

# CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLUSHING

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

DATE: DECEMBER 11, 2008

TIME: 7:00 P.M.

PHONE: 810-659-0800

FAX 810-659-4212

WEB PAGE: <http://www.flushingtowship.com>

## ADMINISTRATION MEMBERS

SUPERVISOR: Donald A. Schwieman  
CLERK: Julia A. Morford  
TREASURER: William J. Noecker

## TRUSTEES

Michael S. Gardner  
Scott R. Matzke  
Scott P. Minaudo  
Mark H. Purkey

## TOWNSHIP ATTORNEY:

STEVEN MOULTON  
Cooley Moulton & Smith LLP  
727 S. Grand Traverse Street  
Flint, Michigan 48502

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER** at 7:00 p.m. by **SUPERVISOR DONALD A. SCHWIEMAN (SCHWIEMAN)** with Roll Call and the Pledge to the American Flag.

**ROLL CALL:** Schwieman, Morford, Noecker, Gardner, Matzke, Minaudo, and Attorney Steve Moulton

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Purkey

**OTHER INDIVIDUALS PRESENT:** 72 other interested residents

**GARDNER** requested to add to the Agenda *Board Benefits* to be listed under "New Business".

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: MINAUDO MOVED**, seconded by Matzke to adopt the revised Agenda with the addition of *Board Benefits* to be listed under "New Business". **MOTION CARRIED.**

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

**A. NOVEMBER 13, 2008: GARDNER MOVED**, seconded by Minaudo to approve the Minutes of November 13, 2008 as printed.

### DISCUSSION:

1. **MORFORD** would like to amend **Page 1**, paragraph 1, line 4, **from** "the Patrol Command Contract" **to** "the Patrol Officers Contract".

### ACTION OF THE MOTION:

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**B. NOVEMBER 24, 2008: GARDNER MOVED**, seconded by Noecker to approve the Minutes of November 24, 2008 as printed. **MOTION CARRIED.**

**C. DECEMBER 2, 2008: GARDNER MOVED**, seconded by Minaudo to approve the Minutes of December 2, 2008 as printed.

### DISCUSSION:

1. **GARDNER** would like to amend **Page 1**, paragraph "Adjourned to Closed Session", line 1, **from** "MORFORD MOVED, seconded by Purdy" **to** "MORFORD MOVED, seconded by Purkey".

### ACTION OF THE MOTION:

**MOTION CARRIED**

**D. DECEMBER 5, 2008: GARDNER MOVED**, seconded by Matzke to approve the Minutes of December 5, 2008 as printed. MOTION CARRIED.

**APPROVAL OF BILLS: MINAUDO MOVED**, seconded by Morford to approve the bills as listed. Questions: Could the Board have a breakdown of the Visa Credit Card Statement in the future.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Gardner, Matzke, Minaudo, Morford, Noecker, and Schwieman,

NAYS: 0 MOTION CARRIED.

ABSENT: Purkey

**7:14 P.M. – OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Eleven (11) interested people gave their opinions.

**7:31 P.M. – CLOSED TO PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**1. Approval of 2009 Meeting Dates and Times**

**MORFORD MOVED**, seconded by Noecker to approve the *2009 Meeting Dates* for the Board of Trustees; Zoning Board of Appeals; the Planning Commission; the Parks and Recreation Committee; the Board of Review; and the Water and Sewer Committee.

**DISCUSSION:**

- **GARDNER** would like to see the dates and times made easier for the general public by changing all the meeting times to 7:00 p.m.
- **MORFORD** stated there were times when the Parks and Recreation Committee (Parks) didn't have specific dates but the proposed schedule was posted to give the General Public an idea of the Park schedule. If time changes were made, the times, etc. was posted on the front door of the Township Hall.
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated he didn't think there would be a problem with the 7:00 p.m. schedule for the Zoning Board of Appeals, but with the Parks, there were reasons for the specific times. During June, July, and August the meetings could be held at the Park at 7:00 p.m. but during the winter months, it would be too dark to hold the meetings at the Park at 7:00 p.m.
- **GARDNER** stated the meetings at the Nature Park were to discuss what would occur at the Nature Park, not to see the park. All the meetings should be held at the Township Hall at 7:00 p.m.
- **SCHWIEMAN** wanted to know if the times were changed to 7:00 p.m. could the *2009 Meeting Dates* be approved; the Board would deal with the summer months at a later date after further review of the issue.
- **GARDNER** wanted to know if all the meetings could be changed to Thursdays, on a rotational basis, to make it easier to keep track of which meeting was which day.
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated he felt 7:00 p.m. would not be a problem, but he (Schwieman) felt the specific days had been set for a particular reason, and from his position, he didn't want to change the day.
- **SCHWIEMAN** asked for an amendment to the motion to: **1)** follow the path of 7:00 p.m.; **2)** keep the current dates; **3)** the park dates could be adjusted in the future; and **4)** the date issue would be reviewed with the other committees to see if there needed to be changes.
- **GARDNER** would like to set the January Meetings for the Boards at 7:00 p.m.; by the January Meetings, more information would have been received to set the remaining eleven (11) months meetings dates.
- **MORFORD** stated the meeting dates had to be posted a certain number of days after the current meeting for the year.

