an article in the Flint Journal entitled “In Your Opinion” regarding a “high price lawyer”. Chief **DOUG KENNEDY** of the Flushing Township Police Department stated the article was made in reference to an attorney that represented the Flushing Township Police through the Michigan Municipal League. The Michigan Municipal League is the Risk Management for the Flushing Township Police Department; the township is not paying anything other than minimum monthly insurance premiums for the attorney services.

THE NEXT BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2006 AT 7:00 P.M. AT THE TOWNSHIP HALL.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business matters, Supervisor Trotogot adjourned the meeting at 8:40 P.M.

Julia A. Morford, Clerk

Andrew Trotogot, Supervisor

APPROVED DATE: _____