

- for the accumulative vacation and personnel sell-back time up to January 1, 2009. How was the Treasurer and Clerk involved in the matter.
2. **NOECKER** stated he had been approached by the Supervisor concerning the request. Since there hadn't been any written documentation, his (Noecker) response had been to say "no we don't need to approve the issue at the time". It was his (Noecker) recollection that the Police Chief had submitted his intention to retire document in December 2008 so didn't see the issue as being urgent to have the money wired the next day. **NOECKER** stated he said "no". He (Noecker) was later told by the Supervisor that he (Supervisor) had approved of the money being wired to the Police Chief's account.
 3. **MORFORD** stated she had been informed by the Treasurer about the money issue one day when she was leaving for lunch. From what **MORFORD** understood, and after having discussed the issue with **ATTORNEY MOULTON**, the money had been part of the Police Chief's back pay that had been determined with the new Contract for the Police Chief went he (Chief) went from hourly to salary in December 2007.
 4. **PURKEY** wanted to know if either the Clerk or the Treasurer authorized the transfer of the funds? The Clerk's response was "no" she did not. The Treasurer's response had been "no". **PURKEY** stated the Board had never approved the funds. **PURKEY** has contacted the Michigan Townships Association (MTA) and was informed the only way funds could be transferred, by any township in the State of Michigan, was by the Clerk and Treasurer signing the check. All transfers of funds have to be authorized by the Clerk and Treasurer.
 5. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the disbursement of the money, in the particular manner in which it was paid, was when the Employment Agreement was entered into between the Flushing Township Board of Trustees and the Flushing Township Police Chief. The Contract specifically identified the amount of time the Police Chief could sell back and it was agreed, and the document that was prepared consistent to the Agreement with the Police Chief's Agreement, that he could sell back that amount of time, was the amount that would be sold back.
 6. **PURKEY** stated all transfer of funds had to be authorized by the Clerk and the Treasurer.
 7. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the fact was true as a general rule. The Police Chief was entitled to sell back his time and the former Board had previously agreed to that arrangement.
 8. **PURKEY** was informed by the Michigan Township Association (MTA) that in the State of Michigan if the Clerk and the Treasurer do not sign off, the transfer would not be a transfer.
 9. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the procedure of an electronic transfer is considered a disbursement form for a check. The former Board had already agreed that the Police Chief would be selling the time back and was entitled to that particular money.
 10. **PURKEY** felt the Board should have seen a bill for the money because he is not sure if the Police Chief was entitled to more or less money or less money.
 11. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** wanted to know if **PURKEY** was questioning the funds that were paid out or the method of payment.
 12. **PURKEY** felt the funds should never have been transferred until it was signed off by both the Clerk and the Treasurer.
 13. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the procedure would be the same with regard to a check or an electronic deposit. The sell back issue had been presented to the former board and it had already been agreed upon that the Police Chief would be selling back a certain amount of time. He (Police Chief) was entitled to the particular amount of money.
 14. **PURKEY** stated once the Board saw a bill for the money, it would be taken care of. The Police Chief could be entitled to more or less money. Neither the Treasurer nor Clerk had signed off on the bill.
 15. **SCHWIEMAN** stated it was clearly stated in the approved Police Chief's Contract that he (Police Chief) could ask for his money and receive it after April 1, 2009. That is what the Police Chief requested. Every two (2) weeks he (Schwieman) signs the pay sheets for the employees, not the Treasurer. If the

township is doing something wrong every two (2) weeks by electronic transfers, then the township has been doing something wrong for a long time. Would it be correct to say the electronic transfer should be approved by the Treasurer and the Clerk. (The question was directed to **PURKEY**).

