

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF FLUSHING

6524 N. SEYMOUR ROAD

FLUSHING, MICHIGAN 48433

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MINUTES

DATE: JUNE 9, 2011

TIME: 7:00 P.M.

PHONE: 810-659-0800

FAX 810-659-4212

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

ADMINISTRATION MEMBERS

SUPERVISOR: Terry A. Peck

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 TERRY A. PECK** with Roll Call and the Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag.

ROLL CALL: Terry A. Peck, Julia A. Morford, William J. Noecker, Michael S. Gardner, Scott P. Minaudo, Mark H. Purkey, and Attorney Steve Moulton

MEMBERS ABSENT: Scott R. Matzke

OTHER INDIVIDUALS PRESENT: Twenty-two (22) other individuals

APPROVAL TO AMEND THE AGENDA: PURKEY MOVED, seconded by Morford to amend the Agenda with the following changes:

a. Unfinished Business:

Addition: Number 3 – Sale of Police Car No 6 (2006 Ford Crown Victoria)

b. New Business:

g. AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 4 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES TO ADD SECTIONS 4-4 THROUGH 4-10 TO DEFINE “VICIOUS DOG”; TO REGULATE THE KEEPING OF A VICIOUS DOG; TO REQUIRE THE REPORTING OF VICIOUS DOGS; AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE ORDINANCE, INCLUDING MAKING A VIOLATION A 90 DAY MISDEMEANOR SUBJECT TO A FINE OF UP TO \$500.00 AND/OR 90 DAYS IN JAIL.

h. AN ORDINANCE TO PROHIBIT MEDICAL MARIJUANA DISPENSARIES; AND TO PROHIBIT THE POSSESSION, STORAGE, TRANSFER OR SALE OF MEDICAL MARIJUANA, EXCEPT AS EXPRESSLY PROVIDED IN THE MICHIGAN MEDICAL MARIJUANA ACT.

i. Community Development Block Grant Funds

Deletions: Letter d – Representative from Swartz Ambulance

ACTION OF THE MOTION

AYES: 6

NAYS: 0

Motion Carried.

ABSENT: Matzke

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES: PURKEY MOVED, seconded by Minaudo to approve the Minutes of May 12, 2011 as presented.

ACTION OF THE MOTION

AYES: 6
NAYS: 0
Motion Carried.
ABSENT: Matzke

APPROVAL OF PAYMENT OF BILLS: MINAUDO MOVED, seconded by Purkey to pay the bills as submitted.

ACTION OF THE MOTION

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Minaudo, Gardner, Purkey, Peck, Noecker, and Morford
NAYS: 0
Motion Carried
ABSENT: Matzke

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Update to the Policies and Procedures Manual

NOECKER MOVED, seconded by Morford to accept the revised *Policies and Procedures Manual*.

DISCUSSION:

Page 25-26: The Treasurer felt the elected/employees were under bonded; suggested increasing the Treasurer and Deputy Treasurer to \$200,000. Per the insurance company, Flushing Township is in pretty good shape since there is a "\$100,000 Employee Theft Bond" which would cover the Water Clerk, Tax Clerk and the Assessor. The insurance company felt the bonds could be decreased; Michigan Townships Association (MTA) felt the rate should be increased. The Treasurer would like to change positional bonds for the Supervisor, Clerk, and Treasurer. Genesee County does carry a bond, which is up to forty (40%) percent of the tax base, on all municipalities in Genesee County. Since the updates can be easily changed, the Treasurer will have more details at a future meeting.

Page 11, Additions to the Agenda: "Additions to the agenda...to be placed on the agenda" **changed to** "Additions or deletions to the agenda made after the closing date as listed shall require approval of all members present to be placed on the agenda."

If a member of the Public would like to be placed on the Agenda, there are only three (3) items – health and safety issue to the township and/or monetary issue that are going to affect the township, all Board Members must receive a letter from the individual requesting the issue to be placed on the agenda.

MINAUDO MOVED, seconded by Noecker to add the language "If a member of the Public would like to be placed on the Agenda, there are only three (3) items – health and safety issue to the township and/or monetary issue that is going to affect the township, all Board Members must receive a letter from the individual requesting the issue to be placed on the agenda which would be part of Page 11.