**ACTION OF THE MOTION:**

Amendment to the Current Motion

**GARDNER MOVED**, seconded by Minaudo to approve the *2009 Meeting Dates* with the change of the Zoning Board of Appeals from 7:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. and the Parks and Recreation Committee from 4:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. **MOTION CARRIED.**

**2. Approval of Board Appointments**

**MINAUDO** requested to postpone the *Committee Appointments* to the next regular scheduled Board Meeting because there were some amendments that needed to be made to the Appointments.

**SCHWIEMAN** stated the *Board Appointments* consisted of the Board of Trustees; the Zoning Board of Appeals; the Planning Commission; and the Board of Review. There seemed to be some confusion as to who made the Board Appointments. **ATTORNEY STEVE MOULTON (ATTORNEY MOULTON)** stated it was the prerogative of the Supervisor to appoint whom the Supervisor preferred. **SCHWIEMAN** appointed **MARK PURKEY (PURKEY)** to the Planning Commission.

**GARDNER** stated he had contacted Michigan Townships Association (MTA) and was told the nominating and appointing authority lies within the township board. The authority for the Zoning Board of Appeals lies entirely within the township board; the Supervisor was the nominating authority for the Planning Commission with Board approval. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated in past practices, the Township Supervisor has made selections to the different boards. If the Board wanted to deem the nominations, the Supervisor’s nominations were before the Board.

**MATZKE MOVED**, seconded by Morford to approve the *Board Appointments*.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Matzke, Morford, Schwieman

NAYS: Minaudo, Noecker, Gardner                      MOTION: TIE VOTE.

ABSENT: Purkey

**3. Approval of Committee Appointments**

**MORFORD MOVED**, seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ to approve the *Committee Appointments for 2009* as listed. **MOTION FAILS FOR LACK OF A SECOND.**

**4. Approval of Deputies for Flushing Township**

**NOECKER MOVED**, seconded by Minaudo to accept Karla Carpenter as the Deputy Treasurer for Flushing Township.

**DISCUSSION:**

- **GARDNER** wanted to know what the Deputy Treasurer was paid. **MORFORD stated in the past the Deputy Treasurer had been paid \$600.00 per year.** **GARDNER** wanted to know if by Ms. Carpenter being an employee, and receiving the money for being a deputy, would there be any line drawn that the work which would be done, should be done outside the hours that she would be compensated for, or could there be a point that Ms. Carpenter would be doing the work at the same time of being paid for her normal salary.
- **NOECKER** stated that in his ten (10) days of experience he (Noecker) could say that Ms. Carpenter was doing a fine job; there had been a lot of extra work getting ready for the current Board Meeting plus Ms. Carpenter had to stay for the current Board meeting. **NOECKER** felt since the Deputy Clerk received \$600.00 per year regardless if she/he was an employee or not, then the Deputy Treasurer should get \$600.00 even though the person was the Accountant. It would be an extra plus for the Township to have the Deputy Treasurer be an employee.

**ACTION OF THE MOTION:**

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Minaudo, Morford, Noecker, Schwieman, Gardner, and Matzke

NAYS: 0 MOTION TIE VOTE.

ABSENT: Purkey

The Deputy Clerk was under consideration at the time.

**SCHWIEMAN MOVED**, seconded by Noecker to have the Deputy Supervisor be Thomas Staley.

**DISCUSSION:**

- **GARDNER** wanted to know what would be the benefit of having a Deputy Supervisor although legally there had to be a Deputy Clerk and Deputy Treasurer but a Deputy Supervisor was not required.
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated there had been a Deputy Supervisor in the past. From his (Schwieman) stand point, if something happened to him (Schwieman) there would be someone from the community that had a similar background and who was a fine outstanding person from the community who has volunteered to help.
- **MINAUDO** wanted to know if the Deputy Supervisor would be paid?
- **GARDNER** wanted to know if the position was not required by law, then why would the Deputy Supervisor be paid the \$600.00.
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated Thomas Staley would be his Deputy Supervisor but would not be paid for the position.