- 16. **PURKEY** stated that per M.T.A., there are no legal transfer of funds by anyone other than the Clerk and the Treasurer.
- 17. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** recommended that several members of the Board sit down with **CHIEF KENNEDY** to review the sell back issue as to the number of vacation and personnel days the Chief has.
- 18. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** will review the sell back issue with M.T.A and other resources; an Opinion will be reviewed by Flushing Township.
- 19. **CHIEF KENNEDY** requested a meeting to put together a Committee to review the funds for the Police Chief so they (the funds) could be expedited immediately. Another sell back time request will be from January 1, through May 31, 2009.
- 20. **SCHWIEMAN** recommended that Mr. Purkey, the Treasurer, and the Clerk take on the task of exploring the situation of sell backs. Recently, it was determined there was a similar situation with the Building Inspector and the Teamsters Contract. The same procedure has been followed for the last six (6) people that have retired from Flushing Township.
- 21. **GARDNER** felt that for the future, if payroll has been regularly paid, the course has been paid. If a large amount comes up, it would be the practicality of anyone writing that amount of a check, to always double check with someone else.
- 22. **SCHWIEMAN** stated Flushing Township had a checks and balance system.
- 23. **CHIEF KENNEDY** stated that since he would be retiring in two (2) weeks, he would respectfully request that the people that will be on the committee, to review the issues as well as the additional funding and to expedite the process effective immediately so when he retired everything would be done the way it was supposed to be done.
- 24. **NOECKER** stated that by law, the township was authorized to pay bills that had been pre-approved, such as contracts, utilities, credit card statements, membership dues, etc.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

NAYS: 0 MOTION CARRIED.

7:50 P.M. – OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Eleven (11) individuals gave their opinions.

8:15 P.M. – CLOSED TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Update on Senior Center Millage Issue (Gasoline for Van)

The question had been brought up at a previous Board of Trustees Budget Meeting why Flushing Township paid for the gasoline for the Flushing Senior Center Van. There had been a request by a Board Member to remove the line item from the budget for the gasoline. The legality of sending the money to the Senior Center was discussed since there was a county wide millage in effect that was funding the Senior Centers.

ATTORNEY MOULTON explained that the county wide millage was to fund senior centers for the county. Prior to the election, a large number of townships had met to discuss the issue. After the millage was passed, the county stepped in and started to indicate how they (County) were going to administer the millage funds. A number of the townships, including the Flushing Township Board was upset. A meeting was held at Flushing Township attended by Supervisors, other Board Members from surrounding townships and cities, representatives, and Genesee County Corporation Counsel Ward Chapman. Since it was a county wide millage, the County would be handling the administration of the money. One item that was implemented early on was if the

townships, such as Flushing Township, submitted a request to the county where disbursements of millage money could fund our senior citizens center, that grant request would, in terms of the grant, be considered only if the local unit indicated, would continue the current level of funding. Flushing Township would be in violation of the County’s requirement of the millage disbursement to the Flushing Senior Center if the line item was eliminated.

The Resolution, which was adopted in 2007 by the former Flushing Township Board of Trustees with regards to obtaining funding from the County, specifically stated that for each fiscal year that Flushing applied for a request, that Flushing Township was going to maintain the existing level of funding to the Flushing Senior Center.

GARDNER wanted to know if the Contract was for perpetuity and there wasn’t any exits or could the Board treat the issue as an exit and if so could there be reimnifications. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the Board could treat the issue as a request from the County since it was a county wide millage. **GARDNER** wanted to know who would be requesting the exit, the Township or the Seniors? **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated when the millage was passed it wasn’t clear as to the terms from which the funds would be distributed. The current Senior Citizen Center is supplied by Flushing Township, the City of Flushing, and Clayton Township, who all share the cost of operation for the Flushing Senior Center.

GARDNER wanted to know if there were Articles of Incorporation for the Senior Center that stated what Flushing Township’s position would be. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated there was an Agreement among the three (3) municipal entities. Per the wording of the Agreement, if the City of Flushing, Flushing Township, and Clayton Township dropped out of the Agreement, it would drastically affect the money which the Flushing Senior Center would receive.

PURKEY wanted to know if the Flushing Senior Center could take advantage of the gasoline discount currently between the City of Flushing, Flushing Township and Flushing Community Schools. **MORFORD** will check out the situation to see what information could be obtained.