DISCUSSION:

It was felt by some that individuals should not be placed on the Agenda unless there is something that is relevant to the Board. If the issue cannot be put into a proposal and voted on it should not be on the agenda but should be placed under "Public Comments". Individual board members place issues on the agenda and the board votes; there needs to be an advocate on the board. It was felt the issue should not be addressed in the *Policies and Procedures Manual* but only the deletions.

The Attorney made reference as to how restrictive the board wanted to be. Example: If City Manager Dennis Bow wanted to make a presentation to the Flushing Township Board of Trustees, on behalf of the City, and it would not require any board on a topic that was mutual interest to the City of Flushing and Flushing Township, would the Board limit Mr. Bow to "Public Comments" or could he be placed on the agenda. There is no way to anticipate the various issues that might arise or who might be the person

coming to the board asking for time to present the issue. The board has complete discretion to place an item on the agenda. If someone wants to address the board outside of "Public Comments", one of the board members has to agree that it is worth while to place the issue on the agenda; if four (4) others disagree, that is the end of the issue. The Clerk mentioned there have been legislators, safety, etc that have called the office wanting to be placed on the agenda; what do we do?

Sometimes there are last minute issues that have to be placed on the agenda. It was recommended to leave as is.

MOTION RECINDED. . .

MINAUDO recinded his motion to add the language "If a member of the Public would like to be placed on the Agenda, there are only three (3) items – health and safety issue to the township and/or monetary issue that is going to affect the township, all Board Members must receive a letter from the individual requesting the issue to be placed on the agenda which would be part of Page 11 but to keep the "deletions".

AMENDMENTS CAN BE MADE AT ANYTIME TO THE *POLICIES AND PROCEDURES MANUAL!*

ACTION OF THE MOTION

AYES: 6
NAYS: 0
Motion Carried
ABSENT: Matzke

2. Second Reading of AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTIONS 13.1-21 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES TO CLARIFY THE STATUS OF THE FLUSHING TOWNSHIP PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION AND TO REGULATE THE LAUNCHING AND RECOVERY OF WATER CRAFT.

MORFORD MOVED, seconded by Purkey to approve the second reading of AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTIONS 13.1-21 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES TO CLARIFY THE STATUS OF THE FLUSHING TOWNSHIP PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION AND TO REGULATE THE LAUNCHING AND RECOVERY OF WATER CRAFT.

ACTION OF THE MOTION

AYES: 6
NAYS: 0
Motion Carried
ABSENT: Matzke

3 Sale of 2006 Ford Crown Victoria – Car 6

GARDNER MOVED, seconded by Minaudo to authorize the Treasure to sell the car for the best price that Flushing Township can get instead of coming back another month.

ACTION OF THE MOTION

ROLL CALL VOTE:
AYES: Purkey, Gardner, Minaudo, Peck, Morford, and Noecker
NAYS: 0
Motion Carried
ABSENT: Matzke

NEW BUSINESS:**1-a. Approve May Monthly Budget**

NOECKER MOVED, seconded by Purkey to approve the May Monthly Budget as presented.

ACTION OF THE MOTION**ROLL CALL VOTE**

AYES: Minaudo, Purkey, Morford, Noecker, Peck, and Gardner

NAYS: 0

Motion Carried

ABSENT: Matzke

1-b. Leon Turnwald, Supervisor of Albee Township – Misteguay Creek

Mr. Leon Turnwald, Supervisor of Albee Township, was present to answer and clarify any questions that residents have concerning the Misteguay Creek; not in attendance to speak for the Misteguay Creek Intercounty Drain Board. Some interesting history facts:

- Has been supervisor of Albee Township for the past twenty-seven (27) years.
- Owns Turnwald's M-13 Storage at Easton Road and M-13.
- Misteguay was a creek (not a man made ditch) back 120 years ago.
- The cleaning out and diking started over 100 years ago and came to a head in the late 1950's early 1960's.
- The prairie land (fertile farm land) down below was in existence 60 to 80 years before that going through government and private ownership.
- In the 1960's there was an injunction placed on all the communities upstream to address the flooding issues that were occurring to the downstream communities. Out of the conjunction three (3) dams were constructed, other diking and erosion control devices were put in place.
- 1985-1986 catastrophic flooding forced the Federal Dam Safety Act.
- 1999-2000 due to the Federal Dam Safety Act a lot of criteria and improvements had to be made to the dam structures on the Misteguay. Assessments were put in place to take care of the improvements.
- Three (3) years after improvements were completed, the downstream on Birch Run Road was washed away – Albee Township, with matching funds from the Road Commission, had to pay for the replacement of the bridge.
- Currently, much more erosion going on. Per the Intercounty Drain Code “ can spend up to \$5,000 per mile without the vote of the people” for reconstruction or maintenance.
- In the past years spending the money to repair the dikes; determined the patchwork method won't be feasible to continue.
- All Communities were called to a meeting held at Albee Township on April 2010 with a slide show presentation to all the communities.
- Decided it was better for one municipality to file a petition – Albee Township filed the petition.
- June 3, 2010, first hearing - presented a reconstruction project worth \$1.8 million – Supervisor of Maple Grove Township decided to look at resolution to fix entire project – Albee Township was opposed to looking at the issue further because it had been engineered to death. Albee Township filed a Freedom of Information Request to the Intercounty Drain Commission to find out how much money had been spent with Spicer Engineering over the past twenty (20) years to do the engineering.
- The Intercounty Drain Commission got back with Albee Township and presented the bills. Spicer Engineering was not the engineers that had done the re-engineering in 2000 when the still ways were open.
- TO DATE:
 - a. Believe it would be less than \$1.8 million to do the project.

- b. All the dikes along the Flint River have been re-constructed over ten (10) years for \$6 million.
- c. Spread over the entire district.
- d. Albee Township had the problem but did not request the repairs.
- e. Misteguay Creek is an asset to everyone.
- f. County drains end in the Misteguay Creek; there has to be an outlet to clean out the drains.
- g. Interest from other communities to expand the work.
- h. On a drainage project of average size cost between \$75 and \$100; becomes expensive when spread over a large area.
- i. Albee Township would be paying the most for the project.
- j. Board of Determination decides on the monetary issues but the health and safety issues would be first.
- k. Flushing Township does agree something has to be done but got involved in the lawsuit.
- l. Flushing Township has 3,080 acres involved in the project; the farmers have a large interest in the project.
- m. The dividing of the cost for the project depends upon the County in which you live – Per Supervisor Peck, Genesee County Drain Commissioner Jeff Wright has done a very good job with the breakdown of the cost.

1-c. Internet (Online) Tax and Assessing Systems

MORFORD MOVED, seconded by Purkey to approve the Internet proposal from BS&A Software for the Pay-Per-Hit Option for Assessing and Tax on line systems with real-time data update. BS&A will set up and configure the web site at no charge to the township.

DISCUSSION:

This will be an on-line system that people can go on the web to check the assessment to their own property at no cost to the individual or Flushing Township. If someone (individuals, realtors, appraisers, etc) wants to get on-line and check the assessment of their neighbor’s property, there will be a \$2.00 charge for the service for each one that is looked up. The funds go direct to BS&A and will be available through the Flushing Township web site. A lot of questions will be answered through the service.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

AYES: 6
NAYS: 0
Motion Carried
ABSENT: Matzke

1-d. Dennis Judson for Deputy Zoning Administrator

GARDNER MOVED, seconded by Purkey to approve Dennis Judson for the Deputy Zoning Administrator.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

AYES: 6
NAYS:
Motion Carried
ABSENT: Matzke

1-e. Sealing and Striping of the Parking Lots for the Flushing Township Hall and Flushing Township Nature Park

GARDNER MOVED, seconded by Noecker to accept the lowest bid of \$3,127 from the Mid-Michigan Seal Coating to seal and stripe the (Flushing Township) Nature Park and

the budget amount in the Park Fund line item Waste Management Designated Expense from -0- to \$3,200; the shortage will be reduce the Fund Balance.

DISCUSSION:

There are two (2) areas that need sealing. Three (3) estimates were received to fill the cracks with hot rubber, seal the cracks, and then stripe the parking lots. The cheapest bid was \$3,127 from Mid-Michigan Seal Coat; the high bid was \$9,000 and the next highest bid was over \$7,000. The funds will come out of the designated "Waste Management Grant" for which \$5,500 remains from an original \$10,000 Grant.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Purkey, Morford, Noecker, Peck, Gardner, and Minaudo

NAYS: 0

Motion Carried.