**ACTION OF THE MOTION:**

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Morford, Noecker, Schwieman, Gardner, Matzke, and Minaudo

NAYS: 0 MOTION CARRIED.

ABSENT: Purkey

**5. Request by Treasurer for Audit**

Although, Plante and Moran, auditors for Flushing Township, come once a year to do the Audit for Flushing Township, **TREASURER NOECKER** has requested another audit be completed. It has been customary in a lot of the municipalities to have an audit to provide the outgoing Treasurer with a degree of comfort as well as the incoming Treasurer and would be a good business practice. The normal cost for an audit would be between \$17,000.00 and \$22,000.00.

**NOECKER**, contacted the auditors to see if they (auditors) could put their thoughts in writing and submit a bid as to the proper way to handle a similar request. The below is a response from Mr. Tadd Harburn of Plante and Moran which **NOECKER** read to the audience:

“**MR. TADD HARBURN** of Plante and Moran, stated that when there is a transition between township treasurers often times both parties are desirous of having some type of audit so there is a documented cut off between the treasurers. The engagement is called an “Agreed Upon Procedures,” which is an engagement whereby targeted procedures are developed by the township that the CPA firm would perform. A report is provided by the CPA firm at the end of the engagement to indicate the results. An “AUP” focuses on confirming the bank balances with the bank of the date of transition and to reconcile the bank balance with the general ledger. Another procedure might be to review the Summer Tax Roll and Collection Reconciliations that is prepared by the Township’s Accountant to assure that all taxes that have been collected have been distributed to the taxing entities. If the AUP focuses only on the bank accounts, the cost of the procedure would range between \$1,500.00 and \$2,000.00. The additional fees to review the Tax Roll Reconciliation would be \$600.00. This fee range anticipates that the Township Accountant would be able to

provide a bank reconciliation as of November 20, 2008 for each account and that the Summer Tax Roll Reconciliation would be completed for our review and testing.”

**MINAUDO** wanted to know where the funds would come from to perform the “Agreed Upon Procedures” engagement? **NOECKER** stated the funds would come out of the General Funds.

**NOECKER MOVED**, seconded by Morford for the Board to approve Plante and Moran to provide an “Agreed Upon Procedures” engagement along with an additional review of the Tax Roll Reconciliation totaling no more than \$2,600.00, possibly \$2,100.00, at the earliest possible convenience.

**DISCUSSION:**

- **GARDNER** wanted to know if **ATTORNEY MOULTON** had seen the procedure and what his (Attorney Moulton) thoughts were on the issue.
- **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the previous Treasurer had been in the position for twelve (12) years; one of **ATTORNEY MOULTON’S** law firm partners worked for another municipality and he (Attorney Moulton) would review the issue with him. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** inquired from Deputy Treasurer **KARLA CARPENTER** if the issue was customary. **CARPENTER** has never seen a similar situation but stated there was a line item in the budget for such issues.
- **MINAUDO** stated reference was made, in the letter from Plante and Moran to **NOECKER**, that the procedure was common when there was a transition between township treasurers.
- **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated Plante and Moran, accountants for Flushing Township, do annual audits for a large number of municipalities throughout the State.
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated Flushing Township’s audit has been completed for 2008.
- **NOECKER** stated this was his first real opportunity to ask for the audit because the other meetings had been “special” meetings.
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated that since Plante and Moran was Flushing Township’s auditing firm, and since the last audit was presented in September 2008, would that be close enough to apply.
- **NOECKER** stated that on the other hand, since the next audit would be March 31, 2009, why not wait until then for the results.
- **GARDNER** stated there were checks and balances and if money was moved from point “A” to point “B” it was not just one person, but two; there would be a paper trail as to when the audit had come up at the end of the current fiscal year, and if there was a discrepancy, it would not be too late to find out when it happened. The goal could still be achieved but the results would not be known for another few months.
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated the current treasurer had been trying very hard to double check everything and not make any mistakes.
- **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the auditors would be looking at the records as they existed March 31, 2009 which would be the end of the fiscal year. Since the records are well kept at the Township and subject to annual audits, **ATTORNEY MOULTON** was unsure if anything would be discovered now that wouldn’t show in the annual audit.
- **NOECKER** stated the audit report was not an accusation to the previous Treasurer; the audit would technically be for everyone’s protection.