SCHWIEMAN will check out the Articles of Incorporation for **GARDNER**.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. 8:30 P.M. ADJOURNED TO GO INTO CLOSED SESSION:

SCHWIEMAN MOVED, seconded by Morford that pursuant to Section 8 of the Open Meetings Act specifically MCL 15.268(h) which allows the Board to meet in Closed Session to discuss matters of state and federal statutes which the Michigan Courts have interrupted to include the discussion of a written opinion from the Township’s Attorney after receiving such an opinion from Attorney Fanning.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

NAYS: Purkey, **MOTION CARRIED.**

9:25 P.M. RECONVENED TO REGULAR SESSION

a. Possible Retirement of Patrol Officer

SCHWIEMAN MOVED, seconded by Matzke to approve Officer’s Coe offer.

DISCUSSION:

- **GARDNER** was not in favor of the buyout. We pay people to work.

- **MATZKE** understood where **GARDNER** was coming from but also could see the financial crises and possible actions that could happen if the township didn't buy out Officer Coe. From the start, everything has been about money. He (Matzke) understood the Police Millage did not pass. People didn't vote that they did not want a Police Department; felt if the township didn't buy out Officer Coe, the township could lose the part timers and the next officer in line so would not be able to provide 24/7 coverage. The residents pay enough so should guarantee 24/7 coverage. There are a lot of issues that could be affected by not approving the buyout.
- **NOECKER** stated that within the last three (3) weeks there have been issues in The Flint Journal about raising taxes; MERS Pension Plan (MERS) was specifically mentioned in the article. He (Noecker) could not comprehend spending a large amount so the person could hurry up and get on MERS. It would cause legal issues in the future when a person got to within three (3) or four (4) years of retirement and would want the township to buy them out. Since Coldwater Road was such a mess, it should be fixed.
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated with Officer Coe's proposal, it would save the township \$321,000. He (Schwieman) stated that without the retirement and laying people off, there wouldn't be 24/7 protection; the part-timers would be gone. The proposal would put money back into the Fund Balance. He is in favor of downsizing the Police Department.
- **MINAUDO** has been doing police work for a long time. The majority of people that end up buying time, buy the time without the governmental institution buying one-half. **MINAUDO** agreed with the buyout but didn't agree paying the large amount.
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated Officer Coe has agreed to not have health insurance for the rest of her life through the township.
- **NOECKER** felt the people have spoken and there are a lot of irate people. It is not proper to belittle each other.

NOECKER MOVED, seconded by Minaudo to call for a vote to end the debate

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

NAYS: Gardner MOTION CARRIED.

ORIGINAL MOTION:

SCHWIEMAN MOVED, seconded by Matzke to approve Officer's Coe offer.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Matzke, Morford, Schwieman

NAYS: Gardner, Minaudo, Purkey, Noecker MOTION FAILED.

b. Consideration Regarding Hiring of New Police Chief

SCHWIEMAN MOVED, seconded by Matzke to enter into contract talks with Don Gansen for the new Flushing Township Police Chief.

DISCUSSION:

- **PURKEY** wanted to know if the motion was whether or not to enter into Contract Negotiations. In support of the motion, **SCHWIEMAN** offered to show the charts to the audience. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated that **SCHWIEMAN** was asking the Board for approval to enter into discussion with Mr. Gansen and then bring the information back to the Board.

There would be a two (2) step process:

1. Permission to negotiate with Mr. Gansen and reach some type of tentative agreement
 2. then bring the information back to the Board.
- **PURKEY** wanted to know why the Board should give **SCHWIEMAN** approval to hire or negotiate for a Chief.
 - **MINAUDO** wanted to know if there had been any interviews.
 - **SCHWIEMAN** stated four (4) people have turned in resumes for the Police Chief's position.
 - **MINAUDO** wanted to know if the job had been offered to anyone yet.
 - **GARDNER** wanted to know, if **SCHWIEMAN** felt that as Supervisor, he was the only one, by law, that could bring the issue to the Board.
 - **SCHWIEMAN** stated the Supervisor had the authority to appoint fire and police personnel. No one would be police chief without the Board's approval.
 - **GARDNER** stated from research that he had done, which went back to 1947, the authority to hire a police chief presided with a Board. The Board may give the authority to the Supervisor or a Superintendent of the Township. The Board may also take away the power. What was the current status?
 - **MINAUDO** stated the Board has had to deal with the situation for twenty-seven (27) years.
 - **PURKEY** stated according to MCL 41.812, the Charter Township and the General Law Township Board may delegate such appointment powers to the administrative board appointed by the township board. The Board could appoint or a committee or board could also be appointed to review the appointment of a police chief.
 - **SCHWIEMAN** stated the motion had been to ask the Board for permission to appoint a chief.
 - **NOECKER** stated it had been repeated numerous times that **SCHWIEMAN** would appoint a police chief.
 - **SCHWIEMAN** stated that he had recommended that **NOECKER** talk to people about becoming the police chief.
 - **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the statute applied to employees in general. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** read from the Charter Township's Supervisor's Guide published by the Michigan Townships Association that stated:
 "that a Charter Township the supervisor or superintendent has the authority to appoint fire and police personnel subject to Board approval". The ultimate decision would lie with the Board, but the question would be who has the initial authority to designate who would be submitted to the Board as a prospective police chief. (Two (2) different opinions were produced from the Michigan Townships Association). The answer would lie in the statutory language itself.
 - **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the Supervisor was asking, by way of the motion, for the Board's approval to approach Mr. Gansen regarding negotiations to become Police Chief. The Board could say either "yes" or "no".
 - **NOECKER** stated that he did not want to vote against Mr. Gansen, but a search Committee should be formed since this is such an important issue. Applications should be put out to see who was qualified for the position; a job description has not been put out to the public. The issue needed to be reviewed from a broader perspective.
 - **SCHWIEMAN** recommended finding out the proper procedure and move forward with the issue.
 - **MATZKE** felt the township had the person that was qualified for the position as police chief and should not have to go after applicants. He (Mr. Gansen) was more than qualified to run the department. Mr. Gansen would be a change of face; he (Mr. Gansen) is well respected in the community, with co-workers, and all the agencies in the department. With the financial situation, it would be a no-

brainer because he could run the department. He (Matzke) could not see why we should continue.

- **PURKEY** did not want to take one person’s view of who should be chief.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Schwieman, Matzke, Morford

NAYS: Gardner, Minaud, Purkey, Noecker MOTION FAILED.

c. **Possible Action Regarding Building Inspector Services**

MORFORD stated Flushing Township was at a position where the office needed to know how to handle the situation of the Building Inspector.

SCHWIEMAN stated a letter had been sent to the State of Michigan for Temporary Building Inspector Assistance. The Township is in a hold position until we hear from the State.

MORFORD stated there had been numerous requests for issues such as ponds, accessory structures, etc. and something had to be done. **SCHWIEMAN** felt the Building Inspector could be called back for a few days to get caught up and then he could go back on laid-off status.

MINAUDO wanted to know if anyone had been doing inspections since Building Inspector **JERRY FITCH (FITCH)** had been laid off? **SCHWIEMAN** stated permits have not been issued nor anything else. Only an application form has been filled out and the person then brings the form back to the office. The Planning Commission could do some of the things, but the township could not do building permits without a licensed inspector.

GARDNER wanted to know how the unemployment would be affected if the building inspector was brought back for two (2) days? Would it restart the clock?
SCHWIEMAN stated that it would restart the unemployment.

Flushing Township is in the waiting process to hear from the State as to when they (the State) will start the inspections/building permits.

NOECKER wanted to know if the State General Contractor also inspected manufactured homes, set ups, etc. similar to the former building inspector. Would there be any shortfalls? **SCHWIEMAN** made reference to the letter that was received from the State. **MORFORD** stated there was word that fifty (50) manufactured homes were going into one manufactured community in Flushing Township. **SCHWIEMAN** would contact the State as to the consequences of bringing the building inspector back for a few days.