ABSENT: Matzke

GARDNER MOVED, seconded by Purkey to accept the bid of \$2,175 from Mid-Michigan Seal Coating to seal and stripe the Township parking lot taking money from line item "Township Building and Grounds Improvement".

DISCUSSION:

A diamond shield additive will be added to the sealant which will add life to the sealant; the process will be a two (2) coat process.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Morford, Noecker, Peck, Gardner, Minaudo, and Purkey

NAYS: 0

Motion Carried.

ABSENT: Matzke

1-f. **AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 4 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES TO ADD SECTIONS 4-4 THROUGH 4-10 TO DEFINE VICIOUS DOG"; TO REGULATE THE KEEPING OF A VICIOUS DOG; TO REQUIRE THE REPORTING OF VICIOUS DOGS; AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE ORDINANCE, INCLUDING MAKING A VIOLATION A 90 DAY MISDEMEANOR SUBJECT TO A FINE OF UP TO \$500.00 AND/OR 90 DAYS IN JAIL.**

MORFORD MOVED, seconded by Purkey to have the first reading of a proposed ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 4 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES TO ADD SECTIONS 4-4 THROUGH 4-10 TO DEFINE VICIOUS DOG"; TO REGULATE THE KEEPING OF A VICIOUS DOG; TO REQUIRE THE REPORTING OF VICIOUS DOGS; AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE ORDINANCE, INCLUDING MAKING A VIOLATION A 90 DAY MISDEMEANOR SUBJECT TO A FINE OF UP TO \$500.00 AND/OR 90 DAYS IN JAIL

DISCUSSION:

There has been a dog in the neighborhood that has attack four (4) people; the proposed ordinance is the only means to correct the situation.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

AYES: 6

NAYS:

Motion Carried

ABSENT: Matzke

1-g. **AN ORDINANCE TO PROHIBIT MEDICAL MARIJUANA DISPENSARIES; AND TO PROHIBIT THE POSSESSION, STORAGE,**

TRANSFER OR SALE OF MEDICAL MARIJUANA, EXCEPT AS EXPRESSLY PROVIDED IN THE MICHIGAN MEDICAL MARIJUANA ACT.

MORFORD MOVED, seconded by Noecker to approve the first reading of the proposed ORDINANCE TO PROHIBIT MEDICAL MARIJUANA DISPENSARIES; AND TO PROHIBIT THE POSSESSION, STORAGE, TRANSFER OR SALE OF MEDICAL MARIJUANA, EXCEPT AS EXPRESSLY PROVIDED IN THE MICHIGAN MEDICAL MARIJUANA ACT.

DISCUSSION:

The issue has been discussed for approximately a year at the Planning Commission; seminars have been attended by the Planning Commission Members; and other reports have been reviewed such as “white papers” from Cooley Law School.

ATTORNEY STEVE MOULTON (ATTORNEY MOULTON) stated everything changed on June 3, 2011. What the analysis were waiting on was the decision out of the case that was filed in the Federal Court for the Western District of Michigan.

Under Federal Law, Marijuana is a Class 1 controlled substance. There are no instances under Federal Law where you can grow, use, possess marijuana. That law has been on the books since 1970.

In 2008, Michigan Legislator passed the *Medical Marijuana Act*, which allows individuals under that Act to have up to 2.5 ounces of marijuana for medical use. There is an elaborate procedure to whereby they apply to the State through the Department of Community Health to qualify as a qualified patient.

The first step in the process is to get a letter from a medical care provider attesting to the fact that the use of marijuana will alleviate some medical conditions the patient has. If they can get the letter, and then submit the application to the State and they receive a card registering them as a qualified patient, then they can use the card as a defense to any criminal prosecution as long as they possess less than 2.5 ounces of marijuana. They are also allowed to cultivate up to twelve (12) marijuana plants for their own use. There is another level for qualified care givers.

The State statute doesn't speak to dispensaries at all. The law comes in and is in conflict with Federal Law. The Michigan case filed in Federal Court for the Western District of Michigan involved a subpoena that was issued by the U.S. Attorneys office on behalf of the DEA (Drug Enforcement Agency) request directed to the Michigan Department of Community Health requesting specific identifying information for seven (7) individuals who had qualified as patients. The State of Michigan refused to honor the subpoena saying the confidentiality provisions of the State Law concluded them from providing that information. The U.S. Attorney filed the lawsuit to compel the State to comply. The intent was that as soon as they got the information they would issue Federal criminal warrants against the seven (7) individuals.