**ACTION OF THE MOTION:**

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Noecker and Morford

NAYS: Minaudo – would approve the first part, but not the second part;  
Matzke, Gardner, and Schwieman,

ABSENT: Purkey

**6. Review of Water Rates for Flushing Township – Presentation by Dave Rowe of Inland Seas Engineering**

**SCHWIEMAN** requested to move the Review of Water Rates for Flushing Township to a Special Meeting to be held on Monday, December 15, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. due to the fact there are so many issues on the current Agenda. Dave Rowe of Inland Seas will be doing the presentation to the Board and the public.

**SCHWIEMAN MOVED**, seconded by Noecker to move the Water Rate Increase issue to a Special Meeting to be held on Monday, December 15, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. at the Township.

**DISCUSSION:**

- **GARDNER** felt the water rate issue could be handled at the current meeting by voting on *Schedule E* which would raise the rates for what the township was being charged but not having the money.
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated that Dave Rowe (Rowe) had faxed new information for which Rowe is currently working on and would be completed by December 15, 2008.
- **SCHWIEMAN** felt the Board should not be too hastily in making a decision as there were a lot of repairs that needed to be done; twenty-two (22) repairs will need to be done during the 2009 spring season. The issue is very serious and should be proceeded with expertise

**ACTION OF THE MOTION:**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES:** Noecker, Schwieman, Matzke, Minaudo, and Morford

**NAYS:** Gardner,

**ABSENT:** Purkey

\* \* \* \* \*

The Supervisor called for a ten (10) minute break.

\* \* \* \* \*

**7. Approval of 2009-2010 Flushing Township Police Department Budget**

**SCHWIEMAN** stated the Flushing Township Police Department budget was the most important decision he has ever had to deal with.

To make the budget work, there needed to be cost containment in wages, health care, and pensions. The township was committed, through the budget, to save as many jobs as possible; and, the Board was looking to talk to the Union as soon as possible to get the issue resolved.

**VERY IMPORTANT FACTS ABOUT THE BUDGET:**

1. The reimbursement for the School Resource Officer.
2. Other monies received from other methods such as tickets, impound fees, State Grants for Education, etc.
3. In order to approve the proposed budget, the previous budget would have to be amended first.
4. Officers were going to have to be laid off.
5. An audit report from Plante and Moran stated “compensated absences due employees of \$219,362.00. In the past there had been larger fund balances.

6. For several years there has been a loss of \$120,000.00 per year.
7. Scenario had been to lay off five (5) officers and with hardly anything due to unemployment, etc.
8. Decided to work with four (4) year's of budget and see the outcome if the unemployment number in the budget would only show this year.
9. There have been two (2) retirements recently, which helped the budget.
  - a. Retirement of the Police Secretary was greatly reduced by using part time clerical.
10. Several health insurance companies have been preparing insurance bids.
11. Biggest area of concern is pensions.
  - a. Municipal Employees Retirement System (MERS) does a five (5) year review of looking at the market instead of one (1) year.
  - b. Flushing Township has a defined benefit program that guarantees the pensions.
12. The township has been paying a cheaper price for gas at the Flushing Township Bus Barn.
13. Vehicle expense; the police department needs a new police car.
14. Per previous budgets, money has never been put into post retirement health care.
15. The Township has to review the post retirement for Command and Patrol
16. Promises have been made so very difficult not to legally honor the promises.
17. There are currently nine (9) full-time officers.
18. Instead of loosing money, the budget has and will gain money next year. Legally, the township has to have a balanced budget.
19. The proposed budget will keep all nine (9) officers employed for the next four (4) years and beyond, but the police officers will have to help.