2. First Reading of AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTIONS 5-26, 5-27, 5-28, and 5-29 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES AND TRANSFER RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE MICHIGAN STATE CONSTRUCTION CODE, as adopted for enforcement in Flushing Township, to the Bureau of Construction Codes under the Provisions of the Still-DEFROSSETT-HALE single State Construction Code Act, Act 230 of the Public Acts of 1972, as amended, MCL 125.1501, et seq.

ATTORNEY MOULTON stated if the Township was going to use the State for purposes of building code enforcement, the Township needed to make sure the ordinance was amended to authorize the State to act in that capacity. The proposed ordinance would repeal certain provisions now in effect that authorize the employment of a local building inspector to replace it by the language required by the State of Michigan to authorize the State to act in place of the local building inspector. The State would only assume State building code enforcements. Other issues that did not deal with building

codes such as ponds, accessory structures, etc. were required by local ordinance enforcements.

GARDNER MOVED, seconded by Schwieman to approve the amendment to the existing ordinance Sections 5-26, 5-27, 5-28, and 5-29 to modify the existing ordinance to authorize the State to act in the capacity.

DISCUSSION:

- **NOECKER** wanted to know if the situation would be a permanent ongoing issue if so **JERRY FITCH** should be scheduled one day a week or so to do ponds etc.
- **GARDNER** wanted to know if the power could be delegated to the Supervisor? Would there have to be a licensed person to fill the duty or could the Township come up with their own rules.
- **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated the reason for having a licensed building inspector was to have some base of confidence in reading blue prints and instruction type material. It would not apply to the construction of ponds etc. More information will be obtain and brought back to the Board in the near future.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

NAYS: 0 MOTION CARRIED.

3. Approval of Recommendation from Parks and Recreation Committee for part-time Park Coordinator’s Wages

SCHWIEMAN read a motion that had been made at the Parks and Recreation Committee Meeting which stated:

“Mr. Schwieman made a motion that Heather Griffin will be the part-time Park Coordinator and will report to him like any other employee would. Heather’s hours would be 24-28 hours as needed between the months of May to September and then would be reduced to 16 hours during the winter months. Her rate of pay will be \$13.58 an hour. Heather will have two (2) part-time seasonal employees that will work 16 hours each a week at \$8.00 an hour. Heather asked the committee for 30 hours as needed for the summer months. Mr. Schwieman amended the motion to change Heather’s summer hours to 24-30 hours as needed.”

Roll Call Vote: To take Mr. Schwieman’s recommendation of the motion to the Board.

Yes: Fitch; McPherson; Schwieman; Drozdowski

No: Noecker

SCHWIEMAN MOVED, seconded by Morford to approve the Parks Committee’s recommendation.

DISCUSSION:

- **MORFORD** wanted to know how the Parks and Recreation Committee came up with the \$13.58 that was mentioned in the motion from the Parks and Recreation Committee.
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated in talking to the Union a possible \$14.00 was discussed. Another full-time union employee was making \$15.08. **HEATHER GRIFFIN (GRIFFIN)** would come in under the Union. **SCHWIEMAN** stated there wasn’t a problem for one year per the Union Representative, but the pay had to be lower than the lowest paid employee or any amount could be put, but the other employees pay would have to be raised.
- **PURKEY** wanted to know if anything was mentioned about full time and part time hours.
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated full time hours were thirty-two (32) or more and full time benefits are mandatory. The question before the board would be the rate of pay, the hours, and the job description. Currently the employee’s rate of pay is \$9.00.