The decision came out June 3, 2011 and as everyone expected, Federal Law pre-empts. The Magistrate Judge ruled in favor of the U.S. Attorneys Office and the State of Michigan had to comply. In the meantime, the U.S. Department of Justice, under the current administration, announced publicly that the Federal Government will not prosecute violations if the substance at issue is marijuana.

Everyone waited a year and the results came out as expected only to have it undercut by the administration's announcement that there may be a violation of Federal Law and they won't prosecute. Had they not announced that, the State Statute would have essentially provided no relief because who would go in and apply for the card knowing that as soon as the information hits the public record, U.S. Attorney's office will be standing there to issue a Criminal Warrant under Federal law.

If the township board chooses to prohibit dispensaries because there isn't any provisions in the State Statute. There are some that is saying it is a reasonable entrance if an individual as a qualifying patient and possesses 2.5 ounces of marijuana then someone needs to provide it to them. The township should provide a store to sell, but the sales would be limited but the State Statute doesn't permit it and it could be excluded.

It was asked the difference between a dispensary and a caregiver:

“Definition of Medical Marijuana Dispensary. Any individual, corporation, partnership, limited liability company, or other entity which cultivates,

produces, possesses, stores, transports, sells, transfers, or otherwise provides medical marijuana to any person including a registered qualifying patient, shall be deemed a Medical Marijuana Dispensary unless such individual or entity is the registered primary caregiver for the registered qualifying patient for whom the medical marijuana is cultivated, produced, possessed, stored, transported, sold, transferred, or made available.”

It was asked that under State Law, the people are not required to tell who they are or where they live for both the patient and the caregiver. If the caregiver is growing marijuana for a patient, they don't have to tell, under the current State Law, who the patients are so really can't tell who they are growing marijuana for.

ATTORNEY MOULTON stated the State statutes and the regulations that were developed under the State Statute don't require that, but there isn't any reason the local municipality can't require that in consistent with. The township would not be prohibiting anyone from doing what the State Statute allows them to do, just requiring that the Township know where they are, who they are providing the medical marijuana to.

Other issues are in another proposed ordinance will be part of an amendment that will be adopted for the Zoning Ordinance if the Planning Commission feels that is appropriate and recommends the proposed ordinance to the Board. The current proposed ordinance doesn't address qualified patients and caregivers but only attempts to prohibit an operation that would operate solely as a dispensary; the sale of marijuana to qualified patients.

There was further discussion regarding the difference between a caregiver and a dispensary such as could the township be on a "slippery slope" when we differentiate between a dispensary and a caregiver? There is a complete absence on the part of the caregiver. **ATTORNEY MOULTON** stated if you are a qualified patient, you can come into his facility and he will sell, he is not tied to the individual in any way, shape or form other than the law states an individual can have up to 2.5 ounces of marijuana, he would sell the individual no more than 2.5 ounces of marijuana as long as the individual can show his/her card showing evidence that the individual is a registered qualifying patient. Under State law, it is a felony. There is a complete absence of the sale outside the qualified care giver.

The only thing being discussed at the particular meeting was the issue of a dispensary since there had been a call regarding a dispensary. The HIPPA Law is not being violated.

There were questions as to how the issue would be prosecuted. There were other questions from the Board so the issue will be postponed until the next meeting.

GARDNER MOVED, seconded by Minaudo to postpone until the next regular Board of Trustees Meeting.

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

AYES: 6

NAYS:

Motion Carried

ABSENT: Matzke

1-h. Community Development Block Grant Funds

MORFORD MOVED, seconded by Purkey to have the Clerk write a letter to the Genesee County Planning Commission (Community Development Program) stating that Flushing Township will continue to participate in the Community Development Block Grant Program for Fiscal Years 2012 through 2014. (*Genesee County Community Development Block Grant Program Cooperative Agreements for Fiscal Years 2012-2014*).