**NOECKER MOVED**, seconded by Morford to accept the budget as is.

**DISCUSSION:**

- “Will the township be able to keep all officers?” **SCHWIEMAN:** YES, if the Police Officers help with the situation.
- “Can money be taken from the General Fund to assist the Police Budget?” **ATTORNEY MOULTON:** The legal answer, YES. The practical answer is that the township operates on ½ mil which is the funding for the General Fund. The combined Police Department Millages are approximately 3.5 mils. With what is available in the General Fund, there isn't going to be enough to do anything significant to the Police Budget. The millages, that were approved to fund the Police Department, were approved specifically dedicated for operation of the Police Department. Money cannot be taken from the Police Department Budget to use for General Fund purposes. The millages that were generated under the three (3) millage proposals have to be used for the Police.
- “What about catch-up with the Pension Plan.” **SCHWIEMAN** stated there was a large amount of money paid to MERS in October for catch-up. The township must look into the issue and review the police pension plans.
- “Could Flushing Township merge with the City of Flushing Police Department?” **SCHWIEMAN** stated the issue had been reviewed but one item that he (Schwieman) has obtained from the budget would be to keep all the Flushing Township Police Officers. The monies for funding of the Police Department will come the next few months from the property taxes.
- **NOECKER** stated a MERS representative recently visited Flushing Township and had some very interesting facts:
  - a. 1,600 groups in Michigan are with MERS
  - b. 19 groups have a pension multiplier of 3.0
  - c. 3 groups are in Flushing Township
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated a MERS representative would be working with the Township. The average municipality is at eighty-five (85%) percent funded; Flushing Township is at fifty-nine (59%).

- **MINAUDO** wanted to know if the money could be borrowed from the water fund.
- Article 9, Section 24 protects all employees including the Police Department.
- **NOECKER** wanted to know if the budget could be amended?
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated if the Township got into a position where there must be lay-offs, then there would be lay offs. The Board must be financially responsible to the township.
- **GARDNER** stated the news has been that we have the worst economy since the Great Depression; the next couple of years will be very questionable as to where the township goes; property values will be decreasing so millages will not bring in as many dollars as current. Washington DC has been talking about a stimulus package and spending money. Over the next few years, the money that will be coming in will decrease and the money that will be spent will increase. There should be a lot of thought put into the budget and the issue should be placed on the next agenda for action. Changes have taken place over the past few days that were not predicted. A question of the contributions with MERS that would be made at the end of the four (4) years and at what percentage.
- **NOECKER** wanted to know if there were limits the budget could be amended?
- **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated that for the future years, it would be more accurate to call the budget a “projection”, not a budget because the Board would be going through the annual budget process every year with the treasurer preparing a budget every year. The real period will be the next few months and the applicability of the numbers outlined for the next month. Another thing to take into account would be the millage in 2013 when the police millages would be up for renewal.
- **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the township had to have a balanced budget; the township could not operate with a deficit.
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated the township had the option to lay off individuals next month and the following month. Today, there has to be a balanced budget. The budget will work! The community and police department can help.
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated his intent was to have a full police department, not a half department.
- **GARDNER** wanted to know if the budget had to be voted on at the current meeting.

**ACTION OF THE MOTION:**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES:** Matzke, Minaudo, Morford, Noecker, Schwieman,

**NAYS:** Gardner,

**ABSENT:** Purkey

## **8. Review of a Committee of a Whole**

**GARDNER MOVED, seconded** by Morford to move to a “Committee of a Whole” so issues could be discussed openly.

**DISCUSSION:**

- **GARDNER** would like to see the “Cafeteria Insurance Plan”, the Life Insurance Benefit, the Dental Benefit, the Vision Benefit, and the Pension Plan all moved to zero for all members of the Board. The pension, per the law, could not go to zero as there had to be some type of pension in place. **GARDNER** received information from MERS which stated the township could offer \$1.00 Defined Contribution Plan which would mean that each year \$1.00 would go into the Defined Contribution Plan and would satisfy the law based on the opinion received. **GARDNER** would like to have the issue placed on the January 2009 Agenda.

**ACTION OF THE MOTION:**

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

1. Patrol Officers Contract – Public Comments on the issue will be limited to three (3) Minutes per Speaker

**COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

None

**REPORTS:**

1. **Building Inspector’s Report:** MINAUTO MOVED, seconded by Matzke to approve the Building Inspector’s Report. MOTION CARRIED.

**BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED:**

NEW HOMES		1
ACCESSORY BUILDINGS		2
DECKS		2
REMODELING		0
ADDITIONS		0
GARAGES		0
FENCE PERMITS		0
ROOF REPAIR		0
POOL		0
COMMERCIAL		0
SIGN		0
<b>TOTAL PERMITS ISSUED</b>		<b>5</b>
PERMIT VALUATION FOR NOVEMBER 2007	\$	56,500
PERMIT VALUATION FOR NOVEMBER 2008		396,140
<b>PERMIT FEES COLLECTED FOR NOVEMBER 2008</b>		<b>\$ 2,033</b>
TRAILER INSPECTIONS		50
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
<b>FOR A TOTAL OF</b>		<b>\$ 2,083</b>
CONSTRUCTION TO DATE NOVEMBER 2007		2,362,704
CONSTRUCTION TO DATE NOVEMBER 2008		1,803,692
<b>FOR A DECREASE OF</b>		<b>\$ 559,012</b>

2. **Treasurer’s Report:** MINAUDO MOVED, seconded by Matzke to accept the Treasurer’s Report. MOTION CARRIED.