- **PURKEY** was concerned about the number of hours and wanted to make sure the hours weren't so close as to kick into fulltime pay with the union. Would the Union be looking at total number of yearly hours or number of hours per week. There could be more hours in the summer than winter, would the number be evened out?
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated there could be a maximum of thirty (30) hours in the summer and less hours in the winter.
- 4. **PURKEY** would like to see the job description completed and a review of the mowing/snowing maintenance contract. He (Purkey) would like to see the mowing contracted out because it was not fair to have her (Heather) do everything.
- 5. **GARDNER** would be in favor of twenty (20) hours maximum with a three (3%) percent increase.
- 6. **MINAUDO** wanted to know if the mowing was contracted out and **HEATHER** wasn't going to be doing the mowing, would she (Heather) need that many hours?
- 7. **SCHWIEMAN** currently has a contractor mow the township.
- 8. **NOECKER** felt **HEATHER'S** expertise was in the park.
- 9. **PURKEY** wanted to see a completed job description and then he would make a more informed decision.
- 10. **MINAUDO** inquired as to the work load for the Park.
- 11. **GARDNER** recommended twenty (20) hours and a \$1.00 raise which was not a reflection on **HEATHER'S** work ethic.
- 12. **NOECKER** recommended a ten (10%) percent raise to \$10.00 an hour and evaluate after a job description has been received. The Board owes **HEATHER** a job description.

PURKEY MOVED, seconded by Gardner for temporary \$1.00 an hour raise immediately and the hours to be twenty (20) hours per week until the Board sees a Job Description.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

NAYS: 0 MOTION CARRIED.

13. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Sale of Nature Park Home

GARDNER MOVED, seconded by Minaudo to instruct the Bids Committee to search out Real Estate Agents and to look at the home and come back to the Board on recommendations of said Real Estate Agents on what needs to be done to bring the home to a sellable position.

DISCUSSION:

- **NOECKER** wanted to know if the gentleman from Traverse City had contacted the Supervisor. Also, knowing that **SCHWIEMAN** was in the building profession, what would his opinion be as to minor repairs for the Park Home.
- **SCHWIEMAN** stated if the house was his, he would paint, maybe carpet, and then sell the house.
- **PURKEY** felt if the gentleman from Traverse City was interested, it might be cheaper to not do anything to the house.
- **NOECKER** wanted to know if **ATTORNEY MOULTON** would handle the sale of the Park Home if the township found a buyer?

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

MOTION CARRIED.

14. Bidable Positions

MINAUDO MOVED, seconded by Purkey for the Bids Committee to research all current outside providers which include, but not limited to, township attorney, auditors, engineer, labor attorney/negotiators, janitorial services, tow service, lawn mowing and maintenance. The bids will be placed in the competitive bids process and the process should be ready to be processed by the next regular scheduled board meeting.

DISCUSSION:

- The bids are for current positions.
- We need to stop fighting and to work for the good of the community.
- Any new hires will be part-time.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Gardner, Matzke, Minaudo, Purkey, and Noecker

NAYS: Morford, and Schwieman **MOTION CARRIED.**

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

None

REPORTS:

1. **Treasurer's Report:** **PURKEY MOVED**, seconded by Morford to accept the Treasurer's Report.

DISCUSSION:

- **NOECKER** stated from reports that he has read, the State Shared Revenue was short \$140,000 for the current year's budget. Since December, 2008, the legal fees have increased.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Minaudo, Purkey, Morford, Noecker, Schwie, Gardner, and Matzke.

NAYS: 0 **MOTION CARRIED.**

11:00 P.M. PUBLIC COMMENTS OPEN:

Three (3) people gave their Opinions

11: 15 P.M. PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

BOARD COMMENTS:

1. **MORFORD** thanked the Board Members for setting up the polling locations for the May 5th election.
2. **NOECKER** thanked the Clerk and everyone that helped make the election process work.
3. **NOECKER** stated he will not vote for any new taxes in this term.
4. **GARDNER** felt the same way that **NOECKER** felt about taxes.
5. **SCHWIEMAN** stated in townships the Supervisor had the authority to appoint Police Chiefs and Fire Authorities
6. **SCHWIEMAN** stated the issue with the former Police Chief had not been discussed with the Treasurer and Clerk; Number 5 of the Police Chief's contract stated the money had to be paid back on or after April 2, 2009.

THE NEXT BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2009 AT 7:00 P.M.

ADJOURNMENT: PURKEY MOVED, seconded by Gardner to adjourn at 11:20 p.m.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:
MOTION CARRIED.

JULIA A. MORFORD, Clerk

DONALD A SCHWIEMAN, Supervisor

APPROVED DATE: _____

05/14/09 Regular