ACTION OF THE MOTION:

AYES: 6

NAYS: 0

Motion Carried

ABSENT: Matzke

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

None

REPORTS:

1. **Treasurer's Report:** As submitted.
 - a. **Frances Road Property:**
The Frances Road property has been sold for \$1,500 to a local resident.
 - b. **Duffield Road Property:**
Mr. Atwell stated he has rented the farm property on Duffield Road in the past; offered \$8,000 for the property; the township board declined. Attorney Moulton will contact Mr. Atwell's Attorney.
 - c. **Plante and Moran** will be offering an all-day *Financial Seminar* on Tuesday, June 21, 2011 in Novi; the Treasurer will be attending and will pay for the seminar if there is a charge.
 - d. **Water Rate Increase:**
Genesee County has informed all municipalities there will be another water rate increase from the City of Detroit effective September 1, 2011. The rate increase will be 22 cents per 100 cubic feet. Since November 2008, Flushing Township has profited over three quarters of a million dollars, with an increase of \$751,770. The money can only be used for water purposes and if borrowed from, then the money has to be paid back with interest. The Treasurer felt the Township was charging too much for water and would like to forego the 22 cent increase. Perhaps have a 90 day trial program and if depleting the funds too much, then start charging the 22 cent increase.

8:24 P.M. – OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS (2Minutes)

One (1) individual gave a comment.

8:25 P.M. - CLOSED FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS**BOARD COMMENTS:**

1. **PURKEY** reminded everyone that if they want to dig a pond, please make sure that you come into the office and get the proper forms to fill out then go before the Planning Commission for a Special Use Permit for a pond.
2. **NOECKER** stated that he did sign the application for the gentleman because he was going to Lansing to obtain his building permit to build his home. If the building construction picks up in Flushing Township, perhaps the township could bring the former building inspector, Jerry Fitch, on a 1099 basis.
3. **MORFORD** stated in answer to a question regarding Elections Inspectors during Public Comments, that Flushing Township has excellent election inspectors. Things will be changing due to the proposed electronic poll book in the works with the County.

Election Inspectors are not eliminated unless they inform the clerk they do not want to work; Flushing Township inspectors are being used not only in Flushing but other townships as well. The clerk likes to have different age brackets ranging from sixteen (16), middle age, and very experienced inspectors and per State Law, the inspectors have to be from both the Democrat and Republican parties.

The Election Inspectors are on a rotation basis so that everyone works at least one election. Since 2008, there have been four (4) elections per year. The Election Commission consisting of the Clerk and two (2) Trustees (Scott Minaudo and Scott Matzke) also check out the inspectors. The process for Elections starts three (3) months ahead of time.

4. **SUPERVISOR PECK'S COMMENTS:**
 - a. **Carpenter Road** (between McKinley and Cedardale) will be closed Monday for four (4) hours in order to work on a 48" culvert that went from an easy project to a very complicated job where there is a gas line on one side and a water line on the other side. The culvert has to be in the appropriate location in order to drain properly.

- b. There have been numerous complaints regarding unmowed lawns in Flushing Township. The past process was to not do anything unless someone came in and signed a complaint; the current process is to receive the complaint, turn it over to Flushing Township Police Chief Dale Stevenson who then has a Patrolman go out and check on the unmowed grass; a registered letter is then sent to the property owner who has ten (10) days to mow the lawn.
 - c. There have been complaints concerning junk cars; the matter is under investigation.
 - d. The Flushing Township Nature Park Rummage Sale had to be postponed from the first of June but will be held on **Wednesday, June 29 and Thursday, June 30**. The article will be posted in the "Rummage Sale" section of the Flint Journal.
 - e. A split rail fence is being constructed in the Nature Park by a local Boy Scout working on his Eagle Badge.
 - f. There will be a BS&A link on the web for obtaining taxes and assessing. Stay tune for further information.
5. **MORFORD** reminded the Board about the upcoming MTA (Michigan Townships Association) Genesee County Chapter Summer Family Picnic at the Flushing Township Nature Park on Thursday, June 16, 2011; there will be two (2) Boy Scouts receiving recognition from MTA President Jack Randolph, Senator John Gleason, Representative Rick Hammel; and Commissioner Archie Bailey.

THE NEXT REGULAR SCHEDULED BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING WILL BE THURSDAY, JULY 14, 2011 AT 7:00 P.M. AT THE FLUSHING TOWNSHIP HALL.

ADJOURNMENT: Due to no other business matters, **SUPERVISOR PECK** adjourned the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

JULIA A. MORFORD, Clerk

TERRY A. PECK, Supervisor

APPROVED DATE: _____