- A. NOECKER** stated when he took office there were large amounts of money in several banks that, per FDIC, were not insured since the insurable amount was \$250,000.00. **NOECKER** made reference to page 26 of the *Charter Township of Flushing Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual* which lists the depository institutions used by Flushing Township. Due to the shaky situations with the banks, **NOECKER** moved some of the money to different lending institutions which yielded more interest. **NOECKER** stated the State Bank of Fenton and Davison have offered four and one-fourth (4 ¼%) on C.D's. up to twelve (12) months. He would like to put money into the two (2) institutions (State Bank of Fenton and State Bank of Davison). With five (5) C.D's averaging four (4%) percent interest, the township could make \$50,000.00.

**NOECKER MOVED**, seconded by Minaudo that the Board approves that the treasurer may be authorized to invest the township funds into any bank or credit union in the State of Michigan provided that institution is fully insured by FDIC.

**ACTION OF THE MOTION:**

None

**MORFORD MOVED**, seconded by Matzke to postpone the issue until Monday, December 15, 2008 to give the Treasurer more time to check out the situation and to find one more bank or credit union.

**DISCUSSION:**

- **GARDNER** stated if the meeting was to be held on Monday, December 15, 2008, there could be a possibility of only having four (4) of the seven (7) board members present.
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated the intention was to do the right thing; the four (4) members would do the right thing.

**ACTION OF THE MOTION:**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES:** Morford, Minaudo, Matzke, and Schwieman,

**NAYS:** Noecker and Gardner

**ABSENT:** Purkey

**THE ISSUE WILL BE ADDED TO THE DECEMBER 15, 2008 AGENDA.**

- B. NOECKER** stated when he was a candidate for the position of Treasurer, he had made promises to the community. Due to the Special Meeting Agendas, the issues had not been placed on the Agenda.

**NOECKER** proposed three (3) issues:

1. Reduce the Current Treasurer's Package by twenty-five (25%) percent. (**NOTE: NOECKER** stated if he couldn't reduce the package, then when his (Noecker) salary reached \$48,000.00 he would refund the remaining balance to the General Fund).
2. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the issue should be placed in the "Business Section" of the Agenda. Technically, since the issue wasn't part of the Business Section, it would not be before the Board for action. The Board of Trustees and Attorney are given the Agenda prior to the meeting to review the issues.
3. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** recommended **NOECKER** make the motion at the next Regular Scheduled Board of Trustees Meeting and "No" the salary of an Elected Official couldn't be reduced after the official took office. The official could decline the fringe benefit package and zero out the total.
4. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** will research the issue of whether the Board could reduce or allow the official to reduce the salary at some later date or refund what the official believed to be more than what the official would receive.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

1. **NOECKER**, who lives on a gravel road, wanted to thank the Genesee County Road Commission because recently when there was five (5) inches of snow, within less than twenty-four (24) hours, the road was plowed three (3) times.
2. **NOECKER** made reference to **CHIEF DOUG KENNEDY'S (CHIEF KENNEDY)** concern about a mandate to use part time officers. **CHIEF KENNEDY** would like for the mandate not to be changed because he (Chief Kennedy) would love to continue to use part-time officers. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated that the part-time officers would be used as in the past until **CHIEF KENNEDY** was instructed otherwise by the Board. **NOECKER** felt if there needed to be any layoffs, it should wait until after Christmas.
3. **GARDNER** stated that if anyone would like to discuss any item in depth, please call him.
4. **SCHWIEMAN** stated there had been a lot of work done to achieve the results of the Police Department and would like to especially thank **CHIEF KENNEDY**.

**9:52 P.M. OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Eight (8) interested individuals gave their opinion

**10:05 P.M. CLOSED FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**THE NEXT REGULAR SCHEDULED BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING IS THURSDAY, JANUARY 8, 2009 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**ADJOURNMENT:** Due to lack of further business, **SCHWIEMAN** adjourned the meeting at 10:10 p.m.

---

JULIA A. MORFORD, Clerk

---

DONALD A. SCHWIEMAN, Supervisor

APPROVED DATE: \_\_\_\_\_